A LANCZOS-LIKE METHOD FOR THE TIME-ORDERED EXPONENTIAL*
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Abstract. The time-ordered exponential is defined as the function that solves a system of coupled first-order linear differential equations with generally non-constant coefficients. In spite of being at the heart of much system dynamics, control theory, and model reduction problems, the time-ordered exponential function remains elusive to evaluate. Here we present a Lanczos-like algorithm capable of evaluating it by producing a tridiagonalization of the original differential system. The algorithm is presented in a theoretical setting. Nevertheless, a strategy for its numerical implementation is also outlined and will be subject of future investigation.
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1. Introduction. Let \( t' \geq t \in I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) be time variables in an interval \( I \), and \( A(t') \) be a \( N \times N \) time-dependent matrix. The time-ordered exponential of \( A(t') \) is defined as the unique solution \( U(t', t) \) of the system of coupled linear differential equations with non-constant coefficients

\[
A(t')U(t', t) = \frac{d}{dt'} U(t', t), \quad U(t, t) = \text{Id},
\]

with \( \text{Id} \) the identity matrix. If the matrix \( A \) commutes with itself at all times, i.e., \( A(\tau_1)A(\tau_2) - A(\tau_2)A(\tau_1) = 0 \) for all \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in I \), then the time-ordered exponential is given by the matrix exponential \( U(t', t) = \exp \left( \int_{t'}^t A(\tau) \, d\tau \right) \). However, when \( A \) does not commute with itself at all times, the time-ordered exponential has no known explicit form in terms of \( A \) and is rather denoted

\[
U(t', t) = T \exp \left( \int_t^{t'} A(\tau) \, d\tau \right),
\]

with \( T \) the time-ordering operator [11]. This expression, introduced by Dyson in 1952, is more a notation than an explicit form as the action of the time-ordering operator is very difficult to evaluate. In particular, \( U(t', t) \) does not have a Cauchy integral representation, and it cannot be evaluated via ordinary diagonalization. It is unlikely that a fully explicit form for \( U(t', t) \) in terms of \( A \) exists at all since even when \( A \) is \( 2 \times 2 \), \( U \) can involve very complicated special functions [45, 25].

Evaluating time-ordered exponentials is a central question in the field of system dynamics, in particular in quantum physics where \( A \) is the Hamiltonian operator. Situations where this operator does not commute with itself are routinely encountered [6], and the departure of the time-ordered exponential from a straightforward matrix exponential is responsible for many peculiar physical effects [2, 43, 31]. Further applications are found via differential Lyapunov and Riccati matrix equations.

---

*November 5, 2019

†Université du Littoral Côte d’Opale, EA2597-LMPA-Laboratoire de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées Joseph Liouville, Calais, France. Email: giscard@univ-littoral.fr

‡Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Sokolovská 83, 186 75 Praha 8, Czech Republic. Email: pozza@karlin.mff.cuni.cz
which frequently appear in control theory, filter design, and model reduction problems [41, 30, 9, 5, 3]. Indeed, the solutions of such differential equations involve time-ordered exponentials [29, 1, 23, 28].

1.1. Existing approaches: Pitfalls and drawbacks. In spite of the paramount importance of the time-ordered exponential, it is usually omitted from the literature on matrix functions and suffers from a scarcity of methods capable of approximating it. Until 2015, only two families of approaches existed. The first one to have been devised relies on Floquet theory and necessitates $A(t')$ to be periodic (see, e.g., [6]). This method transforms Eq. (1.1) into an infinite system of coupled linear differential equations with constant coefficients. This system is then solved perturbatively at very low order, as orders higher than 2 or 3 are typically too involved to be treated. The second method was developed in 1954 by Wilhelm Magnus [33]. It produces an infinite series of nested commutators of $A$ with itself at different times, the ordinary matrix exponential of which provides the desired solution $U(t', t)$. A major drawback of the Magnus series for $U(t', t)$ is that its convergence domain is incurably small [34, 42]. In spite of this, Magnus series are very much in use nowadays [6] due to a lack of alternatives and because they guarantee the unitarity of the approximated $U(t', t)$ in quantum mechanical calculations [6].

In 2015, P.-L. G. et al. proposed a third method to obtain time-ordered exponentials using graph theory and necessitating only the entries $A(t)_{k\ell}$ to be bounded functions of time [17]. The method, termed path-sums, formulates any desired entry or group of entries of $U(t', t)$ as a branched continued fraction of finite depth and breadth. While this approach can provide exact (even analytical) expressions and is unconditionally convergent, it suffers from a computational drawback. Indeed, it requires one to find all the simple cycles and simple paths of a certain graph $G$. These are the walks on $G$ which are not self-intersecting. Unfortunately, the problem of enumerating such walks is \#P-complete [26], hindering the determination of exact solutions in large systems that must be treated using a further property of analytical path-sums called scale-invariance [16]. The present work solves this issue with a numerical outlook, by effectively mapping the dynamical graph $G$ on a structurally simpler graph with well-chosen time-dependent edge weights. On this graph, the path-sum solution takes the form of an ordinary, finite, continued fraction.

1.2. The non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm: Background. Consider the simpler case in which $A$ is not time-dependent. The solution of (1.1) is given by the matrix function $\exp(A(t' - t))$ which can be numerically approximated in several different ways (see, e.g., [35, 36, 24]). One possible method is the Lanczos algorithm. Computing the $(k, \ell)$ element of $\exp(A)$ is equivalent to computing the bilinear form $e_k^H \exp(A) e_\ell$, with $e_k, e_\ell$ vectors from the canonical Euclidean basis, and $e_k^H$ the usual Hermitian transpose (here it coincides with the transpose since the vector is real). The non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm (e.g., [21, 22, 20, 32]) gives, when possible, the matrices

$V_n = [v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}]$, \quad $W_n = [w_0, \ldots, w_{n-1}]$, 

whose columns are biorthonormal bases respectively for the Krylov subspaces

$\text{span}\{e_\ell, A e_\ell, \ldots, A^{n-1} e_\ell\}, \quad \text{span}\{e_k, A^H e_k, \ldots, (A^H)^{n-1} e_k\}$. 

Note that for $A$ Hermitian and $k = \ell$ we can equivalently use the Hermitian Lanczos algorithm (getting $V_n = W_n$). The so-called (complex) Jacobi matrix $J_n$ is the
tridiagonal symmetric matrix with generally complex elements obtained by

\[ J_n = W_n^H A V_n. \]

As described in [20], we can use the approximation

\[ e_k^H \exp(A) e_\ell \approx e_1^H \exp(J_n) e_1, \]

which relies on the so-called matching moment property, i.e.,

\[ e_k^H (A)^j e_\ell \approx e_1^H (J_n)^j e_1, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, 2n - 1; \]

see, e.g., [20, 32] for the Hermitian case, and [39, 40] for the non-Hermitian one. The approximation (1.2) is a model reduction in two senses. First, the size of A is much larger than n – the size of J_n. Second, the structure of the matrix J_n is much simpler since it is tridiagonal. From a graph perspective, looking at A and J_n as adjacency matrices of, respectively, the graphs G and H_n, the possibly very complicated structure of G is reduced to the path (with self-loops) H_n. In this framework, Property (1.3) shows that the weighted number of walks in G of length j from the node k to the node \( \ell \) is equal to the weighted number of closed walks of length j in H_n passing through the node 1, for \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, 2n - 1; \) see, e.g., [12, 4]. The Lanczos approximation (1.2) is connected with several topics, such as (formal) orthogonal polynomials, Gauss quadrature, continued fractions, the moment problem, and many others. Information about these connections and references to the related rich and vast literature can be found, e.g., in the books [10, 20, 32] and the surveys [39, 40].

