

Connecting Kaporin's condition number and the Bregman log determinant divergence

Andreas A. Bock & Martin S. Andersen

March 31, 2025

Abstract

This paper presents some theoretical results relating the Bregman log determinant matrix divergence to Kaporin's condition number. These can be viewed as nearness measures between a preconditioner and a given matrix, and we show under which conditions these two functions coincide. We also give examples of constraint sets over which it is equivalent to minimise these two objectives. We focus on preconditioners that are the sum of a positive definite and low-rank matrix, which were developed in a previous work. These were constructed as minimisers of the aforementioned divergence, and we show that they are only a constant scaling from also minimising Kaporin's condition number. We highlight connections to information geometry and comment on future directions.

1 Introduction

We study preconditioning of the system

$$Ax = b, \quad (1)$$

where A is symmetric positive definite. The purpose of preconditioning is to find a matrix (or operator) P with inverse $H = P^{-1}$ so that the matrix

$$M = H^{\frac{1}{2}} A H^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is better conditioned, which can accelerate the progress of iterative methods such as the conjugate gradient method (CG) [21]. Throughout, we will use the notation above. We also let I denote the identity matrix, sometimes with a subscript to denote its dimension. The *preconditioned* CG method (PCG) for approximating a solution to $Ax = b$ with a preconditioner P is outlined below:

$$r_0 = b - Ax_0 \quad (2a)$$

$$p_0 = Hr_0 \quad (2b)$$

for $k = 1, \dots$

$$\alpha_k = \frac{r_k^* H r_k}{p_k^* A p_k} \quad (2c)$$

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k p_k \quad (2d)$$

$$r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k A p_k \quad (2e)$$

$$\beta_k = \frac{r_{k+1}^* H r_{k+1}}{r_k^* H r_k} \quad (2f)$$

$$p_{k+1} = H r_{k+1} + \beta_k p_k \quad (2g)$$

Common termination criteria include an upper limit on the number of iterations, or the relative residual reaching some prescribed tolerance.

Recently, the authors studied preconditioners obtained as minimisers of the Bregman log determinant divergence [9, 8]:

$$\mathcal{D}_{LD}(A, P) = \text{tr}(AP^{-1}) - \log \det(AP^{-1}) - n,$$

where feasible preconditioners were selected as a sum of a positive definite matrix QQ^* and a low-rank term. We describe this in greater detail in section 4. The results in these papers showed that the divergence is capturing a sense of nearness to A that may be relevant when searching for a preconditioner P for the PCG algorithm, but without any firm theoretical basis connecting $\mathcal{D}_{LD}(A, P)$ with eq. (2). In this note, we establish a relationship between this particular divergence and superlinear convergence of PCG. We highlight the connection between $\mathcal{D}_{LD}(A, P)$ and Kaporin's condition number [25].

This manuscript is structured as follows. Section 2 begins by discussing different condition numbers and relevant literature. These are generally used to characterise the progress of eq. (2), which is covered in section 2.1. Next, section 3 contains our main theoretical contributions related to the condition numbers. As mentioned above, we establish a condition on the trace of a preconditioned matrix which implies that the Bregman log determinant divergence coincides with Kaporin's condition number. Sections 4 and 4.1 summarise the low-rank approximation developed in [8]. In section 4.2 we show how the preconditioners associated with these approximations can be modified to minimise Kaporin's condition number. Section 5 contains a general result on minimisation of the Bregman log determinant divergence and Kaporin's condition number. Section 6 concludes this paper.

2 Spectral and other condition numbers

Let $\sigma(A) = \{\sigma_1(A), \dots, \sigma_n(A)\}$ denote the similarly ordered singular values of an $n \times n$ matrix A . When A has real eigenvalues, we denote these by $\lambda(A) = \{\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A)\}$, with $\lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(A)$.

The condition number of a symmetric positive definite matrix M is defined as

$$\kappa_2(M) = \frac{\sigma_1(M)}{\sigma_n(M)} = \frac{\lambda_1(M)}{\lambda_n(M)}. \quad (3)$$

This quantity is sometimes used as a basis for discussion of what is a good preconditioner, when $M = P^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, i.e. a matrix A symmetrically preconditioned by P . An alternative quantity originated with Kaporin in a series of papers [27, 25, 30, 26], with similar approaches dating back to the 80s [13]. Kaporin introduced the following quantity as a function of a symmetric positive definite matrix M :

$$B(M) = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(M)}{\det(M)^{\frac{1}{n}}} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(M)}{(\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(M))^{\frac{1}{n}}}, \quad (4)$$

and is the arithmetic mean of the eigenvalues of M divided by the geometric mean of the eigenvalues. See [28] for the extension to asymmetric matrices. We shall refer to eq. (4) as *Kaporin's function*. It decreases when eigenvalues of M are clustered and depends only modestly on the smallest eigenvalue if it is well-isolated. The latter is a property not shared by $\kappa_2(M)$ in eq. (3). Kaporin's functional is also closely related to factored sparse approximate inverses (FSAI) [22, 23, 33, 34, 32, 42]. Equation (4) leads to Kaporin's condition number:

$$K(M) = B(M)^n, \quad (5)$$

which is quasi-convex in M and satisfies the following properties [30], [3, Theorem 13.5]:

$$K(M) \geq 1, \quad (6a)$$

$$K(cM) = K(M), \quad \forall c > 0, \quad (6b)$$

$$K(X^{-1}MX) = K(M), \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n, \quad (6c)$$

$$B(M) \leq \kappa_2(M) \leq (\kappa_2(M)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \kappa_2(M)^{-\frac{1}{2}})^2 \leq 4K(M). \quad (6d)$$

