

A low-rank algorithm for solving Lyapunov operator φ -functions within the matrix-valued exponential integrators

Dongping Li^{a,c,*}, Xiuying Zhang^b

^a*School of Mathematics, Changchun Normal University, Changchun 130032, PR China*

^b*International Education Teachers School, Changchun Normal University, Changchun 130032, PR China*

^c*School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, PR China*

Abstract

In this work we develop a low-rank algorithm for the computation of low-rank approximations to the large-scale Lyapunov operator φ -functions. Such computations constitute the important ingredient to the implementation of matrix-valued exponential integrators for large-scale stiff matrix differential equations where the (approximate) solutions are of low rank. We evaluate the approximate solutions of LDL^T -type based on a scaling and recursive procedure. The key parameters of the method are determined using a quasi-backward error bound combined with the computational cost. Numerical results demonstrate that our method can be used as a basis of matrix-valued exponential integrators for solving large-scale differential Lyapunov equations and differential Riccati equations.

Keywords: Low-rank approximation, φ -functions, Lyapunov operator, Exponential integrators

2010 MSC: 65L05, 65F10, 65F30

1. Introduction

In this work we consider the efficient implementation of matrix-valued exponential integrators for large-scale matrix differential equations (MDEs) of the form

$$\begin{cases} X'(t) = AX(t) + X(t)A^T + N(t, X(t)), \\ X(t_0) = X_0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, $N : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the nonlinear part, and $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. MDEs (1) play important roles in many fields like optimal control, model reduction, semi-discretization of two-dimensional parabolic partial differential equation (see e.g., [1, 4, 5, 17]). The well-known differential Lyapunov equations (DLEs) and differential Riccati equations (DREs) are of this type. In many applications, MDEs (1) have low-rank inhomogeneous term and initial value, which is a critical feature and is often efficiently explored in large-scale computations. In the last few years, many time integration methods capable of exploiting the low-rank structure have been presented for the numerical solution of the large-scale DLEs, DREs and related problems, including BDF, Rosenbrock methods, splitting methods and Krylov-based projection methods, etc. (see, e.g., [7, 8, 10, 19, 20, 22, 28, 32–34]).

Exponential integrators have a long history and are very competitive with implicit methods for integration of stiff problems. A main feature of this class of integrators is that they treat the linear part exactly and the nonlinear part explicitly. This gives the integrators good stability properties and makes them possible to integrate stiff problems explicitly in time. Up to now, a number of specific exponential integration schemes and applications to stiff systems have been proposed, see, e.g. [13, 14, 16, 27, 35, 36]. For a historical survey and recent developments of exponential

*Corresponding author.

Email address: lidp@ccsfu.edu.cn (Dongping Li)

integrators, we refer to the overview articles [15, 29], and references therein. More recently, the low-rank matrix-valued exponential Rosenbrock-type integrators have been exploited for solving large DREs, see [24]. For Eq. (1), an exponential integrator based on matrix version can be constructed from the following reformulation of the problem as an integral equation. Let $\mathcal{L}_A : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ denote the Lyapunov operator by

$$\mathcal{L}_A[X] = AX + XA^T, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}. \quad (2)$$

Using the following variation-of-constants formula, (see e.g., [21, Corollary 1.1.6])

$$X(t_n + h) = e^{h\mathcal{L}_A}[X(t_n)] + h \int_0^1 e^{(1-\tau)h\mathcal{L}_A}[N(t_n + \tau h, X(t_n + \tau h))]d\tau, \quad (3)$$

one can derive the matrix-valued exponential integrators by interpolating the nonlinear term $N(t_n + \tau h, X(t_n + \tau h))$. In the simplest case, we approximate the nonlinearity $N(t_n + \tau h, X(t_n + \tau h))$ by $N_n := N(t_n, X(t_n))$ in (3) and obtain the *exponential Euler scheme*

$$X_{n+1} = e^{h\mathcal{L}_A}[X_n] + h\varphi_1(h\mathcal{L}_A)[N_n], \quad \varphi_1(z) = \int_0^1 e^{(1-\theta)z}d\theta. \quad (4)$$

If N is constant, the scheme yields the exact solution.

For the matrix-valued exponential integrators, the central computational problem becomes that of solving the actions of φ -functions of operators on certain matrices:

$$\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q], \quad l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (5)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, and functions $\varphi_l(z)$ are defined as

$$\varphi_l(z) = \begin{cases} e^z, & l = 0, \\ \frac{1}{(l-1)!} \int_0^1 e^{(1-\theta)z} \theta^{l-1} d\theta, & l \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The operator φ -functions are defined via the Taylor series expansion

$$\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+l)!} \mathcal{L}_A^k, \quad l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{L}_A^k denotes the k -fold composition of the Lyapunov operator \mathcal{L}_A . In particular, $\mathcal{L}_A^0 = I_N$. They satisfy the recursive relation

$$\varphi_{k-1}(\mathcal{L}_A) = \mathcal{L}_A \varphi_k(\mathcal{L}_A) + \frac{1}{(k-1)!} I_N, \quad k = l, l-1, \dots, 1. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A) = \mathcal{L}_A^{-l} \left(e^{\mathcal{L}_A} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \mathcal{L}_A^j / j! \right). \quad (9)$$