Inspired by approximation (1.2), we will introduce a method for the model reduction of a time-ordered exponential by providing a time-dependent tridiagonal matrix \( T_n \) satisfying properties analogous to the ones described above. To this goal, we will use a biorthogonalization process with respect to a convolution-like product \(*\). We call such a process \(*\)-Lanczos algorithm since it resembles the Lanczos algorithm. Differently from the classical case, the \(*\)-Lanczos algorithm works on vector distribution subspaces and it has to deal with a non-commutative product.\(^1\)

The time-dependent framework in which the proposed method works is much more complicated than the (time-independent) Krylov subspace approximation given by the (classical) Lanczos algorithm. In this paper, we will not deal with the behavior of the \(*\)-Lanczos algorithm considering approximations and finite-precision arithmetic. Indeed, we aim to give an expression for the time-ordered exponential by our procedure in a finite number of steps. As it is well-known, rounding errors deeply affects the behavior of (classical) Lanczos algorithm by loss of orthogonality of the computed Krylov subspace bases (see, e.g., [32]). We expect to see an analogous behavior in any numerical implementation of the \(*\)-Lanczos. Such an issue needs to be investigated further in order to rely on the method in a computational setting confidently, especially since the proposed algorithm relies on short-recurrences. We stress it again, the described \(*\)-Lanczos algorithm and the code presented later may not be computationally reliable due to rounding errors or inaccuracies given by needed approximations. This paper is the first step, based on which further investigations will be developed.

\(^1\)There exist other examples of variations of the Lanczos algorithm with non-commutative products, such as the block Lanczos algorithms; see, e.g., [14, 15] where several of such methods are classified in term of a matrix-valued inner product.
The work is organized as follows: In Section 2, we present the Lanczos-like algorithm. The algorithm relies on a non-commutative *-product between generalized functions of two-time variables, which we introduce in Section 2.1. Then, in Section 2.2, we state the main result, Theorem 2.1, which underpins the Lanczos-like procedure. The Theorem establishes that the first $2n$ *-moments of a certain tridiagonal matrix $T_n$ match the corresponding *-moments of the original matrix $A$. An algorithmic implementation of the procedure to construct $T_n$ is presented. Theorem 2.1 is proved with the tools developed in the subsequent Section 2.3. Section 3 is devoted to the convergence and breakdown properties of the algorithm, while examples of its use are given in Section 4. In Section 5 we outline a way to implement the Lanczos-like procedure numerically and we evaluate its computational cost. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. The *-Lanczos Algorithm.

2.1. The *-product and *-moments. Let $t$ and $t'$ be time variables in an interval $I$ and let $f_1(t', t)$ and $f_2(t', t)$ be (doubly) time-dependent generalized functions. We consider the convolution-like product $*$ between $f_1(t', t)$ and $f_2(t', t)$ defined as

$$ (f_2 * f_1)(t', t) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_2(t', \tau)f_1(\tau, t)\,d\tau. $$

We will mostly work with ordinary functions $f(t', t)$ so that $f(t', t) = 0$ when $t' < t$. This because the linear algebraic structure associated with the time-ordered exponential imposes $t' \geq t$ in the calculations; a complete explanation can be found in [17]. To reflect this, we will often use ordinary functions of the form $f(t', t) = \tilde{f}(t', t)\Theta(t' - t)$, where $\Theta(\cdot)$ is the Heaviside theta function with the convention that $\Theta(0) = 1$ (here and in the rest of the paper, the tilde indicates that $\tilde{f}$ is an ordinary function). The *-product between two of such functions $f_1, f_2$ effectively reads as

$$ (f_2 * f_1)(t', t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{f}_2(t', \tau)f_1(\tau, t)\Theta(t' - \tau)\Theta(\tau - t)\,d\tau, $$

$$ = \Theta(t' - t)\int_{t}^{t'} \tilde{f}_2(t', \tau)f_1(\tau, t)\,d\tau. $$

The form with the integral over the interval $[t, t']$ is more convenient to wield and will be sufficient in most cases. Moreover, it shows that * can be seen as a generalization of the product in [17]. On the other side, the form with the integral from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ will allow us to properly deal with distributions whenever they arise in calculations.

The *-product extends to matrices composed of (doubly) time-dependent generalized functions. Consider two of such time-dependent matrices $A_1(t', t)$ and $A_2(t', t)$, then

$$ (A_2 * A_1)(t', t) := \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} A_2(t', \tau)A_1(\tau, t)\,d\tau, $$

where the sizes of $A_1, A_2$ are compatible for the usual matrix product (here and in the following, we omit the dependency on $t'$ and $t$ when it is clear from the context). The *-product is associative and distributive with respect to the addition, but it is non-commutative. The identity element with respect to this product is $\Id_* := \Id + 1_*$, with $\Id$ the identity matrix of appropriate size and $1_* := \delta(t' - t)$ the Dirac delta distribution. The *-product is also well defined for matrices which depend on less than
two-time variables. Consider the matrices $A_3(t')$ and $A_1(t', t)$. Then $(A_3 \ast A_1)(t', t) = A_3(t') \int_{t}^{+\infty} A_1(\tau, t) \, d\tau$ and $(A_1 \ast A_3)(t', t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} A_1(t', \tau) A_3(\tau) \, d\tau$. In other terms, the time variable of $A_3(t')$ is always treated as the left time variable of a doubly time-dependent matrix. These definitions extend straightforwardly to time-independent matrices.

The $\ast$-resolvent of any matrix depending on at most two-time variables is well defined, as $R_\ast(A) := (\text{Id}_\ast - A)^{-1} = \text{Id}_\ast + \sum_{k \geq 1} A^k$ exists provided every entry of $A$ is bounded for all $t', t \in I$. Then

$$U(t', t) = \Theta(t' - t) \int_{t}^{t'} R_\ast(A)(\tau, t) \, d\tau$$

is the time-ordered exponential of $A(t', t)$; see [17]. Note that time-ordered exponentials are usually presented with only one-time variable, corresponding to $U(t) \equiv U(t, 0)$. Yet, in general $U(t', t) \neq U(t' - t, 0)$.

In the spirit of Lanczos algorithm, given a time-dependent matrix $A(t', t)$, we will construct a matrix $T_n(t', t)$ of size $n \leq N$ with a simpler (tridiagonal) structure and so that

$$A^j(t', t))_{k,\ell} = (T_n^j(t', t))_{1,1}; \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, \ldots, 2n - 1, \quad t', t \in I.$$

In particular, when $n = N$ Property (2.2) stands for every $j \geq 0$, giving

$$R_\ast(A)_{k,\ell} = R_\ast(T_N)_{1,1}.$$

Hence the solution is given by the path-sum techniques exploiting the fact that the graph associated with $T_N$ is a path with self-loops. More in general, given time-independent vectors $v, w$ we call the $j$th $\ast$-moment of $A, v, w$ the scalar function $w^H(A^j(t', t)) v$, for $j \geq 0$ (note that when the product is omitted, it stands for the usual matrix-vector product). Then Property (2.2) is an instance of the more general case

$$w^H(A^j(t', t)) v = e^H(T_n^j(t', t)) e_1, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, \ldots, 2n - 1, \quad t', t \in I.$$

### 2.2. Building up the $\ast$-Lanczos process

Given a doubly time-dependent matrix $A(t', t)$ and $k + 1$ scalar generalized functions $\alpha_0(t', t), \alpha_1(t', t), \ldots, \alpha_k(t', t)$ which play the role of the coefficients, we define the matrix $\ast$-polynomial $p(A)(t', t)$ of degree $k$ as

$$p(A)(t', t) := \sum_{j=0}^{k} (A^j \ast \alpha_j)(t', t);$$

moreover, we define the corresponding dual matrix $\ast$-polynomial as

$$p^D(A)(t', t) := \sum_{j=0}^{k} (\overline{\alpha}_j \ast (A^j)^H)(t', t),$$

where $\overline{\alpha}_j$ is the conjugated value of $\alpha_j$. Let $v$ be a vector not depending on time. Then we can define the set of vectors $p(A)v$, with $p$ a matrix $\ast$-polynomial. Such a set is a vector space with respect to the product $\ast$ and with scalars $\alpha_j(t', t)$ (the addition
is the usual addition between vectors. Similarly, given a vector \( w^H \) not depending on time, we can define the vector space given by the dual vectors \( w^H p^D(A^H) \). In particular, we can define the *-Krylov subspaces

\[
K_n(A,v)(t',t) := \{ (p(A)v)(t',t) \mid p \text{ of degree at most } n - 1 \},
\]

\[
K_n^D(A^H,w)(t',t) := \{ (w^H p^D(A^H))(t',t) \mid p \text{ of degree at most } n - 1 \}.
\]