Here, \mathbb{H}_{++}^n is the positive definite cone. Equation (6a) follows from the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, with equality if and only if all the eigenvalues of M are equal. A similar quantity to $K(M)$ has been studied in the optimisation literature [11, 24]. While $\kappa_2(M) = \kappa_2(M^{-1})$, in general,

$$K(M) \neq K(M^{-1}).$$

We also mention that when $n = 2$, then $B(M) = \cos \phi(M)^{-1}$, where $\cos \phi(M)$ is the first antieigenvalue of M in the sense of Gustafson [17, 16]. See [18] for a connection between operator trigonometry and

preconditioning.

Finally, we introduce the Bregman log determinant divergence between two matrices $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$, $P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ whose eigendecompositions are given by $A = U\Xi U^*$ and $P = V\Omega V^*$ [35]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) &= \text{tr}(AP^{-1}) - \log \det(AP^{-1}) - n \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbf{u}_i^* \mathbf{v}_j)^2 \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\omega_j} - \ln \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\omega_j} \right) - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We shall also refer to this as the *Bregman divergence* for brevity, since eq. (7) is the only type of Bregman divergence we consider in this paper. See [1] for other divergences. While this quantity is not a condition number, since $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)$ is not always greater than 1, we shall use it to express several results related to the convergence rate of PCG.

2.1 Some convergence results

In this section, we present several well-known results related to PCG in terms of the quantities introduced above. The literature on convergence rates of PCG is vast, so we cover only the essentials. Much material here is covered, or expanded upon in great detail, in [3, 15, 37].

Recall the symmetrically preconditioned matrix is denoted

$$M = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} A P^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The arguably most well-known convergence result is in terms of eq. (3):

$$\frac{\|x - x_k\|_A}{\|x - x_0\|_A} \leq \frac{2}{C^k + C^{-k}} \leq 2C^k, \quad (8)$$

where

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_2(M)} - 1}{\sqrt{\kappa_2(M)} + 1}.$$

Equation (8) is, in general, a pessimistic estimate. The associated estimate of PCG iterations $i_{\ell^2}(\epsilon)$ needed for a ϵ -reduction in $\|x - x_0\|_A$, i.e.,

$$\|x - x_{i_{\ell^2}(\epsilon)}\|_A \leq \epsilon \|x - x_0\|_A,$$

where x_0 is an initial guess, is therefore bounded from above by [5, Equation 8]:

$$i_{\ell^2}(\epsilon) = \lceil \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\kappa_2(M)} \ln \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon} \right) \rceil.$$

It is well-known that CG can exhibit superlinear convergence, and several successful attempts, both theoretical and qualitative, at describing this phenomenon have been made since the 50s [20, 41, 7]. A lesser-known bound can also be expressed in terms of $K(M)$ [30, Theorem 3.1]:

$$\|r_k\|_{P^{-1}} \leq (K(M)^{1/k} - 1)^{k/2} \|r_0\|_{P^{-1}}. \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) is only useful if

$$\sqrt[k]{K(M)} = B(M) < 2, \quad (10)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\log_2 K(M) < n.$$

It is shown in [30, Theorem 3.2] that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive β (subject to some mild conditions), there exists a matrix P^{-1} with $B(P^{-\frac{1}{2}} A P^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \beta$ and an initial residual r_0 such that

$$\|r_k\|_{P^{-1}} = (\beta^{n/k} - 1)^{k/2} \|r_0\|_{P^{-1}}. \quad (11)$$

It is, in this sense, an *unimprovable* estimate. The following upper bound on the number of iterations required for an ϵ -reduction in the residual is given in [30, Theorem 4.1] and is valid for any $\sigma \geq 2$:

$$i_K(\epsilon) = \lceil \frac{\sigma \ln(K(M)) + 2 \ln(\epsilon^{-1})}{\sigma \ln(\sigma) - (\sigma - 1) \ln(\sigma - 1)} \rceil. \quad (12)$$

For $\sigma = 2$ this simplifies to

$$i_K(\epsilon) \leq \lceil n \log_2(B(M)) + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) \rceil,$$

which is reportedly quite accurate when $n \log_2(B(M)) \gg \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})$, although it is reported that the choice

$$\sigma = 2 + \frac{\log(\epsilon^{-1})}{\ln(K(M))}$$

provides a more precise approximation. As pointed out in [6], when $B(M) \geq 1 + c$, for some $c > 0$, then

$$i_K(\epsilon) \leq nc + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}),$$

which, in terms of $B(M)$, is a pessimistic a priori estimate on $i_K(\epsilon)$. In [4], several sublinear and superlinear convergence results are reported for a variety of approaches and condition numbers, one of which is

$$\|x_k - x\|_A \leq \left(\frac{3 \ln(K(M))}{k} \right)^{k/2} \|x - x_0\|_A, \quad (13)$$

which is asymptotically worse than the bound in eq. (11). See [5] for more results on iteration and a posteriori error norm estimates, and [2] for the study of the rate of convergence for PCG based on different condition numbers.

