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#### Abstract

In this paper, we present two new approaches to solve large-scale differential T-Lyapunov matrix equations. The first one is based on the extended block Krylov subspaces, and the second is based on the extended global Krylov subspaces. The initial problem is projected onto an extended block (or global) Krylov subspaces to get a small-scale differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation. The latter problem is solved by iterative methods (Rosenbrock or BDF method), then the obtained solution is used to create a low-rank approximate solution of the original problem. This process is being replicated, which increases the dimension of the projection space until some planned accuracy is achieved. We give some new theoretical results and numerical experiments then we compare the new approaches.
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## 1 Introduction

We consider the differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation (DTLE in short) on the time interval $\left[t_{0}, T_{f}\right]$ of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\prime}(t)=A X(t)+X(t)^{T} A^{T}+B B^{T}, \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the initial condition $X\left(t_{0}\right)=X_{0}$ where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is assumed to be large, sparse, and nonsingular and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}$ is full rank matrix with $s \ll n$.

The differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation play a fundamental role in numerous problems in control, filter design theory, model reduction problems, differential equations and robust control problems; see, [1, 5] and the references therein. Small or medium-sized differential T-Lyapunov equations can be solved, for example, by Backward Differentiation Formula (BDF) method and Rosenbrock method [4, 14. The DTLE (1.1) is equivalent to the following linear ordinary differential equation using the Kronecker formulation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\prime}(t)=\mathfrak{A} x(t)+b, \quad x\left(t_{0}\right)=\operatorname{vec}\left(X\left(t_{0}\right)\right), \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]where $\mathfrak{A}=I_{n} \otimes A+A \otimes I_{n}, b=\operatorname{vec}\left(B B^{T}\right)$ and $\operatorname{vec}(X)$ is the vector of $\mathbb{R}^{n s}$ defined by
$$
\operatorname{vec}(X)=\left[X_{11}, X_{21}, \ldots, X_{n 1}, \ldots, X_{1 s}, X_{2 s}, \ldots, X_{n s}\right]^{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n s}
$$

Reasonable size problems, which are given by (1.2), are solved by using an integration method. The Kronecker product $A \otimes B=\left[a_{i j} B\right]$, where $A=\left[a_{i j}\right]$, satisfies the properties: $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D)=(A C \otimes B D),(A \otimes B)^{T}=A^{T} \otimes B^{T}$ and $\operatorname{vec}(A X B)=\left(B^{T} \otimes A\right) \operatorname{vec}(X)$. For large differential T-Lyapunov matrix equations, we propose a new method based on projection onto extended block (or global) Krylov subspaces with an orthogonality Petrov-Galerkin condition.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we recall the extended block Arnoldi process and some of its properties. In section 3, we recall the extended global Arnoldi process and some of its properties. In section 4, we present a low-rank method for solving large-scale differential T-Lyapunov matrix equations, using projections onto an extended block Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)$ (or extended global Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)$ ), and Galerkin orthogonality condition. Some iterative methods for solving the obtained low dimensional problem are presented in section 5. In section 6, we show theoretical results related to the norm and the error. Finally, numerical examples are presented in section 7 to evaluate the performance of our approaches.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notations. The Frobenius inner product of the matrices $X$ and $Y$ is defined by $\langle X, Y\rangle_{F}=\operatorname{tr}\left(X^{T} Y\right)$, where $\operatorname{tr}(Z)$ denotes the trace of a square matrix $Z$. The associated norm is the Frobenius norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{F}$,

$$
\|A\|_{F}^{2}=\operatorname{tr}\left(A^{T} A\right)=\sum_{i}^{n} \sum_{j}^{m} a_{i j}^{2} \text { with } A=\left[a_{i j}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}
$$

And the 2-norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{2},\|A\|_{2}^{2}=\lambda_{\max }\left(A^{T} A\right)$, and the 2-logarithmic norm of the matrix $A$ is defined by $\mu_{2}(A)=\frac{\lambda_{\max }\left(A+A^{T}\right)}{2}$. We also use the matrix product $\diamond$ defined in [3]. The following proposition gives some properties satisfied by this product.

Proposition 1.1. Let $A, B, C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p s}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, L \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have,

1. $(A+B)^{T} \diamond C=A^{T} \diamond C+B^{T} \diamond C$.
2. $A^{T} \diamond(B+C)=A^{T} \diamond B+A^{T} \diamond C$.
3. $(\alpha A)^{T} \diamond C=\alpha\left(A^{T} \diamond C\right)$.
4. $\left(A^{T} \diamond B\right)^{T}=B^{T} \diamond A$.
5. $A^{T} \diamond\left(B\left(L \otimes I_{s}\right)\right)=\left(A^{T} \diamond B\right) L$.
6. $(D A)^{T} \diamond B=A^{T} \diamond\left(D^{T} B\right)$.

A block matrix $\mathbb{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, V_{2}, \ldots, V_{m}\right]$ is $F$-orthonormal if $\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \diamond \mathbb{V}_{m}=I$. We have the following result.
Lemma 1.2. 11] Let $\mathbb{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, V_{2}, \ldots, V_{m}\right]$ be an $n \times m s F$-orthonormal block matrix, $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m s \times q}$. Then we have

$$
\left\|\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(Z \otimes I_{s}\right)\right\|_{F}=\|Z\|_{F} \text { and }\left\|\mathbb{V}_{m} Y\right\|_{F} \leq\|Y\|_{F}
$$

## 2 The extended block Arnoldi process

We will consider extended block Krylov subspaces associated to the pair $(A, B)$ and defined as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)=\text { range }\left\{B, A^{-1} B, A B, A^{-2} B, A^{2} B, \ldots, A^{m-1} B, A^{-m} B\right\} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We mention the extended block Arnoldi (EBA) [8, 16] algorithm when applied to the pair $(A, B)$. EBA is described in algorithm 1 as follows

Algorithm 1 The extended block Arnoldi algorithm (EBA)
Inputs: $A$ an $n \times n$ matrix, $B$ an $n \times s$ matrix and $m$ an integer.