The vectors \( v, Av, \ldots, A^{*(n-1)}v \) and \( w^H, w^H A, \ldots, w^H A^{*(n-1)} \) are bases respectively for \( K_n(A,v) \) and \( K_n(A^H,w) \). We aim to derive *-biorthonormal bases \( v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1} \) and \( w^H_0, \ldots, w^H_{n-1} \) for the *-Krylov subspaces, i.e., so that

\[
w^H_1 \ast v_j = \delta_{ij} 1_*,
\]

with \( \delta_{ij} \) the Kronecker delta. In our setting, the notation \( f(t',t) = 0 \) means that \( f \) is identically zero on \( I \times I \).

Assume that \( w^H v = 1 \), we can use a non-Hermitian Lanczos-like biorthogonalization process for the triplet \( (w, A(t',t), v) \). We shall call this method the *-Lanczos process. The first vectors of the biorthogonal bases are

\[
v_0 = v 1_*, \quad w^H_0 = w^H 1_*,
\]

so that \( w^H_0 \ast v_0 = 1_* \). Consider now a vector \( \hat{v}_1 \in K_2(A,v) \) given by

\[
\hat{v}_1 = A \ast v_0 - v_0 \ast \alpha_0 = Av - v \alpha_0.
\]

If the vector satisfies the *-biorthogonal condition \( w^H_0 \ast \hat{v}_1 = 0 \), then

\[
(2.4) \quad \alpha_0 = w^H_0 \ast A \ast v_0 = w^H A v.
\]

Similarly, we get the expression

\[
\hat{w}_1^H = w^H_0 \ast A - \alpha_0 \ast w^H_0 = w^H A - \alpha_0 w^H,
\]

with \( \alpha_0 \) given by (2.4). Hence the *-biorthonormal vectors are defined as

\[
v_1 = \hat{v}_1 \ast \beta_1^{-1}, \quad w_1 = \hat{w}_1,
\]

with \( \beta_1 = \hat{w}_1^H \ast \hat{v}_1 \) and \( \beta_1^{-1} \) its *-inverse, i.e., \( \beta_1^{-1} \ast \beta_1 = \beta_1 \ast \beta_1^{-1} = 1_* \) (for the moment, we assume the *-inverse to exist). Assume now that we have the *-biorthonormal bases \( v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1} \) and \( w^H_0, \ldots, w^H_{n-1} \). Then we can build the vector

\[
\hat{v}_n = A \ast v_{n-1} - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} v_i \ast \gamma_i,
\]

where the \( \gamma_i \) are determined by the condition \( w^H_j \ast \hat{v}_n = \delta_{jn} 1_* \), for \( j = 0, \ldots, n-1 \), giving

\[
\gamma_j = w^H_j \ast A \ast v_{n-1}, \quad j = 0, \ldots, n-1.
\]

In particular, since \( w^H_j \ast A \in K_{j+1}^D(A^H, w) \) we get \( \gamma_j = 0 \) for \( j = 0, \ldots, n-3 \). This leads to the following three-term recurrences for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \) using the convention
\( v_{-1} = w_{-1} = 0, \)

\[(2.5a) \quad w_n^H = w_{n-1}^H A - \alpha_{n-1} w_{n-1}^H - \beta_{n-1} w_{n-2}^H, \]

\[(2.5b) \quad v_n + \beta_n = A v_{n-1} - v_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} - v_{n-2}, \]

with the coefficients given by

\[(2.6) \quad \alpha_{n-1} = w_{n-1}^H A v_{n-1}, \quad \beta_n = w_n^H A v_{n-1}. \]

Should \( \beta_n \) not be *-invertible, we would get a breakdown in the algorithm, since it would be impossible to compute \( v_n \). We developed a range of methods to determine the *-inverse of functions of two-time variables which are gathered in [18]. These methods constructively show that as long as \( \beta_n(t', t) = \hat{\beta}_n(t', t) \Theta(t' - t) \) is not identically null, with \( \hat{\beta}_n(t' - t) \) a separable function\(^2\) smooth in both \( t', t \in I \), then \( \beta_n^{*-1}(t', t) \) exists and can be computed. We have good reasons to conjecture that if \( A(t', t) = \hat{A}(t') \Theta(t' - t) \) and the entries of \( \hat{A}(t')(t') \) are smooth in \( I \), then all the not identically null \( \beta_n \) do satisfy the above assumptions and thus are *-invertible (see Subsection 3.1). From now on, we assume that \( \beta_n \) is indeed *-invertible, while breakdowns are studied in Section 3.2.

The *-orthogonalization process described above can be summarized in what we call the *-Lanczos Algorithm (Table 1). The reason for this name is that the algorithm resembles the original Lanczos algorithm. Indeed, if all the inputs were time-independent, and if we substituted \( 1_\ast \) with \( 1 \) and the * product with the usual matrix-vector or scalar-vector products, then Algorithm 1 would be mathematically equivalent to the non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm.

Let us define the tridiagonal matrix

\[(2.7) \quad T_n := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 & 1_\ast \\ \beta_1 & \alpha_1 & \ddots \\ & \ddots & \ddots & 1_\ast \\ \beta_{n-1} & \alpha_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}, \]

and the matrices \( V_n := [v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}] \) and \( W_n := [w_0, \ldots, w_{n-1}] \). Then the three-term recurrences Eqs. (2.5) read, in matrix form,

\[ A * V_n = V_n * T_n + (v_n * \beta_n) e_n^H, \]

\[ W_n^H * A = T_n * W_n^H + e_n w_n^H. \]

Hence the tridiagonal matrix (2.7) can be expressed as

\[ T_n = W_n^H * A * V_n. \]

The following property of \( T_n \) is fundamental for deriving our approximation. We will prove it, together with a polynomial interpretation of the *-Lanczos Algorithm, in the following subsection.

**Theorem 2.1 (Matching Moment Property).** Let \( A, w, v \) and \( T_n \) be as described above, then

\[ w_n^H (A^{*j}) v = e_1^H (T_n^{*j}) e_1, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \ldots, 2n - 1. \]

\(^2\)A function \( \hat{f}(t', t) \) is said to be separable if it can be written as a finite sum of products of functions \( a_i(t') \) and \( b_i(t) \), i.e., \( \hat{f}(t', t) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(t')b_i(t) \).
Input: A complex time-dependent matrix $A$, and complex vectors $v, w$ such that $w^H v = 1$.

Output: Vectors $v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}$ and vectors $w_0, \ldots, w_{n-1}$ spanning respectively $K_n(A, v)$, $K_n(A^H, w)$ and satisfying the $*$-biorthogonality conditions (2.3). The coefficients $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ from the recurrences (2.5).

Initialize: $v_{-1} = w_{-1} = 0$, $v_0 = v 1_s$, $w_0^H = w^H 1_s$.

$\alpha_0 = w^H A v$,
$w_1^H = w^H A - \alpha_0 w^H$,
$\tilde{v}_1 = A v - v \alpha_0$,
$\beta_1 = w^H A^2 v - \alpha_0^2$,

If $\beta_1$ is not $*$-invertible, then stop, otherwise, $v_1 = \tilde{v}_1 * \beta_1^{-1}$.

