

# A tangential low-rank ADI method for solving indefinite Lyapunov equations

Rudi Smith\*      Steffen W. R. Werner<sup>†</sup>

*\*Department of Mathematics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA.*

Email: [smithrgh@vt.edu](mailto:smithrgh@vt.edu), ORCID: [0000-0002-6592-2482](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6592-2482)

*<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, Division of Computational Modeling and Data Analytics, and National Security Institute, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA.*

Email: [steffen.werner@vt.edu](mailto:steffen.werner@vt.edu), ORCID: [0000-0003-1667-4862](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1667-4862)

**Abstract:** Continuous-time algebraic Lyapunov equations have become an essential tool in various applications. In the case of large-scale sparse coefficient matrices and indefinite constant terms, indefinite low-rank factorizations have successfully been used to allow methods like the alternating direction implicit (ADI) iteration to efficiently compute accurate approximations to the solution of the Lyapunov equation. However, classical block-type approaches quickly increase in computational costs when the rank of the constant term grows. In this paper, we propose a novel tangential reformulation of the ADI iteration that allows for the efficient construction of low-rank approximations to the solution of Lyapunov equations with indefinite right-hand sides even in the case of constant terms with higher ranks. We provide adaptive methods for the selection of the corresponding ADI parameters, namely shifts and tangential directions, which allow for the automatic application of the method to any relevant problem setting. The effectiveness of the developed algorithms is illustrated by several numerical examples.

**Keywords:** Lyapunov equation, ADI method, indefinite factorization, low-rank approximation, tangential compression

**Mathematics subject classification:** 15A24, 65F45, 65F55, 65H10, 93A15

**Novelty statement:** We propose a novel tangential ADI method for the solution of Lyapunov equations with indefinite constant terms. For the selection of shift parameters and tangential directions, we develop adaptive algorithms, which update the ADI parameters during the iteration as needed.

## 1 Introduction

Continuous-time algebraic Lyapunov equations are one of the most important foundational tools in systems and control theory with various applications in model order reduction [13, 17, 22, 33] and controller design [1, 25, 48]. They also often appear as the backbone of

differential and nonlinear matrix equation solvers [14, 29, 32, 44]. In general, continuous-time algebraic Lyapunov equations can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^{\mathbf{H}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{H}} = 0, \quad (1)$$

with the coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ , and  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  Hermitian. Here, we denote by  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{H}} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}^{\mathbf{T}}$  the transposed conjugate of the matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ . The task is to find a Hermitian matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , which solves the Lyapunov equation (1). In this work, we consider the classical assumption that the matrix pencil  $\lambda\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$  is Hurwitz, meaning that all its finite eigenvalues lie in the open left half-plane. Also, for simplicity of illustration, we assume in the following the case that  $\mathbf{E}$  is invertible; however, we outline modifications for the case of non-invertible  $\mathbf{E}$  matrices later in Section 3.3.

A variety of methods is available for the solution of (1). In the case of dense small-scale coefficient matrices, direct solvers as well as high-performing iterative solvers have been developed [5, 7, 24, 40]. In the case when  $n$  becomes large ( $\gtrsim 10^4$ ), the matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{E}$  typically appear to be only sparsely populated. However, the solution  $\mathbf{X}$  remains a dense matrix, which complicates computations in terms of time and memory constraints. With the additional assumption that the number of columns of  $\mathbf{B}$  is small and  $\mathbf{R}$  is positive definite, new solvers have been developed, which do not interfere with the sparse structure of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{E}$  while approximating the solution  $\mathbf{X}$  via low-rank factors [12, 19, 26, 30, 46]. Recently, an extension of the Alternating Direction Implicit (ADI) method has been developed for the case that  $\mathbf{R}$  is allowed to be indefinite [28, 29].

One of the main assumptions in solvers for large-scale sparse Lyapunov equations is that the constant term has a low rank  $m$ . This not only promotes the fast decay of the singular values of the solution  $\mathbf{X}$ , which allows its approximation via low-rank factors in the first place, the factors  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are actively involved in the construction of the approximation [12, 19, 28, 46]. However, it has been observed that there are applications [25, 45], in which the constant term is not low-rank and cannot be well approximated in low-rank form, but the solution  $\mathbf{X}$  still exhibits a fast singular value decay for which it can be well approximated by low-rank factors. A remedy for this problem is the framework of tangential Krylov methods. For the solution of Lyapunov equations, a tangential method has been proposed in [52]. This method cannot be applied to the case of indefinite  $\mathbf{R}$  matrices in any way and the work did not provide a computationally feasible approach that yields effective shifts and tangential directions. Here, we propose to resolve these issues.

In this work, we propose a new tangential ADI method for the solution of large-scale sparse Lyapunov equations with indefinite constant terms. This method allows the efficient approximation of the solution to Lyapunov equations via low-rank factors even in the case of high-rank constant terms. Due to its practical importance, we provide theoretical results and algorithms separately for the case of Lyapunov equations with real coefficients of the form

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{T}} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^{\mathbf{T}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{T}} = 0, \quad (2)$$

with  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , and  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  symmetric. In contrast to (1), computational steps have to be modified so that the constructed low-rank factors preserve the realness of the coefficients. To answer the fundamental questions about choosing ADI shifts and the tangential directions, we develop two adaptive algorithms that compute shifts and directions during the ADI iteration as needed.

The rest of the manuscript is organized as follows: In Section 2, we re-derive the indefinite factorized ADI method for the general case of Lyapunov equations with complex

coefficients. These results are then used to develop the tangential ADI method for Lyapunov equations with complex and real coefficients in [Section 3](#). The adaptive generation of suitable ADI shift parameters and the selection of tangential directions are discussed in [Section 4](#). In [Section 5](#), the proposed methods are tested in numerical experiments verifying their effectiveness in comparison to the current state-of-the-art approach. The paper is concluded in [Section 6](#).

## 2 Indefinite factorized ADI method

The tangential approach, which we propose in this work, is based on the low-rank ADI iteration for Lyapunov equations of the form [\(1\)](#). Therefore, we re-derive here the formulation of the low-rank iteration scheme that we consider for our work, and we extend the derivation to the case of complex coefficient matrices. Also, we provide the resulting ADI algorithms for the case of complex as well as real coefficient matrices. These algorithms will serve as the standard approaches for numerical comparisons later in [Section 5](#).

### 2.1 Basic iteration scheme

Originally, the Alternating Direction Implicit (ADI) method was proposed for the numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations in two or more dimensions [\[37\]](#). Given a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , the task is to solve the linear system  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ , with some given right-hand side  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  be split into the sum  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2$  for some suitable  $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , then the ADI iteration is defined via the double-step scheme

$$(\mathbf{A}_1 + \alpha_j \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{x}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} = \mathbf{b} + (\alpha_j \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{A}_2) \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \quad (3a)$$

$$(\mathbf{A}_2 + \alpha_j \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{b} + (\alpha_j \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{A}_1) \mathbf{x}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3b)$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , and some suitable shift parameters  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$  from the strictly positive real axis. In [\(3\)](#), we alternate implicitly between the two operators that compose  $\mathbf{A}$ , while the shifts  $\alpha_j$  serve as conditioning parameters and also provide numerical stability. The resulting iteration converges superlinearly under some mild assumptions on the operators and shifts [\[6\]](#).

The extension of the ADI method to Lyapunov equations of the form [\(1\)](#) with real coefficient matrices has been proposed first in [\[28\]](#). We follow here closely the more detailed derivation in [\[29\]](#) while extending the results to the case of complex matrices. To this end, we replace in the original ADI iteration [\(3\)](#) the matrix-vector multiplications by the matrix-valued operations  $\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{E}^{-H}$ . This results in the new matrix ADI double step

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{X}_{j-\frac{1}{2}} = -\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H - \mathbf{X}_{j-1} (\mathbf{A}^H - \alpha_j \mathbf{E}^H), \quad (4a)$$

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{X}_j^H = -\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H - \mathbf{X}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^H (\mathbf{A}^H - \alpha_j \mathbf{E}^H), \quad (4b)$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $\text{Re}(\cdot)$  denotes the real part of a complex number, and with the shifts  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}_-$  from the left open complex half-plane. By preserving the Hermitian property of the solution to [\(1\)](#) for all iterates,  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{X}_j^H$ , we can rewrite [\(4\)](#) into a single-step iteration of the form

$$\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{X}_{j-1} \mathbf{C}_j^H - 2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{Q}_j, \quad (5)$$

with the Cayley transforms and quotient terms

$$\mathbf{C}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}), \quad \text{and} \quad (6a)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-H}; \quad (6b)$$

see also [27] for the derivation of the basic iteration scheme (5).

To derive a suitable low-rank formulation of the ADI method, we follow the symmetric indefinite factorization used in the constant term of (1). Due to the solution to (1) being Hermitian, we may apply the same structure to the solution, which then yields  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{L}^H$ , with  $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$  and  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$  Hermitian. Introducing this format into the iteration (5), we see that for every iterate we have that  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{L}_j^H$ , where

$$\mathbf{L}_j = [(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{L}_{j-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D}_j = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

To simplify the presentation, we denote the resolvent terms  $\mathbf{H}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1}$ . Then, the iteration factors in (7) can be written as

$$\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{H}_{j-1} \mathbf{B} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{C}_{j-1} \dots \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{B}], \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_j = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} & & & \\ & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{j-1}) \mathbf{R} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1) \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8b)$$

$$= -2 \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j), \dots, \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1)) \otimes \mathbf{R}, \quad (8c)$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product. Due to commutativity of the matrix terms in the Cayley transforms  $\mathbf{C}_j$  with the resolvent terms  $\mathbf{H}_j$ , the indices in (8) can be reordered arbitrarily, which yields the alternative formulation

$$\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{H}_2 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \mathbf{B} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{H}_j \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j-1} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{j-2} \dots \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \mathbf{B}], \quad (9a)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_j = -2 \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1), \dots, \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)) \otimes \mathbf{R}, \quad (9b)$$

with the re-ordered Cayley transform  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_j = (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E})(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} = (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{H}_j$ . By observing the recursive structure of the iteration factors in (9) and by assuming the initial iterate to be given as  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{L}_0 \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{L}_0^H = 0$ , we can write the low-rank factored ADI iteration as

$$\mathbf{V}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_{j-1}} \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{V}_{j-1}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \mathbf{V}_j], \quad (10b)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_j = -2 \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1), \dots, \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)) \otimes \mathbf{R}, \quad (10c)$$

for  $j = 2, 3, \dots$ , and with the initial matrices  $\mathbf{V}_1 = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_1 \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{V}_1$ . We note that in implementations, dimensionless empty matrices  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$  and  $\mathbf{R}_0 = [\ ]$  are used for the initial iterate since  $\mathbf{L}_0, \mathbf{R}_0$  do not contribute to the solution approximation. Finally, we note that it follows from (10) that the iterates are constructed as the sum of rank- $m$  matrices of the form

$$\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{L}_j^H = \sum_{k=1}^j -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_k) \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{R} \mathbf{V}_k^H.$$

In the case that  $m \ll n$ , this often provides a suitable low-rank approximation to the true solution of (1); see, for example, [2, 39, 50].

