

## Homework 7

Due date: March 13, 2025

1. Note that

$$\|A\|_\infty = \max\{|3| + |2| + |4|, |2| + |0| + |2|, |4| + |2| + |3|\} = \max\{9, 4, 9\} = 9.$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\|A\|_1 = \max\{|3| + |2| + |4|, |2| + |0| + |2|, |4| + |2| + |3|\} = \max\{9, 4, 9\} = 9.$$

Finally, we compute the eigenvalues of  $A$  in the following way.

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A - \lambda I) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} 3 - \lambda & 2 & 4 \\ 2 & -\lambda & 2 \\ 4 & 2 & 3 - \lambda \end{pmatrix} = (3 - \lambda)(-\lambda(3 - \lambda) - 4) - 2(2(3 - \lambda) - 8) + 4(4 + 4\lambda) \\ &= -\lambda^3 + 6\lambda^2 + 15\lambda + 8 = -(\lambda + 1)^2(\lambda - 8). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the eigenvalues are given by the roots of  $-(\lambda + 1)^2(\lambda - 8)$ , which are  $\lambda = -1$  and  $\lambda = 8$ . Since  $A$  is symmetric, we have that

$$\|A\|_2 = \rho(A) = \max\{|8|, |-1|\} = 8.$$

2. (a) *Proof.* Let  $M_1 = \max_{\|x\| \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|}$  and  $M_2 = \|A\| = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|$ . It suffices to show that  $M_1 = M_2$ . Note that if  $\|x\| \neq 0$ , then by properties of norms, we have

$$\frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|} = \left\| A \frac{x}{\|x\|} \right\|.$$

Furthermore<sup>1</sup>, since  $\left\| \frac{x}{\|x\|} \right\| = \frac{1}{\|x\|} \|x\| = 1$  we must have that  $M_1 \leq M_2$  by definition of  $M_2$ . Furthermore, if we fix an arbitrary vector,  $x$ , such that  $\|x\| = 1$ . Then we must have

$$\|Ax\| = \left\| A \frac{x}{1} \right\| = \left\| A \frac{x}{\|x\|} \right\| = \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|}$$

by definition of  $M_1$ , we must have that  $M_2 \leq M_1$ , and therefore,  $M_1 = M_2$ , which was the desired result. ■

- (b) *Proof.* Note that by part (a), we have that for any vector  $x \neq 0$ ,

$$\|A\| = \max_{y \neq 0} \frac{\|Ay\|}{\|y\|} \geq \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|}.$$

Multiplying by  $\|x\|$  gives that  $\|Ax\| \leq \|A\| \|x\|$  for all  $x \neq 0$ . Furthermore, note that the inequality also holds when  $x = 0$ , since  $Ax = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\|Ax\| \leq \|A\| \|x\|$$

for all  $x$ . We then have that

$$\|AB\| = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|ABx\| \leq \max_{\|x\|=1} \|A\| \|Bx\| = \|A\| \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Bx\| = \|A\| \|B\|$$

which is the desired result. ■

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that  $\frac{x}{\|x\|}$  is intended to mean  $\frac{1}{\|x\|}x$ , to agree with multiplying  $x$  by a scalar.

(c) *Proof.* By repeatedly applying part (b), we have that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|A^k\| = \|A \cdot A^{k-1}\| \leq \|A\| \|A^{k-1}\| = \|A\| \|A \cdot A^{k-2}\| \leq \|A\|^2 \|A^{k-2}\| \leq \dots \|A\|^k.$$

■

(d) *Proof.* Note that by part (b), we have

$$\|A\| \|A^{-1}\| \geq \|AA^{-1}\| = \|I\| = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|Ix\| = \max_{\|x\|=1} \|x\| = 1$$

which is the desired result. ■

3.

4.

5.

6. *Proof.* First, assume that  $A$  is strictly diagonally dominant. Namely, suppose that

$$|a_{ii}| > \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then, we must have that

$$\|D^{-1}(L+U)\|_{\infty} \leq \|D^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|L+U\|_{\infty} = \|D^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|D-A\|_{\infty}$$

where we used the fact that  $A = D - (L+U)$ . Furthermore, since  $D = \text{diag}(a_{ii})$ <sup>2</sup>, we must have that

$$D^{-1} = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{a_{ii}}\right).$$

Therefore, since we have that

$$L+U = \begin{cases} a_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases},$$

we must have

$$[D^{-1}(L+U)]_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{a_{ij}}{a_{ii}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\|D^{-1}(L+U)\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n |[D^{-1}(L+U)]_{ij}| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{a_{ij}}{a_{ii}} \right| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>I am going to make this assumption, since the theorem is not true without it. For example, if  $A = I$ , then clearly  $A$  is strictly diagonally dominant. However, if we let  $D = \frac{1}{2}I$ , then we must have  $L+U = D-A = -\frac{1}{2}I$ . This may be achieved with  $L = U = -\frac{1}{4}I$ . However, this means  $\|D^{-1}(L+U)\|_{\infty} = \|2I(-\frac{1}{2}I)\|_{\infty} = \|-I\|_{\infty} = 1$  which is obviously not less than 1. I specify this because we only assumed that  $D$  was diagonal,  $L$  is lower triangular, and  $U$  is upper triangular. However, what I have written is a stronger condition.

Since  $A$  is strictly diagonally dominant, we have that

$$\|D^{-1}(L + U)\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| < \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{|a_{ii}|}{|a_{ii}|} = 1.$$

Therefore,  $\|D^{-1}(L + U)\|_{\infty} < 1$ .

Suppose that  $\|D^{-1}(L + U)\|_{\infty} < 1$ . As discussed before, we have that

$$\|D^{-1}(L + U)\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|.$$

Therefore, for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we have that

$$\frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{1}{|a_{ii}|} \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| < 1.$$

Thus, multiplying by  $a_{ii}$  gives that for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| < |a_{ii}|.$$

Therefore,  $A$  is strictly diagonally dominant, which completes the proof. ■