

SECANT METHOD ON RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

RODRIGO CASTRO, GUSTAVO DI GIORGI, AND WILLY SIERRA

ABSTRACT. In this work, by using techniques and results of differential geometry, we propose a new numerical method on complete Riemannian manifolds to find zeros of vector fields. Our algorithm generalizes the classical secant method.

1. INTRODUCTION

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATIONS

2.1. Geometric preliminaries. Let M be a real m -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Given $p \in M$, T_pM will denote the tangent space to M at p , and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ we will denote the scalar product on T_pM , which induces the norm $\|\cdot\|_p = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p^{1/2}$, where the subscript p is usually deleted whenever there is no possibility of confusion. The tangent bundle of M is defined by

$$TM := \{(p, v); p \in M \text{ and } v \in T_pM\} = \bigcup_{p \in M} T_pM,$$

which can be endowed with a $2m$ -dimensional differentiable structure.

A vector field X on M is a function that assigns to each point $p \in M$ a tangent vector $X_p \in T_pM$. We will say that the vector field X is differentiable if the function $X : M \rightarrow TM$ is differentiable. Henceforth, $\mathcal{X}(M)$ will denote the space of all differentiable vector fields on M and we will use $\mathcal{D}(M)$ to denote the ring of differentiable real-valued functions on M . Given $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}(M)$, $df(X) = X(f)$ represents the directional derivative of f in the direction X , where df stands for the differential of f .

If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is a piecewise smooth curve, we define the length of γ by

$$l(\gamma) = \int_a^b \|\gamma'(t)\| dt = \int_a^b \left\langle \frac{d\gamma}{dt}, \frac{d\gamma}{dt} \right\rangle^{1/2} dt,$$

this definition is independent of parametrization and induces a metric on M as follows: the Riemannian distance from p to q is defined by, [3]

$$d(p, q) := \inf_{\gamma} l(\gamma),$$

where the infimum is taken over all the piecewise smooth curves γ connecting p and q . The induced topology by the metric d coincides with the topology of the manifold M .

An affine connection ∇ on M is a mapping

$$\nabla : \mathcal{X}(M) \times \mathcal{X}(M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{X}(M)$$

written $(X, Y) \longmapsto \nabla_X Y$ that satisfies the following conditions:

i) $\nabla_X Y$ is $\mathcal{D}(M)$ –linear in X :

$$\nabla_{fX+gY} Z = f\nabla_X Z + g\nabla_Y Z;$$

ii) $\nabla_X Y$ is \mathbb{R} –linear in Y :

$$\nabla_X (aY + bZ) = a\nabla_X Y + b\nabla_X Z;$$

iii) ∇ satisfies the product rule:

$$\nabla_X (fY) = f\nabla_X Y + X(f)Y,$$

where $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{X}(M)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, and $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(M)$. The vector field $\nabla_X Y$ is called the covariant derivative of Y with respect to X for the connection ∇ . Since $\nabla_X Y$ is tensorial in X we see that the value of $\nabla_X Y|_p$, $p \in M$, depends only on the values of Y in a neighborhood of p and of $X(p)$, so $\nabla_v Y$ is well defined for all $v \in T_p M$. More precisely, $\nabla_v Y = \nabla_X Y|_p$, where X is any vector field satisfying $X_p = v$. This guarantees that for all $p \in M$, the linear function $\mathcal{D}Y(p) : T_p M \longrightarrow T_p M$ given by $\mathcal{D}Y(p)(v) = \nabla_X Y(p)$, where X is any vector field such that $X(p) = v$, is well define.

Let us consider now a curve $\gamma : [a, b] \longrightarrow M$ and a vector field Y along γ , that is, $Y(\gamma(t)) \in T_{\gamma(t)} M$ for all $t \in [a, b]$. We say that Y is parallel along γ if $\nabla_{\gamma'(t)} Y = 0$ for all t . The affine connection is *compatible* with the metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, when for any smooth curve γ and any pair of parallel vector fields P and P' along γ , we have that $\langle P, P' \rangle$ is constant; equivalently,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle X, Y \rangle = \langle \nabla_{\gamma'(t)} X, Y \rangle + \langle X, \nabla_{\gamma'(t)} Y \rangle,$$

for any two vector fields X, Y along γ (cf. [3]). We say that ∇ is *symmetric* if

$$\nabla_X Y - \nabla_Y X = [X, Y] \text{ for all } X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(M),$$

where $[X, Y]$ is the vector field defined by

$$[X, Y]_p f = (X_p Y - Y_p X)f, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(M).$$

The Levi–Civita Theorem establishes that there exists an unique affine connection ∇ on M compatible with the metric and symmetric, this connection is called the Levi-Civita connection (cf. [3]).

Let ∇ be the Levi–Civita connection associated with the Riemannian metric, we say that a parametrized curve $\gamma : I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ is a geodesic at $t_0 \in I$ if $\nabla_{\gamma'(t)} \gamma'(t) = 0$ at the point t_0 . If γ is a geodesic for all $t \in I$, we say that γ is a geodesic, in this case $\|\gamma'(t)\|$ is constant. The restriction of γ to $[a, b] \subseteq I$ is called a geodesic segment joining $\gamma(a)$ to $\gamma(b)$. A geodesic γ joining p to q is said to be minimal if $l(\gamma) = d(p, q)$.

As is known a Riemannian manifold is complete if for any $p \in M$ all geodesic emanating from p is defined for all $-\infty < t < \infty$. By the Hopf–Rinow Theorem, we have that if M is complete then any pair of points in M can be joined by a minimal geodesic. Moreover, (M, d) is a complete metric space (cf. [3]).

Let $B(p, r)$ and $B[p, r]$ denote respectively the open geodesic ball and the closed geodesic with center p and radius r , that is,

$$B(p, r) = \{q \in M : d(p, q) < r\} \quad \text{and} \quad B[p, r] = \{q \in M : d(p, q) \leq r\}.$$

An open set U of M will be called convex if given $p, q \in U$ there exists an unique minimal geodesic in U from p to q .