## 2.2 Implicit residual formulation

The residual of ADI iterates  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{R}_j \mathbf{L}_j^H$  is generally given by

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H, \quad (11)$$

which ideally converges during the iteration to zero. To effectively compute the residual during the iteration as well as to improve the computational costs of the ADI steps in (10), we will make use of the fact that in the ADI iteration, the residual (11) can be implicitly assembled in the same factorized form as the constant term in (1) and our solution iterates  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{R}_j \mathbf{L}_j^H$ .

As the first stepping stone towards formulating the implicit residual, consider the following result about the ADI iteration error for Lyapunov equations of the form (1).

**Lemma 1** (ADI iteration errors). *Given any initial iterate  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , the error for all other ADI iterates  $\mathbf{X}_j$  from (5) is given by*

$$\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X} = \left[ \prod_{k=j}^1 \mathbf{C}_k \right] (\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X}) \left[ \prod_{k=1}^j \mathbf{C}_k^H \right], \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots$$

*Proof.* For any  $\alpha_j \notin \Lambda(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E})$ , the Lyapunov equation (1) can be rewritten into

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^H = (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E})^H - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H.$$

Furthermore, by multiplying the equation from both sides with appropriate inverses and using (6), it holds that

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{C}_j \mathbf{X} \mathbf{C}_j^H - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{Q}_j. \quad (12)$$

Subtracting this expression for the solution of the Lyapunov equation (1) from the ADI iteration (5) then yields

$$\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{C}_j (\mathbf{X}_{j-1} - \mathbf{X}) \mathbf{C}_j^H. \quad (13)$$

Recursively inserting similar expressions for  $\mathbf{X}_{j-1}, \mathbf{X}_{j-2}, \dots$  proves the desired result.  $\square$

With this expression for the ADI iteration error, we can now reformulate the residual in factorized form with implicit updates. The following theorem extends the results in [10] to the case of the indefinite factorized ADI method (10).

**Theorem 1** (Implicit residual factorization). *The Lyapunov residual (11) at iteration  $j$  of the indefinite factorized ADI method (10), with the initial iterate  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{L}_0 \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{L}_0^H = 0$ , has at most rank  $m$  and is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_j^H,$$

where the matrix  $\mathbf{W}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$  can be written as

$$\mathbf{W}_j = (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_j, \quad (14)$$

with  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ .

*Proof.* Subtracting the Lyapunov equation (1) with the solution  $\mathbf{X}$  from the ADI Lyapunov residual in (11) yields

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H = \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}) \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} (\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}) \mathbf{A}^H.$$

Now, let  $\mathbf{P}_j = \prod_{k=j}^1 \mathbf{C}_k$  denote the product of Cayley transforms used up to step  $j$  of the ADI iteration, then using [Lemma 1](#) allows us to rewrite the residual above as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_j &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_j(\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X})\mathbf{P}_j^H\mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{P}_j(\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X})\mathbf{P}_j^H\mathbf{A}^H \\ &= \mathbf{E}\mathbf{P}_j\mathbf{E}^{-1} \left( \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X})\mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X})\mathbf{A}^H \right) \mathbf{E}^{-H}\mathbf{P}_j^H\mathbf{E}^H \\ &= \mathbf{E}\mathbf{P}_j\mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathcal{L}_0\mathbf{E}^{-H}\mathbf{P}_j^H\mathbf{E}^H.\end{aligned}$$

With the initial iterate  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{L}_0\mathbf{R}_0\mathbf{L}_0^H = 0$ , the corresponding Lyapunov residual is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H = \mathbf{W}_0\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_0^H.$$

Substituting this initial residual into the expression above then yields

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_j^H, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{P}_j\mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{B}.$$

This implies that the rank of  $\mathcal{L}_j$  will at most be  $m$ . To derive the expressions for  $\mathbf{W}_j$  from the theorem, we first rewrite the update matrix  $\mathbf{V}_j$  from [\(10\)](#) to show its relation to  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  via

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V}_j &= (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j\mathbf{E})^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_{j-1}}\mathbf{E})\mathbf{V}_{j-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j\mathbf{E})^{-1}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{P}_{j-1}\mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{B} \\ &= (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j\mathbf{E})^{-1}\mathbf{W}_{j-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\mathbf{W}_j = (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})\mathbf{V}_j$  holds. Inserting this expression for  $\mathbf{V}_j$  into the residual factor then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{W}_j &= (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})\mathbf{V}_j \\ &= (\mathbf{A} - \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j\mathbf{E})^{-1}\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}_j,\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

The factorized structure of the Lyapunov residual in [Theorem 1](#) allows for the efficient computation of residual norms during the ADI iteration. This can be used to set appropriate stopping criteria of the general form  $\|\mathcal{L}_j\| < \epsilon\|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H\|$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a user-defined tolerance and  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes a suitable matrix norm. The resulting ADI iteration for Lyapunov equations [\(1\)](#) is shown in [Algorithm 1](#).

In the case that  $m < n$ , the costs for computing the residual norms can be further reduced by choosing the spectral norm or the Frobenius norm. Both of these norms allow for computationally efficient reformulations that are based on the fact that the non-zero spectra of  $\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_j^H \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{W}_j^H\mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  are identical. For the spectral norm, we have that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_j\|_2 = \|\mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_j^H\|_2 = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda(\mathbf{W}_j^H\mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R})} |\lambda|, \quad (15)$$

while for the Frobenius norm, it holds that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_j\|_F = \|\mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_j^H\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^m |\lambda_k|^2}, \quad \text{where} \quad \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\} = \Lambda(\mathbf{W}_j^H\mathbf{W}_j\mathbf{R}). \quad (16)$$

These two expressions [\(15\)](#) and [\(16\)](#) can be used to replace the norm computations done in [Algorithm 1](#) of [Algorithm 1](#).

**Algorithm 1:** Indefinite factorized ADI method: complex case.

---

**Input:** Coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (1), shift parameters  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-$ , residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H \approx \mathbf{X}$ .

- 1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ , and  $j = 1$ .
- 2 **while**  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^H\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H\|$  **do**
- 3     Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  for  $\mathbf{V}_j$ .
- 4     Update the residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_j$ .
- 5     Update the solution factor  $\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \ \mathbf{V}_j]$ .
- 6     Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
- 7 **end**
- 8 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = -2 \operatorname{diag}(\operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1), \dots, \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{j-1})) \otimes \mathbf{R}$ .

---

**2.3 Real coefficients and real solution factors**

In many important use cases, the coefficient matrices in the Lyapunov equation are real (2). Consequently, the solution  $\mathbf{X}$  becomes also real and symmetric, and in the construction of low-rank solutions, we wish the solution factors to preserve this realness, too. In the case that the shift parameters  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$  in Algorithm 1 are chosen to be real, the algorithm naturally constructs real solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_j$  and  $\mathbf{D}_j$  where  $\mathbf{D}_j$  is symmetric. However, for most coefficient matrices, complex shifts are needed to ensure fast convergence of the ADI method [2, 51]. To this end, modifications of the ADI step are needed to guarantee realness as shown by the following result.

**Theorem 2** (Conjugate double ADI update). *Consider the Lyapunov equation with real coefficient matrices in (2), and let the update blocks  $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{j-1}$  as well as the corresponding residual factors  $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  be real. Given the next two consecutive shifts that are complex conjugates so that  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_{j+1} = \overline{\alpha_j}$ , then for the corresponding ADI update blocks  $\mathbf{V}_j$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{j+1}$  from (10a), it holds that*

$$\mathbf{V}_{j+1} = \overline{\mathbf{V}_j} + 2\delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j),$$

with  $\delta_j = \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) / \operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j)$ . Similarly, for the corresponding residual factors (14), it holds

$$\mathbf{W}_{j+1} = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 4 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)).$$

*Proof.* Following the assumptions of the theorem, we have that the update blocks and residual factors up to step  $j - 1$  are real. In the next ADI step, the update block  $\mathbf{V}_j$  is given as the solution to

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1},$$

which can be split into its real and imaginary components via

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A} + \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E}) \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) - \operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1}, \\ (\mathbf{A} + \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E}) \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the second equation into an expression for  $\mathbf{E} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j)$  and inserting this into the recursive residual relation (14) results in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_j &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \operatorname{i} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)) \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + 2\delta_j \left( (\mathbf{A} + \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E}) \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) - \operatorname{i} \operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + 2\delta_j (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}) \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j). \end{aligned}$$



With this expression for the residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_j$ , we have for the next update block  $\mathbf{V}_{j+1}$  with the shift  $\alpha_{j+1} = \overline{\alpha_j}$  that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V}_{j+1} &= (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_j \\ &= (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + 2\delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) \\ &= \overline{\mathbf{V}_j} + 2\delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j).\end{aligned}$$

It then follows for the corresponding residual factor

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{W}_{j+1} &= \mathbf{W}_j - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_{j+1} \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_j - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\overline{\alpha_j}) \mathbf{E} (\overline{\mathbf{V}_j} + 2\delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)) \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 4 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)),\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

One particular effect of [Theorem 2](#) is that two ADI steps are performed from  $\mathbf{V}_{j-1}$  to  $\mathbf{V}_{j+1}$ , while only a single linear system has to be solved. Thus, the computational costs of ADI steps for complex conjugate shifts are about half of the costs of two standard ADI steps.

Following [Theorem 2](#), the solution factors can be updated in a similar fashion. Under the assumptions of [Theorem 2](#), we observe that the following relation holds for the  $(j+1)$ -st ADI iterate

$$\mathbf{X}_{j+1} = \mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top + [\mathbf{V}_j \quad \mathbf{V}_{j+1}] \begin{bmatrix} -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_j^\top \\ \mathbf{V}_{j+1}^\top \end{bmatrix} \quad (17a)$$

$$= \mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top + [\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) \quad \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)] \mathbf{T}_j \mathbf{\Psi}_j \mathbf{T}_j^\mathbf{H} \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j)^\top \\ \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17b)$$

with the matrices

$$\mathbf{T}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_m & \mathbf{I}_m \\ \mathbf{i} \mathbf{I}_m & (2\delta_j - \mathbf{i}) \mathbf{I}_m \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Psi}_j = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alternatively, the center term can be expressed via real matrices as

$$\mathbf{T}_j \mathbf{\Psi}_j \mathbf{T}_j^\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{M}_j \mathbf{\Psi}_j \mathbf{M}_j^\top, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{M}_j = \sqrt{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_m & 0 \\ \delta_j \mathbf{I}_m & \sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \mathbf{I}_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Integrating the matrix  $\mathbf{M}_j$  into the update for the outer solution factors leads to the real-valued ADI update scheme

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{L}_{j+1} &= [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad [\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) \quad \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)] \mathbf{M}_j] \\ &= [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \sqrt{2} (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)) \quad \sqrt{2(\delta_j^2 + 1)} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)], \\ \mathbf{D}_{j+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} & & \\ & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} & \\ & & -2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

The resulting algorithm for Lyapunov equations with real coefficient matrices [\(2\)](#) is outlined in [Algorithm 2](#).