3 Kaporin's condition number and the log determinant divergence

We now establish some relations between Kaporin's condition number eq. (5) to the Bregman log determinant divergence eq. (7).

Theorem 1.

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) \geq \ln K(AP^{-1}), \quad \forall A, P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n. \quad (14)$$

In addition, when

$$\text{tr}(AP^{-1}) = n \quad (15)$$

we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) = \ln K(P^{-1}A). \quad (16)$$

Proof. The inequality Equation (14) follows since

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - 1 \geq \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(P^{-1}A) \right).$$

For equality in Equation (14), we see using eq. (15), and $M = P^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(K(M)) &= n \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(M) \right) - n \frac{1}{n} \ln(\det(M)) \\ &= n \ln \left(\frac{1}{n} n \right) - \ln(\det(M)) \\ &= -\ln(\det(M)) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P). \end{aligned}$$

□

The Jacobi scaling of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ by the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(A)$, $\text{diag}(A)_{ii} = A_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is given by

$$\text{diag}(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A \text{diag}(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This scaling is often used to reduce the condition number of a matrix [15]. Note that

$$\text{tr} \left(\text{diag}(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A \text{diag}(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) = n.$$

The importance of this scaling in constructing FSAI preconditioners has also been highlighted [42, Section 2]. One may therefore view the Bregman divergence as penalising the deviation from the log Kaporin condition number via the term $\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - n$.

We can also quantify how close the divergence $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)$ is to $\ln(K(P^{-1}A))$, as the following corollary shows.

Corollary 1. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$, $P = QQ^* \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ so

$$A = Q(I + \tilde{E})Q^*, \quad (17a)$$

$$\tilde{E} = Q^{-1}(A - P)Q^{-*}. \quad (17b)$$

Then

$$\ln(K(P^{-1}A)) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) + O(\text{tr}(\tilde{E})^2).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) &= \frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E}) - \ln(1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E}))\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ln(1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E})) \\ &\approx \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n}\ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= \ln\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n 1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n}\ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= \ln\left(\frac{1}{n}\text{tr}(I + \tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n}\ln \det(I + \tilde{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\ln(K(M)) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) + O(n^{-1}\text{tr}(\tilde{E})^2).$$

□

The approximation used in the proof is of course poor when $\text{tr}(\tilde{E}) \gg 0$.

Next, we express certain convergence bounds in terms of the Bregman log determinant divergence using theorem 1.

3.1 The log determinant divergence and convergence of PCG

In light of theorem 1, we can state some of the convergence results in section 2.1 in terms of the divergence.

Corollary 2. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and $\beta > 1$, there exists a preconditioner $P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(P^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP^{-\frac{1}{2}}) &= n, \\ \beta &= e^{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)}{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and an initial residual r_0 such that the k^{th} residual, r_k , satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_k\|_{P^{-1}} &= (\beta^{n/k} - 1)^{k/2} \|r_0\|_{P^{-1}} \\ &= (e^{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)}{k}} - 1)^{k/2} \|r_0\|_{P^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using eq. (18) we have

$$K(P^{-1}A)^{1/k} = (e^{\ln K(P^{-1}A)})^{1/k} = (e^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)})^{1/k} = e^{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)}{k}}.$$

The result follows from eq. (6b) and [30, Theorem 3.2].

□

By eq. (10), corollary 2 is nontrivial when

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) < \ln(2)n.$$

Corollary 2 leads to the following two results, where we note that the trace condition eq. (18) is not necessary.

Corollary 3. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ and $P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ be a preconditioner. The k^{th} residual satisfies

$$\|r_k\|_{P^{-1}} \leq \left(e^{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A,P)}{k}} - 1 \right)^{k/2} \|r_0\|_{P^{-1}}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. The result follows from theorem 1 and [30, Theorem 3.1]. \square

Corollary 4. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ and $P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ be a preconditioner. For k even such that

$$3\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A,P) \leq k < n$$

we have

$$\|x_k - x\|_A \leq \left(\frac{3\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A,P)}{k} \right)^{k/2} \|x_0 - x\|_A. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Equation (20) follows from theorem 1 and [4, Theorem 4.3]. \square

We conclude this section with some bounds on the number of iterations required to achieve an ϵ -reduction in the initial residual of PCG.

Theorem 2. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ and $P \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ be a preconditioner. When $\text{tr}(P^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = n$, the number of iterations $i_K(\epsilon)$ needed for an ϵ -reduction in the initial $\|r_0\|_{P^{-1}}$ satisfies

$$i_K(\epsilon) \leq \lceil \ln(2)^{-1} (\ln(\epsilon^{-1}) + D(A,P)) \rceil.$$

Proof. Using eq. (12) for $\sigma = 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_K(\epsilon) &\leq \lceil n \log_2(B(P^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP^{-\frac{1}{2}})) + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) \rceil \\ &= \lceil \log_2(K(P^{-1}A)) + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) \rceil \\ &= \lceil \log_2\left(\frac{1}{\det(P^{-1}A)}\right) + \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}) \rceil \\ &= \left\lceil \frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\det(P^{-1}A)}\right)}{\ln(2)} + \frac{\ln(\epsilon^{-1})}{\ln(2)} \right\rceil \\ &= \lceil \ln(2)^{-1} (\ln(\epsilon^{-1}) - \ln(\det(P^{-1}A))) \rceil \\ &= \lceil \ln(2)^{-1} (\ln(\epsilon^{-1}) + D(A,P)) \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