Besides the the matrix-valued exponential integrators, operator functions like (5) also appear in the stochastic differential equations and filtering theory, see [6, 18]. Evaluating these operator functions numerically is not a trivial task. [37] proposed to approximate (5) by computing a single exponential of a larger block tridiagonal matrix, a further generalization in this direction see [9]. However, the approach may suffer from an overflow error from a computational viewpoint and be difficult to exploit the low-rank structure of Q . In [24], the standard numerical quadrature formula is utilized to solve (5); however, the approach may be time-consuming to obtain highly accurate results while less accurate approximation may lead to numerical instability during the course of numerical integration. More recently, a modified scaling and squaring method has been presented for dense and moderate-sized problems in [26]. However, the application of the method for large-scale problems is limited. The aim of the present paper is to propose novel efficient and accurate method to compute these operator functions. Exploring the sparsity of A and the low-rank

representation of Q , we present low-rank approximation based on an LDL^T -type decomposition. The method utilizes a scaling and recursive procedure and can be implemented by matrix-vectors products. Thus we can reduce the storage and computational complexities.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the scaling and recursive procedure for (5) and show how to choose the optimal parameters to achieve the required accuracy. In Section 3, we exploit the LDL^T based algorithm, which is the main aim of this paper. Numerical experiments in Section 4 demonstrate the performance of the proposed method and illustrate that it can be used as the basis of matrix-valued exponential integrators for solving large-scale MDEs. Finally, we draw some conclusions in Section 5.

Throughout the paper I_N denotes the $N \times N$ identity matrix. In terms of norms, $\|\cdot\|$ refers to any consistent matrix or operator norm, in particular $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denote the 1-norm and the Frobenius norm, respectively. We denote by $\text{Lyap}(N)$ the set of Lyapunov operators \mathcal{L}_A for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. The notation $\rho(\cdot)$ denotes the spectral radius of a matrix or operator, and \otimes represents the Kronecker product of matrices. $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer not less than x . Matlab-like notations are used whenever necessary.

2. Computing the Lyapunov operator φ -functions

2.1. The scaling and recursive procedure

In this section, we describe a scaling and recursive procedure for computing the general Lyapunov operator φ -functions (5). This follows in an approach similar to what we presented for the computation of matrix φ -functions times a vector [25]. We first recall a general formula for φ -functions [31], whose proof for operators can be found in [26]. The result states that

$$\varphi_l((a+b)\mathcal{L}_A) = \frac{1}{(a+b)^l} \left(a^l \varphi_0(b\mathcal{L}_A) \varphi_l(a\mathcal{L}_A) + \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{a^{l-j} b^j}{(l-j)!} \varphi_j(b\mathcal{L}_A) \right), \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

Setting $a = k - 1$ and $b = 1$, we obtain

$$\varphi_l(k\mathcal{L}_A) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^l \varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_A) \varphi_l((k-1)\mathcal{L}_A) + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{k,j}^{(l)} \varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_A), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mu_{k,j}^{(l)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{l-j} \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^j \frac{1}{(l-j)!}. \quad (12)$$

The above identity can be used as a starting in derivation of the scaling and recursive procedure for (5).

For a given positive integer s , let \mathcal{L}_{A_s} denote the Lyapunov operator generated by $A_s = s^{-1}A$ and define

$$C_k^{(l)} := \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{k,j}^{(l)} \varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q], \quad (13)$$

$$\Phi_k^{(l)} := \varphi_l(k\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]. \quad (14)$$

Then, starting from $\Phi_1^{(l)} := \varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$, one can compute $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q]$ iteratively via the recursive relations

$$\Phi_k^{(l)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^l \varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}^{(l)}] + C_k^{(l)}, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, s. \quad (15)$$

To implement such a recursion we need to (i) pre-evaluate $\Phi_1^{(l)}$ and $C_k^{(l)}$, thus for $\varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, l$, and (ii) develop a method for computing $\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\cdot]$ involved in (15). Task (i) can be accomplished in two steps. First, we approximate $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})$ by the order m truncated Taylor series:

$$\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_{A_s}) \approx T_m^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s}) := \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{1}{(k+l)!} \mathcal{L}_{A_s}^k, \quad (16)$$

and compute $T_m^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$ using the Honer's method. Subsequently, we evaluate $\varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$ for $j = l-1, l-2, \dots, 1$ sequentially using the recursive relations (8), that is,

$$\begin{cases} T_{l,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q] := T_m^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q], \\ T_{j,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q] := \mathcal{L}_{A_s} T_{j+1,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q] + \frac{1}{j!} Q, \quad j = l-1, l-2, \dots, 1. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

From (17) we see that $T_{j,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})$ is the degree $m+l-j$ truncated Taylor series of $\varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})$. Once $T_{j,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, l$, are computed, by (13), the matrices $C_k^{(l)}$ can be evaluated directly by simply replacing $\varphi_j(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$ with $T_{j,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$. To keep the notation simple we also use the notations $\Phi_k^{(l)}$ and $C_k^{(l)}$ to denote their corresponding approximations. Task (ii) can be accomplished by replacing $\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})$ by the degree $m+l$ truncated Taylor series, i.e.,

$$\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s}) \approx T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s}) := \sum_{k=0}^{m+l} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{A_s}^k}{k!}. \quad (18)$$

The procedure described above is sketched in Algorithm 1. The cost of the algorithm is dominated by matrix-matrix products. The total cost in matrix multiplications is m if $s = 1$ and $s(m+l)$ if $s > 1$.

Algorithm 1 The scaling and recursive procedure for computing $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q]$.