**Algorithm 2:** Indefinite factorized ADI method: real case.

---

**Input:** Real coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (2), shift parameters  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-$  closed under conjugation and ordered as pairs, residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top \approx \mathbf{X}$ .

- 1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ ,  $\eta = \sqrt{2}$ , and  $j = 1$ .
- 2 **while**  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^\top\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^\top\|$  **do**
- 3     Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  for  $\mathbf{V}_j$ .
- 4     **if**  $\alpha_j$  is real **then**
- 5         Update the residual and the solution factors via
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_j &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2\alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_j, \\ \mathbf{L}_j &= [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \mathbf{V}_j]. \end{aligned}$$
- 6     **else**
- 7         Compute the scaling factor  $\delta_j = \text{Re}(\alpha_j) / \text{Im}(\alpha_j)$ .
- 8         Update the residual and the solution factors via
 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{j+1} &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 4 \text{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\text{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)), \\ \mathbf{L}_{j+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{j-1} & \eta (\text{Re}(\mathbf{V}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j)) & \eta \sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \text{Im}(\mathbf{V}_j) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$
- 9         Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
- 10     **end**
- 11     Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
- 12 **end**
- 13 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = -2 \text{diag}(\text{Re}(\alpha_1), \dots, \text{Re}(\alpha_{j-1})) \otimes \mathbf{R}$ .

---

### 3 Tangential indefinite low-rank ADI method

In this section, we introduce the concept of compressing solution factor updates in the ADI method from Section 2 using tangential directions. We develop the theoretical foundations for a residual formulation of the method, and we provide the algorithms for the cases of complex as well as real coefficient matrices. The special case of non-invertible  $\mathbf{E}$  matrices is discussed at the end.

#### 3.1 Tangential updates and the residual formula

While generally an effective tool to solve large-scale Lyapunov equations, the classical ADI method as described in Section 2 operates blockwise. In other words, every ADI step extends the size of the solution factor  $\mathbf{L}_j$  by  $m$  columns and the block diagonal term  $\mathbf{D}_j$  by  $m$  rows and columns, where  $m$  is the rank of the right-hand side term in (1) and (2). Thus, the ADI steps become computationally demanding in terms of memory for storing the solution factors as well as computational costs for solving linear systems with  $m$  right-hand sides. A remedy to this, originating in matrix interpolation theory [3], is the projection of updates  $\mathbf{V}_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$  onto suitable tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$  so that the new updates take the form  $\mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{V}_j \mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Thereby, only linear systems with a single right-hand side have to be solved in every ADI step, and the solution factors grow only by a single column and diagonal entry, respectively.

For the special case of (2) with  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}_m$ , a tangential version of the ADI method has been proposed previously in [52]. The derivation therein is based on the observation that

the update terms in the ADI method build a basis for a rational Krylov subspace. Since tangential interpolation is necessary in the construction of optimal interpolations of rational functions via rational Krylov subspaces [21], the idea in [52] was to potentially transfer those results towards the ADI method. In contrast, our work aims for the general reduction of computational costs in the ADI method using the concept of tangential compression. Also, we consider the more general cases of complex coefficient matrices in (1) with a potentially indefinite right-hand side.

The following theorem considers the compression of the ADI update terms  $\mathbf{V}_j$  from (10) down to rank 1 using tangential directions and provides a formula for the corresponding Lyapunov residual (11).

**Theorem 3** (Tangential ADI update). *Consider the Lyapunov equation (1) and assume that  $\mathbf{R}$  is invertible. Let  $\mathbf{X}_{j-1} = \mathbf{L}_{j-1}\mathbf{D}_{j-1}\mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H$  be the ADI iterate at step  $j-1$ , with the associated Lyapunov residual  $\mathcal{L}_{j-1} = \mathbf{W}_{j-1}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}_{j-1}^H$ . Given the next ADI shift  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}_-$  and the tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$ , the rank-1 compressed ADI update of the form*

$$\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{X}_{j-1} + d_j \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{v}_j^H$$

is given via the scalar

$$d_j = \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j},$$

and  $\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{C}^n$  as the solution to the linear system

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j.$$

The corresponding Lyapunov residual has the form  $\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_j^H$ , where

$$\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}.$$

*Proof.* To prove the results, we make use of the connection between the ADI iterates and the residual expression from Theorem 1. We proceed by equating the expression for the residual given above with the Lyapunov residual in (11). Substituting the solution update  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{X}_{j-1} + \mathbf{v}_j d_j \mathbf{v}_j^H$  into (11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_j &= (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_{j-1} \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X}_{j-1} \mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H) + d_j (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{v}_j^H \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{v}_j^H \mathbf{A}^H) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{j-1} + d_j \left( (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H + (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j)^H \right). \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of  $\mathbf{v}_j$ , it holds that  $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j - \alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j$ . Inserting this into the previous expression for the residual and using the identity  $\alpha_j + \overline{\alpha_j} = 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)$ , we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \mathcal{L}_{j-1} + d_j \left( (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j - \alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H + (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j - \alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H \right) \quad (18a)$$

$$= \mathcal{L}_{j-1} + d_j \left( (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H + (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j)^H - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H \right). \quad (18b)$$

On the other side, consider the residual given by  $\mathcal{L}_j = \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_j^H$ , and let the residual factor follow the structure from Theorem 1 with a general rank-1 update so that  $\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{c}_j^H$  holds, with an unknown vector  $\mathbf{c}_j \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . Inserting the rank-1 update into the factorized residual then yields

$$\mathcal{L}_j = (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{c}_j^H) \mathbf{R} (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{c}_j^H)^H \quad (19a)$$

$$= \mathcal{L}_{j-1} + (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H + (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}_j)^H + (\mathbf{c}_j^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j) (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H. \quad (19b)$$

To match up the residuals, we compare the coefficients of the terms in (18b) and (19b). Thereby, we find that

$$d_j \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}_j.$$

Under the assumption that  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  has full column rank, multiplying both sides of this equation by the pseudoinverse of  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  leads to  $\mathbf{c}_j = d_j \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j$ . We note that this  $\mathbf{c}_j$  is always a particular solution to the equation, also in the cases when  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  has not full column rank. By comparing the scalar coefficients of the  $(\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)(\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j)^H$  term, we find that

$$-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) d_j = \mathbf{c}_j^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}_j.$$

With the expression for  $\mathbf{c}_j$  from above, it follows

$$-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) d_j = (d_j \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j)^H \mathbf{R} (d_j \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j) = d_j^2 (\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j) = d_j^2 (\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j).$$

Under the assumption that  $d_j \neq 0$ , this equation can be resolved to

$$d_j = \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}.$$

Finally, substituting this expression for  $d_j$  back into the rank-1 update for the residual gives the desired factor update

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_j &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{c}_j^H \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} + d_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j (\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j)^H \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

We note that in contrast to the original result in [Theorem 1](#), the tangential ADI given by [Theorem 3](#) has the additional assumption that the center matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  in (1) has to be invertible. This can always be satisfied by truncating any rank-deficient parts from the constant term in (1). Note that such a “rank truncation” is also strongly recommended as a pre-processing step for the classical block ADI method ([Section 2](#)) to eliminate unnecessary computational costs resulting from non-contributing parts of the constant term.

Following the results of [Theorem 3](#), we can derive the approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_j$  and  $\mathbf{D}_j$  in a similar fashion as done in the block case in [Section 2](#). Let the previous ADI iterate be given in factorized form  $\mathbf{X}_{j-1} = \mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H$ , then the next iterate that includes the rank-1 update from [Theorem 3](#) is given by

$$\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{X}_{j-1} + d_j \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{v}_j^H = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \mathbf{v}_j] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} & 0 \\ 0 & d_j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H \\ \mathbf{v}_j^H \end{bmatrix}.$$

The resulting indefinite factorized tangential ADI method based on the updating scheme from [Theorem 3](#) is summarized in [Algorithm 3](#).

We note that [Algorithm 3](#) corresponds to the block approach in [Algorithm 1](#). The main differences between the two algorithms come from the restriction of the ADI updates to rank 1, which leads to the solution of linear systems with only a single right-hand side and the inclusion of an update vector into the solution factor in [Algorithm 3](#) rather than a matrix with  $m$ -columns as in [Algorithm 1](#). Since the residual has the same structure

---

**Algorithm 3:** Indefinite factorized tangential ADI method: complex case.

---

**Input:** Coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (1), shift parameters

 $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-,$  tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^m,$  residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0.$ 
**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H \approx \mathbf{X}.$ 

1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ , and  $j = 1.$ 

2 **while**  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^H\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H\|$  **do**

3     Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j$  for  $\mathbf{v}_j.$ 

4     Update the residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}.$ 

5     Update the solution factor  $\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \mathbf{v}_j].$ 

6     Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1.$ 

7 **end**

8 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = \operatorname{diag} \left( \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_1)}{\mathbf{t}_1^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_1}, \dots, \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_{j-1})}{\mathbf{t}_{j-1}^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_{j-1}} \right).$ 


---

in both algorithms, we may use the same techniques for the computationally efficient evaluation as described in Section 2.2.

Finally, the similarity of the proposed tangential method to the classical approach allows us to make some general conclusions about the convergence of Algorithm 3. By replacing the tangential directions in Algorithm 3 by identity matrices  $\mathbf{I}_m$ , we directly recover the classical approach. Therefore, for a suitable choice of tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_\ell$  and shifts  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$ , the tangential ADI can recover the solution factors from the block ADI in Algorithm 1. However, we note that not all choices of tangential directions will yield convergence for the ADI method. This will be further discussed in Section 4.2.