1. Compute the $Q R$ decomposition of $\left[B, A^{-1} B\right]$, i.e, $\left[B, A^{-1} B\right]=V_{1} \Lambda$;
2. Set $\mathcal{V}_{0}=[\quad] ;$
3. For $j=1,2,3, \ldots, m$
4. Set $V_{j}^{(1)}=V_{j}(:, 1: s)$ et $V_{j}^{(2)}=V_{j}(:, s+1: 2 s)$
5. $\mathcal{V}_{j}=\left[\mathcal{V}_{j-1}, V_{j}\right] ; \widehat{V}_{j+1}=\left[A V_{j}^{(1)}, A^{-1} V_{j}^{(2)}\right]$;
6. $\quad$ For $i=1, \ldots, j$,
7. $\quad T_{i, j}=V_{i}^{T} \widehat{V}_{j+1}$;
8. $\quad \widehat{V}_{j+1}=\widehat{V}_{j+1}-V_{i} T_{i, j}$;
9. End For $i$
10. Compute the $Q R$ decomposition of $U$ i.e., $\widehat{V}_{j+1}=V_{j+1} T_{j+1, j}$;
11. End For $j$.

Output: $\mathcal{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, \ldots, V_{m}\right], \mathcal{T}_{m}=\left[T_{i, j}\right]$.

After $m$ steps, Algorithm 1 built an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{V}_{m}\left(\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m}=I_{2 m s}\right)$ of the extended block Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{m}=\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} A \mathcal{V}_{m}$ be an $2 s \times 2 s$ block upper Hessenberg matrix. Then we have the following relations

$$
A \mathcal{V}_{m}=\mathcal{V}_{m} \mathcal{T}_{m}+V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T}=\mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{T}_{m}  \tag{2.2}\\
T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T}
\end{array}\right], \quad \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} B=\nabla_{1} \Lambda_{11}
$$

where $E_{m}^{T}=\left[0_{2 s \times 2 s(m-1)}, I_{2 s}\right]$ is the matrix formed with the last $2 s$ columns of the $2 m s \times 2 m s$ identity matrix $I_{2 m s}$, $\nabla_{1}=\left[I_{s}, 0_{s \times(2 m-1) s}\right]^{T}$ and $\Lambda_{11}$ is the $s \times s$ matrix obtained from the QR decomposition

$$
\left[B, A^{-1} B\right]=V_{1} \Lambda \quad \text { with } \quad \Lambda=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\Lambda_{11} & \Lambda_{12} \\
0_{s \times s} & \Lambda_{22}
\end{array}\right]
$$

## 3 The extended global Arnoldi process

In this section, we recall the extended global Krylov subspace and the extended global Arnoldi process. Let $B$ be a matrix of dimension $n \times s$ and $A$ be a matrix of dimension $n \times n$, then the extended global Krylov subspace associated to $(A, B)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{G K}_{m}^{g}(A, B)=\operatorname{span}\left\{B, A^{-1} B, A B, A^{-2} B, A^{2} B, \ldots, A^{m-1} B, A^{-m} B\right\} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The extended global Arnoldi process constructs an $F$-orthonormal basis $\left\{V_{1}, V_{2}, \ldots, V_{m}\right\}$ of the extended global Krylov subspace $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{K}_{m}^{g}(A, B)$ [15]. The algorithm is summarized as follows

```
Algorithm 2 The extended global Arnoldi process (EGA)
Inputs: \(A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}\) and \(m\) an integer.
    1. Compute the global \(Q R\left[B, A^{-1} B\right]\), i.e , \(\left[B, A^{-1} B\right]=V_{1}\left(\Omega \otimes I_{s}\right)\);
    2. Set \(\mathbb{V}_{0}=[]\);
    3. For \(j=1, \ldots, m\)
    4. \(\quad\) Set \(V_{j}^{(1)}=V_{j}(:, 1: s) ; V_{j}^{(2)}=V_{j}(:, s+1: 2 s)\);
    5. \(\quad \mathbb{V}_{j}=\left[\mathbb{V}_{j-1}, V_{j}\right] ; U=\left[A V_{j}^{(1)}, A^{-1} V_{j}^{(2)}\right] ;\)
    6. \(\quad\) For \(i=1, \ldots, j\)
    7. \(H_{i, j}=V_{i}^{T} \diamond U\);
            \(U=U-V_{i}\left(H_{i, j} \otimes I_{s}\right) ;\)
        End for(i).
        Compute the global QR decomposition of \(U\), i.e., \(U=V_{j+1}\left(H_{j+1, j} \otimes I_{s}\right)\);
    11. End for (j).
Outputs: \(\mathbb{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, \ldots, V_{m}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2 m s}\) and \(\mathbb{H}_{m}=\left[H_{i, j}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m \times 2 m}\)
```