Input: $A, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, l

- 1: Select optimal values of m and s ;
 - 2: Set $\mathcal{L}_{A_s}[X] = A_s X + X A_s^T$ with $A_s = \frac{1}{s} A$;
 - 3: Compute $B_l = T_{l,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q]$ using the Honer's method;
 - 4: **if** $s = 1$ **then**
 - 5: **return** $\Phi_s^{(l)} = B_l$;
 - 6: **end if**
 - 7: **for** $k = l-1$ to 1 **do**
 - 8: Compute $B_k = \mathcal{L}_{A_s}[B_{k+1}] + \frac{1}{k!} Q$;
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Set $\Phi_1^{(l)} = B_l$;
 - 11: **for** $k = 2 : s$ **do**
 - 12: Compute $C_k^{(l)} = \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_j^{(l)} B_j$ with $\mu_j^{(l)} = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^{l-j} (\frac{1}{k})^j \frac{1}{(l-j)!}$;
 - 13: Compute $\Phi_k^{(l)}$ by the recurrence $\Phi_k^{(l)} = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^l T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}^{(l)}] + C_k^{(l)}$;
 - 14: **end for**
- Output:** $\Phi_s^{(l)}$.
-

2.2. Choice of the parameters m and s

Algorithm 1 involves two important parameters, namely the degree m of the polynomial $T_m^{(l)}(z)$ and the scaling parameter s , which should be chosen appropriately. Following the analysis made in [2, 3, 11], in an analogous way to the proof of Theorem 1 in [26], we present a quasi-backward error analysis for Algorithm 1, which is utilized to choose suitable parameters m and s .

Define the Lyapunov operator set

$$\Omega_m := \{\mathcal{L} : \|e^{-\mathcal{L}} T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}) - I_N\| < 1, \mathcal{L} \in \text{Lyap}(N)\}, \quad (19)$$

and note that

$$e^{-\mathcal{L}} T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}) - I_N = e^{-\mathcal{L}} (T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}) - e^{\mathcal{L}}) = -e^{-\mathcal{L}} \sum_{k=m+l+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \mathcal{L}^k, \quad (20)$$

where $T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\cdot)$ is defined as in (18). Then, the operator function

$$h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}) = \log\left(e^{-\mathcal{L}}T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L})\right) \quad (21)$$

is exist over Ω_m and it has the Taylor series

$$h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}) = \sum_{k=m+l+1}^{\infty} c_k \mathcal{L}^k, \quad (22)$$

here log denotes the principal logarithm. For given m and l , the polynomial $h_{m+l}(x)$ can be directly determined by expanding the logarithm function (21) into a power series. In the next theory we present the quasi-backward error analysis.

Theorem 1. Let $s^{-1}\mathcal{L}_A \in \Omega_m$, the approximation $\Phi_s^{(l)}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfy

$$\Phi_s^{(l)} = \mathcal{L}_A^{-l} \left(e^{\mathcal{L}_A + \Delta\mathcal{L}_A} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \mathcal{L}_A^j / j! \right) [Q], \quad (23)$$

where

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_A := sh_{m+l}(s^{-1}\mathcal{L}_A). \quad (24)$$

Proof. We prove the claim for $\Phi_k^{(l)}$ by finite induction over $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Let $\mathcal{L} := s^{-1}\mathcal{L}_A$. From (21) it follows that

$$T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}) = e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})}. \quad (25)$$

Furthermore, we infer that

$$T_{i,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}^{-i} \left(e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})} - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{L}^j / j! \right), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, l. \quad (26)$$

Notice that $\Phi_1^{(l)} = T_{l,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L})[Q]$. This gives the base case.

Now we assume that

$$\Phi_{k-1}^{(l)} = ((k-1)\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{(k-1)(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} ((k-1)\mathcal{L})^j / j! \right) [Q], \quad k \geq 2. \quad (27)$$

The inductive step follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_k^{(l)} &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^l T_{0,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L})[\Phi_{k-1}^{(l)}] + C_k^{(l)} \\ &= (k\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{k(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \frac{(k-1)^j}{j!} \mathcal{L}^j \right) [Q] + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_j^{(l)} \mathcal{L}^{-j} \left(e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})} - \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mathcal{L}^i / i! \right) [Q] \\ &= (k\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{k(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \frac{(k-1)^j}{j!} \mathcal{L}^j + \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{(k-1)^{l-j}}{(l-j)!} \mathcal{L}^{l-j} \left(e^{\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L})} - \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mathcal{L}^i / i! \right) \right) [Q] \\ &= (k\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{k(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - \sum_{j=1}^l \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{(k-1)^{l-j}}{(l-j)! i!} \mathcal{L}^{l+i-j} \right) [Q] \\ &= (k\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{k(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=0}^j \frac{(k-1)^{j-i}}{(j-i)! i!} \mathcal{L}^j \right) [Q] \\ &= (k\mathcal{L})^{-l} \left(e^{k(\mathcal{L} + h_{m+l}(\mathcal{L}))} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} (k\mathcal{L})^j / j! \right) [Q]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The result now follows by taking $k = s$. □

Theorem 1 interprets the truncation errors in the Taylor approximations (16), (17) and (18) as equivalent to a perturbation of \mathcal{L}_A in the operator exponential of the expression (9). For a given tolerance Tol we want to choose suitable parameters m and s such that

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mathcal{L}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{L}_A\|} = \frac{\|h_{m+l}(s^{-1}\mathcal{L}_A)\|}{\|s^{-1}\mathcal{L}_A\|} \leq \text{Tol}. \quad (29)$$

Define the function

$$\bar{h}_{m+l}(x) = \sum_{k=m+l}^{\infty} |c_{k+1}|x^k, \quad (30)$$

and let

$$\theta_{m+l} = \max\{\theta : \bar{h}_{m+l}(\theta) \leq \text{Tol}\}. \quad (31)$$

Then, once we choose s such that

$$s^{-1}\|\mathcal{L}_A^k\|^{1/k} \leq \theta_{m+l} \text{ for } k \geq m+l, \quad (32)$$

the relative quasi-backward error (29) satisfy

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mathcal{L}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{L}_A\|} \leq \bar{h}_{m+l}(\theta_{m+l}) \leq \text{Tol}. \quad (33)$$

Table 1 lists the values of θ_{m+l} such that the quasi-backward error bound (33) for Tol = 2^{-53} for some given values of $m+l$.