### 3.2 Real-valued tangential ADI updates

As in the classical block ADI, we typically wish to construct real solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_j$  and  $\mathbf{D}_j$  when the Lyapunov equation has real coefficient matrices (2). Similar to the results in Section 2.3, we can make use of the structure resulting in consecutive ADI steps when using complex conjugate shifts. The resulting real-valued update scheme is shown in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4** (Tangential conjugate double ADI update). *Consider the Lyapunov equation with real coefficient matrices in (2) and assume  $\mathbf{R}$  is invertible. Let  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  be a real-valued residual factor, let the next two ADI shifts be complex conjugates so that  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_{j+1} = \overline{\alpha_j}$ , and let the corresponding tangential directions be identical and real so that  $\mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\mathbf{t}_{j+1} = \mathbf{t}_j$ . Then, the iterate after two steps is real-valued,  $\mathbf{X}_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and can be written via a rank-2 update of the form*

$$\mathbf{X}_{j+1} = \mathbf{X}_{j-1} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_j & \mathbf{f}_{j+1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d_j & 0 \\ 0 & d_j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_j^T \\ \mathbf{f}_{j+1}^T \end{bmatrix},$$

where the update components are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}_j &= \sqrt{2}(\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)), \\ \mathbf{f}_{j+1} &= \sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j), \\ d_j &= \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

with the scaling factor  $\delta_j = \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)/\operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j)$  and the vector  $\mathbf{v}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j$ . The corresponding residual factor is given by

$$\mathbf{W}_{j+1} = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{4 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}.$$

*Proof.* Following [Theorem 3](#), the update to the solution approximation after two consecutive tangential ADI steps is in general given via

$$\mathbf{X}_{j+1} = \mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top + [\mathbf{v}_j \quad \mathbf{v}_{j+1}] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_j^\mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf{v}_{j+1}^\mathbf{H} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the update vectors are the solutions to the two linear systems

$$(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j} \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_{j+1} = \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{t}_j.$$

Since all the coefficient matrices as well as the previous residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  and the tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}_j$  are real, we can apply the results from [Theorem 2](#) and the basis change in (17), which allow us to rewrite the solution update by splitting the update vector  $\mathbf{v}_j$  into its real and imaginary parts so that

$$\mathbf{X}_{j+1} = \mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top + [\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) \quad \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)] \mathbf{M}_j \mathbf{\Psi}_j \mathbf{M}_j^\top \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j)^\top \\ \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where the center matrices are given by

$$\mathbf{M}_j = \sqrt{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \delta_j & \sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Psi}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} \end{bmatrix},$$

with the scaling factor  $\delta_j = \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)/\operatorname{Im}(\alpha_j)$ . Integrating the transformation  $\mathbf{M}_j$  into the outer factors via

$$\begin{aligned} [\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) \quad \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)] \mathbf{M}_j &= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2}(\operatorname{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) & \sqrt{2}\sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \operatorname{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= [\mathbf{f}_j \quad \mathbf{f}_{j+1}] \end{aligned}$$

and labeling the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{\Psi}_j$  as  $d_j = \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j)}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}$ , yields the desired result for the real-valued update of the solution approximation.

For the update of the residual factor, we have from [Theorem 3](#) that

$$\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \operatorname{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}$$

holds, with the update vector  $\mathbf{v}_j$  from above. By observing that all coefficient matrices as well as the previous residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  and the tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}_j$  are real, we may split the update vector into its real and imaginary part  $\mathbf{v}_j = \text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \mathbf{i} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)$ , which satisfy the systems of linear equations

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A} + \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E}) \text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) - \text{Im}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1}\mathbf{t}_j, \\ (\mathbf{A} + \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E}) \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \text{Im}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the second equation in terms of  $\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j)$  allows us to rewrite the residual update as

$$\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \left( (\mathbf{A} + \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E}) \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) - \mathbf{i} \text{Im}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) \right) \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}.$$

This allows us to write the update vector alternatively via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{j+1} &= (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{t}_j \\ &= (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j + 2\delta_j (\mathbf{A} + \overline{\alpha_j}\mathbf{E})^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left( (\mathbf{A} + \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E}) \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) - \mathbf{i} \text{Im}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) \right) \\ &= \overline{\mathbf{v}_j} + 2\delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the corresponding residual factor we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{j+1} &= \mathbf{W}_j - \frac{2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_{j+1} \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} + 2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} (\overline{\mathbf{v}_j} + 2\delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j} \\ &= \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{4 \text{Re}(\alpha_j)\mathbf{E} (\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Two important points in [Theorem 4](#) are the assumptions that the tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}_j$  is a real vector and that the same direction is used for both complex conjugate shifts. These assumptions provide the necessary structure to make [Theorem 4](#) the tangential equivalent of the block ADI version in [Theorem 2](#). Additionally, we do not see these assumptions to be restrictive in any capacity considering the role of the tangential directions. Since in the case of real coefficient matrices, these are used to essentially compress only real-valued terms in the ADI method, there is no reason to assume that a complex direction may yield more information about the solution. Furthermore, we will see later in [Section 4](#) that these assumptions will naturally be satisfied in our proposed method for selecting tangential directions.

The tangential ADI method for Lyapunov equations with real coefficients based on [Theorem 4](#) is outlined in [Algorithm 4](#). As before, we can observe strong similarities between the tangential approach in [Algorithm 4](#) and its classical block equivalent in [Algorithm 2](#). The differences as desired are the restriction of update terms to scalars and vectors rather than  $m$ -dimensional matrices. Also, we would like to remind the reader that the residual follows the same factorized structure as before so that the techniques mentioned in [Section 2.2](#) should be used for efficient residual norm computations.

---

**Algorithm 4:** Indefinite factorized tangential ADI method: real case.
 

---

**Input:** Real coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (2), shift parameters

 $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-$  closed under conjugation and ordered as pairs, real tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top \approx \mathbf{X}$ .

1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ ,  $\eta = \sqrt{2}$ , and  $j = 1$ .

2 **while**  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^\mathbf{H}\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^\mathbf{H}\|$  **do**

3     Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j$  for  $\mathbf{v}_j$ .

4     **if**  $\alpha_j$  is real **then**

5         Update the residual and the solution factors via

$$\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{2\alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j},$$

$$\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \mathbf{v}_j].$$

6     **else**

7         Compute the scaling factor  $\delta_j = \text{Re}(\alpha_j) / \text{Im}(\alpha_j)$ .

8         Update the residual and the solution factors via

$$\mathbf{W}_{j+1} = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - \frac{4 \text{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}}{\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_j},$$

$$\mathbf{L}_{j+1} = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \quad \eta (\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \quad \eta \sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)].$$

9         Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .

10     **end**

11     Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .

12 **end**

13 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{-2 \text{Re}(\alpha_1)}{\mathbf{t}_1^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_1}, \dots, \frac{-2 \text{Re}(\alpha_{j-1})}{\mathbf{t}_{j-1}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_{j-1}} \right)$ .

---

### 3.3 Non-invertible $\mathbf{E}$ matrices and projected Lyapunov equations

For the ease of presentation, we assumed so far that the  $\mathbf{E}$  matrix in (1) and (2) is invertible. However, in certain applications, for example, those involving partial differential equations [17], the  $\mathbf{E}$  matrix becomes non-invertible. Under the assumption that the matrix pencil  $\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$  is regular, i.e., there exists a  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  so that  $\det(\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}) \neq 0$ , one typically considers the solution of (1) and (2) over the subspace of finite eigenvalues of  $\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$ . This subspace-restricted problem is given via the projected Lyapunov equation

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{E}^\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A}^\mathbf{H} + \mathcal{P}_\ell \mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^\mathbf{H} \mathcal{P}_\ell^\mathbf{H} = 0, \quad (20a)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_r \mathbf{X} \mathcal{P}_r^\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X}, \quad (20b)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_r \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are the left and right projectors onto the subspace of finite eigenvalues of  $\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$ . In general, the matrices  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{P}_r$  are given as spectral projectors via the Weierstrass canonical form of  $\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$ ; see, for example, [31]. Typically, the computations necessary to obtain these projectors via subspace decompositions are undesired in the case of large-scale sparse coefficient matrices. However, for several practically occurring matrix structures, the projectors have been formulated explicitly in terms of parts of the coefficient matrices [16, 49].



In practice, the implicit application of  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{P}_r$  using structural projectors is preferred over the explicit formation and application of the projectors. In this case, the solution of (20) is directly computed on the correct lower dimensional subspace. Similar to the use of the spectral projectors, the implicit projection can only be realized for certain matrix structures, for which the projectors onto the correct subspaces and truncation of the coefficient matrices are known by construction; see, for example, [4, 20, 43]. We refer the reader to the MATLAB implementation of the Matrix Equations, Sparse Solvers (M-M.E.S.S.) library [9, 42] for details on the implementation of these structural projectors.

In all cases, we can note that none of the fundamental steps of the algorithms presented in this paper change in the case of non-invertible  $\mathbf{E}$  matrices. This case can be implemented by simply modifying the matrix-matrix and matrix-vector operations needed in the algorithms to work directly on the correct subspaces. We also note that the invertibility of  $\mathbf{E}$  does not influence the role and effect of the tangential directions in any way, which is why we continue with the presentation of our results for the case of invertible  $\mathbf{E}$  matrices.

## 4 Adaptive parameter selection

As in the classical block ADI method (Section 2), the performance of the tangential approach presented in Section 3 is governed by the choice of iteration parameters, namely the shifts  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-$  and the tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . In the following, we present two adaptive frameworks that allow for the selection of the shift parameters as well as the tangential directions during the execution of the ADI method independent of each other. In particular, the independence of the methods allows us to replace, for example, the shift selection method by other approaches from the literature [38, 51] as desired.

### 4.1 Shift selection via projection

The selection of suitable shifts is a crucial point in any ADI-type method and determines the practical convergence speed. Poorly chosen shifts can result in many iteration steps, negating the computational benefits of the low-rank formulation in the large-scale sparse case. Classically, ADI theory relies on selecting shifts based on the relative progression of the approximation error of the ADI iterates. Assume that the eigenvalues of  $\lambda\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$  are semi-simple and given the right generalized eigenvector basis matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  so that  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}$  where  $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. Then, it follows directly from Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X}\|_2} &\leq \left\| \prod_{k=j}^1 \mathbf{C}_k \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \kappa_2(\mathbf{U})^2 \left\| \text{diag} \left( \prod_{k=1}^j \frac{\lambda_1 - \overline{\alpha_k}}{\lambda_1 + \alpha_k}, \dots, \prod_{k=1}^j \frac{\lambda_n - \overline{\alpha_k}}{\lambda_n + \alpha_k} \right) \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \kappa_2(\mathbf{U})^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \prod_{k=1}^j \left| \frac{\lambda_i - \overline{\alpha_k}}{\lambda_i + \alpha_k} \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

holds, where  $\kappa_2(\mathbf{U})$  is the spectral condition number of the basis matrix  $\mathbf{U}$ . To minimize the norm of this error expression, optimal shifts are given as the solution to the rational

minimax problem

$$\min_{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j\} \subset \mathbb{C}_-} \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \prod_{k=1}^j \left| \frac{\lambda_i - \overline{\alpha_k}}{\lambda_i + \alpha_k} \right| \right), \quad \text{where } \lambda_i \in \Lambda(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}). \quad (21)$$

This is also known as the ADI shift parameter problem [27, 51].