Assuming that M be complete, if $v \in T_p M$ there exists an unique locally minimizing geodesic γ such that $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$. The point $\gamma(1)$ is called the image of v by the exponential map at p , that is, the function

$$\exp_p : T_p M \longrightarrow M$$

given by $\exp_p(v) = \gamma(1)$ is well defined. It is not difficult see that, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, $\gamma(t) = \exp_p(tv)$. For other important properties of the exponential map, see [3]. When for all $p \in M$ the exponential map is defined for all $v \in T_p M$ we will say that the Riemannian manifold M is geodesically complete or, simply, complete. This is equivalent to say that for all $p \in M$, any geodesic γ starting from p is defined for all values of the parameter $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Next, we recall the notion of parallel transport.

Definition 1. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M$ be a piecewise smooth curve, the parallel transport along γ , denoted by P_γ, \dots is defined by

$$P_{\gamma,a,b} : \begin{array}{ccc} T_{\gamma(a)}M & \longrightarrow & T_{\gamma(b)}M \\ v & \longmapsto & V(\gamma(b)), \end{array}$$

for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$; where V is the unique vector field along γ satisfying $\nabla_{\gamma'(t)}V = 0$ and $V(\gamma(a)) = v$.

It is easy to show that $P_{\gamma,a,b}$ is linear and one-one, so that $P_{\gamma,a,b}$ is an isomorphism between the tangent spaces $T_{\gamma(a)}M$ and $T_{\gamma(b)}M$. Its inverse is the parallel transport along the reversed portion of γ from $V(\gamma(b))$ to $V(\gamma(a))$. Thus $P_{\gamma,a,b}$ is an isometry between $T_{\gamma(a)}M$ and $T_{\gamma(b)}M$. Note that, for any $a, b, d \in \mathbb{R}$ the parallel transport has the following important properties:

$$P_{\gamma,b,d} \circ P_{\gamma,a,b} = P_{\gamma,a,d}, \quad P_{\gamma,b,a}^{-1} = P_{\gamma,a,b}, \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\gamma,a,b}(\gamma'(a)) = \gamma'(b).$$

2.2. Divided differences on Riemannian manifolds. We start with the definition of divided difference, which has been widely studied in the setting of Banach space. Let X, Y be two real vector spaces and $B(X, Y)$ the space of bounded linear operators from X into Y . Give a function $F : X \rightarrow Y$, an operator $[x, y, F] \in B(X, Y)$

is said to be a divided difference of first order of F in the pair of points x, y , $x \neq y$, if

$$(1) \quad [x, y, F](x - y) = F(x) - F(y).$$

With this notation, in [1] the secant method in Banach spaces is described by the following algorithm:

$$x_{n+1} = x_n - [x_{n-1}, x_n, F]^{-1} F(x_n), \quad x_0, x_1 \text{ given.}$$

Following these ideas, we give a definition of divided differences on Riemannian manifolds, which is a slight modification of the definition proposed in [24].

Definition 2. *Let M be a Riemannian manifold and γ a regular curve in M . Let us suppose that $[s, s+h] \subset \text{dom}(\gamma)$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ is a continuous vector field on M . A linear operator*

$$\theta : T_{\gamma(s+h)}M \longrightarrow T_{\gamma(s)}M$$

is said to be a divided difference of first order for the vector field X on the points $\gamma(s)$, $\gamma(s+h)$ in direction $\gamma'(s)$ if satisfies

$$(2) \quad \theta(P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(\gamma'(s))) = \frac{1}{h} (X(\gamma(s+h)) - P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(X(\gamma(s)))).$$

Given $p, q \in M$, $[p, q; X]$ will denote a divided difference satisfying (2) with γ a geodesic joining the points $\gamma(s) = p$ and $\gamma(s+h) = q$, $[s, s+h] \subset \text{dom}(\gamma)$.

We observe that if M is an euclidean space, the geodesic connecting two points $x, y \in M$ is given by

$$\gamma(s) = x + s(y - x), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then (2) implies, with $s = 0$ and $h = 1$, that

$$[x, y; X](y - x) = \theta(y - x) = X(y) - X(x),$$

which is (1) with $F = X$. So, (2) generalizes the classical definition of divided difference of first order in euclidean spaces.

The following theorem shows that we can always define a divided difference for a vector field X on a Riemannian manifold M , on any pair of points of a curve $\gamma \subset M$.

Teorema 3. *Let M be a manifold, X a vector field (not necessarily continuous) on M , and let γ be a regular curve on M , such that $[s, s+h] \subset \text{dom}(\gamma)$. Then there is a divided difference of first order for the vector field X on the points $\gamma(s)$ and $\gamma(s+h)$ in direction $\gamma'(s)$.*

Proof. Given $s \in \text{dom}(\gamma)$, we consider the subspace $M_1 = \text{gen} \{\gamma'(s)\} \subseteq T_{\gamma(s)}M$ and define on $\tilde{M}_1 = P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(M_1) \subseteq T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$ the linear application $\tilde{\theta} : \tilde{M}_1 \longrightarrow T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$ by

$$\tilde{\theta} \circ P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(\lambda\gamma'(s)) = \frac{1}{h} (\lambda X(\gamma(s+h)) - \lambda P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(X(\gamma(s)))).$$

Let Π be the linear projection of $T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$ onto \tilde{M}_1 . Then $\Pi(v) = v$ for all $v \in \tilde{M}_1$ and therefore, the linear application

$$\theta := \tilde{\theta} \circ \Pi : T_{\gamma(s+h)}M \longrightarrow T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s))) &= \tilde{\theta}(\Pi(P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s)))) \\ &= \tilde{\theta} \circ P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{h}(X(\gamma(s+h)) - P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(X(\gamma(s)))) , \end{aligned}$$

which shows that θ is a divided difference of the vector field X on the points $\gamma(s)$, $\gamma(s+h)$ in direction $\gamma'(s)$. \square

Following the argument of the proof of the before theorem, we construct some examples of divided difference for (not necessarily differentiable) vector fields.