Table 1: Maximal values θ_{m+l} such that the quasi-backward error bound (33) for Tol = 2^{-53} for some given $m+l$.

$m+l$	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55
θ_{m+l}	2.40e-3	1.44e-1	6.41e-1	1.44e0	2.43e0	3.54e0	4.73e0	5.97e0	7.25e0	8.55e0	9.87e0

As shown in [26], one can derive an upper bound of $\|\mathcal{L}_A^k\|^{1/k}$ using two approaches. The first approach is to bound the norm of \mathcal{L}_A^k in terms of the spectral radius of \mathcal{L}_A . For a given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a consistent norm $\|\cdot\|_\epsilon$ so that $\|\mathcal{L}_A\|_\epsilon \leq 2\rho(A) + \epsilon$, which implies

$$\|\mathcal{L}_A^k\|_\epsilon^{1/k} \leq 2\rho(A) + \epsilon. \quad (34)$$

We then take $s = \max\{1, \lceil(2\rho(A) + \epsilon)/\theta_{m+l}\rceil\}$. The bottleneck in applying it is due to the difficulty in interpreting such a norm.

The second approach is applicable to any consistent matrix norm. Utilizing the techniques in the proof of Theorem 4.2 in [2] one can easily verify that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_A^k\|^{1/k} \leq \alpha_p(\mathcal{L}_A) := \max\left(\|\mathcal{L}_A^p\|^{1/p}, \|\mathcal{L}_A^{p+1}\|^{1/(p+1)}\right), \quad p(p-1) \leq m+l \leq k. \quad (35)$$

The approach requires the evaluation of $\|\mathcal{L}_A^p\|^{1/p}$, $\|\mathcal{L}_A^{p+1}\|^{1/(p+1)}$ for $p(p-1) \leq m+l$. Utilizing the definition of composition of operators, it is easily shown that

$$\mathcal{L}_A^p[X] = \sum_{j=0}^p C(p, j)A^jX(A^{p-j})^T, \quad (36)$$

where $C(p, j) = \frac{p!}{j!(p-j)!}$ is the number of combinations of p items chosen j at a time. Then we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_A^p\|^{1/p} \leq d_p := 2 \max\{\|A^j\|^{1/p} \cdot \|A^{p-j}\|^{1/p}, j = 0, 1, \dots, p\}. \quad (37)$$

In the case the scaling parameter s is naturally set as

$$s = \max\{1, \lceil\alpha_p(\mathcal{L}_A)/\theta_{m+l}\rceil\}. \quad (38)$$

In practical, the specific values of m and p would be chosen such that the minimal cost is attained, i.e.,

$$[m_*, p_*] = \arg \min\{s(m+l) : 2 \leq p \leq p_{\max}, p(p-1) \leq m+l \leq m_{\max}\}, \quad (39)$$

where m_{\max} is the maximum allowed number of $m+l$ and p_{\max} is the largest value of p such that $p(p-1) \leq m_{\max}$. In practical implementation, we set $m_{\max} = 55$ and $p_{\max} = 7$. The details on procedure for their choice are summarized in Algorithm 2. In this procedure for the convenience of computing we use the 1-norm, which is implemented by the block 1-norm estimation algorithm; see [12].

Algorithm 2 `select_m_s`: this algorithm computes the parameters m and s .

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, l , m_{\max} and p_{\max} .

- 1: **for** $p = 2 : p_{\max} + 1$ **do**
- 2: Estimate $d_p = \max\{\|A^k\|_1 \cdot \|A^{p-k}\|_1, k = 0, 1, \dots, p\}$;
- 3: **end for**
- 4: Compute $\alpha_p = 2 \max(d_p^{1/p}, d_{p+1}^{1/(p+1)})$, $p = 1, 2, \dots, p_{\max}$;
- 5: $[m_*, p_*] = \arg \min_{m,p} \{(m+l) \lceil \alpha_p / \theta_{m+l} \rceil : p(p-1) \leq m+l \leq m_{\max}\}$;
- 6: $s = \max(\lceil \alpha_{p_*} / \theta_{m_*+l} \rceil, 1)$, $m = m_*$;

Output: m , s .

3. Low-rank approximation for Lyapunov operator φ -functions

We now consider how to obtain the low-rank version of Algorithm 1. This is motivated by an often observed very small (numerical) rank of $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q]$, provided the matrix Q has a low-rank factorization of the form

$$Q = LDL^T, \quad L \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, r \ll N. \quad (40)$$

Exploiting the sparsity of A , together with the low-rank structure (40), we can implement Algorithm 1 efficiently in a low-rank approach in terms of computational effort and storage costs. We will follow the notations introduced in Section 2.

To construct such a low-rank approximation we need to present low-rank representations of B_k , $C_k^{(l)}$ and $\Phi_k^{(l)}$ within Algorithm 1, respectively. For simplicity of presentation, in the rest of this section we omit all the superscript "(l)" involved. Below we describe how to accomplish these tasks.