Using (21) for the selection of shifts comes with two apparent problems: (i) the expression (21) is independent of the constant term in the Lyapunov equation (1), which is known to have a significant influence on the numerical rank structure of the solution  $\mathbf{X}$ , and (ii) the solution to (21) can only be determined effectively in very few cases of matrix spectra [51]. To mitigate these issues, the authors of [11] proposed an efficient adaptive shift generation scheme for the classical block ADI approach (Section 2) with  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}_n$  that has been observed to provide suitable ADI shift parameters for general spectra of  $\lambda\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$ . Thereby, the shifts are generated as Ritz values of the matrix pencil  $\lambda\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$  projected onto the subspace spanned by the last ADI update matrix  $\mathbf{V}_{j-1}$ . An extension to this was proposed in [15], which suggests to further enrich the projection space by including a set number  $k$  of previous update blocks  $\mathbf{V}_{j-k}, \mathbf{V}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{j-1}$  and then select a subset of the computed Ritz values as shifts using a simplified variant of (21). In contrast to the works [11, 15], we consider here the case of Lyapunov equations with indefinite constant terms. However, the projection shift method does not have to change for this case since it is based on the range of the ADI updates, which is still determined by the update matrices; cf. Section 2.

For the tangential ADI approach (Section 3), the original projection shifts generation from [11] would be insufficient. Since the update terms are only single columns, a new shift would need to be generated in every ADI step, which becomes computationally demanding, and since only single shifts are generated, there would be no complex conjugate shifts in the case of real coefficient matrices (2). The latter issue was the main motivation for the extension of the approach in [15], where real shifts alone did not lead to any meaningful convergence of the ADI method due to the mechanical matrix structures. Therefore, we also recommend in this work the use of the  $k$  last update columns  $\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1}$  for the construction of the projection space with some suitable  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$  be a unitary basis of the subspace  $\text{span}(\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1})$ , then the projection shifts are computed as the eigenvalues of the projected matrix pencil  $\lambda\mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}$ . Note that depending on the coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{E}$ , some of the projected eigenvalues may not be suited as ADI shifts. Undesired shifts that lie in the right closed half-plane or are infinite should be removed from the set. Also, in principle, one may want to use some additional vectors to further enrich the projection space beyond the number of actually desired shifts. Then, similar to [15], we propose to apply a modified version of the minimax problem (21) to determine, which subset of shifts should be used. The resulting projection shift routine is outlined in Algorithm 5. In the case that too few ADI update vectors are given or that a significant amount of projected eigenvalues are invalid shifts, Algorithm 5 in Algorithm 5 is used to return the remaining valid shifts.

The remaining open problem for using the projection shifts as described in Algorithm 5 is the initial phase of the ADI iteration when no ADI update vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1}$  are available yet. One remedy to this problem is the use of alternative shift generation techniques such as heuristic shifts [38] until enough ADI update vectors have been generated to apply the projection shifts. On the contrary, it has been suggested in [11] to use the constant term of the Lyapunov equation (1) to generate the initial projection space. While this may work well as long as  $m \leq \ell$ , where  $\ell$  is the number of desired projection shifts, we consider cases in this work when  $m > \ell$  and the rank of the constant term

**Algorithm 5:** Projection shift routine.

**Input:** ADI update vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1}$ , coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}$ , number of desired shifts  $\ell$ .

**Output:** Projection shifts  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$ .

- 1 Compute a unitary basis  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$  of  $\text{span}(\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1})$ .
- 2 Compute the eigenvalues  $\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_k$  of the matrix pencil  $\lambda \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}$ .
- 3 Remove unwanted eigenvalues via  $\{\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_p\} = \{\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_k\} \cap \mathbb{C}_-$ .
- 4 **if**  $p > \ell$  **then**
  - 5 | Select the  $\ell$  most important shifts as the solution to
 
$$\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\} = \underset{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\} \subset \{\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_p\}}{\text{argmin}} \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \left| \frac{\hat{\lambda}_i - \overline{\alpha_j}}{\hat{\lambda}_i + \alpha_j} \right| \right).$$
- 6 **else**
  - 7 | Set  $\ell \leftarrow p$  and  $\alpha_i \leftarrow \hat{\lambda}_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ .
- 8 **end**

becomes too large to use its entirety for the construction of the projection space. In these situations, we propose to use some type of low-rank approximation of the constant term in (1) to construct the initial projection basis, for example, via the sparse singular value decomposition or randomized sketching [23].

## 4.2 Tangential direction selection

In addition to the ADI shifts, tangential directions have to be selected for the presented tangential ADI method (Section 3). To this end, we first outline general restrictions on the choice of potential tangential directions and derive specialized versions of Algorithms 3 and 4 based on these results before we propose a new adaptive mechanism for efficiently selecting suitable directions in the tangential ADI method.

### 4.2.1 Challenges of static tangential directions

While both types of iteration parameters, ADI shifts and tangential directions, appear in a similar way in Algorithms 3 and 4, their influence on the convergence of the ADI method is drastically different. Most notably, the ADI method in any form is known to converge to the desired solution even when only a single shift is used, i.e., when  $\alpha = \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_\ell$ ; see, for example, [38, 51]. The use of different shifts during the iteration only serves the purpose of increasing the convergence speed, which is of particular importance when the method is used to construct low-rank approximations.

On the contrary, using a variety of tangential directions is necessary in most situations to allow convergence of the tangential ADI method towards the correct solution. Let us assume the extreme case of choosing all tangential directions to be identical  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_1 = \dots = \mathbf{t}_\ell$ . Then, the tangential ADI applied to (1) is identical to using the classical block ADI method from Section 2 to the equation

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{t}^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{t}^H \mathbf{B}^H = 0. \quad (22)$$

The solutions to (1) and (22) are only identical, if the constant terms in both equations are identical, which can only be the case if the original constant term in (1) has rank 1.

Thus, in most scenarios, multiple tangential directions are needed for the tangential ADI to converge to the desired solution.

Furthermore, the preemptive generation of suitable tangential directions similar to the idea of heuristic shifts [38] is a highly difficult task since it is not known in which way the tangential directions contribute to the solution factors constructed by the ADI in terms of the approximation error. In the case that the constant term in (1) has a steep singular value decay, it can be effectively approximated via an indefinite low-rank factorization of the form

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}\widehat{\mathbf{R}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}^H = \sum_{k=1}^r \mathbf{B}\mathbf{t}_k\mathbf{t}_k^H\mathbf{R}\mathbf{t}_k\mathbf{t}_k^H\mathbf{B}^H \approx \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H, \quad (23)$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  with  $r \ll m$ . Using the tangential directions in (23) in a cyclic manner is expected to allow the tangential ADI to converge as desired since the principal information of the constant term is captured. However, when  $r$  is in a similar order of magnitude as  $m$ , this will lead to similar computational costs and convergence behavior as the classical block ADI approach.

In general, good choices of tangential directions that allow for a fast convergence of the ADI method towards the correct solution are expected to depend on the chosen ADI shifts as well as on the corresponding ADI iterates. Therefore, an adaptive approach is needed to generate tangential directions during the ADI iteration that take these factors into account.

#### 4.2.2 Eigenvector directions

Tangential directions as introduced in Section 3 compress the block updates from the original ADI in Section 2 down to single columns and scalars. In general, this compression during the ADI iteration can be expressed in the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^j \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{R} \mathbf{Z}_i^H \approx \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{Z}_k^H, \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$  are placeholders for any of the outer block matrices occurring in the classical ADI iteration, like the update matrices  $\mathbf{V}_j$  and the residual factors  $\mathbf{W}_j$ , and  $p$  is the approximation rank. At the center of this approximation stand the rank-1 projections of the indefinite center term  $\mathbf{R}$ . If we assume for simplicity constant outer factors, the compression via the tangential directions becomes essentially

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{R} \mathbf{Z}_i^H \approx \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{Z}_i^H = \mathbf{Z}_i \left( \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^H.$$

This suggests that tangential directions should be chosen in such a way that their projections effectively decompose the  $\mathbf{R}$  matrix into rank-1 terms, which in sum yield a good approximation. In particular, we see that random directions are theoretically not expected to yield any good results.

Since  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  is assumed to be Hermitian (or symmetric in the case of real coefficients), the optimal rank-1 decomposition of the matrix with exactly  $m$  terms is given by the eigendecomposition of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Let  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{T}^H$  be the eigendecomposition of  $\mathbf{R}$ , where  $\mathbf{T} = [\mathbf{t}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{t}_m]$  is the unitary matrix of eigenvectors and  $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. Then, we have for the eigenvectors and eigenvalues that

---

**Algorithm 6:** Indefinite tangential ADI with eigenvectors: complex case.

---

**Input:** Coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (1), shift parameters

 $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-,$  residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^H \approx \mathbf{X}$ .

1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ , and  $j = 1$ .

2 Compute the eigendecomposition  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{T}^H$ , with  $\mathbf{T} = [\mathbf{t}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{t}_m]$  and  $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ .

3 **while**  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^H\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^H\|$  **do**

4     Select eigenvector  $\mathbf{t}_{p_j}$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $s_{p_j}$  for  $p_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

5     Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_{p_j}$  for  $\mathbf{v}_j$ .

6     Update the residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2 \text{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_{p_j}^H$ .

7     Update the solution factor  $\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \ \mathbf{v}_j]$ .

8     Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .

9 **end**

10 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = -2 \text{diag}(\text{Re}(\alpha_1) s_{p_1}, \dots, \text{Re}(\alpha_{j-1}) s_{p_{j-1}})$ .

---

 $\mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{t}_k = 1$  and  $s_k = \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t}_k$  so that it holds

$$\mathbf{R} = \sum_{k=1}^m s_k \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H \mathbf{R} \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^H. \quad (25)$$

Inserting the eigenvectors into the general approximation (24) then yields best low-rank approximations of the terms occurring in the ADI iteration.

**Remark 1** (Reconstruction of block ADI updates). The original block ADI method (Section 2) can be recovered from the tangential approach (Section 3) by making use of the eigendecomposition (25). To this end, for each ADI shift, we cycle through all  $m$  eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$  as tangential directions so that we recover update blocks of size  $m$  as in the classical block ADI. Note that the remaining difference between tangential and block ADI in the constructed matrices stems from the unitary transformation that diagonalizes the center matrix  $\mathbf{D}_j$  in the tangential approach, while in the block method that center matrix is block diagonal.

The algorithms presented in Section 3 were formulated for the general case of tangential directions. With the restriction of these directions to the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ , these algorithms can be further adapted. Due to the practical importance of the choice of these specific tangential directions and the corresponding algorithmic changes, we outline the tangential ADI method with eigenvector directions for the cases of complex and real coefficient matrices in Algorithms 6 and 7. In comparison to the general Algorithms 3 and 4, the eigenvector based variants in Algorithms 6 and 7 fully avoid the rescaling with the inverse center matrix  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$  and instead involve the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Also, the selection of tangential directions in Algorithm 6 of Algorithm 6 and Algorithm 7 of Algorithm 7 simplifies to the discrete choice between  $m$  different fixed vectors. We will make use of this in the next section to devise multiple schemes that allow the adaptive selection of tangential directions in every ADI step.