Example 4. We suppose that γ is a regular curve on a Riemannian manifold M and let s, h such that $[s, s+h] \subset \text{dom}(\gamma)$. We take a basis

$$\{e_{\gamma(s+h)}^i\}_{i=1}^n$$

of $T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$, and in this basis we write $P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s))$ in the form

$$P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\gamma e_{\gamma(s+h)}^i, \quad \lambda_i^\gamma \in \mathbb{R}.$$

As $P_{\gamma,s,s+h}$ is injective and $\gamma'(s) \neq 0$, if i_0 is the first index for which $\lambda_{i_0}^\gamma \neq 0$, then

$$\left\{ e_{\gamma(s+h)}^1, \dots, e_{\gamma(s+h)}^{i_0-1}, P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s)), e_{\gamma(s+h)}^{i_0+1}, \dots, e_{\gamma(s+h)}^n \right\}$$

also is a basis of $T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$. Let now M_1 , \tilde{M}_1 , and $\tilde{\theta}$ be as in the proof of the preceding theorem, and we define the linear projection $\Pi : T_{\gamma(s+h)}M \longrightarrow \tilde{M}_1$ by

$$\Pi(P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s))) = P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(e_{\gamma(s+h)}^i) = 0_{\gamma(s+h)}, \quad \text{for } i \neq i_0,$$

where $0_{\gamma(s+h)}$ denotes the null vector of $T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$. Thus, for $v = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^\gamma e_{\gamma(s+h)}^i \in T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$,

$$\Pi(v) = \beta_{i_0}^\gamma \Pi(e_{\gamma(s+h)}^{i_0}),$$

whence, in virtue of the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s))) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\gamma \Pi(e_{\gamma(s+h)}^i) \\ &= \lambda_{i_0}^\gamma \Pi(e_{\gamma(s+h)}^{i_0}), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that

$$\Pi(v) = \frac{\beta_{i_0}^\gamma}{\lambda_{i_0}^\gamma} \Pi(P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(\gamma'(s))).$$

From here, the linear application $\theta = \tilde{\theta} \circ \Pi$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(v) &= \frac{\beta_{i_0}^\gamma}{\lambda_{i_0}^\gamma} \Pi(P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(\gamma'(s))) \\ (3) \quad &= \frac{\beta_{i_0}^\gamma}{\lambda_{i_0}^\gamma} \tilde{\theta}(P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(\gamma'(s))) \\ &= \frac{\beta_{i_0}^\gamma}{\lambda_{i_0}^\gamma} \frac{1}{h} (X(\gamma(s+h)) - P_{\gamma, s, s+h}(X(\gamma(s)))). \end{aligned}$$

The former example is useful when the field vector is not differentiable; the next lemma gives other divided differences, which we will define in terms of the covariant derivative, for differentiable vector fields.

Lema 5. *Let γ be a geodesic on a Riemannian manifold M and let X be a vector field of class C^1 on M . Then for all $s, h \in \text{dom}(\gamma)$, the operator $[\gamma(s), \gamma(s+h); X]$ defined by*

$$[\gamma(s), \gamma(s+h); X](\cdot) := \frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma, t, s+h}(\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma, s+h, t}(\cdot))) dt$$

is a divided difference along of the curve γ . In particular, if γ is a geodesic joining the points $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma(1) = q$, we obtain

$$[p, q; X](\cdot) = \int_0^1 P_{\gamma, t, 1}(\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma, 1, t}(\cdot))) dt.$$

Proof. We consider the curve in $T_{\gamma(s)}M$ given by

$$f(t) = P_{\gamma, t, s}(X(\gamma(t))), \quad t \in \text{dom}(\gamma).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(t+w) - f(t)}{w} \\ &= \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{w} (P_{\gamma, t+w, s}(X(\gamma(t+w))) - P_{\gamma, t, s}(X(\gamma(t)))) \\ &= \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{w} (P_{\gamma, t, s}(P_{\gamma, s, t} \circ P_{\gamma, t+w, s} X(\gamma(t+w)) - X(\gamma(t)))), \end{aligned}$$

whence, by continuity and linearity of $P_{\gamma,t,s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= P_{\gamma,t,s} \left[\lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{w} (P_{\gamma,s,t} \circ P_{\gamma,t+w,s} (X(\gamma(t+w))) - X(\gamma(t))) \right] \\ &= P_{\gamma,t,s} \left[\lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{w} (P_{\gamma,t+w,t} (X(\gamma(t+w))) - X(\gamma(t))) \right] \\ &= P_{\gamma,t,s} (\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(\gamma'(t))), \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,t,s} (\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(\gamma'(t))) dt &= \int_s^{s+h} f'(t) dt \\ &= f(s+h) - f(s) \\ &= P_{\gamma,s+h,s} (X(\gamma(s+h))) - P_{\gamma,s,s} (X(\gamma(s))) \\ &= P_{\gamma,s+h,s} (X(\gamma(s+h))) - X(\gamma(s)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,t,s+h} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma,s+h,t}(\gamma'(s+h)))] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,s,s+h} \circ P_{\gamma,t,s} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma,s+h,t}(\gamma'(s+h)))] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{h} P_{\gamma,s,s+h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,t,s} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(\gamma'(t))] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{h} P_{\gamma,s,s+h} (P_{\gamma,s+h,s} X(\gamma(s+h)) - X(\gamma(s))) \\ &= \frac{1}{h} (X(\gamma(s+h)) - P_{\gamma,s,s+h} X(\gamma(s))), \end{aligned}$$

and, in consequence, the linear operator $\theta : T_{\gamma(s+h)}M \rightarrow T_{\gamma(s+h)}M$ defined by the formula

$$\theta(\cdot) := \frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,t,s+h} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma,s+h,t}(\cdot))] dt,$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(P_{\gamma,s,s+h}(\gamma'(s))) &= \theta(\gamma'(s+h)) \\ &= \frac{1}{h} (X(\gamma(s+h)) - P_{\gamma,s,s+h} X(\gamma(s))). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, θ is a divided difference for the vector field X on the points $\gamma(s)$, $\gamma(s+h)$ in direction $\gamma'(s)$. So, with the notation of Definition 2,

$$[\gamma(s), \gamma(s+h); X](\cdot) := \frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} P_{\gamma,t,s+h} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma,s+h,t}(\cdot))] dt.$$

In particular, if γ is a geodesic joining the points $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma(1) = q$, we have

$$[p, q; X](\cdot) = \int_0^1 P_{\gamma,t,1} [\mathcal{D}X(\gamma(t))(P_{\gamma,1,t}(\cdot))] dt,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

3. SECANT METHOD ON RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

In this section we formulate our method, which allows us to find zeros of a vector field on a Riemannian manifold. For the formulation, we use the same notation as in Section 2. The algorithm is defined by

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} v_n &= -[p_{n-1}, p_n, X]^{-1}(X(p_n)) \\ p_{n+1} &= \exp_{p_n}(v_n), \end{cases}$$

for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, with p_0 and p_1 given.

