

# MAT 245 Lab 4

Oct. 16, 2017

## Ill-conditioned matrices

**The condition number.** Recall that the condition number of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  is defined to be

$$\kappa(A) := \left( \sup_{e \neq 0} \frac{\|A^{-1}e\|_2}{\|e\|_2} \right) \left( \sup_{b \neq 0} \frac{\|b\|_2}{\|A^{-1}b\|_2} \right) = \|A^{-1}\|_2 \|A\|_2.$$

If we are studying the linear system  $Ax = b$ , one can intuitively think of the condition number as measuring the rate of change solution of the solution  $x$  as we perturb  $b$ . When we working with the Frobenius matrix norm, as above, there is a particularly simple formula for the condition number. If  $\sigma_{\max}(A)$  and  $\sigma_{\min}(A)$  denote the maximum and minimum singular values of  $A$  respectively, then

$$\kappa(A) = \frac{\sigma_{\max}}{\sigma_{\min}}.$$

**The Hilbert matrix.** The  $n \times n$  Hilbert matrix is the matrix  $H(n)$  defined by

$$(H(n))_{ij} = \frac{1}{i+j-1}.$$

In other words, it is the matrix whose  $ij^{th}$  entry is  $\frac{1}{i+j-1}$ . For example:

$$H(5) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} & \frac{1}{8} \\ \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{7} & \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{9} \end{bmatrix}$$

## Goals

1. Write a `python` function that returns the Hilbert matrix  $H(n)$  given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
2. Write a `python` function that takes a `numpy` 2D-array  $A$  and computes the condition number  $\kappa(A)$ .
3. Use your implementation of the condition number function to compute  $\kappa(H(n))$  for  $n = 10, 15, 20, 25$ . Compare these values with those computed by the University of Kyoto at: <http://bit.ly/2x6jIP7>. Do they match?
4. Plot the graph of the function  $n \mapsto \kappa(H(n))$  for  $1 \leq n \leq 10$ .
5. Define random two vectors  $t_0, t_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{20}$  using the `numpy.random.rand` function. Set

$$b_0 := H(20) \cdot t_0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_1 := H(20) \cdot t_1$$

Now compute  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  by

$$x_0 = H(20)^{-1} \cdot b_0 \quad \text{and} \quad x_1 = H(20)^{-1} \cdot b_1$$

Clearly  $x_i = t_i$  since

$$x_i = H(20)^{-1} H(20) t_i \quad i = 0, 1.$$

Use `numpy.linalg.norm` to compute the norm of  $\|x_i - t_i\|_2$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Do you obtain the expected result?

6. Now let's try computing the  $x_i$  in a different way. This time use `numpy.linalg.solve` to solve the linear systems

$$H(20)x_0 = b_0 \quad \text{and} \quad H(20)x_1 = b_1.$$

By the definition of  $b_i$ , we should again have  $x_i = t_i$ . Compute  $\|x_i - t_i\|_2$  as above to see whether this is the case.

## Computing the variance

Consider the following two formulas for computing the variance of a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :

(a)

$$S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

(b)

$$S^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n\bar{x}^2 \right).$$

One of these algorithms is numerically unstable.

1. Write **python** implementations of both formulas.
2. Can you determine which one is more numerically stable? Use examples to demonstrate the issues with the unstable algorithm. (Hint: Try sample data whose variance is very small relative to the mean and consider the placement of the <sup>2</sup>).
3. Compare both algorithms to the results obtained from **numpy**'s own variance function **numpy.var**. If  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are the results of any two variance computations, try computing  $\frac{|v_1 - v_2|}{|v_1|}$ .

## Approximating the exponential function

1. Implement a **python** function that computes the  $N^{th}$  partial sum of  $\exp(x)$ . In other words, implement the mapping

$$(x, N) \mapsto \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{x^k}{k!}.$$

2. Compute approximate values for  $\exp(-5.5)$  for  $N = 5, 10, 15$  in three ways:
  - (a) directly with the function you implemented in the first step.
  - (b) with  $\exp(-5.5) = 1/\exp(5.5)$ , and your implementation for  $\exp(5.5)$ .
  - (c) with  $\exp(-5.5) = (\exp(0.5))^{-11}$ , and your implementation for  $\exp(0.5)$ .

How can the results be interpreted?