The obtained $n \times 2 m s$ matrix $\mathbb{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, V_{2}, \ldots, V_{m}\right]$ is F-orthonormal $\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \diamond \mathbb{V}_{m}=I_{2 m}$, of the extended global Krylov subspace $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{K}_{m}^{g}(A, B)$ with $V_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2 s}$ and $2 m \times 2 m$ upper block Hessenberg matrix

$$
\mathbb{H}_{m}=\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \diamond\left(A \mathbb{V}_{m}\right)
$$

We have the following relation

$$
\begin{align*}
A \mathbb{V}_{m} & =\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{H}_{m} \otimes I_{s}\right)+V_{m+1}\left(H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)  \tag{3.2}\\
& =\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left(\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbb{H}_{m} \\
H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{s}\right), \quad \mathbb{V}_{m}=\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{c}
I_{2 s m} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 s m}
\end{array}\right] \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T}=\left[0_{2 \times 2(m-1)}, I_{2}\right]$ is the matrix formed with the last 2 columns of the $2 m \times 2 m$ identity matrix $I_{2 m}$.

## 4 Krylov method

### 4.1 Low-rank method by extended block Arnoldi

In this section, we show how to obtain low-rank approximate solutions to the differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation (1.1) by first projecting directly the initial problem onto extended block Krylov subspaces and then solving the obtained low-dimensional differential matrix equation. We, firstly, apply the extended block Arnoldi algorithm to $(A, B)$ to get the matrices

$$
\mathcal{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, \ldots, V_{m}\right] \text { and } \mathcal{T}_{m}=\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} A \mathcal{V}_{m}
$$

with $\mathcal{V}_{m}$ whose columns form orthonormal bases of the extended block Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{m}$ the upper block Hessenberg matrix. After $m$ iterations, we consider the low-rank approximate solutions $X_{m}(t)$ of exact solution $X(t)$ to equation (1.1) of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m}(t)=\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The matrix function $Y_{m}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m s \times 2 m s}$ can be obtained by the Petrov-Galerkin orthogonality condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} R_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}=0_{2 m s \times 2 m s}, \quad t \in\left[t_{0}, T_{f}\right] \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $R_{m}(t)=X_{m}^{\prime}(t)-A X_{m}(t)-X_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-B B^{T}$ is the residual.
Theorem 4.1. Let $Y_{m}(t)$ be the matrix function defined by 4.1, then it satisfies the following low-order differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
Y_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m}(t)+Y_{m}(t)^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T}  \tag{4.3}\\
Y_{m}\left(t_{0}\right)=\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} X_{0} \mathcal{V}_{m}
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $B_{m}=\nabla_{1} \Lambda_{11}$.
Proof . Using the condition (4.1) and the relation (4.2) we obtain the reduced differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation $Y_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m}(t)+Y_{m}(t)^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T}$.

We have now to solve the last differential matrix equation (4.3) by Resenbrock method or Backward Differentiation Formula (BDF) method.

Next, we give a result that allows us to compute the norm of the residual without forming the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ at each step $m$ of the extended block Arnoldi process (EBA). The approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ is computed in a factored form only when convergence is achieved.

Theorem 4.2. Let the matrix function $X_{m}(t)=\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}$ be the approximate solution obtained at step $m$ by extended block Arnoldi process. Then, the Frobenius norm of the residual $R_{m}(t)$ associated to the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ satisfies the following relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}=\sqrt{2}\left\|T_{m+1, m} \underline{Y}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\underline{Y}_{m}(t)$ is the $2 \times 2 m s$ matrix corresponding to the last $2 s$ rows of $Y_{m}(t)$.

Proof. We have $R_{m}(t)=X_{m}^{\prime}(t)-A X_{m}(t)-X_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-B B^{T}$ and using the relations 4.2 and 2.2, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{m}(t)= & \mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
Y_{m}^{\prime}(t) & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T}-\mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m}(t) & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} Y_{m}(t) & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T} \\
& -\mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
Y_{m}(t)^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T} & Y_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m} T_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T}-\mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T} B B^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m} & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T} \\
= & \mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
Y_{m}^{\prime}(t)-\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m}(t)+Y_{m}^{T}(t) \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}-B_{m} B_{m}^{T} & Y_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m} T_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} Y_{m}(t) & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T} .
\end{aligned}
$$

and $Y_{m}(t)$ is the solution of the reduced differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 4.3). We get

$$
R_{m}(t)=\mathcal{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0_{2 m s \times 2 m s} & -Y_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m} T_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} Y_{m}(t) & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathcal{V}_{m+1}^{T}
$$

Since $\mathcal{V}_{m+1}$ are the orthonormal matrices, so we have $\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}=\sqrt{2}\left\|T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} Y_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}$.
To save memory, the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)=\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}$ can be given as a product of two low-rank matrices. Thus, we consider the singular value decomposition of the $2 m s \times 2 m s$ matrix $Y_{m}=U D V^{T}$ where $D$ is the diagonal matrix of the singular values of $Y_{m}(t)$ sorted in decreasing order. Let $U_{l}$ and $V_{l}$ be the $2 m s \times l$ matrices of the first $l$ columns of $U$ and $V$ respectively, corresponding to the $l$ singular values of magnitude greater than some tolerance $d_{\text {tol }}$. We obtain the truncated singular value decomposition $Y_{m} \approx U_{l} D_{l} V_{l}^{T}$, where $D_{l}=\operatorname{diag}\left[\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{l}\right]$. Setting $Z_{m, 1}=\mathcal{V}_{m} U_{l} D_{l}^{\frac{1}{2}}, Z_{m, 2}=\mathcal{V}_{m} V_{l} D_{l}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m}=Z_{m, 1} Z_{m, 2}^{T} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This result is important for large-scale problems to decrease central processing unit (CPU) time and memory requirements; the approximate solution could be given as a product of low-rank matrices.