We will study a result of semi-local convergence, for which we need extend, to the context of manifolds, conditions of continuity of the Holder-type and Lipschitz-type.

Throughout Section 3, $\omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a function that is non-decreasing and continuous in its two arguments. Let M be a Riemannian manifold and $\Omega \subset M$ an open set. We say that a vector field $X \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ satisfies the ω -condition on Ω , if

$$(5) \quad \|[p_1, p_2, X] \circ (P_{\gamma,0,1}) - (P_{\gamma,0,1}) \circ [q_1, q_2, X]\| \leq \omega(d(p_1, q_1), d(p_2, q_2))$$

for all $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in \Omega$, where γ is a geodesic joining the points $\gamma(0) = q_2$ and $\gamma(1) = p_2$.

3.1. Analysis for semilocal convergence. Let Ω be an open connected subset of a Riemannian manifold M and $p_0, p_{-1} \in \Omega$. Next we define the following functions:

$$a(u) = \frac{\beta\omega(\alpha, u)}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha, u)}, \quad b(u) = \frac{\beta\omega(u, 2u)}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha + u, u)}, \quad c(u) = \frac{\beta\omega(2u, 2u)}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha + u, u)},$$

where

$$(6) \quad \alpha = d(p_0, p_{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \|[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}\|.$$

Teorema 6. *With the above notation, we suppose that for all $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, \Omega$ there are divided difference operators of order one $[p_1, p_2; X]$ and $[q_1, q_2; X]$ satisfying the ω -condition (5). Let us assume that*

- i) the linear operator $L_0 = [p_{-1}, p_0, X]$ is invertible and $\|[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}(X(p_0))\| \leq \eta$;
- ii) the equation

$$u = \left(\frac{b(u)a(u)}{1 - c(u)} + a(u) + 1 \right) \eta$$

has a smaller positive root R , which satisfies

$$\beta\omega(R + \alpha, R) < 1, \quad c(R) < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad B[p_0, R] \subset \Omega.$$

Then the sequence (p_k) generated by the secant method (4) is well defined and converges to the unique solution $p_* \in B(p_0, R)$.

In order to prove the theorem, we first prove some lemmas.

Lema 7. *If the sequence (p_k) generated by the secant method (4) is well defined, then*

$$(7) \quad X(p_n) = ([p_{n-1}, p_n, X] \circ P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1} - P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1} \circ [p_{n-2}, p_{n-1}, X])(v_{n-1}),$$

where γ_{n-1} is the minimizing geodesic joining $\gamma_{n-1}(0) = p_{n-1}$ to $\gamma_{n-1}(1) = p_n$.

Proof. By (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\gamma_{n-1}(s), \gamma_{n-1}(s+h); X] \circ P_{\gamma_{n-1}, s, s+h}(\gamma'_{n-1}(s)) = \\ \frac{1}{h} (X(\gamma_{n-1}(s+h)) - P_{\gamma_{n-1}, s, s+h}(X(\gamma_{n-1}(s)))) , \end{aligned}$$

from which we obtain, with $s = 0$ and $h = 1$, that

$$[p_{n-1}, p_n, X] \circ P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}(\gamma'_{n-1}(0)) = X(p_n) - P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}(X(p_{n-1})).$$

It follows from $\gamma'_{n-1}(0) = v_{n-1}$, which is a consequence of the equality

$$\gamma_{n-1}(t) = \exp_{p_{n-1}}(tv_{n-1}),$$

that

$$(8) \quad [p_{n-1}, p_n, X] \circ P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}(v_{n-1}) = X(p_n) - P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}(X(p_{n-1})).$$

On the other hand, by (4)

$$v_{n-1} = -[p_{n-2}, p_{n-1}, X]^{-1}(X(p_{n-1})),$$

whence

$$X(p_{n-1}) = -[p_{n-2}, p_{n-1}, X](v_{n-1}).$$

Hence and (8),

$$[p_{n-1}, p_n, X] \circ P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}(v_{n-1}) = X(p_n) + P_{\gamma_{n-1}, 0, 1}[p_{n-2}, p_{n-1}, X](v_{n-1}),$$

which implies (7). □

Lema 8. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 6 we have that*

$$d(p_3, p_0) \leq (ba + a + 1)\eta < R,$$

where $a = a(R)$ and $b = b(R)$.

Proof. We first prove that $p_1 \in B(p_0, R)$. In fact, by (4) one has

$$\begin{aligned} v_0 &= -[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}(X(p_0)) \\ p_1 &= \exp_{p_0}(v_0), \end{aligned}$$

whence, because of $\gamma_0(t) = \exp_{p_0}(tv_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_0, p_1) &= \int_0^1 \|\gamma_0'(t)\| dt \\ &= \|v_0\| \\ &= \|[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}(X(p_0))\|. \end{aligned}$$

From here and the hypothesis *ii*), we get

$$(9) \quad d(p_0, p_1) \leq \eta < R.$$

On the other hand, the ω -condition (5) implies

$$(10) \quad \|P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X] - [p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1}\| \leq \omega(d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_1, p_0)) \leq \omega(\alpha, R),$$

the last inequality being a consequence of (6), $d(p_0, p_1) < R$, and the fact that ω is non-decreasing in its two arguments. Since the parallel transport is an isometry, it follows by hypothesis *ii*) that

$$\|P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X] - [p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1}\| < \frac{1}{\beta} = \frac{1}{\|(P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X])^{-1}\|}.$$

Thus, a classical result of linear operator theory, see Theorem 2.3.5 in [38], shows that $[p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1}$ is invertible and moreover,

$$\|[p_0, p_1, X]^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\|[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}\|}{1 - \|[p_{-1}, p_0, X]^{-1}\| \|P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X] - [p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1}\|}.$$