\square

4 Preconditioners based on low-rank approximations

Kaporin also constructs preconditioners using low-rank matrices [26, 27, 29]. In [26], a sparse lower triangular matrix variable G is introduced, and the expression

$$B(GAG^\top)$$

is minimised subject to some structural constraints on G . This is referred to as the first stage. Second, they construct a matrix

$$F = I + CSC^\top \quad (21)$$

such that $B(FGAG^\top)$ is minimised. Here, some structure is imposed on $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ and the matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ that minimises $B(FGAG^\top)$ has the following form:

$$S = \pi_0 C^\top GAG^\top C - (C^\top C)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r},$$

where

$$\pi_0 = \frac{n - \text{tr}((C^\top C)^{-1}C^\top GAG^\top C)}{n - r}.$$

[6] adopts a similar two-stage approach. The preconditioner described above can be written as

$$G^{-\top} F^{-1} G^{-1} = G^{-\top} (I + CSC^\top)^{-1} G^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

If we let $G^{-\top}G^{-1} \approx A$ be an incomplete Cholesky factorisation of A , and recall that for some $n \times n$ matrix W with $\text{rank } W = r$,

$$F^{-1} = (I + CSC^{\top})^{-1} = I + W,$$

then eq. (22) can be written as

$$Q(I + W)Q^{\top}, \quad \text{rank } W = r.$$

This is similar to the preconditioners sought in [9, 8]. In eq. (21) above, the low-rank term has a specific structure given by the choice of C , which is more restrictive than the general low-rank constraint considered in the previous references. In this report, we focus preconditioners for which $K(M)$ or $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)$ is minimised; however, other approaches include κ_2 -based minimisation, see e.g. [39, 14] and the references therein.

4.1 Bregman log determinant divergence-based preconditioners

In this section, we describe the preconditioners introduced in [9, 8], which combine approximate factorisations with low-rank approximations sought as minimisers of a Bregman divergence. We introduce the approach taken in these references to generalise the resulting preconditioners in section 4.2, and establish the connection with Kaporin's condition number.

In [9, 8], the authors assume that an approximate factorisation QQ^* of the target matrix $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ is assumed available (e.g. incomplete Cholesky). Writing A in terms of Q we obtain

$$A = Q(I + \tilde{E})Q^*, \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{E} = Q^{-1}AQ^{-*} - I$. A low-rank term was introduced to produce the preconditioner

$$P = Q(I + VDV^*)Q^*, \quad (24)$$

where $V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ are chosen such that

$$VDV^* \approx \tilde{E}.$$

The approximation above was sought in the sense of the Bregman log determinant divergence introduced in eq. (7). This divergence is invariant to congruence transformations. Indeed, using eqs. (23) and (24) we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(I + \tilde{E}, I + VDV^*).$$

Then, the matrices $V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ are found as minimisers of

$$\min_{V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(I + \tilde{E}, I + VDV^*) \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{s. t. } I + VDV^* \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n \quad (25b)$$

$$\text{rank } D \leq r. \quad (25c)$$

In [9], \tilde{E} was assumed to be positive semidefinite, in which case V and D were found as the constituents of a truncated singular value decomposition (TSVD) of \tilde{E} . [8] generalised the approach and allowed \tilde{E} to be indefinite, and it was shown that a low-rank matrix VDV^* that minimises eq. (25a) can differ from a TSVD of \tilde{E} . To see this, let

$$\tilde{E} = U\Theta U^* \quad (26)$$

be an eigendecomposition of \tilde{E} , and let $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a diagonal matrix with positive entries. The divergence $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(I + U\Theta U^*, I + U\Pi U^*)$ takes the form of the following simple expression (cf. eq. (7)):

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(I + U\Theta U^*, I + U\Pi U^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1 + \theta_i}{1 + \pi_i} - \log \left(\frac{1 + \theta_i}{1 + \pi_i} \right) - 1 \right) \quad (27)$$

since eigenspaces of the inputs are aligned. If $\pi_i = \theta_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, the i^{th} summand of eq. (27) vanishes. If we consider eq. (27) as a function of the diagonal matrix Π with the constraint $\text{rank } \Pi \leq r$, a minimiser will satisfy $\pi_i = \theta_i$ for some indices i , and $\pi_i = 0$ otherwise (by the rank constraint). The $n - r$ summands of eq. (27) that do not vanish are therefore of the form

$$\theta_i - \log(1 + \theta_i).$$

By seeking a low-rank approximation of \tilde{E} in the sense of eq. (25), it is therefore of interest to identify the eigenvalues θ_i that take on the largest value under the image of the map

$$\gamma(\lambda) = \lambda - \log(1 + \lambda). \quad (28)$$

γ is different from the map $\lambda \mapsto |\lambda|$, which can lead to VDV^* being different from a TSVD of \tilde{E} . The map γ induces an order on the eigenvalues of a matrix A , which is captured by the following definition.