For $n = 2, \ldots$

$\alpha_{n-1} = w_{n-1}^H A * v_{n-1}$,
$w_n^H = w_{n-1}^H A - \alpha_{n-1} * w_{n-1}^H - \beta_{n-1} * w_{n-2}^H$,
$\tilde{v}_n = A * v_{n-1} - v_{n-1} * \alpha_{n-1} - v_{n-2}$,
$\beta_n = w_n^H A * v_{n-1}$,

If $\beta_n$ is not $*$-invertible, then stop, otherwise, $v_n = \tilde{v}_n * \beta_n^{-1}$,

end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$*$-Lanczos Algorithm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the time-ordered exponential $U_n$ given by the differential equation

\begin{equation}
T_n(t', t) U_n(t', t) = \frac{d}{dt'} U_n(t', t), \quad U(t, t) = \text{Id}.
\end{equation}

Theorem 2.1 and Eq. (2.1) justify the use of the approximation

\begin{equation}
w^H U(t', t) v \approx e_1^H U_n(t', t) e_1 = \Theta(t' - t) \int_t^{t'} R_*(T_n)_{1,1}(\tau, t) d\tau.
\end{equation}

The system (2.9) can be seen as a reduced order model of the initial differential Eq. (1.1) from two points of view. First, $n$ may be much smaller than the size of $A$; in this sense, in Section 3, we will discuss the convergence behavior of the approximation using Theorem 2.1. Secondly, looking at $A$ and $T_n$ as adjacency matrices, $A$ may correspond to a graph with a complex structure, while $T_n$ corresponds to a very simple graph composed of one path with possible self-loops. Then the path-sum method gives

\begin{equation}
R_*(T_n)_{1,1}(t', t) = \left(1_s - \alpha_0 - (1_s - \alpha_1 - (1_s - \ldots) * 1_s - \ldots) * 1_s - \ldots) * \beta_2 * \beta_1\right)^{-1}.
\end{equation}
see [19, 17]. This expression is analogous to the one for the first diagonal entry of the inverse of an ordinary tridiagonal matrix [27] (see also [20, 32] for Jacobi matrices), except here all operations are taken with respect to the *-product.

For \( n = N \), we get \( V_n * W_n^H = W_n^H * V_n = \text{Id} \). As a consequence

\[
    w^H(A^*) v = e_1^H(T_0) e_1, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots,
\]

and therefore the approximation (2.10) is exact.

**Remark 2.1.** The Lanczos-like method derived here for the time-ordered exponential is immediately valid for the ordinary matrix exponential function, since the latter is obtained from the former in the situation where \( A \) commutes with itself at all times,

\[
    T e^{\int A(\tau) \, d\tau} = e^{\int t' A(t') \, dt'}.
\]

This situation includes the case where \( A \) is time-independent, in which case setting \( t = 0 \) and \( t' = 1 \) above yields the matrix exponential of \( A \). However, the *-Lanczos algorithm cannot be considered a generalization of the Lanczos algorithm since its outputs on constant matrices are made of distributions and time depending functions.

### 2.3. Matching *-moments through *-biorthonormal polynomials

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we will exploit the connection between the *-Lanczos Algorithm and families of *-biorthonormal polynomials. Let us define the set of *-polynomials

\[
    \mathcal{P}_* := \left\{ p(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^k \lambda^* j * \gamma_j(t', t) \right\},
\]

with \( \gamma_j(t', t) \) scalar generalized functions. Consider a *-sesquilinear form \( [\cdot, \cdot] \) from \( \mathcal{P}_* \times \mathcal{P}_* \) to the space of the scalar generalized functions, i.e., so that given \( p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{P}_* \) and \( \alpha, \beta \) scalar generalized functions, it satisfies

\[
    [q_1 * \alpha, p_1] = [q_1, p_1] * \beta,
\]

\[
    [q_1 + q_2, p_1 + p_2] = [q_1, p_1] + [q_2, p_1] + [q_1, p_2] + [q_2, p_2].
\]

From now on we assume that every considered *-sesquilinear form \( [\cdot, \cdot] \) also satisfies

\[
    [\lambda * q, p] = [q, \lambda * p]. \tag{2.12}
\]

The *-sesquilinear form \( [\cdot, \cdot] \) is determined by its *-moments defined as

\[
    m_j(t, t') := [\lambda^* j, 1] = [1, \lambda^* j], \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots.
\]

We aim to build sequences of *-polynomials \( p_0, p_1, \ldots \) and \( q_0, q_1, \ldots \) so that they are *-biorthonormal with respect to \( [\cdot, \cdot] \), i.e.,

\[
    [q_j, p_j] = \delta_{ij} 1_*, \tag{2.13}
\]

where the subindex \( j \) in \( p_j \) and \( q_j \) corresponds to the degree of the *-polynomial. Here and in the following we assume \( m_0 = 1_*, \) getting \( p_0 = q_0 = 1_*. \) Consider the *-polynomial

\[
    q_0(\lambda) = \lambda * q_0(\lambda) - q_0(\lambda) * \overline{\alpha}_0.
\]
The orthogonality conditions (2.13) give

\[ \alpha_0 = [\lambda \ast q_0, p_0]. \]

Similarly, we get the \( \ast \)-polynomial

\[ p_1(\lambda) \ast \beta_1 = \lambda \ast p_0(\lambda) - p_0(\lambda) \ast \alpha_0, \]

with

\[ \alpha_0 = [q_0, \lambda \ast p_0], \quad \beta_1 = [q_1, \lambda \ast p_0]. \]

Repeating the \( \ast \)-orthogonalization process, we obtain the three-term recurrences for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \)

(2.14a) \[ q_n(\lambda) = \lambda \ast q_{n-1}(\lambda) - q_{n-1}(\lambda) \ast \bar{\beta}_{n-1} - q_{n-2}(\lambda) \ast \bar{\beta}_{n-1} \]

(2.14b) \[ p_n(\lambda) \ast \beta_n = \lambda \ast p_{n-1}(\lambda) - p_{n-1}(\lambda) \ast \alpha_{n-1} - p_{n-2}(\lambda), \]

with \( p_{-1} = q_{-1} = 0 \) and

(2.15) \[ \alpha_{n-1} = [q_{n-1}, \lambda \ast p_{n-1}], \quad \beta_n = [q_n, \lambda \ast p_{n-1}]. \]

Note that deriving the recurrences needs property (2.12). The \( \ast \)-biorthonormal polynomials \( p_0, \ldots, p_n \) and \( q_0, \ldots, q_n \) exist under the assumption that \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \) are \( \ast \)-invertible.

Let \( A \) be a time-dependent matrix, and \( w, v \) time-independent vectors such that \( w^H v = 1 \). Consider the \( \ast \)-sesquilinear form \([\cdot, \cdot]\) defined by

\[ [q, p] = w^H q^D (A^H) \ast p(A) v. \]

Assume that there exist \( \ast \)-polynomials \( p_0, \ldots, p_n \) and \( q_0, \ldots, q_n \) \( \ast \)-biorthonormal with respect to \([\cdot, \cdot]\). Defining the vectors

\[ v_j = p_j(A) v, \quad w_j^H = w^H q_j^D (A^H), \]

and using the recurrences (2.14) gives the \( \ast \)-Lanczos recurrences (2.5). Moreover, the coefficients in (2.15) are the \( \ast \)-Lanczos coefficients in (2.6).

