

MAT-INF4130

Mandatory Assignment 2

Andreas Slyngstad

19. oktober 2016

We are presented the general problem

Find a k -dimensional subspace W of \mathbb{R}^m so that the sum of the (squared) distances from a set of n given points x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n in \mathbb{R}^m to W is as small as possible. We define the matrix of observations \mathbf{X} as

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{(1)} & x_2^{(1)} & \cdots & x_n^{(1)} \\ x_1^{(2)} & x_2^{(2)} & \cdots & x_n^{(2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_1^{(m)} & x_2^{(m)} & \cdots & x_n^{(m)} \end{pmatrix}$$

Problem 1

First we assume that W is known such that $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is an orthonormal basis for W , and let $\{w_i\}_{i=k+1}^m$ be an orthonormal basis for W^\perp . We define the projection operator

$$proj_u v = \frac{\langle v, u \rangle}{\langle u, u \rangle} u$$

as the projection of a vector v onto the vector u .

Now using this operator to find the projection of the columns of the matrix of observations x_i on the space W^\perp we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|proj_{W^\perp} x_i\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle x_i^T, W^\perp \rangle}{\langle W^\perp, W^\perp \rangle} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=k+1}^m \frac{\langle x_i^T, w_j \rangle}{\langle w_j, w_j \rangle}$$

Since $\{w_i\}_{i=k+1}^m$ spans an orthonormal basis for W^\perp , by definition $\langle w_i, w_i \rangle = 1$. From this we can rewrite the last sum in a more compact form as the Frobenius norm of the matrix product $\|X^T \mathbf{W}\|$, where \mathbf{W} is the matrix with columns $\{w_i\}_{i=k+1}^m$.

Problem 2

As introduced, if $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}^*$ is and SVD of \mathbf{X} then $\mathbf{X}^T = \mathbf{V}\Sigma^T\mathbf{U}^*$ we have the relation

$$\|\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{W}\|_F^2 = \|\Sigma^T\mathbf{U}^*\mathbf{W}\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=k+1}^m \sigma_i^2 \langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{w}_j \rangle^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 \|\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \mathbf{u}_i\|^2$$

From SVD we know that the unitary matrix \mathbf{U} spans an orthonormal basis of \mathbf{X} such that $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k)$ for $k = \text{rank}(X)$. Now to minimize $\|\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{W}\|_F^2$ we want in some sense to construct \mathbf{W} such that \mathbf{W} is in the same span as \mathbf{X} , hence we want to construct \mathbf{W} such that \mathbf{W} spans the same space as the orthonormal basis \mathbf{U} of \mathbf{X} .

Since W is a k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R} , we can orientate W such that $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^k$ spans the same space as the components \mathbf{u}_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, in other words $W = \text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k)$.

Then $\sum_{i=1}^k \|\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \mathbf{u}_i\|^2 = 0$ (Mark the upper limit of the sum)

Now \mathbf{u}_i for $i = k+1, k+2, \dots, m$ will lie in $\text{span}(W^\perp)$, and therefore $\sum_{i=k+1}^m \|\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \mathbf{u}_i\|^2 = m - k$ since both $\{w_i\}_{i=k+1}^m$ and $\{u_i\}_{i=k+1}^m$ spans an orthonormal basis.

From this argumentation, finding the optimal subspace of W is equivalent to minimizing the system $\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 x_i$ which will happen when the conditions $x_1 = \dots = x_k = 0$, $x_{k+1} = \dots = x_m = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i = m - k$.