We conclude from (6) and (10) that

$$(11) \quad \|[p_0, p_1, X]^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha, R)}.$$

Next, we note that by Lemma 7 and (10) we get,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|X(p_1)\| &= \|[p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1} - P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| \|v_0\| \\ &\leq \|[p_0, p_1, X] \circ P_{\gamma_0,0,1} - P_{\gamma_0,0,1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| \|v_0\| \\ &\leq \omega(\alpha, R) \|v_0\| \\ &= \omega(\alpha, R) d(p_0, p_1). \end{aligned}$$

The following step is to show that $d(p_1, p_2) \leq \alpha d(p_0, p_1)$ and $d(p_0, p_2) < R$. To prove the first inequality, we use (4) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= -[p_0, p_1, X]^{-1}(X(p_1)) \\ p_2 &= \exp_{p_1}(v_1), \end{aligned}$$

which gives, by (11) and (12),

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_2, p_1) &= \|v_1\| \\ &\leq \|[p_0, p_1, X]^{-1}\| \|X(p_1)\| \\ &\leq \|[p_0, p_1, X]^{-1}\| \|X(p_1)\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\omega(\alpha, R)}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha, R)} d(p_1, p_0). \end{aligned}$$

By definition of a it follows that

$$(13) \quad d(p_2, p_1) \leq ad(p_1, p_0),$$

which gives us that

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} d(p_2, p_0) &\leq d(p_2, p_1) + d(p_1, p_0) \\ &\leq (a + 1)d(p_1, p_0) \\ &< (a + 1)\eta. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of R , we obtain the second inequality. Thus

$$(15) \quad P_2 \in B(p_0, R).$$

Now, we consider a sequence of geodesics (ϕ_n) satisfying $\phi_n(0) = p_0$, $\phi_n(1) = p_n$, and $\phi_1 = \gamma_0$. We conclude from (5), (6), (15), and $d(p_0, p_1) < R$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[p_1, p_2, X] \circ P_{\phi_2, 0, 1} - P_{\phi_2, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| &\leq \omega(d(p_1, p_{-1}), d(p_2, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_0, p_1) + d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_2, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(R + \alpha, R), \end{aligned}$$

hence that

$$\|[p_1, p_2, X] \circ P_{\phi_2, 0, 1} - P_{\phi_2, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| \leq \frac{1}{\beta},$$

by hypothesis *ii*). Proceeding as in the proof of (11) one obtains that the operator $[p_1, p_2, X]$ is invertible and

$$(16) \quad \|[p_1, p_2, X]^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)}.$$

We claim that $d(p_3, p_2) \leq bd(p_2, p_1)$. Indeed, by Lemma 7,

$$X(p_2) = ([p_1, p_2, X] \circ P_{\gamma_1, 0, 1} - P_{\gamma_1, 0, 1} \circ [p_0, p_1, X])(v_1),$$

from which we infer, by using (5) and $d(p_2, p_1) = \|v_1\|$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(p_2)\| &\leq \|[p_1, p_2, X] \circ P_{\gamma_1, 0, 1} - P_{\gamma_1, 0, 1} \circ [p_0, p_1, X]\| \|v_1\| \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_1, p_0), d(p_2, p_1)) d(p_2, p_1) \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_1, p_0), d(p_2, p_0) + d(p_1, p_0)) d(p_2, p_1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to what we have proved above,

$$(17) \quad \|X(p_2)\| \leq \omega(R, R+R) d(p_2, p_1) \leq \omega(R, 2R) d(p_2, p_1).$$

Here we have used the fact that ω is non-decreasing in its two arguments.

On the other hand, by (4),

$$\begin{aligned} v_2 &= -[p_1, p_2, X]^{-1}(X(p_2)) \\ p_3 &= \exp_{p_2}(v_2). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude from (16) and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_3, p_2) &= \|v_2\| \\ &\leq \|[p_1, p_2, X]^{-1}\| \|X(p_2)\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\omega(R, 2R)}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)} d(p_2, p_1), \end{aligned}$$

hence that,

$$(18) \quad d(p_3, p_2) \leq bd(p_2, p_1).$$

Finally, by (9), (13), (14), and (18), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_3, p_0) &\leq d(p_3, p_2) + d(p_2, p_0) \\ &\leq bd(p_2, p_1) + (a+1)d(p_1, p_0) \\ &\leq ab d(p_1, p_0) + (a+1)d(p_1, p_0) \\ &\leq (ba + a + 1)\eta, \end{aligned}$$

whence, in virtue of the equality

$$R = \left(\frac{ba}{1-c} + a + 1 \right) \eta,$$

we see that

$$d(p_3, p_0) \leq (ba + a + 1)\eta < R,$$

since $0 < c < 1$. □

Lema 9. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 6 we have that*

- (1) $d(p_n, p_0) < R$;
- (2) The operator $[p_{n-1}, p_n, X]$ is invertible and

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|[p_{n-1}, p_n, X]^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \omega(d(p_{n-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_n, p_0))} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)}; \end{aligned}$$

- (3) $\|X(p_n)\| \leq \omega(2R, 2R) d(p_n, p_{n-1})$;
- (4) $d(p_{n+1}, p_n) \leq cd(p_n, p_{n-1})$,

for all $n \geq 3$.