Definition 1 (Bregman log determinant truncation [8]). *Let $I + X \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ and let*

$$X = W\Lambda W^*$$

be an eigendecomposition where the diagonal elements of Λ are sorted in algebraically non-increasing order and W is orthonormal. We introduce a permutation matrix \mathcal{P} and define Z and \mathfrak{B} via

$$X = W\mathcal{P}^\top \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{P}W^* = Z\mathfrak{B}Z^*,$$

where

$$\mathfrak{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{b}_1(X) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathfrak{b}_n(X) \end{bmatrix},$$

is the diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues X given by the order \succeq :

$$\mathfrak{b}_i(A) \succeq \mathfrak{b}_j(A) \quad \text{if} \quad \gamma(\mathfrak{b}_i(A)) \geq \gamma(\mathfrak{b}_j(A)).$$

Here, γ is the function given in eq. (28). We define a BLD truncation of X to order r by

$$\langle\langle X \rangle\rangle_r = [z_1 | \cdots | z_r] \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{b}_1(X) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathfrak{b}_r(X) \end{bmatrix} [z_1 | \cdots | z_r]^*. \quad (29)$$

In other words, the BLD truncation is found by selecting the rows and columns of an eigendecomposition of a matrix corresponding to the r largest values of the eigenvalues under the map γ .

Definition 1 leads to the following preconditioner.

Definition 2 (Bregman log determinant precondition [8]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$, $QQ^* \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ and $1 \leq r < n$, and assume \tilde{E} has rank greater than r . We call*

$$P = Q(I + \langle\langle \tilde{E} \rangle\rangle_r)Q^*. \quad (30)$$

a Bregman log determinant preconditioner.

4.2 Minimisation of the Bregman divergence and Kaporin's condition number

In this section, we modify eq. (30) by permitting an arbitrary constant scaling of the preconditioner:

$$P_\alpha = Q(\alpha(I - VV^*) + V(I_r + D)V^*)Q^*. \quad (31)$$

When $\alpha = 1$, we recover eq. (30). We proceed to show that a specific choice of α leads to eq. (31) minimising Kaporin's condition number, as well as the Bregman divergence. Consider the following expression

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(I + \tilde{E}, \alpha(I - VV^*) + V(I_r + D)V^*). \quad (32)$$

Theorem 3 below describes a minimiser of eq. (32) as a function of α , letting V and D be fixed:

Theorem 3. *Suppose $V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ have been chosen according to a Bregman truncation i.e.*

$$\langle\langle \tilde{E} \rangle\rangle_r = VDV^*,$$

and set

$$P = Q(I + \langle\langle \tilde{E} \rangle\rangle_r)Q^*.$$

Then,

$$\alpha^* = \frac{\text{tr}((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))}{n - r} = \frac{\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - r}{n - r} = \frac{\sum_{i=r+1}^n 1 + \mathbf{b}_i(\tilde{E})}{n - r} \quad (33)$$

is the unique minimiser of eq. (32) as a function of α . Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha) = \ln K(P_\alpha^{-1}A) = -\ln \det(P_\alpha^{-1}A) = -\ln \det(P^{-1}A) + (n - r) \ln(\alpha). \quad (34)$$

Proof. Let $\Delta_\alpha = \alpha(I - VV^*) + V(I_r + D)V^*$. Then

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha) = -\text{tr}(\Delta_\alpha^{-1}(I + \tilde{E})\Delta_\alpha^{-1} \frac{d\Delta_\alpha}{d\alpha}) + \frac{d}{d\alpha} \ln \det \Delta_\alpha.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Delta_\alpha}{d\alpha} &= I - VV^*, \\ -\text{tr}(\Delta_\alpha^{-1}(I + \tilde{E})\Delta_\alpha^{-1} \frac{d\Delta_\alpha}{d\alpha}) &= -\alpha^{-2} \text{tr}((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} \ln \det \Delta_\alpha = \alpha^{-1} \text{tr}(I - VV^*)$$

yields the equation

$$-\alpha^{-2} \text{tr}((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*)) + \alpha^{-1} \text{tr}(I - VV^*) = 0.$$

Equation (33) follows as a consequence. Uniqueness follows since $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha)$ is convex in $\beta = \alpha^{-1}$.

By direct computation,

$$(I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*) = \text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - r.$$

Finally, eq. (34) follows since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha) &= \frac{\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - r}{\frac{\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) - r}{n - r}} - \ln \det(P_\alpha^{-1}A) - (n - r) \\ &= -\ln \det(P_\alpha^{-1}A). \end{aligned}$$

□

α in eq. (31) is very similar to the σ variable in [6, Section 3.3], which was used to move the set of smallest eigenvalues of the preconditioned matrix closer to the larger eigenvalues.

