



- 1 a) The LDL^T factorization of the matrix \mathbf{A}_1 uses the matrices

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix};$$

it does not have a Cholesky factorization, as it is not positive definite (the entry a_{11} is negative).

For the matrix \mathbf{A}_2 we have an LDL^T factorization with matrices

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Moreover, it has a Cholesky factorization with the matrix

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -\sqrt{3} & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

- b) The first system has the solution $\mathbf{x} = [73.5, -14, 9, -17]^T$, the second system the solution $\mathbf{x} = [-135, 20, -25, 17]^T$.

In the case of the LDL^T factorization, the first solution is obtained by first solving the equation $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}$, which yields the result $\mathbf{y} = [-3, 9, -8, 17]^T$ (note that the system is unit triangular, thus one can in a sense read off the result using the formula $y_k = b_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \ell_{kj}y_j$). Then one solves the system $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y}$ (which means: one computes $z_i = y_i/d_{ii}$), which yields the result $\mathbf{z} = [1.5, 3, -8, -17]^T$. Finally, one computes \mathbf{x} , starting from x_n , with the formula $x_k = z_k - \sum_{j=k+1}^n \ell_{jk}x_j$.

In the second case, one obtains the intermediate results $\mathbf{y} = [-3, 9, -8, 17]^T$ and $\mathbf{z} = [-3, 3, -8, 17]^T$.

For the Cholesky factorization, the approach is similar. Here one solves first the equation $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}$ using the formula $y_k = (b_k - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \ell_{kj}y_j)/d_{kk}$ and then $\mathbf{L}^T\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ using $x_k = (y_k - \sum_{j=k+1}^n \ell_{jk}x_j)/d_{jj}$. Here one obtains the intermediate result $\mathbf{y} = [-3, \sqrt{27}, -8, 17]^T$.

- 2 The diagonal entries of \mathbf{L} are given by the formula

$$\ell_{ii} = \left(a_{ii} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \ell_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus the i -th diagonal entry requires $i - 1$ additions, $i - 1$ multiplications, and taking one square root. For the off-diagonal entries we have the formula

$$\ell_{ij} = \frac{a_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \ell_{ik} \ell_{jk}}{\ell_{jj}}.$$

In column j , each entry requires therefore $j - 1$ additions, $j - 1$ multiplications, and one division. Since column j has $n - j + 1$ entries, it thus needs $(j - 1)(n - j + 1)$ additions and multiplications. Summing over all columns, we thus obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (j - 1)(n - j + 1) = \sum_{j=1}^n n(j - 1) - (j - 1)^2 = n \frac{n(n - 1)}{2} - \frac{n(n - 1)(2n - 1)}{6} \approx \frac{n^3}{6}$$

multiplications and the same number of additions. Moreover we have $n(n - 1)/2$ divisions (one for each off-diagonal entry), and n square root computations (one for each diagonal entry). We can assume that taking square roots is not much more complicated than multiplication¹ Consequently, the total number of long operations is approximately $n^3/6$, which is about half the number that is needed for the computation of an LU factorization.

3 Example code can be found on the webpage of the course.

4 We obtain the intervals

$a = 1,$	$b = 2,$
$a = 1,$	$b = 1.5,$
$a = 1.25,$	$b = 1.5,$
$a = 1.375,$	$b = 1.5,$
$a = 1.375,$	$b = 1.4375,$
$a = 1.40625,$	$b = 1.4375,$
$a = 1.40625,$	$b = 1.421875,$
$a = 1.4140625,$	$b = 1.421875,$
$a = 1.4140625,$	$b = 1.41796875,$
$a = 1.4140625,$	$b = 1.416015625,$
$a = 1.4140625,$	$b = 1.4150390625.$

After that, the length of the solution interval is smaller than 10^{-3} .

In general, the error after the k -th step is smaller than 2^{-k} times the length of the first interval (which is 1). Thus we will need more than $\log_2(10^{12}) \approx 39.9$ steps for an accuracy of 10^{-12} . In other words: 40 iterations are required for the desired accuracy.

¹One can, for instance, use the *Babylonian method* (which is nothing else than Newton's method for solving the equation $x^2 - a = 0$). This method basically needs a fixed number of additions and divisions for obtaining a result of a given precision. More details can be found here.

- 5 You find a possible implementation on the webpage of the course.

Note that the method will “fail” in case of the function \tan on the interval $[1, 2]$. More precisely, the search interval will shrink to the point $\pi/2$, where \tan has a singularity (and report the limit as a solution of the equation). One possibility to safeguard against this behavior is to include error (or warning) messages in case the function values appear not to converge to 0.

- 6 The Bisection method assumes a continuous function that changes sign on an interval $[a, b]$. If such a function has a unique zero on this interval, the Bisection method finds an approximation to it. The method repeatedly halves the initial interval, always choosing the half where the function changes sign. It continues until it stumbles upon the actual root or until the current interval is small enough. The approximation after n iterations c_n is the midpoint of the current interval $[a_n, b_n]$. From the description it is clear that the series of approximations $\{c_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ generated by the method only depends upon the sign and zero of the function on $[a, b]$. Since the product of continuous functions is again continuous and $g(x)$ is positive on $[a, b]$, it follows that $f(x)$ and $h(x)$ are both continuous and have the same sign function (same sign and same zero) on $[a, b]$. Thus both functions will satisfy the assumptions for the Bisection method to be applicable, and $c_n^f = c_n^h$ for all $n \geq 0$.