Let \( T_n \) be a tridiagonal matrix as in (2.7) composed of the coefficients (2.15) associated with the \( \ast \)-sesquilinear form \([\cdot, \cdot]\). Then we can define the \( \ast \)-sesquilinear form

\[ [q, p]_n = e_1^H q^D (T_n^H) \ast p(T_n) e_1. \]

The following lemmas show that

\[ m_j = [\lambda^{*j}, 1_s] = [\lambda^{*j}, 1_s]_n, \quad j = 0, \ldots, 2n - 1, \]

proving Theorem 2.1.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( p_0, \ldots, p_n \) and \( q_0, \ldots, q_n \) be \( \ast \)-biorthonormal polynomials with respect to the \( \ast \)-sesquilinear form \([\cdot, \cdot]\). Assume that the coefficients \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \) in the related recurrences (2.14) are \( \ast \)-invertible. Then the \( \ast \)-polynomials are also \( \ast \)-biorthonormal with respect to the form \([\cdot, \cdot]_n \) defined above.
Proof. Consider the vectors $y_j^H = e_i^H T_n^j$ and $x_j = T_n^j e_1$. Since the matrix $T_n$ is tridiagonal, for $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have

$$e_i^H x_j = 0, \text{ for } i \geq j + 2, \quad \text{and} \quad e_j^H x_j = \beta_j \cdots \beta_1,$$

$$y_j^H e_i = 0, \text{ for } i \geq j + 2, \quad \text{and} \quad y_j^H e_{j+1} = 1_+.$$ 

By assumption, the product $\beta_j \cdots \beta_1$ is invertible. Therefore there exist $\ast$-polynomials $\tilde{p}_0, \ldots, \tilde{p}_{n-1}$ and $\tilde{q}_0, \ldots, \tilde{q}_{n-1}$ so that, for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, we get

$$1_+ e_i^H = e_i^H \tilde{q}_i (T_n^1), \quad 1_+ e_{i+1} = \tilde{p}_i (T_n) e_1.$$ 

Such $\ast$-polynomials are $\ast$-biorthonormal with respect to $[\cdot, \cdot]_n$ since they satisfy

$$[\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{p}_j]_n = 1_+ e_{i+1}^H \ast 1_+ e_{j+1} = \delta_{ij} 1_+.$$ 

Moreover, for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, the corresponding recurrence coefficients (2.15) are the same as the ones of the $\ast$-polynomials $p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1}$ and $q_0, \ldots, q_{n-1}$. Indeed,

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{i-1} = [\tilde{q}_{i-1}, \lambda \ast \tilde{p}_{i-1}]_n = e_{i-1}^H T_n e_{i-1} = \alpha_{i-1},$$

$$\tilde{\beta}_i = [\tilde{q}_i, \lambda \ast \tilde{p}_{i-1}]_n = e_i^H T_n e_{i-1} = \beta_i.$$ 

Since $\tilde{p}_0 = p_0 = \tilde{q}_0 = q_0 = 1_+$, we get $\tilde{p}_i = p_i$ and $\tilde{q}_i = q_i$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$. □

Lemma 2.3. Let $p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1}$ and $q_0, \ldots, q_{n-1}$ be $\ast$-biorthonormal polynomials with respect to a $\ast$-sesquilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]_A$ and to a $\ast$-sesquilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]_B$. If $[1_+, 1_+]_A = [1_+, 1_+]_B = 1_+$, then $[\lambda^{\ast j}, 1_+]_A = [\lambda^{\ast j}, 1_+]_B$ for $j = 0, \ldots, 2n-1$.

Proof. We prove it by induction. Let $m_j = [\lambda^{\ast j}, 1_+]_A$ and $\widehat{m}_j = [\lambda^{\ast j}, 1_+]_B$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, 2n-1$. By the expression for the coefficients in (2.15) we get

$$[q_0, \lambda \ast p_0]_A = \alpha_0 = [q_0, \lambda \ast p_0]_B.$$ 

Hence $m_1 = \alpha_0 = \widehat{m}_1$. Assuming $m_j = \widehat{m}_j$ for $j = 0, \ldots, 2k-3$ we will prove that $m_{2k-2} = \widehat{m}_{2k-2}$ and $m_{2k-1} = \widehat{m}_{2k-1}$, for $k = 2, \ldots, n$. The coefficient expressions in (2.15) gives

$$[q_{k-1}, \lambda \ast p_{k-2}]_A = \beta_{k-1} = [q_{k-1}, \lambda \ast p_{k-2}]_B,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} a_i \ast m_{i+j+1} \ast b_j = \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \widehat{a}_i \ast \widehat{m}_{i+j+1} \ast b_j,$$

with $a_i, b_j$ the coefficients respectively of $q_{k-1}$ and $p_{k-2}$. The inductive assumption implies

$$\widehat{a}_{k-1} \ast m_{2k-2} \ast b_{k-2} = \widehat{a}_{k-1} \ast \widehat{m}_{2k-2} \ast b_{k-2}.$$ 

The leading coefficients of the $\ast$-polynomials $q_{2k-2}$ and $p_{2k-2}$ are respectively $a_{k-1} = 1_+$ and $b_{k-2} = (\beta_{k-2} \cdots \beta_1)^{-1}$. Hence $m_{2k-2} = \widehat{m}_{2k-2}$. Repeating the same argument with the coefficient $\alpha_{k-1} (2.15)$ concludes the proof. □
3. Convergence, breakdown, and related properties.

3.1. Convergence. It is difficult to control the quality of the approximation
\[ \int_t^{t'} R_n(T_n)(\tau, t)_{1,1} \, d\tau \simeq w^H U \nu \] as a function of \( n \leq N \). This since nothing a priori precludes the \( \alpha_j \) and \( \beta_j \) entries of \( T_n \) from being unbounded distributions, which makes controlling the norm of \( R_n(T_n) \) very challenging. From Theorem 2.1, our studies, and several examples, we can confidently say that, provided that the entries of \( \hat{A} \) are smooth functions of time, all the \( \alpha_j \) and \( \beta_j \) distributions should well behave (in the sense defined below). However, the proof of this statement is not completed, yet is already very long and technical. As a consequence, at present, we can only state these properties as a conjecture:

**Conjecture 3.1.** Let \( \hat{A}(t', t) := \hat{A}(t') \Theta(t' - t) \) with \( \hat{A}(t') \) a \( N \times N \) time-dependent matrix such that all its entries are smooth in \( t' \in I \). Let \( \alpha_{n-1} \) and \( \beta_n \) be the coefficients generated by Algorithm 1 running on \( \hat{A} \). Then there exist separable functions \( \hat{\alpha}_{n-1} \), \( \hat{\beta}_n \) smooth in \( t' \in I \) and \( t \in I \) such that, for \( 1 \leq n \leq N \),
\[ \beta_n = \hat{\beta}_n(t', t) \Theta(t' - t), \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_{n-1} = \hat{\alpha}_{n-1}(t', t) \Theta(t' - t). \]

Assuming the conjecture, we can establish the following bound for the approximation error:

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( w \) and \( \nu \) be constant vectors so that \( w^H \nu = 1 \). Let \( A(t', t) = \hat{A}(t') \Theta(t' - t) \) be a time-dependent matrix such that all entries \( \hat{A}(t')_{i,j} \) are smooth functions of time over a closed interval \( I \). Let \( U(t', t) \) designate the time-ordered exponential of \( \hat{A}(t) \) and let \( T_n \) be the tridiagonal matrix of Section 2.2 such that
\[ w^H A^{*j} \nu = (T_n^{*j})_{1,1}, \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, \ldots, 2n - 1. \]

Then, for \( t', t \in I \),
\[ \left| w^H U(t', t) \nu - \int_t^{t'} R_n(T_n)_{1,1}(\tau, t) \, d\tau \right| \leq \frac{C^{2n} + D_n^2}{(2n)!} (t' - t)^2n e(C + D_n)(t' - t). \]
Here \( C := \sup_{t' \in I} \| \hat{A}(t') \|_\infty \) and \( D_n := 3 \sup_{t', t \in I} \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} \{ |\hat{\alpha}_j(t', t)|, |\hat{\beta}_j(t', t)| \} \) are both finite.