While the choice eq. (33) minimises Kaporin's condition number and Bregman divergence as a function of α , the following theorem reveals that many different values of α minimise the condition number i.e. the map

$$\alpha \mapsto \kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Theorem 4. *Suppose V and D have been chosen according to a Bregman truncation (cf. definition 2). Then any*

$$\alpha \in [\mathbf{b}_{r+1}(A), \mathbf{b}_n(A)] \quad (35)$$

will be a minimiser of

$$\alpha \mapsto \kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Proof. We have

$$\kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \frac{\max\left(1, \frac{\lambda_1((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))}{\alpha}\right)}{\min\left(1, \frac{\lambda_n((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))}{\alpha}\right)} \geq \frac{\lambda_1((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))}{\lambda_n((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))} =: \kappa_2^*(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (36)$$

If $\alpha > \lambda_1((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))$,

$$\kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_n((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))} > \kappa_2^*(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Conversely, if $\alpha < \lambda_n((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))$,

$$\kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \frac{\lambda_1((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))}{\alpha} > \kappa_2^*(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

The result follows by definition 1, namely

$$[\mathbf{b}_{r+1}(A), \mathbf{b}_n(A)] = [\lambda_1((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*)), \lambda_n((I + \tilde{E})(I - VV^*))]$$

□

We conclude this section with a numerical illustration of the effect of α on the condition numbers seen above. $A \in \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ is the matrix 494.bus from the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [31] of order $n = 494$ and Q given by a zero fill incomplete Cholesky decomposition of A . P_α is defined in eq. (31), with $r = 49$. In fig. 1, $\kappa_2^*(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha)$, $\ln(K(P_\alpha^{-1}A))$ are plotted as a function of α . The condition number is flat on the interval in eq. (35), in agreement with theorem 4. $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha)$ and $\ln(K(P_\alpha^{-1}A))$ have a minimum at α^* , in agreement with theorem 3. Indeed, as stated in eq. (33), the value of α that minimises Kaporin's condition number is the *average* of the remaining eigenvalues not selected by the Bregman truncation.




Figure 1: Numerical illustration of how α influences the values $\kappa_2(P_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}AP_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_\alpha)$, $\ln(K(P_\alpha^{-1}A))$.

5 A general result on trace scaling

We conclude with a result similar to, but more general than theorem 3. We recall that PCG converges in a single iteration when the preconditioned matrix is some scalar multiple of the identity, say,

$$P^{-1}A = cI,$$

for $c > 0$. This motivates the study of preconditioners scaled by some constant. In particular, we can choose the constant c such that

$$\text{tr}((cP)^{-1}A) = c^{-1} \text{tr}(P^{-1}A) = n \Leftrightarrow c = \frac{\text{tr}(P^{-1}A)}{n},$$

from which we deduce

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, cP) = \ln K((cP)^{-1}A) \tag{37}$$

as shown in theorem 1.

This leads to the following observation, namely that minimisation of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P)$ is equivalent to minimisation of $K(P^{-1}A)$ when considering preconditioners for which the divergence cannot be reduced by scaling P by a positive constant.

Proposition 1. Let $A \in \mathbb{H}_{+++}^n$ and $C \subseteq \mathbb{H}_{+++}^n$, and consider the two following optimisation problems:

$$S_1 = \arg \min_{P \in C} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P). \quad (38)$$

$$S_2 = \arg \min_{P \in C} \ln K(P^{-1}A). \quad (39)$$

If C is a cone, then the following statements hold.

- (i) $\min_{P \in C} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) = \min_{P \in C} \ln K(P^{-1}A)$,
- (ii) $S_1 \subset S_2$,
- (iii) $\text{cone}(S_1) = S_2$, where $\text{cone}(S_1)$ denotes the conic hull of S_1 .

Proof. Suppose P^* is a minimiser of eq. (39). Since Kaporin's condition number is invariant under any positive scaling of the preconditioner, we can choose P^* such that $\text{tr}((P^*)^{-1}A) = n$. By theorem 1, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P^*) = \ln K((P^*)^{-1}A)$ which proves (i). To see (ii), note that any minimiser P of eq. (38) must satisfy $\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) = n$. Indeed, suppose P is a minimiser of eq. (38) but $\text{tr}(P^{-1}A) \neq n$. Define

$$P_c = cP, \quad P \in S_1,$$

where $c = \frac{\text{tr}(P^{-1}A)}{n}$ such that $\text{tr}(P_c^{-1}A) = n$. Then,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) > \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_c)$$

since

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) - \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P_c) = n(c - 1 - \ln(c)) > 0$$

using $x \geq 1 + \ln x$, $x > 0$. As a result, $c = 1$ if $P \in S_1$, since C is a cone. Further, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) = \ln K(P^{-1}A)$. S_2 contains all positive scalings of P^* , which includes $P \in S_1$. Finally, (iii) holds by the scaling invariance of Kaporin's condition number. \square

We also highlight that $K(P_c^{-1}A) = K(P_{\alpha^*}^{-1}A)$ for any $c > 0$. In other words, $\ln K(P_c^{-1}A)$ is a flat line on fig. 1 whereas $\ln K(P_{\alpha}^{-1}A)$ has curvature away from α (recall P_{α} is given in eq. (31)). This is of course obvious from eq. (6b), but there are preconditioners prevalent in the literature, such as the randomised Nyström preconditioner [12], where a scaling similar to that controlled by α is used to control the condition number of the preconditioned matrix. Partial scaling of the preconditioner influences the iterates of PCG (as opposed to scaling the entire preconditioner, e.g. $P \mapsto cP$, $c > 0$), so it would be interesting and useful to analyse the consequence of a given choice beyond controlling the condition number.