The following result shows that the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ is an exact solution of perturbed differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation.

Theorem 4.3. Let the matrix function $X_{m}(t)$ be the approximate solution given by 4.1. Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\left(A-F_{m}\right) X_{m}(t)+X_{m}(t)^{T}\left(A-F_{m}\right)^{T}+B B^{T} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F_{m}=V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}$.
Proof . Multiplying 4.3 from left by $\mathcal{V}_{m}$ and from right by $\mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}$, we obtain

$$
\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}^{\prime}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}=\mathcal{V}_{m} \mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}(t)^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathcal{V}_{m} B_{m} B_{m}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}
$$

then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{m}^{\prime}(t) & =\left[A \mathcal{V}_{m}-V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T}\right] Y_{m}(t) \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathcal{V}_{m} Y_{m}(t)^{T}\left[A \mathcal{V}_{m}-V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T}\right]^{T}+B B^{T} \\
& =\left[A-V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}\right] X_{m}(t)+X_{m}(t)^{T}\left[A-V_{m+1} T_{m+1, m} E_{m}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{m}^{T}\right]^{T}+B B^{T},
\end{aligned}
$$

so $X_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\left(A-F_{m}\right) X_{m}(t)+X_{m}(t)^{T}\left(A-F_{m}\right)^{T}+B B^{T}$.

### 4.2 Low-rank method by extended global Arnoldi

In this section, we show how to obtain low-rank approximate solutions to the differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation (1.1) by first projecting directly the initial problem onto extended global Krylov subspaces and then solving the obtained low dimensional problem. We apply the extended global Arnoldi algorithm to the pair $(A, B)$ to get the matrices

$$
\mathbb{V}_{m}=\left[V_{1}, \ldots, V_{m}\right] \text { and } \mathbb{H}_{m}=\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \diamond\left(A \mathbb{V}_{m}\right)
$$

with $\mathbb{V}_{m}$ whose columns form orthonormal bases of the extended global Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{K}_{m}^{e}(A, B)$ and $\mathbb{H}_{m}$ the upper block Hessenberg matrix. Let $X_{m}(t)$ be the desired low-rank approximate solution given as

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m}(t)=\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the matrix function $\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m \times 2 m}$ is the solution of the low-order differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{X}_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\mathbb{H}_{m} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t)+\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \mathbb{H}_{m}^{T}+\|B\|_{F}^{2} e_{1}^{(2 m)}\left(e_{1}^{(2 m)}\right)^{T} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left(e_{1}^{(2 m)}\right)^{T}=[1,0, \ldots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{2 m}$.
The next result shows how to compute the norm of $R_{m}(t)$ without forming the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ which is computed in a factored form only when convergence is achieved.

Theorem 4.4. The Frobenius norm of the residual matrix function $R_{m}(t)$ associated to the approximation matrix function $X_{m}(t)$ obtained at step $m$ by the extended global Arnoldi method satisfies the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}\left\|H_{m+1, m} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)$ is the $2 \times 2 m$ matrix corresponding to the last 2 rows of $\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)$.
Proof . Using the relation 4.7) and the fact that $R_{m}(t)=X_{m}^{\prime}(t)-A X_{m}(t)-X_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-B B^{T}$, therefore

$$
R_{m}(t)=\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}^{\prime}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}-A \mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}-\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} A^{T}-B B^{T}
$$

using the relation 3.2, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{m}(t)= & \mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbb{X}_{m}^{\prime}(t) \otimes I_{s} & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T}-\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbb{H}_{m} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s} & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T} \\
& -\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \mathbb{H}_{m}^{T} \otimes I_{s} & \mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \otimes I_{s} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T} \\
& -\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \diamond B B^{T} \diamond \mathbb{V}_{m} & 0_{2 m s \times 2 s} \\
0_{2 s \times 2 m s} & 0_{2 s \times 2 s}
\end{array}\right] \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T} \\
= & \mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left(\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbb{X}_{m}^{\prime}(t)-\mathbb{H}_{m} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t)-\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \mathbb{H}_{m}^{T}-B_{m} B_{m}^{T} & -\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) & 0_{2 \times 2}
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T}
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)$ exact solution of the low dimensional differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 4.8, so

$$
R_{m}(t)=\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left(\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0_{2 m \times 2 m} & -\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) & 0_{2 \times 2}
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T}
$$

so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}^{2} & =\left\|\mathbb{V}_{m+1}\left(\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0_{2 m \times 2 m} & -\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) & 0_{2 \times 2}
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T}\right\|_{F}^{2} \\
& \leq\left\|\left(\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0_{2 m \times 2 m} & -\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) & 0_{2 \times 2}
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m+1}^{T}\right\|_{F}^{2} \\
& \leq\left\|\left[\begin{array}{cc}
0_{2 m \times 2 m} & -\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} E_{m}^{e} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \\
-H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) & 0_{2 \times 2}
\end{array}\right]\right\|_{F}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

So $\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}^{2} \leq 2\left\|H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}^{2}$.
The following result shows that the approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ is an exact solution of a perturbed differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation.

