

NLA III: Error analysis of GEPP

To control the error produced by GEPP, we want to apply the two steps:

(1) Analyse round off to show that the matrix

$$\hat{A}_{\text{GEPP}} = A + \delta_{\text{GEPP}} A \quad \text{produced by GEPP}$$

has a small^(*) relative error (backward analysis)

(2) Apply perturbation theory (condition numbers) to bound the error in the computation of x_{GEPP} :

$$A_{\text{GEPP}} \cdot x_{\text{GEPP}} = b$$

(*) What does "small" mean in this context?

Let ε be the machine epsilon & $\|\cdot\|$ a "standard" norm (like $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, $\|\cdot\|_1$, etc)

Rounding off the entries of A gives $\hat{A} = A + \delta A$ with

$$\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} < \varepsilon$$

By perturbation theory, this error will be amplified to

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} < K_{\|\cdot\|}(A) \cdot \varepsilon$$

To keep the quality of this bound, we want

$$\frac{\|\delta_{\text{GEPP}} A\|}{\|A\|} \leq C \cdot \varepsilon$$

with C as small as possible ①

To this end, we have to be careful about pivoting

III.1 The need of pivoting [D, §2.4.1]

We apply LU factorization without pivoting to

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with η a power of the base β that is smaller than ε . In the book

$$\beta = 10, \quad \varepsilon = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}, \quad \eta = 10^{-4}$$

Hence

$$1 \oplus \eta = fl(1 + \eta) = 1$$

η is "lost" when added to 1

Set $A = LU = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \eta^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 1 \\ 0 & 1 - \eta^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$

Then \downarrow Gauss elimination without pivoting
 $L_{GEPP} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \eta^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} = L$

but $U_{GEPP} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 1 \\ 0 & \eta^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$

and $A_{GEPP} = L_{GEPP} \cdot U_{GEPP} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ not close to A !

$$\frac{\|S A_{GEPP}\|_{\infty}}{\|A\|_{\infty}} = \frac{\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \|_{\infty}}{\| \begin{pmatrix} \eta & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \|_{\infty}} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (\text{and } \underline{\text{not}} < C \cdot \varepsilon)$$

Hence GE without pivoting is not backward stable.

This is reflected in the loss of precision when applying this to linear equation solving: the equation

$$A \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

has a correct answer close to $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Solving

$$L_{GEWP} \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

gives $y_1 = 1$ and $y_2 = 2 \ominus \eta^{-1} = -\eta^{-1}$

Then

$$U_{GEWP} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\eta^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

gives $x_2 = \frac{-\eta^{-1}}{-\eta^{-1}} = 1$ and $x_1 = \frac{1 \ominus 1}{1 \ominus \eta} = 0$

Hence $x_{GEWP} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, not close to $x \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$

The instability is also reflected in the disparity between the condition numbers of A and of L and U

$\|A\|_\infty \approx 4$ well-conditioned

$\|L\|_\infty, \|U\|_\infty \approx \eta^{-2}$ ill-conditioned

III.2 Formal error analysis in GEPP [D, §2.4.2]

When the intermediate quantities are too large, the information in A can be easily lost.

To make the analysis, suppose that A is already pivoted. Studying how L and U are constructed ~~and~~ we obtain that

$$A_{\text{GEPP}} = L \cdot U + E$$

with $|E| \leq n \cdot \varepsilon \cdot (|L| \cdot |U|)$, see [D, pages 47-48]
 \uparrow matrix of absolute values for details

Hence

~~$\|A_{\text{GEPP}}\|$~~

$$\|A - A_{\text{GEPP}}\|_{\infty} \leq n \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \| |L| \cdot |U| \|$$

In general $\kappa_{\text{GEPP}} \leq 2^{n-1}$ and this bound can be attained:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & 1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & \bigcirc & \vdots \\ -1 & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \bigcirc & \\ -1 & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & 1 \\ & \ddots & & 2 \\ & & \bigcirc & \vdots \\ & & & 2^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Ex: $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$

The bound (*) is too pessimistic in practice, since typically

$$\|L\|_{\infty} \|U\|_{\infty} \approx \|A\|_{\infty}$$

If this is the case

$$\frac{\|\delta_{\text{GEPP}} A\|}{\|A\|} \lesssim n \varepsilon$$

and GEPP would be ~~backward~~ stable.

We say that GEPP is backward stable in practice (whatever that means!)