Proof. The verification of the conditions 1-4 of Lema9 follows by induction on n . For the case $n = 3$, the condition $d(p_n, p_0) < R$ is obvious from Lemma 8. To prove 2 when $n = 3$, we consider a geodesic ϕ_3 satisfying $\phi_3(0) = p_0$ and $\phi_3(1) = p_3$. Then, from (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[p_2, p_3, X] \circ P_{\phi_3, 0, 1} - P_{\phi_3, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| &\leq \omega(d(p_2, p_{-1}), d(p_3, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_2, p_0) + d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_3, p_0)) \end{aligned}$$

and so, by (6), (15), and Lemma 8, it may be concluded that

$$\|[p_2, p_3, X] \circ P_{\phi_3, 0, 1} - P_{\phi_3, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| \leq \omega(\alpha + R, R).$$

Proceeding as in the proof of (11) one obtains that $[p_2, p_3, X]$ is invertible and

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \|[p_2, p_3, X]^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \omega(d(p_2, p_{-1}), d(p_3, p_0))} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is (19) for $n = 3$. Next, by Lemma 7 and (5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(p_3)\| &\leq \|[p_2, p_3, X] \circ P_{\gamma_3, 0, 1} - P_{\gamma_3, 0, 1} \circ [p_1, p_2, X]\| \|v_2\| \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_2, p_1), d(p_3, p_2)) d(p_3, p_2) \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_2, p_0) + d(p_1, p_0), d(p_3, p_0) + d(p_2, p_0)) d(p_3, p_2), \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$\|X(p_3)\| \leq \omega(2R, 2R) d(p_3, p_2).$$

Hence, (4), and (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_4, p_3) &= \|v_3\| \\ &\leq \|[p_2, p_3, X]^{-1}\| \|X(p_3)\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\omega(2R, 2R)}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)} d(p_3, p_2), \end{aligned}$$

which, by definition of c , yields

$$d(p_4, p_3) \leq c d(p_3, p_2).$$

This completes the proof for $n = 3$; the argument in the case $n > 3$ is similar, so we only give the main lines of the proof. Let us suppose that Lemma 9 holds for $k = 3, \dots, n$; more precisely we suppose that

$$(1) \quad d(p_k, p_0) < R;$$

(2) The operator $[p_{k-1}, p_k, X]$ is invertible and

$$\begin{aligned} \|[p_{k-1}, p_k, X]^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0))} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)}; \end{aligned}$$

(3) $\|X(p_k)\| \leq \omega(2R, 2R) d(p_k, p_{k-1})$;

(4) $d(p_{k+1}, p_k) \leq c d(p_k, p_{k-1})$,

for all $k \in \{3, \dots, n\}$, we prove that the same is true for $k = n + 1$. We first observe that by the inequality 4,

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_k) \leq c^{k-2} d(p_3, p_2),$$

and, in consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_{n+1}, p_0) &\leq d(p_{n+1}, p_n) + \dots + d(p_3, p_2) + d(p_2, p_0) \\ &\leq \frac{1 - c^{n-1}}{1 - c} d(p_3, p_2) + d(p_2, p_0). \end{aligned}$$

From what has already been shown it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (21) \quad d(p_{n+1}, p_0) &\leq \frac{1 - c^{n-1}}{1 - c} ab\eta + (a + 1)\eta \\ &< \left(\frac{ab}{1 - c} + a + 1 \right) \eta \\ &= R. \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider a geodesic ϕ_{n+1} joining $\phi_{n+1}(0) = p_0$ to $\phi_{n+1}(1) = p_{n+1}$. Then, by applying the ω -condition, (21), and the inductive hypothesis, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[p_n, p_{n+1}, X] \circ P_{\phi_{n+1}, 0, 1} - P_{\phi_{n+1}, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| &\leq \omega(d(p_n, p_{-1}), d(p_{n+1}, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(d(p_n, p_0) + d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_{n+1}, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(\alpha + R, R). \end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument used to prove (11), one can show that $[p_n, p_{n+1}, X]$ is invertible and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \|[p_n, p_{n+1}, X]^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \omega(d(p_n, p_{-1}), d(p_{n+1}, p_0))} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the assertion 3, we use Lemma 7 to conclude that

$$\|X(p_{n+1})\| \leq \|[p_n, p_{n+1}, X] \circ P_{\gamma_n, 0, 1} - P_{\gamma_n, 0, 1} \circ [p_{n-1}, p_n, X]\| \|v_n\|,$$

from which we obtain

$$\|X(p_{n+1})\| \leq \omega(2R, 2R) d(p_{n+1}, p_n).$$

Finally, from the equalities

$$v_k = -[p_{k-1}, p_k, X]^{-1}(X(p_k)) \quad \text{and} \quad d(p_{k+1}, p_k) = \|v_k\|, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_{n+2}, p_{n+1}) &\leq \|[p_n, p_{n+1}, X]^{-1}\| \|X(p_{n+1})\| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\omega(2R, 2R)}{1 - \beta\omega(R + \alpha, R)} d(p_{n+1}, p_n) \\ &\leq c d(p_{n+1}, p_n), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 9. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 6. We first observe that, as a consequence of Lemma 9, part 2, the sequence (p_n) defined by the method (4) is well-defined. In order to prove the convergence of (p_n) , we prove that it is a Cauchy sequence. Indeed, by part 4 of Lemma 9, we have

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_k) \leq c^k d(p_1, p_0), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

whence, if $m < n$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_n, p_m) &\leq d(p_n, p_{n-1}) + d(p_{n-1}, p_{n-2}) + \dots + d(p_{m+1}, p_m) \\ &\leq (c^{n-1} + c^{n-2} + \dots + c^m) d(p_1, p_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $c < 1$, we deduce that (p_n) is a sequence of Cauchy in $B[p_0, R]$, and so there is $p_* \in B[p_0, R]$ such that (p_n) converges to p_* .

Now we show that p_* is a root of X . This follows directly by taking limits of both sides of the inequality

$$\|X(p_n)\| \leq \omega(2R, 2R) d(p_n, p_{n-1}),$$

which is part of the conclusion of Lemma 9. To finish the proof, we prove that p_* is the unique root of X in $B[p_0, R]$. If there existed a $q_* \in B[p_0, R]$ such that $X(q_*) = 0$, we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[q_*, p_*, X] \circ P_{\phi, 0, 1} - P_{\phi, 0, 1} \circ [p_{-1}, p_0, X]\| &\leq \omega(d(q_*, p_{-1}), d(p_*, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(d(q_*, p_0) + d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_*, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(\alpha + R, R), \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ is a geodesic joining $\phi(0) = p_0$ to $\phi(1) = p_*$. We can now proceed analogously as before to conclude that $[q_*, p_*, X]$ is invertible. Next, let α be a geodesic satisfying $\alpha(0) = q_*$ and $\alpha(1) = p_*$. Then by (2),

$$[\alpha(0), \alpha(1), X] \circ P_{\alpha,0,1}(\alpha'(0)) = X(\alpha(1)) - P_{\alpha,0,1}(X(\alpha(0))) = 0$$

and therefore

$$[q_*, p_*, X] \circ P_{\alpha,0,1}(\alpha'(0)) = 0.$$

Since $[p_*, q_*, X]$ and $P_{\alpha,0,1}$ are invertible, it follows that $\alpha'(0) = 0$. Thus $p_* = q_*$, and the proof is complete. \square

4. ORDER OF CONVERGENCE OF THE METHOD

In this section we study the local order of convergence of the proposed method. For this, we first extend to Riemannian manifolds the classical notion of order of convergence as follows.

