# UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

# Faculty of mathematics and natural sciences

Exam in:	MAT3110 — Introduction to numerical analysis
Day of examination:	14 December 2018
Examination hours:	0900-1300
This problem set consists of 5 pages.	
Appendices:	None
Permitted aids:	None

Please make sure that your copy of the problem set is complete before you attempt to answer anything.

All 8 part questions will be weighted equally.

# Problem 1 Matlab function

Write a Matlab (or Python) function [L,U] = mylu(A) that computes the LU factorization of an  $n \times n$  matrix A, assuming that no pivoting is required.

#### Answer:

```
function [L,U] = mylu(A)
n = size(A,1);
L=zeros(n,n);
U=zeros(n,n);
B = A;
for k=1:n
   U(k,:) = B(k,:);
   L(:,k) = B(:,k) / B(k,k);
   B = B - L(:,k) * U(k,:);
end
```

# Problem 2 Cholesky

Use the Cholesky algorithm to determine whether the matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 6 & -4 \\ 6 & 17 & 7 \\ -4 & 7 & 10 \end{bmatrix}$$

(Continued on page 2.)

is positive-definite.

**Answer** By a theorem from the course, A is positive-definite if and only if it has an  $LDL^T$  factorization where the diagonal elements of D are positive.

We initialize  $A_0 = A$ . In the first step we use the first column of  $A_0$ :

$$\mathbf{l}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2\\6\\-4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1\\3\\-2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the first diagonal element of  $A_0$ :

$$D_{1,1} = 2.$$

Then we find

$$\mathbf{l}_1 \mathbf{l}_1^T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & -2 \\ 3 & 9 & -6 \\ -2 & -6 & 4 \end{bmatrix},$$

and so

$$D_{1,1}\mathbf{l}_{1}\mathbf{l}_{1}^{T} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 6 & -4 \\ 6 & 18 & -12 \\ -4 & -12 & 8 \end{bmatrix},$$

and we let

$$A_1 = A_0 - D_{1,1} \mathbf{l}_1 \mathbf{l}_1^T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 19 \\ 0 & 19 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

In the second step of the algorithm we set  $D_{2,2}$  to be the second element of the second column of  $A_1$ . Thus  $D_{2,2} = -1$ . Thus A is not positive-definite.

## Problem 3 Matrix norm and SVD

#### 3a

Recall that the 2-norm of a vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{2}\right)^{1/2}$$

If U is an orthogonal  $n \times n$  matrix, what is the 2-norm of  $U\mathbf{x}$ ? Answer: If U is orthogonal then  $U^T U = I$ . Therefore

$$||U\mathbf{x}||_2^2 = (U\mathbf{x})^T (U\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T U^T U\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} = ||\mathbf{x}||_2^2,$$

and so the 2-norm of  $U\mathbf{x}$  equals the 2-norm of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

(Continued on page 3.)

#### 3b

What is the definition of the 2-norm of a real  $n \times n$  matrix A?

#### Answer:

$$||A||_2 = \max_{\mathbf{x}\neq 0} \frac{||A\mathbf{x}||_2}{||\mathbf{x}||_2}.$$

#### **3**c

Using the singular value decomposition of A, show that the 2-norm of A equals  $\sigma_1$ , the largest singular value of A.

**Answer**: The SVD of A is

$$A = USV^T,$$

where  $U, S, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ , U, V are orthogonal, and S is diagonal with diagonal elements  $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$ , the singular values of A, where  $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_n$ . Therefore,

$$||A||_{2} = \max_{\mathbf{x}\neq 0} \frac{||USV^{T}\mathbf{x}||_{2}}{||\mathbf{x}||_{2}} = \max_{\mathbf{x}\neq 0} \frac{||SV^{T}\mathbf{x}||_{2}}{||\mathbf{x}||_{2}},$$

because U is orthogonal. Letting  $\mathbf{x} = V\mathbf{y}$ ,

$$||A||_{2} = \max_{V\mathbf{y}\neq 0} \frac{||S\mathbf{y}||_{2}}{||V\mathbf{y}||_{2}} = \max_{\mathbf{y}\neq 0} \frac{||S\mathbf{y}||_{2}}{||\mathbf{y}||_{2}},$$

because V is also orthogonal. Therefore

$$||A||_2 = \max_{\mathbf{y} \neq 0} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 y_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2} \right)^{1/2}$$

Therefore,

$$\|A\|_2 \le \sigma_1$$

and the inequality is equality because we can choose  $\mathbf{y} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

### Problem 4 Iterative scheme

Consider the linear system  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  where A is a non-singular  $n \times n$  matrix and **b** is a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose we try to find the solution **x** using the iterative scheme

$$(A - B)\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} = -B\mathbf{x}^{(k)} + \mathbf{b}, \qquad k = 0, 1, 2,$$

with  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$  some initial guess. Assuming A - B is non-singular, what condition on A, B, and  $\mathbf{b}$  is both necessary and sufficient for the sequence  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \ldots$  to converge to  $\mathbf{x}$ ? Explain your answer.