And finally since $\|\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \mathbf{u}_i\|^2 = 1$ for $i = k+1, k+2, \dots, m$,

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^m \sigma_i^2 \|\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \mathbf{u}_i\|^2 = \sum_{i=k+1}^m \sigma_i^2 = \|\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{W}\|_F^2$$

Problem 3

In exercise 2 we introduced the a vector \mathbf{c} to help find the best approximation for the matrix \mathbf{X} on \mathbf{W} such that the distance from $\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{c}$ to \mathbf{W} is as small as possible. Using the results from exercise 2 we replace \mathbf{x}_i with $\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{c}$. This relation is the same as replacing \mathbf{X} with $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}(1 \ 1 \cdots 1)$ Using this relation we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{w}_i\|^2 &= (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{w}_i)^T (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{w}_i) = \mathbf{w}_i^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{w}_i \\ &= \mathbf{w}_i^T (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}(1 \ 1 \cdots 1)) (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}(1 \ 1 \cdots 1))^T \mathbf{w}_i = \\ &= \mathbf{w}_i^T (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}(1 \ 1 \cdots 1)) (\mathbf{X}^T - (1 \ 1 \cdots 1)^T \mathbf{c}^T) \mathbf{w}_i = \\ &= \mathbf{w}_i^T (\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T - \mathbf{X} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1)^T \mathbf{c}^T - \mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1) \mathbf{X}^T + \mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1) (1 \ 1 \cdots 1)^T \mathbf{c}^T) \mathbf{w}_i \end{aligned}$$

1. $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{w}$ falls out directly from multiplication
2. From $\mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1) (1 \ 1 \cdots 1)^T \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{w}_i$
we observe that the matrix multiplication $\mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1) \mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1)^T$
(which is a scalar $(1 \times n)(n \times 1)$) will just be sum n, and by rearranging the terms we get $n \mathbf{c}_i^T \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c}$
3. The two final terms can be rewritten into one term. By a closer look at the $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{c} (1 \ 1 \cdots 1) \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{w}$ we change the order of multiplication and still get the equivalent expression $(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{(i)} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{(i)} \cdots \sum_{i=1}^n x_m^{(i)}) \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c}$. Equivalent argument yields for the last term

And we find that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{w}_i\|^2 = n \mathbf{c}_i^T \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} - 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_1^{(i)} \sum_{i=1}^n x_2^{(i)} \cdots \sum_{i=1}^n x_m^{(i)} \right) \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} + n \mathbf{c}_i^T \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c}$$

Problem 4

In general the Lagrange method or method of Lagrange multipliers we want to find a local maxima or minima of a function f , with some constraints evaluated from a function g . We define a Lagrange function \mathcal{L} such that

$$\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i g_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

where λ_i yields some scalar value to each constraint. Here the function g is limited to the set of points such that $g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0$. Further from a mathematical evaluation these local maxima or minima occur when the function f and g are parallel, which is equivalent to that the gradient of f and g are parallel. Hence the problem is reduced on the form

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \nabla g_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad (1)$$

In our case these multiple constraints is defined as $\mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ as set in exercise 3 by the assumption that vector $\mathbf{c} \in W$. Further the function f , generalized to our problem is to minimize $\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{W}\|_F^2$, and the gradient is taken with respect to \mathbf{c} , as this is the value of interest to find the best approximation.

Now by (1) we easily see that the left hand side is just the gradient of $\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{W}\|_F^2$ with respect to \mathbf{c} as defined in exercise 3. For the right hand side we get the result by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{c}} g(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{c}} \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{w}_i^T \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k \\ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \nabla g_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{w}_i^T = (\mathbf{w}_1 \ \mathbf{w}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{w}_k) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_k \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

From this result we can show that $\mathbf{c} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in W$ where $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i$. Considering the left hand side we can rewrite the terms using the relation from the Lagrange multiplier

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=k+1}^m \left(2n \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{c} - 2 \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}_i^T \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n x_1^{(i)} \\ \sum_{i=1}^n x_2^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^n x_m^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \right) &= \sum_{i=k+1}^m 2 \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \left(\mathbf{c} - \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n x_1^{(i)} \\ \sum_{i=1}^n x_2^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^n x_m^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ \sum_{i=k+1}^m 2 \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T (\mathbf{c} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

And since $\mathbf{w}_i \in W$ for $i = k+1, \dots, m$, clearly $\mathbf{c} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in W$ to fulfill the equation.