Before moving on, we would like to outline the practical difference between the choice of eigenvector based tangential directions and the proposed eigenvector directions. For this purpose, we are using a randomly generated stable test example with outer dimension  $n = 1000$  and with a constant term of rank  $m = 10$  that has an indefinite  $\mathbf{R}$  matrix. We

---

**Algorithm 7:** Indefinite tangential ADI with eigenvectors: real case.

---

**Input:** Real coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R}$  from (2), shift parameters

 $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell \in \mathbb{C}_-$  closed under conjugation and ordered as pairs, residual tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Output:** Approximate solution factors  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1}, \mathbf{D}_{j-1}$  so that  $\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_{j-1} \mathbf{L}_{j-1}^\top \approx \mathbf{X}$ .

```

1 Initialize  $\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_0 = [\ ]$ ,  $\eta = \sqrt{2}$ , and  $j = 1$ .
2 Compute the eigendecomposition  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{T}^\top$ , with  $\mathbf{T} = [\mathbf{t}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{t}_m]$  and
    $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ .
3 while  $\|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{W}_{j-1}^\mathbf{H}\| \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^\mathbf{H}\|$  do
4   Select eigenvector  $\mathbf{t}_{p_j}$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $s_{p_j}$  for  $p_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .
5   Solve  $(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E}) \mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_{p_j}$  for  $\mathbf{v}_j$ .
6   if  $\alpha_j$  is real then
7     Update the residual and the solution factors via
              
$$\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 2\alpha_j \mathbf{E} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{t}_{p_j}^\top,$$

              
$$\mathbf{L}_j = [\mathbf{L}_{j-1} \ \mathbf{v}_j].$$

8   else
9     Compute the scaling factor  $\delta_j = \text{Re}(\alpha_j) / \text{Im}(\alpha_j)$ .
10    Update the residual and the solution factors via
              
$$\mathbf{W}_{j+1} = \mathbf{W}_{j-1} - 4 \text{Re}(\alpha_j) \mathbf{E} (\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) \mathbf{t}_{p_j}^\top,$$

              
$$\mathbf{L}_{j+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{j-1} & \eta (\text{Re}(\mathbf{v}_j) + \delta_j \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j)) & \eta \sqrt{\delta_j^2 + 1} \text{Im}(\mathbf{v}_j) \end{bmatrix}.$$

11    Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
12  end
13  Increment  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ .
14 end
15 Compute the solution factor  $\mathbf{D}_{j-1} = -2 \text{diag}(\text{Re}(\alpha_1) s_{p_1}, \dots, \text{Re}(\alpha_{j-1}) s_{p_{j-1}})$ .
```

---

compare the classical block ADI from Section 2 with the tangential approaches using random sets of orthogonalized directions and the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ . The convergence behavior of the different methods over the size of the solution factors is shown in Figure 1. The classical block ADI (ADI) converges to a reasonably small normalized Lyapunov residual computed as  $\|\mathcal{L}_j\|_2 / \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{B}^\mathbf{H}\|_2$  showcasing that the ADI can be successfully applied here. The tangential ADI with eigenvectors (TADI(eig)) converges similarly fast but the tangential ADI with random directions (TADI(rand)) diverges instead. This fits our previous discussion that random directions are not suited to solve the approximation problem (24).

We note that throughout various numerical experiments, we have observed that in the case of indefinite  $\mathbf{R}$  matrices, the tangential ADI always diverges as shown in Figure 1 when the tangential directions are chosen as linear combinations of eigenvectors corresponding to at least one positive and one negative eigenvalue. Random tangential directions satisfy this property with high probability when  $\mathbf{R}$  is indefinite. On the other side, if the tangential directions have been chosen as arbitrary vectors from either the eigenspace corresponding to the positive eigenvalues or the eigenspace corresponding to the negative eigenvalues, the convergence of the tangential ADI essentially stagnates about the initial residual. Overall, we could not observe any choice of tangential directions other than the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$  that resulted in visible convergence of the tangential ADI method. Finally, the special case of trivial center matrices is discussed in the following remark.






Figure 1: Convergence behavior of the classical block ADI method (ADI), the tangential ADI with random directions (TADI(rand)) and the tangential ADI with eigenvector directions (TADI(eig)): The eigenvector-based method behaves similarly to the classical approach and converges to a small normalized residual, while the choice of random directions leads to divergence of the tangential ADI.

**Remark 2** (Relation to the previous tangential ADI). The previously proposed tangential ADI approach from [52] can be recovered from this work by setting  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}_m$  in the Lyapunov equation (2) and by normalizing all tangential directions  $\mathbf{t}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$  so that  $\mathbf{t}_j^\top \mathbf{t}_j = 1$ . By setting the center term to the identity, the approximation problem (24) that appears in the ADI generally simplifies to

$$\sum_{i=1}^j \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i^\mathbf{H} \approx \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{t}_k \mathbf{t}_k^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{Z}_k^\mathbf{H},$$

for which any choice of tangential directions will yield reasonable results. In particular, it is not necessary to restrict the directions to the eigenvectors of the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}_m$  to ensure convergence of the tangential ADI method as illustrated in [52]. We note that the normalization used in [52] is not necessary in our work since the corresponding rescaling is integrated into Algorithms 3 and 4. Also, note that this discussion holds when using any trivially scaled variant of the identity for the center term, i.e., when  $\mathbf{R} = \beta \mathbf{I}_m$  for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ .

#### 4.2.3 Adaptive selections via heuristic scoring

With the tangential directions restricted to the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ , the problem of adaptively constructing directions during the ADI iteration simplifies to the selection of 1 out of  $m$  pre-computed vectors in every tangential ADI step. In general, the goal is to select the tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}_j$  from the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ , which for a given shift  $\alpha_j$  and a given previous residual factor  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  minimizes the approximation error of the constructed solution vectors via the resulting update vector  $\mathbf{v}_j$ , which is given by  $\mathbf{v}_j = (\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}_j$ . The exact solution to this problem is practically infeasible, since it requires the construction of all  $m$  possible update vectors and the computation of the corresponding residuals, which is computationally much more costly than performing classical block ADI steps. Instead, we propose the use of heuristic values that indicate the importance of potential updates so that we may base the choice of tangential directions on this heuristic.

In general, we expect all update vectors  $\mathbf{v}_j$  computed via the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$  to positively contribute towards the solution of the Lyapunov equation in some way since all those update vectors are constructed following the classical ADI theory. To quantify the contribution, we may simply use the Euclidean norm of the update vectors since a large



---

**Algorithm 8:** Projection-based heuristic tangential direction selection.

---

**Input:** Unitary eigenvectors  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m$  of  $\mathbf{R}$ , previous ADI update vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1}$ , previous residual vector  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$ , next ADI shift  $\alpha_j$ , coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}$ .

**Output:** Next tangential direction  $\mathbf{t}$ .

- 1 Compute a unitary basis matrix  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$  of  $\text{span}(\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1})$ .
- 2 Compute the projected terms  $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{E}} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U}$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_{j-1} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{W}_{j-1}$ .
- 3 Compute the projected update vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1 \ \dots \ \hat{\mathbf{v}}_m]$  via the solution of

$$(\hat{\mathbf{A}} + \alpha_j \hat{\mathbf{E}}) \hat{\mathbf{V}} = \hat{\mathbf{W}}_{j-1} [\mathbf{t}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{t}_m].$$

- 4 Select the index with the largest vector norm  $p = \arg\max_{\ell=1, \dots, m} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_\ell\|_2$ .
  - 5 Return the corresponding tangential direction  $\mathbf{t} \leftarrow \mathbf{t}_p$ .
- 

vector norm indicates large changes in the solution approximation while a small vector norm indicates only minor changes. Thus, a heuristic approach for choosing the tangential directions is given by the solution to the problem

$$\mathbf{t}_j = \arg\max_{\mathbf{t} \in \{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m\}} \|\mathbf{v}_j\|_2 = \arg\max_{\mathbf{t} \in \{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m\}} \|(\mathbf{A} + \alpha_j \mathbf{E})^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}\|_2, \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m$  are the unitary eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Similar to the original problem of selecting the optimal tangential direction, this heuristic (26) is practically infeasible as it requires the solution of  $m$  linear systems of dimension  $n$ . To lower the computational costs of the heuristic, we propose the use of the same Galerkin projection framework that is used in the generation of adaptive shifts in Section 4.1. To this end, let  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$  denote the unitary basis matrix for the  $k$ -dimensional subspace spanned by the previous update vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{j-k}, \mathbf{v}_{j-k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{j-1}$ . Then, compute the next tangential direction as the solution to the problem

$$\mathbf{t}_j = \arg\max_{\mathbf{t} \in \{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m\}} \|(\hat{\mathbf{A}} + \alpha_j \hat{\mathbf{E}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}\|_2, \quad (27)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{E}} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{E} \mathbf{U}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_{j-1} = \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{W}_{j-1}$ , and where  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m$  are the unitary eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ . This projective heuristic (27) requires only the solution to  $m$  linear systems of dimension  $k$ , where  $k$  is typically chosen to be very small in comparison to the full dimension  $n$ . Note that these  $m$  linear systems only differ in their right-hand side so that all  $m$  solutions can be computed simultaneously using a single LU decomposition. As in the case of the projection shifts (Section 4.1), we expect the last ADI update columns to contain enough information about the iteration behavior to allow for further improvements. Due to its importance for practical implementations, we have summarized the algorithmic description of the projection-based heuristic selection of the tangential directions in Algorithm 8.

**Remark 3** (Simplified heuristics). The motivation for the heuristics in (26) and (27) was to determine the tangential directions that contribute the most towards the solution approximation. In contrast to that, one may consider to use instead the tangential directions that capture most of the current residual factor to drive the residual towards zero. A corresponding heuristic for selecting tangential directions is given by

$$\mathbf{t}_j = \arg\max_{\mathbf{t} \in \{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m\}} \|\mathbf{W}_{j-1} \mathbf{t}\|_2, \quad (28)$$




Figure 2: Comparison of the different heuristic selection strategies for tangential direction selection: The full heuristic selection based on (26) performs best closely followed by the projected variant (27). The residual-based heuristic selection (28) performs slightly worse than the other heuristics but still provides reasonably fast convergence.

where  $\mathbf{W}_{j-1}$  is the previous residual factor and  $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_m$  are the unitary eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{R}$ . This heuristic is computationally inexpensive even on the high-dimensional residual factor since it fully avoids the solution of linear systems. However, Equation (28) does not account for the influence of the next ADI shift so that we expect a tangential ADI algorithm equipped with (28) to converge slower in terms of iteration steps than a tangential ADI that uses (27).

To illustrate the difference between the proposed selection heuristics, we employ the same test example that has been used in Section 4.2.2. The results shown in Figure 2 verify that the full heuristic from (26) performs consistently best with the smallest number of iterations. However, the projected variant (27), which is computationally significantly cheaper, performs very similarly to the full approach. Finally, the residual-based variant from (28) performs the worst of all the considered strategies but still yields reasonably fast convergence so that it could be employed in practice. We also note that the residual-based approach shows several phases of stagnation throughout the iteration. This implies that selecting directions with respect to the largest residual contribution does not necessarily lead to a reduction of the residual norm.