In considering how to compute low-rank representation of B_k we first state a result for deriving the LDL^T factorization of a general Lyapunov operator polynomial.

Lemma 1. Let $P_m(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m a_k x^k$, $\mathcal{L}_A \in \text{Lyap}(N)$ and $Q = LDL^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$ with $L \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, then $P_m(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q]$ can be rewritten as the form of LDL^T -type:

$$P_m(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q] = \tilde{L}(\Gamma \otimes D)\tilde{L}^T, \quad (41)$$

where $\tilde{L} = [L, AL, \dots, A^m L] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r(m+1)}$ and $\Gamma = [\gamma_{i,j}]_{i,j=0}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times (m+1)}$ with

$$\gamma_{i,j} := \begin{cases} a_{i+j} C(i+j, i), & i+j \leq m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Proof. Plugging the expression (36) into the operator polynomial function and setting $a_k := 0$ for $k = m+1, m+2, \dots, 2m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_m(\mathcal{L}_A)[Q] &= \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{i=0}^k a_k C(k, i) A^i LDL^T (A^T)^{k-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^{m-i} a_{i+j} C(i+j, i) A^i LD(A^j L)^T \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^m a_{i+j} C(i+j, i) A^i LD(A^j L)^T, \end{aligned}$$

which directly yields (41). \square

Based on Lemma 1, one easily get

$$B_l = T_{l,m}^{(l)}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[Q] = \tilde{L}_l D_l \tilde{L}_l^T, \quad (43)$$

where

$$\tilde{L}_l = [L, A_s L, \frac{1}{2!} A_s^2 L, \dots, \frac{1}{m!} A_s^m L] \text{ and } \tilde{D}_l = (T \otimes D), \quad (44)$$

with

$$T = \text{diag} \begin{pmatrix} \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{i} & \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{i+1} & \cdots & \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{i+m} \\ \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{i+1} & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \prod_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{i+m} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times (m+1)} \quad (45)$$

for $l \geq 1$, while for $l = 0$,

$$T = \text{diag} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times (m+1)}. \quad (46)$$

The column size of \tilde{L}_l is $r(m+1)$, which linearly grow with respect to the value of m and may far more than the rank of B_l . This will produce additional costs in subsequent calculations. Therefore, it is necessary to embed a column-compression strategy to eliminate the redundant information of \tilde{L}_l and \tilde{D}_l , see [22, Section 3.4].

Applying the recursion (17) and starting with the low-rank factors \tilde{L}_l and \tilde{D}_l of B_l , the low-rank splitting $\tilde{L}_k \tilde{D}_k \tilde{L}_k^T$ of B_k are given iteratively by

$$\tilde{L}_k = [L, \tilde{L}_{k+1}, A_s \tilde{L}_{k+1}], \quad \tilde{D}_k = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{k!} D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{D}_{k+1} \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_{k+1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Collecting the above expressions, we obtain

$$C_k = \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{k,j} B_j = G_k S_k G_k^T \quad (48)$$

with

$$G_k = [L_1, L_2, \dots, L_l] \text{ and } S_k = \text{blkdiag}(\mu_{k,1} D_1, \mu_{k,2} D_2, \dots, \mu_{k,l} D_l). \quad (49)$$

Here, $\mu_{k,j} = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^{l-j} (\frac{1}{k})^j \frac{1}{(l-j)!}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, l$. In our computation, once the new splitting factors are formed, column-compression strategy will be performed to eliminate the redundant information.

The next step is to extract a low-rank approximation for Φ_k . From line 13 of Algorithm 1 we have seen that the key ingredient for the factorization is to form low-rank approximation of $(1 - \frac{1}{k})^l T_{0,m}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}]$. Provided the previous solution approximation Φ_{k-1} admits a decomposition of the form

$$\Phi_{k-1} = L_{k-1} D_{k-1} L_{k-1}^T \quad (50)$$

with $L_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r_{k-1}}, D_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{k-1} \times r_{k-1}}$. Since $T_{0,m}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})$ is the order $m + l$ truncated Taylor series of $e^{\mathcal{L}_{A_s}}$, again applying Lemma 1 and using similar approach to (43), we can compute directly the LDL^T -based factorization of $T_{0,m}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}]$. In this case, the computational cost would include using a column-compression strategy in each recursive step to eliminate the redundant information of splitting factors generated, which is also the dominant component of the computational time for large-scale systems. In practice it may be very costly if the value of the scaling parameter s is too large. Instead of approximating $\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}]$ by $T_{0,m}(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}]$, we consider an alternative way based on the identity

$$\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}] = e^{A_s} \Phi_{k-1} e^{A_s}. \quad (51)$$

By approximating e^{A_s} by the order $m + l$ truncated Taylor series $T_{0,m}(A_s)$, we can evaluate $\varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}]$ in a low-rank format

$$(1 - \frac{1}{k})^l \varphi_0(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[\Phi_{k-1}] \approx \widetilde{G}_k \widetilde{S}_k \widetilde{G}_k^T, \quad (52)$$

with $\widetilde{G}_k = T_{0,m}(A_s)L_{k-1}$, $\widetilde{S}_k = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^l D_{k-1}$. This approach not only saves $s - 1$ column compressions but also can give more accurate results. Finally, the splitting factors L_k, D_k of Φ_k can be computed as follows:

$$L_k = [\widetilde{G}_k, G_k] \text{ and } D_k = \text{blkdiag}(\widetilde{S}_k, S_k). \quad (53)$$

Algorithm 3 gives the procedure for obtaining low-rank approximation of $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_{A_s})[LDL^T]$.