**Proof.** Observe that
\[ w^H U(t', t) \nu - \int_t^{t'} R_n(T_n)_{1,1}(\tau, t) \, d\tau = \int_t^{t'} \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} w^H A^{*j}(\tau, t) \nu - (T_n^{*j})_{1,1}(\tau, t) \, d\tau, \]
so that
\[ \left| w^H U(t', t) \nu - \int_t^{t'} R_n(T_n)_{1,1}(\tau, t) \, d\tau \right| \leq \int_t^{t'} \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} \left| w^H A^{*j}(\tau, t) \nu \right| + \left| (T_n^{*j})_{1,1}(\tau, t) \right| \, d\tau. \]

Now \( \sup_{t' \in I} \| w^H \hat{A}(t') \| \leq C \) and
\[ \int_t^{t'} w^H A^{*j}(\tau, t) \nu \, d\tau \leq \Theta(t' - t) * (C \Theta(t' - t))^{*j} = C^j \frac{(t' - t)^{j}}{j!}. \]
We proceed similarly for the terms involving \( T_n \). Conjecture 3.1 implies the existence of \( D_n := \sup_{t', t \in I} \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} \{ |\hat{\alpha}_j(t', t)|, |\hat{\beta}_j(t', t)| \} \) < \( \infty \). The matrix element
\((T_{n}^{\ast j})_{1,1}\) is given by the sum of \(*\)-products of coefficients \(\alpha_i, \beta_i\) and \(1_*\). Replacing all the factors in those \(*\)-products with \(D_{n}\Theta(t' - t)\) gives an upper bound for \((T_{n}^{\ast j})_{1,1}\). Hence we get

\[
\left| (T_{n}^{\ast j})_{1,1} \right| \leq \left( \left( D_{n}P_{n}\Theta(t' - t) \right)^{\ast j} \right)_{1,1} \leq \hat{D}_{n}^{j}||P_{n}||_{\infty}^{j}\Theta(t' - t)^{\ast j},
\]

where \(P_{n}\) is the \(n \times n\) tridiagonal matrix whose nonzero entries are equal to 1. Note that \(||P_{n}||_{\infty} = 3\). Hence the error can be bounded by

\[
\sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} (C_{j} + D_{n}^{j}) \frac{(t' - t)^{j}}{j!} \leq \frac{(C_{2n} + D_{n}^{2n})}{2n!} (t' - t)^{2n} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2n!}{(2n + j)!} (C_{j} + D_{n}^{j}) (t' - t)^{j},
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(C_{2n} + D_{n}^{2n})}{2n!} (t' - t)^{2n} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(C + D_{n})^{j}(t' - t)^{j}}{j!},
\]

\[
\leq \frac{(C_{2n} + D_{n}^{2n})}{2n!} (t' - t)^{2n} e^{(C + D_{n})(t' - t)},
\]

concluding the proof.

Analogously to the classical non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm, we need to further assume \(D_{n}\) to be bounded or slowly increasing for \(n \geq 1\) in order to get a meaningful bound. Such an assumption can be verified a-priori. We emphasize that the bound of Proposition 3.1 is very poor and is only provided here to demonstrate that under reasonable assumptions, the approximation error has a super-linear (in fact, super-exponential) decay. We also recall that the algorithm converges for \(n = N\), assuming no breakdowns. The computational cost of the algorithm is discussed separately in Section 5.

**3.2. Breakdown.** A breakdown in Algorithm 1 arises when \(\beta_{n}\) is not invertible. In the classical non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm, a breakdown appears either when an invariant Krylov subspace is produced (lucky breakdown) or when the last vectors of the biorthogonal bases \(v_{n}, w_{n}\) are nonzero, but \(w_{n}^{H}v_{n} = 0\) (serious breakdown); for further details refer, e.g., to [44, 38, 37, 21, 13, 22]. Analogously, in the \(*\)-Lanczos Algorithm 1, a lucky breakdown arises when either \(w_{n} = 0\) or \(v_{n} = 0\). In such a case, the algorithm has converged to the solution, as the following proposition shows.

**Proposition 3.2.** Assume that the \(*\)-Lanczos Algorithm in Table 1 does not breakdown until the \(n\)th step when a lucky breakdown arises, i.e., \(\tilde{v}_{n} = 0\) (or \(w_{n} = 0\)). Then

\[
w^{H}(A^{*j}) v = e_{1}^{H}(T_{n}^{*j}) e_{1}, \quad \text{for} \ j \geq 0,
\]

\[
w^{H}U(t', t)v = \int_{0}^{t} R_{*}(T_{n})_{1,1}(\tau, t) \, d\tau.
\]

**Proof.** We prove it for \(\tilde{v}_{n} = 0\). The case \(w_{n} = 0\) follows similarly. Note that we use the notation of Subsection 2.3. Let \(q, p\) be \(*\)-polynomials so that \(p\) has a \(*\)-invertible leading coefficient, then we can define a process analogous to the Euclidean polynomial division giving the \(*\)-polynomials \(s, r\) so that \(q = s * p + r\), where \(r\) has degree smaller than \(p\). By recurrences (2.14), the leading coefficients of the \(*\)-polynomial

\[
\hat{p}_{n}(\lambda) := \lambda * p_{n-1}(\lambda) - p_{n-1}(\lambda) * \alpha_{n-1} - p_{n-2}(\lambda)
\]
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is \((\beta_{n-1} \cdots \beta_1)^{*-1}\). Therefore for any integer \(k \geq n\) we can rewrite \(\lambda^k\) as

\[
\lambda^k = s_{k-n}(\lambda) \ast \hat{p}_n(\lambda) + r_{n-1}(\lambda),
\]

where \(s_{k-n}\) and \(r_{n-1}\) are \(*\)-polynomials with degree respectively \(k - n\) and \(n - 1\). Then we get

\[
w^H A^k v = w^H s_{k-n}(A) \ast \hat{p}_n(A)v + w^H r_{n-1}(A)v.
\]

Since \(\hat{p}_n(A)v = \tilde{v} = 0\), then

\[
w^H A^k v = w^H r_{n-1}(A)v.
\]

By Theorem 2.1

\[
e^H \nu_j^D(T_n^H) \ast \hat{p}_n(T_n)e_1 = e^H \nu_j^D(A^H) \ast \hat{p}_n(A)v = 0, \quad j = 0, \ldots, n - 1.
\]

This implies \(\hat{p}_n(T_n)e_1 = 0\) since \(e^H \nu_j^D(T_n^H) = 1^*e_{j+1}\) for \(j = 0, \ldots, n - 1\), as shown in the proof of Lemma 2.2. Hence (3.1) gives

\[
e^H T_n^k e_1 = e^H r_{n-1}(T_n)e_1.
\]

Since \(r_{n-1}\) has degree \(n - 1\), by Theorem 2.1, we get

\[
w^H r_{n-1}(A)v = e^H r_{n-1}(T_n)e_1,
\]

concluding the proof.

We will not treat the serious breakdown case, but a possible way to deal with it is by a look-ahead strategy analogous to the one for non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm; see, e.g., [44, 38, 7, 8, 37, 21, 13, 22]. Nevertheless, we need to discuss the particular case of serious breakdowns arising when \(w = e_i\) and \(v = e_j\). If \(i \neq j\), then \(w^H v = 0\), which does not satisfy \(*\)-Lanczos assumption. Moreover, if \(i = j\) and \(A\) is a sparse non-Hermitian matrix, then it is possible that \(A_{ii} = 0\) and \(A^{*2}_{ii} = 0\). As a consequence, we get \(\beta_1 = 0\). We can try to fix these problems rewriting the approximation of the time-ordered exponential \(U\) as

\[
e_i^H U e_j = (e + e_i)^H U e_j - e^H U e_j,
\]

with \(e = (1, \ldots, 1)^T\). Then one can approximate \((e + e_i)^H U e_j\) and \(e^H U e_j\) separately, which are less likely going to have a breakdown, thanks to the fact that \(e\) is a full vector; see, e.g., [20, Section 7.3].

4. Examples. In this section, we use the \(*\)-Lanczos Algorithm 1 on examples in ascending order of difficulty. All the computations have been performed using Mathematica 11.