Theorem 4.5. Let $X_{m}(t)$ be the approximate solution given by (1.1). Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\left(A-F_{m}\right) X_{m}(t)+X_{m}(t)^{T}\left(A-F_{m}\right)^{T}+B B^{T} \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F_{m}=V_{m+1}\left(H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)\left(\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \mathbb{V}_{m}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}$.

Proof. Multiplying 4.8 from left by $\mathbb{V}_{m}$ and from right by $\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}^{\prime}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}= & \mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{H}_{m} \mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \mathbb{H}_{m}^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(B_{m} B_{m}^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \\
= & \mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{H}_{m} \otimes I_{s}\right)\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}+\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)\left(\mathbb{H}_{m}^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \\
& +\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(B_{m} \otimes I_{s}\right)\left(B_{m}^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}
\end{aligned}
$$

since $A \mathbb{V}_{m}=\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{H}_{m} \otimes I_{s}\right)+V_{m+1}\left(H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{m}^{\prime}(t)= & {\left[A \mathbb{V}_{m}-V_{m+1}\left(H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)\right]\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right) } \\
& +\left(\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \otimes I_{s}\right)^{T}\left[\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} A^{T}-\left(E_{m} H_{m+1, m}^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) V_{m+1}^{T}\right]+B B^{T} \\
= & {\left[A-V_{m+1}\left(H_{m+1, m}\left(E_{m}^{e}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right)\left(\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \mathbb{V}_{m}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{V}_{m}^{T}\right] X_{m}(t) } \\
& +X_{m}(t)^{T}\left[A^{T}-\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{V}_{m}^{T} \mathbb{V}_{m}\right)^{-1}\left(E_{m}^{e}\left(H_{m+1, m}\right)^{T} \otimes I_{s}\right) V_{m+1}^{T}\right]+B B^{T},
\end{aligned}
$$

so $X_{m}^{\prime}(t)=\left(A-F_{m}\right) X_{m}(t)+X_{m}(t)^{T}\left(A-F_{m}\right)^{T}+B B^{T}$.
The approximate solution $X_{m}(t)$ can be given as a product of two low-rank matrices, i.e., $X_{m}=Z_{1} Z_{2}^{T}$ where the matrix $Z_{1}$ and $Z_{2}$ are of low rank (lower than $2 m$ ). Consider the singular value decomposition of the $2 m \times 2 m$ matrix

$$
\mathbb{X}_{m}(t)=\widetilde{G}_{1} \Sigma \widetilde{G}_{2}^{T}
$$

where $\Sigma$ is the diagonal matrix of the singular values of $\mathbb{X}_{m}$ sorted in decreasing order. Let $\mathbb{X}_{1, l}$ and $\mathbb{X}_{2, l}$ be the $2 m \times l$ matrices of the first $l$ columns of $\widetilde{G}_{1}$ and $\widetilde{G}_{2}$ respectively, corresponding to the $l$ singular values of magnitude greater than some tolerance $d_{t o l}$. We obtain the truncated SVD

$$
\mathbb{X}_{m}(t) \approx \mathbb{X}_{1, l} \Sigma_{l} \mathbb{X}_{2, l}^{T}
$$

where $\Sigma_{l}=\operatorname{diag}\left[\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{l}\right]$. Setting $Z_{1, m}=\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{1, l} \Sigma_{l}^{1 / 2} \otimes I_{s}\right)$ and $Z_{2, m}=\mathbb{V}_{m}\left(\mathbb{X}_{2, l} \Sigma_{l}^{1 / 2} \otimes I_{s}\right)$, leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{m} \approx Z_{1, m} Z_{2, m}^{T} \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is very important for large problems when one doesn't need to compute and store the approximate solution $X_{m}$ at each iteration, see [16, 15].

In the next section, we give some iterative methods to solve the reduced order differential T-Lyapunov matrix equations 4.3) and 4.8).

## 5 Iterative methods for solving the reduced differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation

### 5.1 Rosenbrock method

In this section, we will apply Rosenbrock method [4, 14 to the low dimensional differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 4.3). The new approximation $Y_{m, j+1}$ of $Y_{m}\left(t_{j+1}\right)$ obtained at step $j+1$ is defined, by the relations

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{m, j+1}=Y_{m, j}+\frac{3}{2} P_{1}+\frac{1}{2} P_{2}, \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ solve the following T-Sylvester matrix equations in these two articles [12, 7].

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{T}_{m, 1} P_{1}+P_{1}^{T} \mathbb{T}_{m, 2}=\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m, j}+Y_{m, j}^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{T}_{m, 1} P_{2}+P_{2}^{T} \mathbb{T}_{m, 2}=\mathcal{T}_{m}\left(Y_{m, j}+P_{1}\right)+\left(Y_{m, j}+P_{1}\right)^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T}-\frac{2}{h} P_{1} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbb{T}_{m, 1}=\frac{1}{h} I_{2 m s}-\gamma \mathcal{T}_{m}$, and $\mathbb{T}_{m, 2}=-\gamma \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}$.
We summarize the steps of the Rosenbrock method in the following algorithm

Algorithm 3 The Rosenbrock method for 4.3)
Inputs: $\mathcal{T}_{m}, B_{m}, t_{0}, T_{f}$.
Inputs: $\mathcal{T}_{m}, B_{m}, t_{0}, T_{f}$.

1. Choose h.
2. Compute: $N=\frac{T_{f}-t_{0}}{h}$
3. Compute: $\mathbb{T}_{m, 1}, \mathbb{T}_{m, 2}$
4. For $j=1: N$
5. Solve (5.2) and (5.3).
6. Calculate $Y_{m, j+1}$ by (5.1)
7. End For $j$.