**Answer**: Consider the *k*-th error,

$$\mathbf{e}^{(k)} := \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{x}.$$

(Continued on page 4.)

The equation

$$(A-B)\mathbf{x} = -B\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$$

is also satisfied by  $\mathbf{x}$  and subtracting it from

$$(A-B)\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} = -B\mathbf{x}^{(k)} + \mathbf{b}$$

implies

$$(A-B)\mathbf{e}^{(k+1)} = -B\mathbf{e}^{(k)}.$$

Under our assumption that A - B is non-singular this means that

$$\mathbf{e}^{(k+1)} = H\mathbf{e}^{(k)}, \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$
 (1)

where

$$H = -(A - B)^{-1}B$$

By a theorem from the notes, the error vectors  $\mathbf{e}^{(k)}$  converge to zero as  $k \to \infty$  if and only if  $\rho(H) < 1$ , where  $\rho(H)$  is the spectral radius of H,

$$\rho(H) = \max_{i=1,\dots,n} |\lambda_i|,$$

and the  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of H.

### Problem 5 Polynomial interpolation

The polynomial of degree  $\leq n$  that interpolates a function  $f : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ at distinct points  $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n \in [-1, 1]$  can be expressed as

$$p_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n \prod_{\substack{j=0\\j \neq i}}^n \frac{x - x_j}{x_i - x_j} f(x_i).$$

For approximating f, what is a good choice of the points  $x_i$  when n is large? Answer:

The interpolation error is given by

$$e(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\xi)}{(n+1)!}\omega(x), \qquad x \in [-1,1],$$

where  $\xi \in [-1, 1]$  and

$$\omega(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{n} (x - x_i).$$

We can minimize the absolute value of  $\omega$  in [-1, 1] by choosing

$$\omega(x) = 2^{-n} T_{n+1}(x),$$

where  $T_{n+1}$  is the Chebyshev polynomial

$$T_{n+1}(x) = \cos((n+1)\arccos(x)).$$

Thus a good choice of  $x_0, \ldots, x_n$  is the zeros of  $T_{n+1}$  which are

$$x_i = \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{2i+1}{n+1}\right), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

(Continued on page 5.)

### Problem 6 Non-linear least squares

Suppose we want to minimize a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  of the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i(\mathbf{x})^2, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$
(2)

where  $r_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ , i = 1, ..., n, are the so-called residuals. What are the Newton and Gauss-Newton methods for this problem, and what are their advantages and disadvantages?

**Answer**: The Newton method for minimizing f is Newton's method for root-finding applied to  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ , which is the iteration

$$\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - (\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))^{-1} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}).$$

An advantage of this method is that it has quadratic convergence if it converges.

The Gauss-Newton method is a simplification of the Newton method. Differentiating (2) with respect to  $x_j$  gives

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_j} r_i,$$

and so the gradient of f is

$$\nabla f = J_r^T \mathbf{r},$$

where  $\mathbf{r} = [r_1, \ldots, r_m]^T$  and  $J_r \in \mathbb{R}^{m,n}$  is the Jacobian of  $\mathbf{r}$ ,

$$J_r = \left[\frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_j}\right]_{i=1,\dots,m,j=1,\dots,n}.$$

Differentiating again, with respect to  $x_k$ , gives

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_k} + r_i \frac{\partial^2 r_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} \right),$$

and so the Hessian of f is

$$\nabla^2 f = J_r^T J_r + Q,$$

where

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i \nabla^2 r_i.$$

The Gauss-Newton method is the result of neglecting the term Q, i.e., making the approximation

$$\nabla^2 f \approx J_r^T J_r. \tag{3}$$

Thus the Gauss-Newton iteration is

$$\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{x}^{(k)} - (J_r(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})^T J_r(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))^{-1} J_r(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})^T \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$$

In general the Gauss-Newton method will not converge quadratically. On the other hand it is easier to implement and it is more robust than Newton's method because the search direction is always a descent direction.

Good luck!