Example 4.1 (Ordinary matrix exponential). Let us first consider a constant matrix

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & -1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Because \(A\) commutes with itself at all times, its time-ordered exponential coincides with its ordinary exponential, \(T e^\lambda^1 A^{(r)} dr \equiv e^{A(r)}\) (we set \(t = 0\)). Note that the matrix

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & -1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

is not a full matrix.
chosen here is symmetric only to lead to concise expressions suitable for presentation in an article, e.g.,

\[(e^{A'})_{11} = -\frac{1}{2}\sinh(2t') + \frac{1}{2}\cosh(2t') + \frac{1}{2}\cosh\left(\sqrt{2}t'\right),\]

and that such symmetries are not a requirement of the *-Lanczos approach.

Now let us find the result of Eq. (4.1) with Algorithm 1. We define \(w := v^H := (1,0,0), w_0 = w_1, v_0 = v_1,\) from which it follows that \(\alpha_0(t', t) = -1 \times \Theta(t' - t)\) and \(w_1 = \tilde{\alpha}_1 = (0, 1, 1) \Theta(t' - t).\) Furthermore, since \(A\) is a constant matrix times \(\Theta(t' - t),\) we have \(A^{*n} = A^n \times \Theta(t' - t)^{*n} = \tilde{A} \times (t' - t)^{(n-1)!} \times \Theta(t' - t)\) and similarly \(\alpha_0(t', t) = \tilde{\alpha}_0 \times (t' - t) \Theta(t' - t).\) Thus

\[
\beta_1 = w^H A^2 v \times (t' - t) \Theta(t' - t) - \tilde{\alpha}_0(1 - t') \Theta(t' - t) = 2(t' - t) \Theta(t' - t).
\]

The right-action of the *-inverse of \(\beta_1\) on a test function \(f\) is

\[
f \ast \beta_1^{*^{-1}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} f(t', t),
\]

from which we get

\[
v_1 = v_1 \ast \beta_1^{*^{-1}} = (0, 1, 1)^H \frac{1}{2} \delta'(t' - t),
\]

where \(\delta'(t' - t)\) is the Dirac delta derivative and in general \(\delta^{(j)}(t' - t)\) denotes the \(j\)th Dirac delta derivative; more information on *-inverses can be found in [18]. Now it follows that

\[
\alpha_1(t', t) = w_1 \ast \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \Theta(t' - t),
\]

\[
w_2(t', t) = w_2 \ast \beta_1 = w_1 \ast \alpha_1 \ast w_1 - \beta_1 \ast w_0 = (0, 1, -1)^H \frac{1}{2} \Theta(t' - t),
\]

\[
\tilde{v}_2(t', t) = A \ast v_1 = v_1 \ast \alpha_1 - v_0 = (0, 1, -1)^H \frac{1}{4} \delta(t' - t),
\]

\[
\beta_2 = w_2 \ast A \ast v_1 = \frac{1}{4} \Theta(t' - t).
\]

The right-action of the *-inverse of \(\beta_2\) on a test function \(f\) is \(f \ast \beta_2^{*^{-1}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} f(t', t)\) and so

\[
v_2 = v_2 \ast \beta_2^{*^{-1}} = (0, 1, -1)^H \frac{1}{2} \delta'(t' - t) \quad \alpha_2 = w_2 \ast A \ast v_2 = -\frac{3}{2} \Theta(t' - t).
\]

At this point we have determined the *-Lanczos matrices \(T, V\) and \(W\) entirely

\[
\begin{align*}
T &= \begin{pmatrix}
-\Theta & \frac{\delta}{2} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} \Theta & -\frac{1}{2} \delta \\
\frac{1}{2} (t' - t) \Theta & -\frac{1}{2} (t' - t) \Theta
\end{pmatrix}, \\
V &= \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} \delta & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} \delta' & \delta'' \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} \delta' & -\delta''
\end{pmatrix}, \\
W^H &= \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} \delta & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \Theta & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} (t' - t) \Theta & -\frac{1}{2} (t' - t) \Theta
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]
In all of these expressions, Θ is a short-hand notation for Θ(t' − t) and δ, δ' and δ'' are to be evaluated in t' − t. It is now straightforward to verify the matching moment property \((T^{*j})_{11} = (A^{*j})_{11}\) for all \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). We can also check directly that the time-ordered exponential of \(A\) is correctly determined from \(T\) using either the general formula of Eq. (2.11) or, because the situation is so simple that all entries depend only on \(t' − t\), we may use a Laplace transform with respect to \(t' − t\). This gives \(T(s)\), and the inverse Laplace-transform of the resolvent \((1 − T(s))_{11}^{-1}\) is the desired quantity. Both procedures give the same result, namely the derivative of \(e^{At}\) as it should [17], i.e.,

\[
(\text{Id}_s − T)^{−1}_{11}(t', 0) = \left(\sinh(2t') + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sinh\left(\sqrt{2}t'\right) - \cosh(2t')\right) \Theta(t'),
\]

which is indeed the derivative of Eq. (4.1).

Example 4.2 (Time-ordered exponential of a time-dependent matrix). In this example, we consider the \(5 \times 5\) time-dependent matrix \(A(t', t) = \tilde{A}(t')\Theta(t' − t)\) with

\[
\tilde{A}(t') = \begin{pmatrix}
\cos(t') & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & \cos(t') − t' & 1 & 3t' & t' \\
0 & t' & 2t' + \cos(t') & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 2t' + 1 & t' + \cos(t') & t' \\
t' & −t' − 1 & −6t' − 1 & 1 − 2t' & \cos(t') − 2t'
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The matrix \(\tilde{A}\) does not commute with itself at different times \(\tilde{A}(t')\tilde{A}(t) − \tilde{A}(t)\tilde{A}(t') \neq 0\), and the corresponding differential system Eq. (1.1) has no known analytical solution. We use Algorithm 1 to determine the tridiagonal matching moment matrix \(T\) such that \((A^{*j})_{11} = (T^{*j})_{11}\) for \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). We define \(w := \nu^H := (1, 0, 0)\), \(\nu_0 = \nu_1\), \(v_0 = \nu_1\), from which it follows that

\[
\alpha_0(t', t) = \cos(t')\Theta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\nu_1 = (0, 0, 1, 2, 1)\Theta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\tilde{v}_1^H = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)\Theta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\beta_1(t', t) = \frac{1}{2} (t^2 − t^2) \Theta(t' − t).
\]

Observing that \(\beta_1 = \Theta(t' − t) * t' \Theta(t' − t)\), we get \(\beta_1^{−1} = \frac{1}{2} \delta'(t' − t) * \delta'(t' − t)\), so that

\[
v_1^H = \tilde{v}_1^H * \beta_1^{−1} = (0, 0, 0, 0, −1)\delta'(t' − t),
\]

which terminates the initialization phase of the Algorithm. We proceed with

\[
\alpha_1(t', t) = \nu_1 * A * \nu_1 = \cos(t)\Theta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\nu_2 = \nu_1 * A − \alpha_1 * \nu_1,
\]

\[
= (0, t' − t, t' − t, t' − t, 0)\Theta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\tilde{v}_2^H = A * \nu_1 − \nu_1 * \alpha_1 = (0, 0, 0, t, −2t)\delta(t' − t),
\]

\[
\beta_2 = \nu_2 * A * \nu_1 = t(t' − t)\Theta(t' − t).
\]