Definition 10. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold and let (p_k) be a sequence in M converging to a limit p_* . If there is a chart (U, x) of p_* and constants $p > 0$ and $M \geq 0$ such that*

$$(22) \quad \|x^{-1}(p_{k+1}) - x^{-1}(p_*)\| \leq M \|x^{-1}(p_k) - x^{-1}(p_*)\|^p$$

holds for all sufficiently large k , we say that (p_k) converges to p_ with order at least p .*

We remark that the definition above do not depend on the choice of the chart. More precisely, if (V, y) is another chart of p_* , then (22) holds changing x by y and probably with a constant \tilde{M} instead of M [39]. So, we can assume that U is a normal neighborhood of each of its points (also called a totally normal neighborhood), see Theorem 3.7 in [3]. Since in a totally normal neighborhood U of p_* ,

$$(23) \quad \|\exp_{p_k}^{-1}(p) - \exp_{p_k}^{-1}(q)\| = d(p, q),$$

for all $p, q \in U$ and for all sufficiently large k , we can rewrite (22) as

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_*) \leq M d(p_k, p_*)^p.$$

Teorema 11. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 6, we have*

$$d(p_{n+1}, p_*) \leq \frac{\beta\omega(d(p_n, p_{n-1}), d(p_n, p_*))}{1 - \beta\omega(d(p_{n-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_n, p_0))} d(p_n, p_*),$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$d(p_{n+1}, p_*) \leq c(R)d(p_n, p_*),$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

Proof. By above remark, without loss of generality, we can assume that U is a totally normal neighborhood of p_* and $p_k \in U$ for all k . So, (23) holds for all $p, q \in U$ and all k . Thus, if $\mu_k \in T_{p_k}M$ satisfies $\exp_{p_k}(\mu_k) = p_*$, then

$$(24) \quad \beta_k(t) = \exp_{p_k}(t\mu_k),$$

is a minimizing geodesic joining p_k to p_* and $d(p_k, p_*) = \|\mu_k\|$. Therefore, by (2),

$$[\beta_k(0), \beta_k(1); X]P_{\beta_k,0,1}(\beta_k'(0)) = X(\beta_k(1)) - P_{\beta_k,0,1}(X(\beta_k(0))),$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} [p_k, p_*; X]P_{\beta_k,0,1}(\mu_k) &= X(p_*) - P_{\beta_k,0,1}(X(p_k)) \\ &= -P_{\beta_k,0,1}(X(p_k)), \end{aligned}$$

since $X(p_*) = 0$ and $d(\exp_q)_0$ is the identity of T_qM for all $q \in M$. We conclude that

$$X(p_k) = -P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1}(\mu_k)$$

hence that

$$-[p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1}(X(p_k)) = [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1}(\mu_k),$$

and finally that

$$v_k = [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1}(\mu_k),$$

the last equality being due to (4). It follows that

$$v_k - \mu_k = ([p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - I_{T_{p_k}M})(\mu_k),$$

whence, by (4) and (23),

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_{k+1}, p_*) &= \|\exp_{p_k}^{-1}(p_{k+1}) - \exp_{p_k}^{-1}(p_*)\| \\ &= \|v_k - \mu_k\| \\ &= \|([p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - I_{T_{p_k}M})(\mu_k)\| \\ &\leq \| [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - I_{T_{p_k}M} \| \|\mu_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with $d(p_k, p_*) = \|\mu_k\|$, imply that

$$(25) \quad d(p_{k+1}, p_*) \leq \| [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - I_{T_{p_k}M} \| d(p_k, p_*).$$

On the other hand, by the ω -condition (5), (19), and the fact that $P_{\beta_k,1,0}$ is an isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\| [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \circ [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - I_{T_{p_k}M} \| \\ &\leq \| [p_{k-1}, p_k; X]^{-1} \circ P_{\beta_k,1,0} \| \| [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - P_{\beta_k,0,1} \circ [p_{k-1}, p_k; X] \| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta\omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0))} \| [p_k, p_*; X] \circ P_{\beta_k,0,1} - P_{\beta_k,0,1} \circ [p_{k-1}, p_k; X] \| \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_k), d(p_k, p_*))}{1 - \beta\omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0))}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude from (25) that

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_*) \leq \frac{\beta\omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_k), d(p_k, p_*))}{1 - \beta\omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0))} d(p_k, p_*).$$

From here and the two inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_k), d(p_k, p_*)) &\leq \omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_0) + d(p_k, p_0), d(p_k, p_0) + d(p_0, p_*)) \\ &\leq \omega(2R, 2R), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0)) &\leq \omega(d(p_{k-1}, p_0) + d(p_0, p_{-1}), d(p_k, p_0)) \\ &\leq \omega(\alpha + R, R), \end{aligned}$$

which are a consequence of Lemma 9, we see that

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_*) \leq \frac{\beta\omega(2R, 2R)}{1 - \beta\omega(\alpha + R, R)} d(p_k, p_*) = c(R)d(p_k, p_*).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 12. *The theorem implies that the convergence order of the secant method on Riemannian manifolds is at least 1, however it is known that in \mathbb{R} the secant method has order of convergence $\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)$. It would be desirable to have the same order of convergence as in the real case, but we have not been able to prove this.*