Output: $Y_{m, j+1}$.

In the same way, we solve the reduced-order differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation (4.8) by Rosenbrock method, it is enough to replace $\mathcal{T}_{m}$ by $\mathbb{H}_{m}$.

We summarize the steps of the approach EBA-Rosenbrock method for the extended block Arnoldi and EGARosenbrock methods for the extended global Arnoldi in the following algorithm.

```
Algorithm 4 The EBA-Rosenbrock method or EGA-Rosenbrock method for solving DTLE.
Inputs: \(A\) and \(B\) an matrix.
    1. Choose a tolerance \(d_{t o l}, t o l>0\) and an integer \(m_{\max }\).
    2. For \(m=1: m_{\text {max }}\)
    3. Apply EBA Algorithm 1 for the EBA-Rosenbrock method to \((A, B)\) to get the matrices \(\mathcal{V}_{m}, \mathcal{T}_{m}\) or apply EGA
    Algorithm 2 for the EGA-Rosenbrock method to \((A, B)\) to get the matrices \(\mathbb{V}_{m}, \mathbb{H}_{m}\).
    4. Apply Algorithm 3 to solve the low dimensional differential matrix equation.
    5. If \(\left\|R_{m}\right\|_{F}<t o l\).
    6. End For \(m\)
    7. Compute the approximate solution \(X_{m}\) in the factored form given by the relation 4.5 for the EBA-Rosenbrock
        method or the relation (4.11) for the EGA-Rosenbrock method.
```


## Output: $X_{m}$.

### 5.2 BDF method

We use the Backward Differentiation Formula method for solving the reduced differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 4.3). At each time $t_{j}$, let $Y_{m, j}$ be the approximation of $Y_{m}\left(t_{j}\right)$, where $Y_{m}$ is a solution of 4.3). Then, the new approximation $Y_{m, j+1}$ of $Y_{m}\left(t_{j+1}\right)$ obtained at step $j+1$ by BDF2 is defined by the implicit relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{m, j+1}=\frac{4}{3} Y_{m, j}-\frac{1}{3} Y_{m, j-1}+\frac{2 h}{3}\left(\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m, j+1}+Y_{m, j+1}^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T}\right) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h=t_{j+1}-t_{j}$ is the step size. The approximation $Y_{m, j+1}$ solves the following matrix equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
-Y_{m, j+1}+\frac{2 h}{3}\left(\mathcal{T}_{m} Y_{m, j+1}+Y_{m, j+1}^{T} \mathcal{T}_{m}^{T}+B_{m} B_{m}^{T}\right)+\frac{4}{3} Y_{m, j}-\frac{1}{3} Y_{m, j-1}=0 \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\mathbb{T}_{m}=\frac{2 h}{3} \mathcal{T}_{m}-\frac{1}{2} I_{2 m s}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{m, j+1}=\frac{2 h}{3} B_{m} B_{m}^{T}+\frac{4}{3} Y_{m, j}-\frac{1}{3} Y_{m, j-1}$, therefore, we can write 5.5 as the following T-Sylvester matrix equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{T}_{m} Y_{m, j+1}+Y_{m, j+1}^{T} \mathbb{T}_{m}^{T}=-\mathbb{Q}_{m, j+1} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We summarize the steps of the BDF method in the following algorithm

```
Algorithm 5 The BDF method for 4.3
Inputs: \(\mathcal{T}_{m}, B_{m}, t_{0}, T_{f}\).
```

1. Choose $h$.
2. Compute: $N=\frac{T_{f}-t_{0}}{h}$
3. Compute: $\mathbb{T}_{m}$
4. For $j=1: N$
5. Calculate $\mathbb{Q}_{m, j+1}$
6. Solve 5.6
7. End For $j$.

Output: $Y_{m, j+1}$.

In the same way, we solve the reduced order differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 4.8 by BDF method, it is enough to replace $\mathcal{T}_{m}$ by $\mathbb{H}_{m}$.

We summarize the steps of the approach EBA-BDF method for the extended block Arnoldi and EGA-BDF method for the extended global Arnoldi in the following algorithm.

## Algorithm 6 The EBA-BDF method or EGA-BDF method for solving DTLE. <br> Inputs: $A$ and $B$ an matrix.

1. Choose a tolerance $d_{t o l}, t o l>0$ and an integer $m_{\max }$.
2. For $m=1: m_{\text {max }}$
3. Apply EBA Algorithm 1 for the EBA-BDF method to $(A, B)$ to get the matrices $\mathcal{V}_{m}, \mathcal{T}_{m}$ or apply EGA Algorithm 2 for the EGA-BDF method to $(A, B)$ to get the matrices $\mathbb{V}_{m}, \mathbb{H}_{m}$.
4. Apply Algorithm 5 to solve the low dimensional differential matrix equation.
5. If $\left\|R_{m}\right\|_{F}<t o l$.
6. End For $m$
7. Compute the approximate solution $X_{m}$ in the factored form given by the relation 4.5 for the EBA-BDF method or the relation 4.11 for the EGA-BDF method.

Output: $X_{m}$.

## 6 The norm of the error

In this section, we give results related to the norm of the error. The next result states that the error $\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)=$ $X(t)-X_{m}(t)$ also satisfies a differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation.