6 Summary and future directions

We explored a lesser-known condition number, the Kaporin condition number, and established its connection with the Bregman log determinant divergence. The link between Kaporin's condition number and this divergence lies in the trace scaling of the preconditioned matrix M ensuring $\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(M) = 1$. This led to the error bounds presented in section 3. In section 4 we explore this connection in the context of the truncation described in [8]. Section 4.2 described this scaling via α (by scaling the orthogonal complement of the truncation) or c (the entire preconditioner). We also highlight a relationship with the condition number. Section 5 contained a result concerning the equivalence of using the divergence and logarithm of the Kaporin condition number as an objective function.

We comment on some possible future directions. An obvious extension would be to compute approximate factor Q of a matrix A using an FSAI approach [23, 40], and then compensate using a low-rank term for the error $E = A - QQ^{\top}$ using the low-rank truncation provided in [8]. This could lead to a more principled approach than in [8], where Q is obtained as an incomplete Cholesky factor of A .

Randomised linear algebra is a family of techniques in linear algebra that leverages randomness to approximate large-scale problems that may otherwise be computationally infeasible [19, 36]. Such methods could prove to be useful in estimating a randomised version of the log determinant divergence,

and therefore providing operational approximate convergence bounds.

The recent paper by Carson et al. [10] contains a wealth of insights on the behaviour of CG. The authors point out that not only is clustering of the eigenvalues of a matrix important for CG, but so is their position. As described in [10, Section 2.2], the position of the clusters can have an enormous effect on the residual error in energy norm. The scaling of the preconditioned matrix via α given in section 4.2 can be thought of as controlling the position of the "unpreconditioned" part of the matrix A , and it would be interesting to explore theoretically and quantitatively the impact of α .

The Bregman log determinant divergence has been studied in detail in the field of information geometry [1]. When N is a smooth submanifold of a manifold M , the point dual geodesic projection P_N^* of P onto N is given by:

$$P_N^* = \arg \min_{R \in N} \mathcal{D}(P, R),$$

In certain cases, uniqueness of such projection holds, see [1] and [38, Section 3.7] for more details. Candidate preconditioners described by some adequate submanifold $N \subset \mathbb{H}_{++}^n$ could therefore be interesting, and insights or algorithms from information geometry may be relevant to preconditioning or other problems in numerical linear algebra.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Novo Nordisk Foundation under grant number NNF20OC0061894.

A Proof of corollary 1

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) &= \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E}) - \ln(1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E})) \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E}) \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln(1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E})) \\ &\approx \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n} \ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= \ln\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + \lambda_i(\tilde{E}))\right) - \frac{1}{n} \ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= \ln\left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(I + \tilde{E})\right) - \frac{1}{n} \ln \det(I + \tilde{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) &\approx n \ln\left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(I + \tilde{E})\right) - \ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= n \ln\left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(I + \tilde{E})\right) - \ln \det(I + \tilde{E}) \\ &= \ln(K(M)^n), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\ln(K(M)^n) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{LD}}(A, P) + O(n^2 \text{tr}(\tilde{E})).$$

□

References

- [1] S.-I. AMARI, *Information geometry and its applications*, vol. 194, Springer, 2016.

- [2] A. AXELSSON, *Condition numbers for the study of the rate of convergence of the conjugate gradient method*, (1995).
- [3] O. AXELSSON, *Iterative solution methods*, Cambridge university press, 1996.
- [4] O. AXELSSON AND I. KAPORIN, *On the sublinear and superlinear rate of convergence of conjugate gradient methods*, *Numerical Algorithms*, 25 (2000), pp. 1–22.
- [5] ———, *Error norm estimation and stopping criteria in preconditioned conjugate gradient iterations*, *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 8 (2001), pp. 265–286.
- [6] ———, *Optimizing two-level preconditionings for the conjugate gradient method*, in *Large-Scale Scientific Computing: Third International Conference, LSSC 2001 Sozopol, Bulgaria, June 6–10, 2001 Revised Papers 3*, Springer, 2001, pp. 3–21.
- [7] B. BECKERMANN AND A. B. KUIJLAARS, *Superlinear convergence of conjugate gradients*, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 39 (2001), pp. 300–329.
- [8] A. A. BOCK AND M. S. ANDERSEN, *A new matrix truncation method for improving approximate factorisation preconditioners*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06417, (2023).
- [9] ———, *Preconditioner design via Bregman divergences*, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 45 (2024), pp. 1148–1182.
- [10] E. CARSON, J. LIESEN, AND Z. STRAKOŠ, *Towards understanding CG and GMRES through examples*, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, (2024).
- [11] J. E. DENNIS, JR AND H. WOLKOWICZ, *Sizing and least-change secant methods*, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 30 (1993), pp. 1291–1314.
- [12] Z. FRANGELLA, J. A. TROPP, AND M. UDELL, *Randomized Nyström preconditioning*, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 44 (2023), pp. 718–752.
- [13] V. GADJOKOV, *Quasi-optimum scaling of symmetric positive-definite matrices*, *Computer physics communications*, 36 (1985), pp. 19–24.
- [14] W. GAO, Z. QU, M. UDELL, AND Y. YE, *Scalable approximate optimal diagonal preconditioning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15594, (2023).
- [15] A. GREENBAUM, *Iterative methods for solving linear systems*, SIAM, 1997.
- [16] K. GUSTAFSON, *A computational trigonometry, and related contributions by Russians Kantorovich, Krein, Kaporin*.
- [17] K. GUSTAFSON, *Operator trigonometry of iterative methods*, *Numerical linear algebra with applications*, 4 (1997), pp. 333–347.
- [18] K. GUSTAFSON, *Operator trigonometry of preconditioning, domain decomposition, sparse approximate inverses, successive overrelaxation, minimum residual schemes*, *Numerical linear algebra with applications*, 10 (2003), pp. 291–315.
- [19] N. HALKO, P.-G. MARTINSSON, AND J. A. TROPP, *Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions*, *SIAM review*, 53 (2011), pp. 217–288.
- [20] R. M. HAYES, *Iterative methods of solving linear problems on Hilbert space*, in *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 58, AMER MATHEMATICAL SOC 201 CHARLES ST, PROVIDENCE, RI 02940-2213, 1952, pp. 653–653.
- [21] M. R. HESTENES, E. STIEFEL, ET AL., *Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems*, vol. 49, NBS Washington, DC, 1952.
- [22] T. HUCKLE, *Factorized sparse approximate inverses for preconditioning*, *The Journal of Supercomputing*, 25 (2003), pp. 109–117.