As we did for \(\beta_1\), we factorize \(\beta_2 = \Theta(t' − t) * t \Theta(t' − t)\) so that its *-inverse is \(\beta_2^{−1} = \frac{1}{2} \delta'(t' − t) * \delta'(t' − t)\). Then

\[
v_2 = (0, 0, 0, 1, −2)\delta''(t' − t).
\]
Continuing in this fashion yields the tridiagonal output matrix $T_5 \equiv T$,

\[
T = \begin{pmatrix}
\cos(t') \Theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{1}{2}(t'^2 - t^2) \Theta & \cos(t) \Theta & \delta & 0 \\
0 & t(t' - t) \Theta & \tilde{\alpha}_2(t', t) \Theta & \delta \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}(3t^2 - 4tt' + t'^2) \Theta & \tilde{\alpha}_3(t', t) \Theta \\
0 & 0 & 0 & (-2t^2 + 3tt' - t'^2) \Theta & \tilde{\alpha}_4(t', t) \Theta
\end{pmatrix},
\]

with

\[
\tilde{\alpha}_2(t', t) = (t' - t) \sin(t) + \cos(t),
\]

\[
\tilde{\alpha}_3(t', t) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 4(t' - t) \sin(t) - ((t - t')^2 - 2) \cos(t) \right),
\]

\[
\tilde{\alpha}_4(t', t) = \frac{1}{6} \left( ((t - t')^2 - 18) (t - t') \sin(t) + (6 - 9(t - t')^2) \cos(t) \right),
\]

and the bases matrices

\[
V_5 = \begin{pmatrix}
\delta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \delta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \delta & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \delta' & -2\delta'' & 2\delta^{(3)} & -3\delta^{(4)} \\
0 & \delta'' & -2\delta''' & 2\delta^{(4)} & -3\delta^{(5)}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
W_5^j = \begin{pmatrix}
\delta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \delta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \delta' & -2\delta'' & 2\delta^{(3)} & -3\delta^{(4)} \\
0 & \delta'' & -2\delta''' & 2\delta^{(4)} & -3\delta^{(5)} \\
0 & \delta''' & -2\delta'''' & 2\delta^{(5)} & -3\delta^{(6)} \\
0 & \delta'''' & -2\delta''' & 2\delta^{(6)} & -3\delta^{(7)} \\
0 & \delta''' & -2\delta'''' & 2\delta^{(7)} & -3\delta^{(8)} \\
0 & \delta'''' & -2\delta''' & 2\delta^{(8)} & -3\delta^{(9)} \\
0 & \delta''' & -2\delta'''' & 2\delta^{(9)} & -3\delta^{(10)} \\
0 & \delta'''' & -2\delta''' & 2\delta^{(10)} & -3\delta^{(11)}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

In all of these expressions, $\Theta$ and $\delta^{(n)}$ are short-hand notations respectively for $\Theta(t' - t)$ and $\delta^{(n)}(t' - t)$. All the required $\beta_{j^{-1}}$ were calculated using the strategies described in [18], getting the factorized $*$-inverses

\[
\beta_5^{-1} = \frac{1}{t} \Theta(t' - t) * \delta^{(3)}(t' - t), \quad \beta_4^{-1} = \frac{t'}{t} \Theta(t' - t) * \delta^{(3)}(t' - t).
\]

We have also verified that $(A^*)_{11} = (T^{*})_{11}$ holds for $j$ up to 9. The $*$-resolvent of $T$ has no closed-form expression, its Neumann series likely converging to a hitherto undefined special function. Ultimately, such difficulties are connected with the propensity of systems of coupled linear ordinary differential equations with non-constant coefficients to produce transcendental solutions.

5. Outlook: Numerical implementation. We do not expect exact closed-forms to exist in most cases for the entries of time-ordered matrix exponentials as these can involve higher special functions [45]. In addition, very large matrices $A(t')$ are to be treatable by the algorithm for it to be relevant to most applications. For these reasons, it is fundamental to implement the $*$-Lanczos algorithm numerically, e.g., using time discretization approximations. Luckily, [17] exhibited an isometry $\Phi$ between the algebra of generalized functions depending on two-time variables and the algebra of “time-continuous” operators (for which the time variables $t'$ and $t$ serve as line and row indices). Once time is discretized, these operators become matrices,
which multiply as usual. In other terms, the isometry $\Phi$ followed by a time discretization sends the $\ast$-product to the ordinary matrix product. Then the Dirac delta distribution is sent to the identity matrix rather than a naively time-sampled version of $\delta(t' - t)$. Most importantly, $\Phi$ followed by time discretization, transforms functions of two times $f(t', t) = \tilde{f}(t', t)\Theta(t', t)$ into lower triangular matrices, the matrix inverse of which is the image under $\Phi$ of the time-discretized $\ast$-inverse of $f(t', t)$. More generally, all the usual operations on functions, including integration and differentiation, can be performed at the matrix level. Indeed, discretizing $\Phi(\Theta(t', t))$ gives the triangular matrix $1_T$ which is $(1_T)_{ij} = 1$ when $i \geq j$ and 0 otherwise. Then $\int f(t', t) \, dt'$ is transformed by $\Phi$ followed by time-discretization into multiplying on the left by $1_T$, while a right multiplication performs integration with respect to $t$. Multiplying on the left or right by $1_T^{-1}$ realizes a time-discretized derivation with respect to $t'$ or $t$, respectively. A consequence of all these observations is that the time-discretized version of the path-sum formulation Eq. (2.11) only involves ordinary matrix inverses, while the final integration of $R_s(\mathbf{T}_n)_{11}$ yielding $w^{d_T}u^v$ becomes a left multiplication by $1_T$. Hence a numerical implementation of the time-discretized $\ast$-Lanczos algorithm only requires ordinary operations on triangular matrices (under Conjecture 3.1).

We can now meaningfully evaluate the numerical cost of the time-discretized version of the algorithm. Let $N_i$ be the number of time steps for both the $t$ and $t'$ time variables. Then any $\ast$-multiplication or $\ast$-inversion costs $O(N_i^2)$ operations since only triangular matrices are involved. For a $N \times N$ time-dependent matrix $A(t)$, the $\ast$-Lanczos algorithm thus necessitates $O(N_i \times N_i^2)$ operations to obtain $\mathbf{T}_N$. Here $N_i$ is the number of iteration needed to get an error lower than a given tolerance. Unfortunately, as well-explained in [32], the presence of computational errors can slow down Lanczos convergence. Hence, in general, we cannot assume $N_i \approx N$ since $\ast$-Lanczos could analogously require more iterations. However, in many cases, (classical) Lanczos demands few iterations to reach the tolerance also in finite precision arithmetic. We would expect $\ast$-Lanczos behaving analogously, giving $N_i \ll N$ in many cases. A possible solution could be given by $\ast$-reorthogonalization, as it happens in the classical Lanczos. Overall, further investigation on the interplay between approximation errors and loss of $\ast$-orthogonality is needed. Finally, we must take into account the calculation of the $\ast$-resolvent of $\mathbf{T}_{N_i}$, which involves $N_i - 1$ $\ast$-multiplications and inversions, at the cost of $O(N_i \times N_i^2)$ operations. The corresponding approximation quality and further issues pertaining to numerical applications of the present algorithm are beyond the scope of this work. There is, however, no reason to expect that $N_i$ would depend on $N$ since $N_i$ controls the quality of the $\ast$-inverses of individual functions.$^3$ Therefore the time-discretized $\ast$-Lanczos algorithm should be able to estimate any $e_i u(t', t)e_j$ for all values of $t, t'$ over any chosen range at once in $O(N_i \times N_i^2)$ operations.

6. Conclusion. In this work, we presented the first Lanczos-like algorithm capable of tackling the time-ordered exponential matrix function and thus solve systems of coupled linear differential equations with non-constant coefficients. The algorithm relies on a non-commutative operation and is analogous in spirit to the non-Hermitian Lanczos algorithm. Although a detailed analysis of the convergence and breakdowns of the algorithm remains to be carried out, the proof of principle given here opens the door to efficient numerical algorithms for large scale computations.

$^3$From numerical experiments, we rather expect that to reach a desired accuracy on some $f^{\ast x - 1}$, $N_i$ might depend on the steepness or speed of variations of the function $f$ as well as on the size of the time interval of interest $I$. 
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