Theorem 6.1. The error $\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)$ satisfies the following differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{E}_{m}^{\prime}(t)=A \mathcal{E}_{m}(t)+\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-R_{m}(t) \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof . We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{m}^{\prime}(t) & =X^{\prime}(t)-X_{m}^{\prime}(t) \\
& =A X(t)+X(t)^{T} A^{T}+B B^{T}-A X_{m}(t)-X_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-B B^{T}-R_{m}(t) \\
& =A\left(X(t)-X_{m}(t)\right)+\left(X(t)-X_{m}(t)\right)^{T} A^{T}-R_{m}(t) \\
& =A \mathcal{E}_{m}(t)+\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-R_{m}(t),
\end{aligned}
$$

so $\mathcal{E}_{m}^{\prime}(t)=A \mathcal{E}_{m}(t)+\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}-R_{m}(t)$.
Theorem 6.2. Let $\beta=\max _{\tau \in\left[t_{0}, t\right]}\left\|R_{m}(\tau)\right\|_{F}$. The norm of the error $\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)$ satisfies the following upper bound

$$
\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \leq\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(t_{0}\right)\right\|_{F} e^{2\|A\|_{2}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}+\frac{\beta}{2\|A\|_{2}}\left(e^{2\|A\|_{2}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}-1\right)
$$

Proof . Applying vec and $\|\cdot\|_{2}$ the differential T-Lyapunov matrix equation 6.1), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2} & \leq\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(A \mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T} A^{T}\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(R_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2} \\
& \leq\left\|I_{n} \otimes \operatorname{Avec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|A \otimes I_{n} \operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T}\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(R_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2} \\
& \leq\left\|I_{n} \otimes A\right\|_{2}\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|A \otimes I_{n}\right\|_{2}\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)^{T}\right)\right\|_{2}+\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(R_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

As $\left\|\operatorname{vec}\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right)\right\|_{2}=\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} & \leq\|A\|_{2}\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}+\|A\|_{2}\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}+\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \\
& \leq 2\|A\|_{2}\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F}+\left\|R_{m}(t)\right\|_{F},
\end{aligned}
$$

through the Grönwall's lemma, so

$$
\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}(t)\right\|_{F} \leq\left\|\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(t_{0}\right)\right\|_{F} e^{2\|A\|_{2}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}+\frac{\max _{\tau \in\left[t_{0}, t\right]}\left\|R_{m}(\tau)\right\|_{F}}{2\|A\|_{2}}\left(e^{2\|A\|_{2}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}-1\right)
$$

In Figure 1, diagram of the proportion of the Frobenius error norm $\log \left(\left\|X_{m}^{E G A}-X_{\text {exact }}^{\text {ode23s }}\right\|_{F}\right)$ in functions of the numbers iterations, and the time interval was $[0,1], n=49$, we used $s=2$. The tolerance was set to $10^{-9}$ for the stop test on the residual. For the EGA-BDF method, we used a constant timestep $h=0.01$.


Figure 1: The $\log \left(\left\|X_{m}^{E G A}-X_{\text {exact }}^{o d e 23 s}\right\|_{F}\right)$ in functions of the numbers iterations

## 7 Numerical experiments

In this section, we compare the approach presented in this article with the solution that is given by the command in MATLAB: ode23s, and trace the residual according to the iterations. All the experiments were performed on a laptop with an Intel Core i3 processor and 4GB of RAM. The algorithms were coded in MATLAB R2018b, the matrix $B$ is generated randomly and their coefficients were uniformly distributed in $[0,1]$. We compare the two approaches proposed in algorithm 6 (EBA-BDF method and EGA-BDF method), and algorithm 4 (EGA-Rosenbrock method and EBA-Rosenbrock method).

### 7.1 Example 1

In this example, the matrix $A$ is obtained from the centered finite difference discretization of the operators:

$$
\mathcal{L}(u)=\Delta u+f_{1}(x, y) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}+f_{2}(x, y) \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}+f_{3}(x, y) u
$$

on the unit square $[0,1] \times[0,1]$ with homogeneous dirichlet boundary conditions. The number of inner grid points in each direction was $n_{0}$ for the operators $\mathcal{L}$. The matrix $A$ was obtained from the discretization of the operator $\mathcal{L}$ with the dimensions $n=n_{0}^{2}$. The discretization of the operator $\mathcal{L}(u)$ yields matrix extracted from the Lyapack package [13] using the command $\mathrm{fdm}_{-} 2 \mathrm{~d}$ _matrix and denoted as $\operatorname{fdm}\left(n 0,{ }^{\prime} f_{-} 1(x, y)^{\prime},{ }^{\prime} f_{-} 2(x, y)^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} f_{\_} 3(x, y)^{\prime}\right)$. To the author's knowledge, there is no exact solution available in the literature. We compared the results obtained from the new four ways and Matlab's ode23s solver to test if our approach gives reliable results. For this experiment, we consider $A=\operatorname{fdm}\left(n 0, f_{1}(x, y), f_{2}(x, y), f_{3}(x, y)\right)$ with $f_{1}(x, y)=e^{x y}, f_{2}(x, y)=\sin (x y)$ and $f_{3}(x, y)=y^{2}$, we used $s=2$. The time interval considered was $[0,1]$. The tolerance was set to $10^{-9}$ for the stop test on the residual and $d_{t o l}=10^{-10}$ for the EBA-BDF, EGA-BDF, EGA-Rosenbrock and EBA-Rosenbrock methods, we used a constant timestep $h=0.005$. We chose a size of $64 \times 64$ for the matrix $A$. In Figure 2, we plotted the solutions using the new four ways and ode 23 s method in functions of the times. Computational time taken from an EBA-BDF method is 1.02 seconds, EGA-BDF method is 0.64 seconds, EGA-Rosenbrock method 1.21 seconds, EBA-Rosenbrock method is 3.54 seconds versus ode23s method is 496.24 seconds.


