

# Polar Decomposition

Thomas Seleiro

November 25, 2020

2. Prove that the singular values of  $A$  are the eigenvalues of  $H$ .

We know that any matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ ,  $m \geq n$  has a thin singular value decomposition  $A = P\Sigma Q^*$  where  $P \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  has orthogonal columns,  $Q \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is unitary, and  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  is diagonal with  $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$  where  $\text{rank}(A) = r$  and  $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r \geq 0$ , the singular values of  $A$ . Thus we can write

$$A = (PQ^*)(Q\Sigma Q^*) =: UH \quad (1)$$

where  $U$  and  $H$  satisfy the properties of a polar decomposition.

In particular we have  $H = Q\Sigma Q^*$  where  $\Sigma$  is diagonal and  $Q$  is orthogonal. Thus the diagonal values of  $\Sigma$  are the eigenvalues of  $H$ , which are the singular values of  $A$ .

3. Prove that  $A$  is normal ( $A^*A = AA^*$ ) iff  $U$  and  $H$  commute.

We first suppose that  $U$  and  $H$  commute. Note that for the product  $HU$  to be well defined, we must have  $m = n$  which implies  $U \in \mathbb{C}$  is unitary. Since  $A = UH = HU$  we get

$$A^*A = (UH)^*(UH) = H^*(U^*U)H = H^2 \quad (2)$$

$$AA^* = (HU)(HU)^* = H(UU^*)H^* = H^2 \quad (3)$$

so  $A$  is normal.

Now suppose  $A$  is normal. Since  $A^*A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  and  $AA^* \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ ,  $A$  normal requires  $m = n$ . Using the singular value decomposition of  $A$ , we have

$$AA^* = (P\Sigma Q^*)(Q\Sigma P^*) = P\Sigma^2 P^* \quad (4)$$

where  $\Sigma^2 = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_r^2)$ . Equating (2) and (4), we get  $H^2 = P\Sigma^2 P^*$ . From [p.405], we know that there is a unique Hermitian positive semi-definite matrix  $(AA^*)^{1/2}$  such that  $(AA^*)^{1/2}(AA^*)^{1/2} = AA^* = H^2$ . It is obvious by its construction that  $H$  is said matrix, but we also note that  $(P\Sigma P^*)(P\Sigma P^*) = P\Sigma^2 P^* = AA^*$ . Therefore  $H = P\Sigma P^*$  and

$$HU = (P\Sigma P^*)(PQ^*) = P\Sigma Q^* = A = UH \quad (5)$$

by the properties of the SVD of  $A$ . Therefore  $U$  and  $H$  commute.

4. Verify the formula

$$U = \frac{2}{\pi} A \int_0^\infty (t^2 I - A^* A)^{-1} dt \quad (*)$$

for full rank  $A$  by using the singular value decomposition (SVD) of  $A$  to diagonalize the formula.

Since  $A^* A = (Q \Sigma P^*)(P \Sigma Q^*) = Q \Sigma^2 Q^*$ , we have

$$t^2 I + A^* A = Q(t^2 I)Q^* + Q \Sigma^2 Q^* = Q D Q^* \quad (6)$$

where  $D := \text{diag}(t^2 + \sigma_1, \dots, t^2 + \sigma_r)$ . Inverting (6) gives

$$(t^2 I + A^* A)^{-1} = Q D^{-1} Q^*, \quad D^{-1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{t^2 + \sigma_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{t^2 + \sigma_r} \right) \quad (7)$$

Since  $Q$  and  $Q^*$  do not depend on  $t$ , they can be taken outside the integral, leaving the right hand side of (\*) in the form

$$\frac{2}{\pi} A Q \int_0^\infty D^{-1} dt Q^* \quad (8)$$

The integral is a diagonal matrix where the  $i$ th diagonal component is

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t^2 + \sigma_i} dt = \left[ \frac{1}{\sigma_i} \arctan \left( \frac{t}{\sigma_i} \right) \right]_0^\infty = \frac{\pi}{2\sigma_i} \quad (9)$$

So the right hand side of (\*) is

$$A Q \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_r^{-1}) Q^* = P \Sigma Q^* Q \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_r^{-1}) Q^* \quad (10)$$

$$= P Q^* = U \quad (11)$$

5. Derive Newton's method for computing  $U$  by considering equations  $(X + E) * (X + E) = I$ , where  $E$  is a "small perturbation". (Newton's method is  $X_{k+1} = (X_k + X_k^{-*})/2$ ,  $X_0 = A$ )

6. Prove that Newton's method converges, and at a quadratic rate, by using the SVD of  $A$ .

7. Use the SVD to analyze the convergence of the Newton-Schulz iteration for computing  $U$ :

$$X_{k+1} = \frac{1}{2} X_k (3I - X_k^* X_k), X_0 = A$$

8. Evaluate the operation count for one step of Newton's method and one step of the Newton-Schulz iteration (taking account of symmetry). Ignoring operation counts, how much faster does matrix multiplication have to be than matrix inversion for Newton-Schulz to be faster than Newton (assuming both take the same number of iterations)?