- [23] C. JANNA, M. FERRONATO, F. SARTORETTO, AND G. GAMBOLATI, *Fsaipack: A software package for high-performance factored sparse approximate inverse preconditioning*, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS), 41 (2015), pp. 1–26.
- [24] W. L. JUNG, D. TORREGROSA-BELÉN, AND H. WOLKOWICZ, *The ω -condition number: applications to preconditioning and low rank generalized Jacobian updating*, Computational Optimization and Applications, (2025), pp. 1–48.
- [25] I. KAPORIN, *An alternative approach to estimating the convergence rate of the CG method*, Numerical Methods and Software, Yu. A. Kuznetsov, ed., Dept. of Numerical Mathematics, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, (1990), pp. 55–72.
- [26] ———, *Optimization of conjugate gradient algorithms*, Computational Mathematics and Modeling, 5 (1994), pp. 139–147.
- [27] I. E. KAPORIN, *Preconditioning of the method of conjugate gradients for solving discrete analogues of differential problems*, Differentsial’nye Uravneniya, 26 (1990), pp. 1225–1236.
- [28] I. E. KAPORIN, *Explicitly preconditioned conjugate gradient method for the solution of unsymmetric linear systems*, International journal of computer mathematics, 44 (1992), pp. 169–187.
- [29] I. E. KAPORIN, *Two-level explicit preconditionings for the conjugate gradient method*, Differentsial’nye Uravneniya, 28 (1992), pp. 329–339.
- [30] I. E. KAPORIN, *New convergence results and preconditioning strategies for the conjugate gradient method*, Numerical linear algebra with applications, 1 (1994), pp. 179–210.
- [31] S. P. KOLODZIEJ, M. AZNAVEH, M. BULLOCK, J. DAVID, T. A. DAVIS, M. HENDERSON, Y. HU, AND R. SANDSTROM, *The suitesparse matrix collection website interface*, Journal of Open Source Software, 4 (2019), p. 1244.
- [32] L. Y. KOLOTILINA, A. A. NIKISHIN, AND A. Y. YEREMIN, *Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditionings. IV: Simple approaches to rising efficiency*, Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications, 6 (1999), pp. 515–531.
- [33] L. Y. KOLOTILINA AND A. Y. YEREMIN, *Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditionings I. Theory*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 14 (1993), pp. 45–58.
- [34] ———, *Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditioning II: Solution of 3D FE systems on massively parallel computers*, International Journal of High Speed Computing, 7 (1995), pp. 191–215.
- [35] B. KULIS, M. A. SUSTIK, AND I. S. DHILLON, *Low-rank kernel learning with Bregman matrix divergences.*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 10 (2009).
- [36] P.-G. MARTINSSON AND J. A. TROPP, *Randomized numerical linear algebra: Foundations and algorithms*, Acta Numerica, 29 (2020), pp. 403–572.
- [37] O. NEVANLINNA, *Convergence of iterations for linear equations*, Birkhäuser, 2012.
- [38] F. NIELSEN, *An elementary introduction to information geometry*, Entropy, 22 (2020), p. 1100.
- [39] Z. QU, W. GAO, O. HINDER, Y. YE, AND Z. ZHOU, *Optimal diagonal preconditioning*, Operations Research, (2024).
- [40] F. SCHÄFER, M. KATZFUSS, AND H. OWHADI, *Sparse Cholesky factorization by Kullback–Leibler minimization*, SIAM Journal on scientific computing, 43 (2021), pp. A2019–A2046.
- [41] A. VAN DER SLUIS AND H. A. VAN DER VORST, *The rate of convergence of conjugate gradients*, Numerische Mathematik, 48 (1986), pp. 543–560.
- [42] A. Y. YEREMIN, L. Y. KOLOTILINA, AND A. NIKISHIN, *Factorized sparse approximate inverse preconditionings. III. iterative construction of preconditioners*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 101 (2000), pp. 3237–3254.