Figure 2: Values of $X_{1,1}(t)$ for $t \in[0,1]$ computed by using the new four ways and ode23s method

In Fig 3, we chose a size of $4096 \times 4096$ for the matrix $A$, we plotted the Frobenius norms of the residuals $\left\|R_{m}\left(T_{f}\right)\right\|_{F}$ at final time $T_{f}$ versus the number of EBA and EGA iterations for the EBA-Rosenbrock, EGA-Rosenbrock, EBA-BDF and EGA-BDF methods, we used a constant timestep $h=0.1$.


Figure 3: Residual norm versus number $m$ of EBA and EGA iterations

In Table 1. we list the Frobenius residual norms at final time $T_{f}=1$ and the corresponding CPU time for each method. For this experiment, the algorithms are stopped when the residual norms are smaller than $10^{-9}$.

| Test Problem | Method | CPU time (seconds) | Iterations $(m)$ | $\left\\|R_{m}\left(T_{f}\right)\right\\|_{F}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4096 \times 4096$ | EBA-Rosenbrock | 4.91 | 24 | $4.11 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EGA-Rosenbrock | 7.90 | 29 | $4.64 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EBA-BDF | 4.60 | 24 | $8.19 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EGA-BDF | $\mathbf{2 . 2 3}$ | 30 | $2.39 \times 10^{-10}$ |
| $5776 \times 5776$ | EBA-Rosenbrock | 4.25 | 26 | $8.29 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EGA-Rosenbrock | 2.61 | 31 | $7.74 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EBA-BDF | 4.94 | 35 | $8.83 \times 10^{-10}$ |
|  | EGA-BDF | $\mathbf{2 . 0 3}$ | 32 | $8.64 \times 10^{-10}$ |

Table 1: Runtimes in seconds and the residual norms for the new four ways

### 7.2 Example 2

For the second set of experiments, we used the matrices add32 and thermal from the University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection [6] and from the Harwell Boeing Collection
(http://math.nist.gov/MatrixMarket). The tolerance was set to $10^{-11}$ for the stop test on the residual. For the EBA-BDF and EBA-Rosenbrock methods, we used a constant timestep $h=0.1$.

For this example, the matrix $A=a d d 32, \quad n=4960$. The time interval considered was $[0,1]$. In Figure 4 we plotted the Frobenius residual norm $\left\|R_{m}\left(T_{f}\right)\right\|_{F}$ in functions of the numbers iterations.


Figure 4: Frobenius residual norm in functions of the numbers iterations for example 2

For this example, the matrice $A=$ thermal, $n=3456$. The time interval considered was $[0,1]$. In Figure 5 , we plotted the times, and the Frobenius residual norm $\left\|R_{m}\left(T_{f}\right)\right\|_{F}$ in functions of the numbers iterations.


Figure 5: Frobenius residual norm in functions of the numbers iterations for example 2

In Table 2, we list the Frobenius residual norms at final time $T_{f}=1$ and the corresponding CPU time for each
method. For this experiment, the algorithms are stopped when the residual norms are smaller than $10^{-11}$.

| Test Problem | Method | CPU time (seconds) | Iterations $(m)$ | $\left\\|R_{m}\left(T_{f}\right)\right\\|_{F}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $A=$ thermal | EBA-Rosenbrock | 9.09 | 11 | $2.88 \times 10^{-12}$ |
| $3456 \times 3456$ | EGA-Rosenbrock | $\mathbf{8 . 7 4}$ | 11 | $6.16 \times 10^{-12}$ |
|  | EBA-BDF | 8.87 | 11 | $1.95 \times 10^{-12}$ |
|  | EGA-BDF | 9.37 | 11 | $2.23 \times 10^{-12}$ |
| $A=$ add32 | EBA-Rosenbrock | 25.11 | 6 | $2.69 \times 10^{-12}$ |
| $4960 \times 4960$ | EGA-Rosenbrock | 24.06 | 6 | $4.96 \times 10^{-12}$ |
|  | EBA-BDF | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1 6}$ | 6 | $5.13 \times 10^{-12}$ |
|  | EGA-BDF | 23.54 | 6 | $9.84 \times 10^{-12}$ |

Table 2: Runtimes in seconds and the residual norms for example 2

## 8 Conclusion

We presented in this paper a way to solve large-scale differential T-Lyapunov matrix equations. Our approach consists in projecting the initial problem on extended Krylov subspaces, through low-rank approximate solutions and an expanded Arnoldi algorithm to obtain a small-scale differential matrix equation that is solved using iterative methods (Rosenbrook method or BDF method). The process is stopped as soon as selected accuracy is achieved. We have given some theoretical results. In particular, we have demonstrated that the residual norm can be calculated without explicitly calculating the approximate solution. This result is very important as calculating an approximate solution can be a major memory challenge for large-scale cases. Moreover, this allowed us to design a stop test for Arnoldi iterations. Numerical experiments have shown that our approach is interesting for large-scale problems, providing accurate results, and that computing time is much lower. As there is no other way to deal with such large dimensions cases available in the literature, we have not been able to cope with our way to other approaches (except for small-scale cases that have led to a very satisfactory way), but the fact that we were able to calculate the remaining standard ensures that the method is accurate.
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