Algorithm 3 phi_lyap_ldl: this algorithm computes low-rank approximation of $\varphi_l(\mathcal{L}_A)[LDL^T]$.

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, L \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}, D \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}, l$.

- 1: Call Algorithm 2 to determine the values of m and s ;
 - 2: $A_s = s^{-1}A$;
 - 3: Form $\widetilde{L}_l = [L, A_s L, \frac{1}{2!}A_s^2 L, \dots, \frac{1}{m!}A_s^m L]$ and $\widetilde{D}_l = (T \otimes D)$, where T is as defined in (45);
 - 4: Column-compress \widetilde{L}_l and \widetilde{D}_l ;
 - 5: **if** $s = 1$ **then**
 - 6: **return** $\widetilde{L}_l, \widetilde{D}_l$;
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: **for** $k = l - 1$ to 1 **do**
 - 9: $\widetilde{L}_k = [L, \widetilde{L}_{k+1}, A_s \widetilde{L}_{k+1}]$;
 - 10: $\widetilde{D}_k = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{k!}D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \widetilde{D}_{k+1} \\ 0 & \widetilde{D}_{k+1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$;
 - 11: Column-compress \widetilde{L}_k and \widetilde{D}_k ;
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: $L_1 = \widetilde{L}_l, D_1 = \widetilde{D}_l$;
 - 14: **for** $k = 2 : s$ **do**
 - 15: Compute $a_j = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^{l-j} (\frac{1}{k})^j \frac{1}{(l-j)!}, j = 1, 2, \dots, l$;
 - 16: Form $G_k = [\widetilde{L}_1, \widetilde{L}_2, \dots, \widetilde{L}_l]$ and $S_k = \text{blkdiag}(a_1 \widetilde{D}_1, a_2 \widetilde{D}_2, \dots, a_l \widetilde{D}_l)$;
 - 17: Compute $\widetilde{G}_k = T_{0,m}(A_s)L_{k-1}$ and $\widetilde{S}_k = (1 - \frac{1}{k})^l D_{k-1}$;
 - 18: Form $L_k = [\widetilde{G}_k, G_k]$ and $D_k = \text{blkdiag}(\widetilde{S}_k, S_k)$;
 - 19: Column-compress L_k and D_k ;
 - 20: **end for**
- Output:** L_s and D_s .
-

4. Numerical experiments

In this section we present a few numerical experiments to illustrate the method above can serve as the basis of a low-rank matrix-valued exponential integrator for solving DLEs and DREs. All the experiments are performed under

MATLAB R2018b running on a desktop of an Intel Core i7 processor with 2.1GHz and 64GB of RAM. The relative error is measured in the F-norm, i.e.,

$$Error = \frac{\|Y - \widehat{Y}\|_F}{\|Y\|_F}, \quad (54)$$

where \widehat{Y} and Y are the computed solution and the reference solution, respectively.

Experiment 1. This example is taken from [28], and consider the LDEs

$$\begin{cases} X'(t) = AX(t) + X(t)A^T + BB^T =: F(X(t)), \\ X(t_0) = L_0L_0^T. \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

The matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ arises from the spatial finite difference discretization of the heat equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \alpha \Delta u, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

on $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$ with $N = n^2$ inner discretization nodes and mesh size $h = \frac{1}{n+1}$, and the matrix has form

$$A = (n+1)^2(I_n \otimes K + K \otimes I_n), \quad K = \text{tridiag}(1, -2, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

The matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 5}$ and $L_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2}$ are randomly generated by MATLAB function `randn`, respectively. The solution of Eq. (55) at time t can be exactly represented by the matrix-valued exponential Euler scheme (denoted by `expeul`), i.e., $X(t) = e^{t\mathcal{L}_A}[X(t_0)] + t\varphi_1(t\mathcal{L}_A)[BB^T] = X(t_0) + t\varphi_1(t\mathcal{L}_A)[F(X(t_0))]$. In our computation, the scheme is implemented by first splitting the term $F(X(t_0))$ to in the format LDL^T -type, then computing the LDL^T factorization of $t\varphi_1(t\mathcal{L}_A)[F(X(t_0))]$ using `phi_lyap_ldl` (Algorithm 3), and finally forming the low-rank factors of $X(t)$ by collecting the two terms of right hand side.

To test the performance of `phi_lyap_ldl`, we compare `expeul` with two classes of low-rank integrators as developed in [23], which includes BDF methods of order 1 to 4 and Rosenbrock methods of orders 1 and 2. We abbreviate them as BDF1, BDF2, BDF3, BDF4, Ros1 and Ros2, respectively.

In the following we take $n = 100$ and obtain $N = n^2 = 10^4$. We present numerical experiments with three different values of the coefficient $\alpha = 2 \cdot 10^{-4}, 2 \cdot 10^{-3}, 2 \cdot 10^{-2}$. The problem's stiffness increases as the value of α grows. We use the constant time step size $h = 0.01$ to implement these methods and compute the time evolution up to $T = 1$ (i.e., making 100 time steps). Due to the system size, there is no available reference solution for such a large LDEs in the literature. The reference solutions of `expeul` are obtained from running BDF3 with the time step $h = 10^{-4}$. While for other methods, we measure the relative errors compared to the solution obtained by the `expeul`.