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Sergeev, On the method of chords, *Sibirsk. Mat. Ž.* (2), (1961), 282–289.
- [2] C. Li, J. Wang: Newton’s method for sections on Riemannian manifolds: Generalized covariant α -theory, *Journal of Complexity*, 24, (2007), 423–451.
- [3] Do Carmo M., *Riemannian geometry*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1992.
- [4] F. Alvarez, J. Bolte, Munier, A unifying local convergence result for Newton’s method in Riemannian manifolds, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 8, (2), (2008), 197–226.
- [5] I.K. Argyros, Chebyshev-Halley like methods in Banach spaces, *Korean Journ. Comp. Appl. Math.*, 4, (1), (1997), 83–107.
- [6] I.K. Argyros and D. Chen, Results on the Chebyshev method in Banach spaces, *Proyecciones*, 12, (1993), 119–128.
- [7] J. Dedieu, D. Nowicki, Symplectic methods for the approximation of the exponential map and the Newton iteration on Riemannian submanifolds, *Journal of Complexity*, 21, (2005), 487–501.
- [8] J.A. Ezquerro, A modification of the Chebyshev method, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 17, (4), (1997), 511–525.
- [9] J.A. Ezquerro, J.M. Gutiérrez, M.A. Hernández, M.A. Salanova, Chebyshev-like methods and quadratic equations, *Rev. Anal. Numér. Théor. Approx.*, 28, (1), (2000), 23–35.
- [10] J.A. Ezquerro, M.A. Hernández, New Kantorovich-type conditions for Halley’s method, *Appl. Numer. Anal. Comput. Math.*, 2, (1), (2005), 70–77.
- [11] J. M. Ortega and W. C. Rheinboldt, *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables*, Academic Press, New York, NY, USA, 1970.

- [12] J. M. Gutiérrez and M. A. Hernández, A family of Chebyshev–Halley type methods in Banach spaces, *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 55, (1), (1997), 113–130.
- [13] J. Kou, Y. Li and X. Wang, A modification of Newton method with third-order convergence, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 181, (2007), 1106–1111.
- [14] J.P. Dedieu, P. Priouret, G. Malajovich, Newton’s method on Riemannian manifolds: covariant alpha theory, *IMA J Numer Anal.*, 23, (2003) 395–419.
- [15] L.V. Kantorovich. and G. P. Akilov, *Functional Analysis in Normed Spaces*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1964.
- [16] M.A. Hernández, Second-derivative-free variant of the Chebyshev method for nonlinear equations, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 104, (3), (2000), 501–515.
- [17] M. Spivak, *A comprehensive introduction to differential geometry. Vol. II, third ed.*, Publish or Perish Inc., Houston, texas, 2005.
- [18] N. Romero, *Familias paramétricas de procesos iterativos de alto orden de convergencia*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Logroño, Spain, 2006.
- [19] O. Ferreira ., B. Svaiter, Kantorovich’s Theorem on Newton’s Method in Riemannian manifolds, *Journal of Complexity*, 18, (2002), 304–329.
- [20] O.P. Ferreira, B.F. Svaiter, Kantorovich’s theorem on Newton’s method in Riemannian manifolds, *J. Complex*, 18, (2002), 304–329.
- [21] Q. B. Wu and Y. Q. Zhao, Third-order convergence theorem by using majorizing function for a modified Newton method in Banach space, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 175, (2), (2006), 1515–1524.
- [22] R. Castro, *Higher order iterative methods in Riemannian manifolds*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Chile 2011.
- [23] R. Kress. *Numerical Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [24] S. Amat, Ioannis K. Argyros, Sonia Busquier, R. Castro, Saïd Hilout, Sergio Plaza, On a bilinear operator free third order method on Riemannian manifolds, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 219, (14), (2013), 7429–7444.
- [25] S. Amat, I. K. Argyros, S. Busquier, R. Castro, S. Hilout, S. Plaza, Traub-type high order iterative procedures on Riemannian manifolds, *SeMA Journal*, 63, (1), 27–52.
- [26] S. Amat, S Busquier, R. Castro And S. Plaza, Third-order methods on Riemannian Manifolds under Kantorovich condition , *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 255, (2014), 106–121.
- [27] S. Amat, I. K. Argyros, S. Busquier, R. Castro, S. Hilout and S. Plaza, Newton-type Methods on Riemannian Manifolds under kantorovich-type conditions, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 227, (C), (2014), 762–787.
- [28] S. Amat, S. Busquier, A two-step Steffensen’s method under modified convergence conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 324, (2006), 1084–1092.
- [29] S. Amat, S. Busquier, J. M. Gutiérrez: Third-order iterative methods with applications to Hammerstein equations: A unified approach, *J. Computational Applied Mathematics*, 235, (9), (2011), 2936–2943.
- [30] S. Amat, C. Bermúdez, S. Busquier, M. J. Legaz S. Plaza, *On a family of high order iterative methods under Kantorovich conditions and some applcations*, AMS, 2011.
- [31] S. Amat, C. Bermúdez, S. Busquier, S. Plaza, On a third-order Newton-type method free of bilinear operators, *Numer, Linear Algebra Appl*, 17, (4), (2010), 639–653.
- [32] S. Amat and S. Busquier. Third-order iterative methods under Kantorovich conditions, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 336, (1), (2007), 243–261.
- [33] S. Lang, *Introduction to Differentiable Manifolds*, Springer 2002.

- [34] S. Lang, *Differential and Riemannian Manifolds*, GTM No. 160. Springer-Verlag, third edition, 1995.
- [35] S. Richard, D. George Parker. *Elements of differential geometry*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, c1977
- [36] V. E. Shamanskii, A modification of Newton's method, *Ukrain. Mat. Zh.*, 19, (1967), 133–138.
- [37] V. I. Averbuh and O. G. Smoljanov (1967), Differentiation theory in linear topological spaces, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* 6, 201–260, *Russian Math. Surveys*, 6, 201–258.
- [38] K. Atkinson and W. Han, *Theoretical Numerical Analysis: A Functional Analysis Framework*, Text in applied mathematics, 39, Third Edition, Springer.
- [39] P. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre, *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 2008.

RODRIGO CASTRO, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE VALPARAÍSO. CASILLA 5030,, VALPARAÍSO-CHILE

GUSTAVO DI GIORGI, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE VALPARAÍSO. CASILLA 5030,, VALPARAÍSO-CHILE

WILLY SIERRA, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DEL CAUCA, POPAYÁN-COLOMBIA