## 5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we demonstrate the proposed tangential ADI method (further on denoted by TADI) in comparison to the classical block approach (from here on as ADI) on several synthetic and real-world benchmark examples. Following the discussions in Section 4, we restrict ourselves for TADI to the tangential ADI method with eigenvector directions as outlined in Algorithms 6 and 7 and using the projected heuristic selection of the tangential directions from Algorithm 8. Also, for ADI and TADI, shifts are adaptively computed using the projection shift routine from Algorithm 5. For the comparisons, we are computing the normalized residual norms as

$$\frac{\|\mathcal{L}_j\|_2}{\|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H\|_2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}_j\mathbf{E}^H + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}_j\mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H\|_2}{\|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^H\|_2},$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_j = \mathbf{L}_j\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{L}_j^H$  is the current ADI iterate. In all experiments, all shown methods are run to compute approximations with a normalized residual norm of less than  $10^{-12}$ .




Figure 3: Convergence plots for ADI methods on synthetic examples: The tangential ADI methods converge similarly to the classical block ADI methods in these examples to a normalized residual of about  $10^{-12}$ . For all shown methods, the implicit residual update formulas align with the true explicit Lyapunov residuals.

The reported numerical experiments have been performed on a MacBook Air with 16 GB of RAM and an Apple M2 processor running macOS Ventura version 13.4 with MATLAB 25.1.0.2973910 (R2025a) Update 1. The source codes, data, and results of the numerical experiments reported in this section and in [Section 4](#) are available at [\[47\]](#).

### 5.1 Verifying convergence and implicit residuals

Before tackling high-dimensional real-world examples from the literature, we will verify the correctness of our theoretical results with two medium-scale synthetic numerical examples. Both examples are randomly generated with the dimensions  $n = 1000$  and  $m = 20$  and modified so that the eigenvalues of the matrix pencils  $\lambda \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{A}$  lie in the open left half-plane. The first example has complex coefficient matrices, while the second one has real coefficients. For the real example, we note that the matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{E}$  are non-symmetric so that the shifts generated via [Algorithm 5](#) can be both real or occur in complex conjugate pairs. For both examples, the center matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is constructed to be indefinite. The final coefficient matrices for both examples have been exported and saved in the accompanying code package [\[47\]](#) for potential reproduction of the presented experiments.

The two goals of the numerical experiments with these examples are to verify for the complex as well as the real versions of the indefinite factorized ADI ADI and TADI that (i) the methods do converge to a reasonable approximation of the solution, and (ii) that the formulas from [Sections 2](#) and [3](#) for the implicitly updated residual factors do match with the true Lyapunov residual. The results of these experiments are shown in [Figure 3](#). We see that for both examples, the classical block ADI and the novel tangential approach converge to a normalized residual of about  $10^{-12}$ . Also, for both types of methods, the implicitly updated residual factors align with the true Lyapunov residuals, which verifies the computational correctness of our theoretical results from [Sections 2](#) and [3](#).




Figure 4: Convergence plot for the linear steel profile example: Both ADI methods converge fast to an accurate solution approximation. The tangential approach yields smaller solution factors than the block approach for the same level of accuracy due to the effective compression via the tangential directions.

## 5.2 Examples with large-scale coefficient matrices

In this section, we consider three known benchmark examples from the literature and compare the proposed tangential ADI method to the classical block approach.

### 5.2.1 Simplified heat transfer in a steel bar

The first example is the classical steel rail data set from [36, 41]. This data set describes the cooling process of a steel bar via a linear system of ordinary differential equations of the form

$$\tilde{E}\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{A}x(t) + \tilde{B}u(t), \quad y(t) = \tilde{C}x(t),$$

where  $\tilde{E}, \tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , and  $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ , with  $n = 20\,209$ ,  $m = 7$ , and  $p = 6$ . Therein, the matrix  $\tilde{E}$  is symmetric positive definite while  $\tilde{A}$  is symmetric negative definite. Lyapunov equations are used in the construction of reduced-order models and controllers for this dynamical system. Here, we aim for the solution of the observability Lyapunov equations, which is given in the form (2) by setting  $A = \tilde{A}^\top$ ,  $E = \tilde{E}^\top$ , and  $B = \tilde{C}^\top$ . For the center matrix  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ , we consider an indefinite symmetric matrix inspired by the setting of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -control [8, 34], where the positive eigenvalues correspond to the performance of the system while the negative eigenvalues describe how perturbations are observed.

The performance of TADI and ADI can be seen in Figure 4. Both methods converge fast to a small Lyapunov residual. However, the tangential approach provides the smaller solution factors for the same level of accuracy that is achieved by the block approach. The outer factors  $L_j$  in TADI have about 50 fewer columns than those computed by ADI.

### 5.2.2 Nonlinear heat transfer problem

This problem is a modification of the previous example modeling the cooling process of a steel bar. The original model developed in [41] naturally leads to a nonlinear dynamical system of the form

$$\tilde{E}\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{A}x(t) + \sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{N}_k x(t) u_k(t) + \tilde{B}u(t), \quad y(t) = \tilde{C}x(t), \quad (29)$$

where the bilinear terms are described by the matrices  $\tilde{N}_1, \dots, \tilde{N}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . The data for this example can be found in [42] and the matrix dimensions are as in Section 5.2.1. In




Figure 5: Convergence plot for the bilinear steel profile example: The tangential approach quickly converges to a solution approximation of dimension about 500, while the classical block approach gives back a solution approximation of dimension 16 000. Thus, the tangential approximation is  $32\times$  smaller than the results of the classical block method.

the design of low-dimensional models, systems analysis and controller design, systems of the form (29), multi-term Lyapunov equations need to be solved. A popular approach is the solution of such multi-term equations via the solution of coupled Lyapunov equations of the form

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}^\top + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^\top + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{N}_k \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{N}_k^\top + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{B}^\top = 0, \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_0$  is the solution to the classical Lyapunov equation (2) without the bilinear terms; see, for example, [45]. Given the low-rank approximation of the initial Lyapunov solution  $\mathbf{X}_0 \approx \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{L}^\top$ , we can reformulate (30) into a classical indefinite Lyapunov equation with

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}^\top + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}^\top + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = 0, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = [\mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{N}_1\mathbf{L} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{N}_m\mathbf{L}] \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & & & \\ & \mathbf{D} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We note that the constant term in (31) has generically a large rank due to the concatenation of previous solution factors, yet the solution of (31) is typically numerically low rank. For our numerical experiments, we use a rank-truncated version of the solution to the Lyapunov equation (down to rank 209) obtained for the linear steel profile example in Section 5.2.1 and restrict to a single nonzero  $\mathbf{N}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{N}}_k^\top$  term. The latter adjustment limits the size of the right-hand side to a level, which allows us to apply the classical ADI method for the comparison.

The results for this experiment are shown in Figure 5. The approximation computed by the tangential approach has only about 500 columns in the inner dimension, which is 32 times smaller than the solution computed with the block approach with returned solution factors with 16 000 columns. The tangential approach strongly outperformed the classical method in this example and saved significant amounts of computation time and memory in the process.




Figure 6: Convergence plot for the butterfly gyroscope example: The solution factors computed by TADI are more than 1 000 columns smaller than the factors computed by the classical block ADI. This is a 20% reduction in size by using the tangential approach.

### 5.2.3 Vibrational response of a mechanical microstructure

The final numerical example comes from the modeling of the vibrational response of a micro-mechanical gyroscope [18, 35]. The corresponding dynamical system is described by second-order differential equations. After reformulation into first-order form, we consider a Lyapunov equation of the form (2), where the coefficient matrices have the following block structure

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\widetilde{\mathbf{K}} \\ \mathbf{I}_q & -\widetilde{\mathbf{D}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_q & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{\mathbf{M}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^\top \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{D}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$  are symmetric positive definite. For the center term  $\mathbf{R}$ , we model again an indefinite matrix which represents the performance of the system and the observation of perturbations. The dimensions of the Lyapunov equation are  $n = 34\,722$  and  $m = 12$ .

The performance results for the two ADI methods are shown in Figure 6. While both methods compute suitable solution factors, the one constructed by the tangential approach is about 20% smaller than the one computed by the classical block approach. In relation to the overall size of the problem ( $n = 34\,722$ ), such a reduction yields significant improvements in terms of memory consumption.

## 6 Conclusions

In this work, we presented a tangential variant of the ADI iteration for the construction of low-rank solutions to Lyapunov equations with indefinite constant terms. We derived the theoretical foundations of the method in complex arithmetic and provided a variant of the theory as well as the algorithm that allows the construction of real solution factors in the case that the coefficient matrices of the Lyapunov equation are real. An adaptive projection-based shift computation method and a heuristic selection strategy for tangential directions have been presented to ensure efficient computations with guaranteed convergence. The numerical examples verified that the proposed tangential approach together with the adaptive parameter selection outperforms the current state-of-the-art ADI-based approach in terms of the size of the computed approximations.

While we motivated the restriction of the tangential directions to the eigenvectors of the center matrix in the constant term of the Lyapunov equation, it is not proven that there

exists no other set of potential tangential directions that also allows for the tangential ADI method to converge efficiently. In particular, further investigations are needed into why the mixing of positive and negative eigenspaces for the selection of the tangential directions leads to the divergence of the tangential ADI method. Theoretical results on this topic will have strong implications on the application of inexact and compressed Krylov subspaces in other research areas such as model order reduction or rational function interpolation.