Table 2 presents the performance of all methods in terms of both accuracy and CPU time. We note that `expeul` based on `phi_lyap_ldl` outperforms other methods delivering both better efficiency and accuracy, in some cases by a considerable margin. It is theoretically possible that the method `expeul` can generate approximations of arbitrary accuracy for LDEs. Since BDF3 appears to produce less accurate solutions for a given step size compared to exponential methods, thereby the accuracy of `expeul` presented in Table 2 is only a conservative estimate. We also note that the effect of all the methods on efficiency becomes apparent particularly when stiffness of the problem increases. As an interpretation of the `expeul`, the norm of Lyapunov operator increases as the problem's stiffness increases, which would, in turn, leads to large scaling parameter s of `phi_lyap_ldl` and increases the computational load. The performance could be improved in the future by using the preprocessing techniques to reduce the norm of Lyapunov operator.

Table 2: The relative errors and the CPU time (in seconds) for Experiment 1.

<i>method</i>	$\alpha = 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$		$\alpha = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$		$\alpha = 2 \cdot 10^{-2}$	
	error	time	error	time	error	time
BDF1	2.4790e-03	60.65	1.6985e-03	108.16	1.4036e-03	318.59
BDF2	4.9224e-05	56.56	3.2074e-05	114.38	2.7815e-05	302.89
BDF3	6.3122e-06	60.60	4.0807e-06	131.77	3.5403e-06	380.71
BDF4	6.5235e-06	65.44	4.2865e-06	138.74	3.7159e-06	450.07
Ros1	2.4790e-03	54.16	1.6985e-03	95.91	1.4036e-03	243.72
Ros2	1.8896e-04	361.82	1.2398e-04	1791.73	1.0741e-04	7335.82
expeu1	1.1436e-09	1.49	9.6709e-08	16.38	3.5272e-09	211.39




Figure 1: The relative errors of exprb2, exprb3, Ros2 and Split4 versus the time step sizes $h \in \{\frac{1}{80}, \frac{1}{160}, \frac{1}{320}, \frac{1}{640}, \frac{1}{1280}\}$, when integrating each of equations for Experiment 2 for $t = 0.1$.




Figure 2: The relative errors of `exprb2`, `exprb3`, `Ros2` and `Split4` versus the computation time when integrating each of equations for Experiment 2 for $t = 0.1$.

Experiment 2. In this experiment, we consider the DREs

$$\begin{cases} X'(t) = AX(t) + X(t)A^T + C^T C - X(t)BB^T X(t) =: F(X(t)), \\ X(0) = L_0 L_0^T. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

The matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the 5-point difference discretization of the following advection-diffusion operator

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta u - 10x \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - 100y \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}$$

on the unit square $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. The matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times N}$ are set as described in [28]. The low-rank factor $L_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ of the initial value $X(0)$ is randomly generated. This is a always used model to test proposed methods.

As in [24, Experiment 3], we use two low-rank matrix-valued exponential integration schemes `exprb2` and `exprb3` to integrate system (56) of problem sizes $N = 1600, 2500, 3600, 6400$, respectively. The first scheme is second-order and involves the operator function φ_1 . The second scheme is third-order and the operator functions φ_1 and φ_3 need to be evaluated at each time step.

For a comparison of the relative errors and computational times, the two exponential integrators are compared to the second-order Rosenbrock method (denoted by `Ros2`) and the fourth-order splitting method (denoted by `Split4`) as developed in M.E.S.S. toolbox [30]. We run the latter two codes with their default parameters, except for the tolerance of Krylov method and the tolerance of quadrature in `Split4`, which are set to 10^{-12} . The reference solutions are produced by the eighth-order symmetric splitting scheme in [33] with time step size $h = 10^{-4}$.

In Fig. 1 we plot the precision diagrams for `exprb2`, `exprb3`, `Ros2` and `Split4` for each system over the integration interval $[0, 0.1]$ with time step sizes $h \in \{\frac{1}{80}, \frac{1}{160}, \frac{1}{320}, \frac{1}{640}, \frac{1}{1280}\}$. The vertical axis indicates the relative errors at the state $t = 0.1$ and the horizontal axis gives the time step sizes. We can see that `exprb2` and `exprb3` are more accurate than `Ros2` and `Split4` under the same time step size.

In Fig. 2 we show the computational efficiency of all methods. We plot the relative errors as a function of the total computational time. The diagram indicates that the two exponential methods are more efficient compared to other methods in most cases.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have devised a novel algorithm based on an LDL^T decomposition for solving the Lyapunov operator φ -functions appearing in matrix-valued exponential integrators. We demonstrate the performance of the method by comparing matrix-valued exponential integrators to some existing state-of-the-art integrators. Numerical experiments verify the effectiveness and reliability of the method and illustrate that it can be used as a basis of matrix-valued exponential integrators for solving large-scale DLEs and DREs. In addition, Our research suggests matrix-valued exponential integrators as very competitive alternatives to commonly used implicit integrators. We plan to implement the higher-order matrix-valued exponential integrators based on the method and test their performance on large-scale MDEs. We would like to point out that the presented method can be generalized to the φ -functions of a Sylvester operator. In the future we hope to further improve the performance of the method by using preprocessing steps such as the shifting and balancing techniques.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the Jilin Scientific and Technological Development Program (Grant No. 20200201276JC) and the Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (Grant No. 20200822KJ), and the Natural Science Foundation of Changchun Normal University (Grant No. 2021001).

Data Availability

Enquiries about data or code availability should be directed to the corresponding author.