## References

- [1] E. Armstrong. An extension of Bass’ algorithm for stabilizing linear continuous constant systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 20(1):153–154, 1975. doi:[10.1109/TAC.1975.1100874](https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.1975.1100874).
- [2] J. Baker, M. Embree, and J. Sabino. Fast singular value decay for Lyapunov solutions with nonnormal coefficients. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 36(2):656–668, 2015. doi:[10.1137/140993867](https://doi.org/10.1137/140993867).
- [3] J. A. Ball, I. Gohberg, and L. Rodman. *Interpolation of Rational Matrix Functions*, volume 45 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1990. doi:[10.1007/978-3-0348-7709-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-7709-1).
- [4] E. Bänsch, P. Benner, J. Saak, and H. K. Weichelt. Riccati-based boundary feedback stabilization of incompressible Navier-Stokes flows. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 37(2):A832–A858, 2015. doi:[10.1137/140980016](https://doi.org/10.1137/140980016).
- [5] R. H. Bartels and G. W. Stewart. Solution of the matrix equation  $AX + XB = C$ . *Commun. ACM*, 15(9):820–826, 1972. doi:[10.1145/361573.361582](https://doi.org/10.1145/361573.361582).
- [6] B. Beckermann and A. Gryson. Extremal rational functions on symmetric discrete sets and superlinear convergence of the ADI method. *Constr. Approx.*, 32(3):393–428, 2010. doi:[10.1007/s00365-010-9087-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-010-9087-6).
- [7] P. Benner, J. M. Claver, and E. S. Quintana-Ortí. Efficient solution of coupled Lyapunov equations via matrix sign function iteration. In *Proc. 3<sup>rd</sup> Portuguese Conf. on Automatic Control CONTROLO’98*, Coimbra, pages 205–210, 1998.
- [8] P. Benner, J. Heiland, and S. W. R. Werner. Robust output-feedback stabilization for incompressible flows using low-dimensional  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -controllers. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 82(1):225–249, 2022. doi:[10.1007/s10589-022-00359-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-022-00359-x).
- [9] P. Benner, M. Köhler, and J. Saak. Matrix Equations, Sparse Solvers: M-M.E.S.S.-2.0.1—Philosophy, features and application for (parametric) model order reduction. In P. Benner, T. Breiten, H. Faßbender, M. Hinze, T. Stykel, and R. Zimmermann, editors, *Model Reduction of Complex Dynamical Systems*, volume 171 of *International Series of Numerical Mathematics*, pages 369–392. Birkhäuser, Cham, 2021. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-72983-7\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72983-7_18).
- [10] P. Benner, P. Kürschner, and J. Saak. An improved numerical method for balanced truncation for symmetric second-order systems. *Math. Comput. Model. Dyn. Syst.*, 19(6):593–615, 2013. doi:[10.1080/13873954.2013.794363](https://doi.org/10.1080/13873954.2013.794363).



- [11] P. Benner, P. Kürschner, and J. Saak. Self-generating and efficient shift parameters in ADI methods for large Lyapunov and Sylvester equations. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 43:142–162, 2014. URL: <https://etna.mcs.kent.edu/volumes/2011-2020/vol43/abstract.php?vol=43&pages=142-162>.
- [12] P. Benner, J.-R. Li, and T. Penzl. Numerical solution of large-scale Lyapunov equations, Riccati equations, and linear-quadratic optimal control problems. *Numer. Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 15(9):755–777, 2008. doi:10.1002/nla.622.
- [13] P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, and D. C. Sorensen. *Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems*, volume 45 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.* Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. doi:10.1007/3-540-27909-1.
- [14] P. Benner and J. Saak. Numerical solution of large and sparse continuous time algebraic matrix Riccati and Lyapunov equations: a state of the art survey. *GAMM-Mitt.*, 36(1):32–52, 2013. doi:10.1002/gamm.201310003.
- [15] P. Benner, J. Saak, and M. M. Uddin. Structure preserving model order reduction of large sparse second-order index-1 systems and application to a mechatronics model. *Math. Comput. Model. Dyn. Syst.*, 22(6):509–523, 2016. doi:10.1080/13873954.2016.1218347.
- [16] P. Benner and T. Stykel. Numerical solution of projected algebraic Riccati equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52(2):581–600, 2014. doi:10.1137/130923993.
- [17] P. Benner and T. Stykel. Model order reduction for differential-algebraic equations: A survey. In A. Ilchmann and T. Reis, editors, *Surveys in Differential-Algebraic Equations IV*, Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum, pages 107–160. Springer, Cham, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-46618-7\_3.
- [18] D. Billger. The butterfly gyro. In P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, and D. C. Sorensen, editors, *Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems*, volume 45 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pages 349–352. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. doi:10.1007/3-540-27909-1\_18.
- [19] V. Druskin and V. Simoncini. Adaptive rational Krylov subspaces for large-scale dynamical systems. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 60(8):546–560, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.sysconle.2011.04.013.
- [20] F. Freitas, J. Rommes, and N. Martins. Gramian-based reduction method applied to large sparse power system descriptor models. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, 23(3):1258–1270, 2008. doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2008.926693.
- [21] K. Gallivan, A. Vandendorpe, and P. Van Dooren. Model reduction of MIMO systems via tangential interpolation. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 26(2):328–349, 2004. doi:10.1137/S0895479803423925.
- [22] M. Green. A relative error bound for balanced stochastic truncation. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 33(10):961–965, 1988. doi:10.1109/9.7255.
- [23] N. Halko, P. G. Martinsson, and J. A. Tropp. Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions. *SIAM Rev.*, 53(2):217–288, 2011. doi:10.1137/090771806.

- [24] S. J. Hammarling. Numerical solution of the stable, non-negative definite Lyapunov equation. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 2(3):303–323, 1982. doi:10.1093/imanum/2.3.303.
- [25] J. Heiland, Y. Kim, and S. W. R. Werner. Deep polytopic autoencoders for low-dimensional linear parameter-varying approximations and nonlinear feedback design. e-print 2403.18044, arXiv, 2024. Optimization and Control (math.OC). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2403.18044.
- [26] M. Hochbruck and G. Starke. Preconditioned Krylov subspace methods for Lyapunov matrix equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 16(1):156–171, 1995. doi:10.1137/S0895479892239238.
- [27] P. Kürschner. *Efficient Low-Rank Solution of Large-Scale Matrix Equations*. Dissertation, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität, Magdeburg, Germany, 2016. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-0029-CE18-2>.
- [28] N. Lang, H. Mena, and J. Saak. An  $LDL^T$  factorization based ADI algorithm for solving large-scale differential matrix equations. *Proc. Appl. Math. Mech.*, 14(1):827–828, 2014. doi:10.1002/pamm.201410394.
- [29] N. Lang, H. Mena, and J. Saak. On the benefits of the  $LDL^T$  factorization for large-scale differential matrix equation solvers. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 480:44–71, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2015.04.006.
- [30] J.-R. Li and J. White. Low rank solution of Lyapunov equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 24(1):260–280, 2002. doi:10.1137/S0895479801384937.
- [31] V. Mehrmann and T. Stykel. Balanced truncation model reduction for large-scale systems in descriptor form. In P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, and D. C. Sorensen, editors, *Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems*, volume 45 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pages 83–115. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. doi:10.1007/3-540-27909-1\_3.
- [32] H. Mena, A. Ostermann, L.-M. Pfurtscheller, and C. Piazzola. Numerical low-rank approximation of matrix differential equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 340:602–614, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.cam.2018.01.035.
- [33] B. C. Moore. Principal component analysis in linear systems: controllability, observability, and model reduction. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, AC-26(1):17–32, 1981. doi:10.1109/TAC.1981.1102568.
- [34] D. Mustafa and K. Glover. Controller reduction by  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -balanced truncation. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 36(6):668–682, 1991. doi:10.1109/9.86941.
- [35] Oberwolfach Benchmark Collection. Butterfly gyroscope. hosted at MORwiki – Model Order Reduction Wiki, 2004. URL: [https://modelreduction.org/morwiki/index.php/Butterfly\\_Gyroscope](https://modelreduction.org/morwiki/index.php/Butterfly_Gyroscope).
- [36] Oberwolfach Benchmark Collection. Steel profile. hosted at MORwiki – Model Order Reduction Wiki, 2005. URL: [https://modelreduction.org/morwiki/Steel\\_Profile](https://modelreduction.org/morwiki/Steel_Profile).
- [37] D. W. Peaceman and H. H. Rachford Jr. The numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations. *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.*, 3(1):28–41, 1955. doi:10.1137/0103003.

- [38] T. Penzl. A cyclic low-rank Smith method for large sparse Lyapunov equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 21(4):1401–1418, 2000. doi:[10.1137/S1064827598347666](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1064827598347666).
- [39] T. Penzl. Eigenvalue decay bounds for solutions of Lyapunov equations: the symmetric case. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 40(2):139–144, 2000. doi:[10.1016/S0167-6911\(00\)00010-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6911(00)00010-4).
- [40] J. D. Roberts. Linear model reduction and solution of the algebraic Riccati equation by use of the sign function. *Internat. J. Control*, 32(4):677–687, 1980. Reprint of Technical Report No. TR-13, CUED/B-Control, Cambridge University, Engineering Department, 1971. doi:[10.1080/00207178008922881](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207178008922881).
- [41] J. Saak. Effiziente numerische Lösung eines Optimalsteuerungsproblems für die Abkühlung von Stahlprofilen. Diploma thesis, Universität Bremen, Germany, 2003. doi:[10.5281/zenodo.1187041](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1187041).
- [42] J. Saak, M. Köhler, and P. Benner. M-M.E.S.S. – The Matrix Equations Sparse Solvers library (version 3.0), August 2023. See also: <https://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/projects/mess>. doi:[10.5281/zenodo.7701424](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7701424).
- [43] J. Saak and M. Voigt. Model reduction of constrained mechanical systems in M-M.E.S.S. *IFAC-Pap.*, 51(2):661–666, 2018. 9th Vienna International Conference on Mathematical Modelling MATHMOD 2018. doi:[10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.03.112](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.03.112).
- [44] J. Saak and S. W. R. Werner. Using  $LDL^T$  factorizations in Newton’s method for solving general large-scale algebraic Riccati equations. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 62:95–118, 2024. doi:[10.1553/etna\\_vol62s95](https://doi.org/10.1553/etna_vol62s95).
- [45] S. D. Shank, V. Simoncini, and D. B. Szyld. Efficient low-rank solution of generalized Lyapunov equations. *Numer. Math.*, 134(2):327–342, 2015. doi:[10.1007/s00211-015-0777-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-015-0777-7).
- [46] V. Simoncini. A new iterative method for solving large-scale Lyapunov matrix equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 29(3):1268–1288, 2007. doi:[10.1137/06066120X](https://doi.org/10.1137/06066120X).
- [47] R. Smith and S. W. R. Werner. Code, data and results for numerical experiments in “A tangential ADI method for the efficient solution of large-scale indefinite Lyapunov equations” (version 1.0), December 2025. doi:[10.5281/zenodo.17632592](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17632592).
- [48] E. D. Sontag. *Mathematical Control Theory*, volume 6 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, second edition, 1998. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4612-0577-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0577-7).
- [49] T. Stykel. Low-rank iterative methods for projected generalized Lyapunov equations. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 30:187–202, 2008. URL: <https://etna.math.kent.edu/volumes/2001-2010/vol30/abstract.php?vol=30&pages=187-202>.
- [50] N. Truhar and K. Veselić. Bounds on the trace of a solution to the Lyapunov equation with a general stable matrix. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 56(7–8):493–503, 2007. doi:[10.1016/j.sysconle.2007.02.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2007.02.003).
- [51] E. Wachspress. *The ADI Model Problem*. Springer, New York, NY, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4614-5122-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5122-8).

- [52] T. Wolf, H. K. F. Panzer, and B. Lohmann. ADI iteration for Lyapunov equations: A tangential approach and adaptive shift selection. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 109:85–95, 2016. doi:[10.1016/j.apnum.2016.06.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2016.06.006).