References

- [1] H. Abou-Kandil, G. Freiling, V. Ionescu and G. Jank, *Matrix Riccati Equations in Control and Systems Theory*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2003.
- [2] A. Al-Mohy and N. Higham, A new scaling and modified squaring algorithm for matrix functions, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31 (2009), pp. 970-989.
- [3] A. Al-Mohy and N. Higham, Computing the action of the matrix exponential, with an application to exponential integrators, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 33 (2011), pp. 488-511.
- [4] A. C. Antoulas, *Approximation of large-scale dynamical Systems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2009.
- [5] U.M. Ascher, R.M. Mattheij and R.G. Russell, *Numerical solution of boundary value problems for ordinary differential equations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1988.
- [6] L. Arnold, *Stochastic Differential Equations: Theory and Applications*, Wiley Interscience Publications, New York, 1974.
- [7] M. Behr, P. Benner and J. Heiland, Solution Formulas for Differential Sylvester and Lyapunov Equations, *Calcolo*, 56 (4) (2019), pp. 1-33.
- [8] P. Benner and H. Mena, Rosenbrock methods for solving Riccati differential equations, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 58 (2013), pp. 2950-2956.
- [9] F. Carbonell, J.C. Jiménez, Pedroso L M. Computing multiple integrals involving matrix exponentials, *J. comput. Appl. Math.*, 213 (1) (2008), pp. 300-305.
- [10] Y. Guldogan, M. Hached, K. Jbilou, and M. Kurulaya, Low rank approximate solutions to large-scale differential matrix Riccati equations, *Appl. Math.*, 45 (2018), pp. 233-254.
- [11] N.J. Higham, The scaling and squaring method for the matrix exponential revisited, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 26 (2005), pp. 1179-1193.
- [12] N.J. Higham and F. Tisseur, A block algorithm for matrix 1-norm estimation, with an application to 1-norm pseudospectra, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 21 (2000), pp. 1185-1201.
- [13] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann, Explicit Exponential Runge-Kutta Methods for Semilinear Parabolic Problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43 (2006), pp. 1069-1090.
- [14] M. Hochbruck, A. Ostermann and J. Schweitzer, Exponential Rosenbrock-Type Methods, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 47 (2009), pp. 786-803.

- [15] M. Hochbruck, and A. Ostermann, Exponential Integrators, *Acta Numer.*, 19 (2010), pp. 209-286.
- [16] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann, Exponential multistep methods of Adams-type, *BIT Numer. Math.*, 51 (2011), pp. 889-908.
- [17] O.L.R. Jacobs, *Introduction to Control Theory*, Oxford Science Publications, Oxford, UK, 2nd ed., 1993.
- [18] A.H. Jazwinski, *Stochastic Processes and Filtering Theory*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1970.
- [19] G. Kirsten and V. Simoncini, Order reduction methods for solving large-scale differential matrix Riccati equations, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 42 (4) (2020), pp. 2182-2205.
- [20] A. Koskela and H. Mena, A structure preserving Krylov subspace method for large scale differential Riccati equations, 2017, arXiv preprint, [arXiv:1705.07507v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.07507v1).
- [21] V. Kučera, A review of the matrix Riccati equation, *Kybernetika*, 9 (1973), pp. 42-61.
- [22] N. Lang, H. Mena and H. Saak, On the benefits of the LDL^T factorization for large-scale differential matrix equation solvers, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 480 (2015), pp. 44-71.
- [23] N. Lang, J. Saak, T. Stykel, LTV-BT for MATLAB, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.834953> .
- [24] D.P. Li, X.Y. Zhang and R.Y. Liu, Exponential integrators for large-scale stiff Riccati differential equation, *J. comput. Appl. Math.*, 389 (2021), 113360.
- [25] D.P. Li, S.Y. Yang and J.M. Lan, Efficient and accurate computation for the φ -functions arising from exponential integrators, *Calcolo*, 59 (1) 2022, pp. 1-24.
- [26] D.P. Li, Y. Zhang and X.Y. Zhang, Computing the Lyapunov operator φ -functions, with an application to matrix-valued exponential integrators, 2022, arXiv preprint, [arXiv:2204.12976](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.12976).
- [27] V.T. Luan and A. Ostermann, Exponential B-series: the stiff case, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51 (2013), pp. 3431-3445.
- [28] H. Mena, A. Ostermann, L. Pfütscheller and C. Piazzola, Numerical low-rank approximation of matrix differential equations, *J. comput. Appl. Math.*, 340 (2018), 602-614.
- [29] B.V. Minchev and W.M. Wright, A review of exponential integrators for first order semi-linear problems, Tech. report 2/05, Department of Mathematics, NTNU, 2005.
- [30] J. Saak, M. Koehler and P. Benner, M.E.S.S.—the matrix equations sparse solvers library, <https://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/projects/mess>.
- [31] B. Skaflestad and W.M. Wright, The scaling and modified squaring method for matrix functions related to the exponential, *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59 (2009), pp. 783-799.
- [32] T. Stillfjord, Low-rank second-order splitting of large-scale differential Riccati equations, *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 60 (2015), pp. 2791-2796.
- [33] T. Stillfjord, Adaptive high-order splitting schemes for large-scale differential Riccati equations, *Numer. Algor.*, 78 (2018), pp. 1129-1151.
- [34] T. Stillfjord, *Singular value decay of operator-valued differential Lyapunov and Riccati equations*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 56 (2018), pp. 3598-3618.
- [35] M. Tokman, Efficient integration of large stiff systems of ODEs with exponential propagation iterative (EPI) methods, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 213 (2) (2006), 748-776.
- [36] M. Tokman, J. Loffeld, P. Tranquilli, New adaptive exponential propagation iterative methods of Runge-Kutta type, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 34 (5) (2012), A2650-A2669.
- [37] C.F. Van Loan, Computing integrals involving the matrix exponential, *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 23 (1978), pp. 395-C404.