CPSC 302 - Assignment 4

Tristan Rice, q7w9a, 25886145

1. Data Fitting

1.a

The equation u(t) isn't linear, thus you can't find a perfect match using linear least squares.

1.b

We're trying to solve for $v(t) = x_1 + x_2 t$.

Normal equations:

$$X^T X b = X^T y$$

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.0 \\ 1 & 1.0 \\ 1 & 2.0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1\\0.9\\2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Solving the normal equations gives us

$$b = \begin{bmatrix} 0.05 \\ 0.95 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$v(t) = 0.05 + 0.95t$$

$$u(t) = e^{v(t)} = e^{0.05+0.95t}$$

$$u(t) = e^{v(t)} = e^{0.05}e^{0.95t}$$

$$u(t) = 1.0512711e^{0.95t}$$

2. Classical Gram-Schmidt vs. Modified Gram-Schmidt

2.a

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix}$$

Since we have a 4x3 matrix, we can decompose it into a 4x3 matrix and a 3x3 matrix.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}} & 0 & 1\\ \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon^2}} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1+\epsilon^2} & \epsilon & \epsilon\\ 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

2.b

TODO

2.c

TODO

3. Comparison of Algorithms

3.a

$$A^T A x = A^T b$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \epsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix}$$

$$b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^T b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^{T}A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \epsilon^{2} & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 + \epsilon^{2} & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 + \epsilon^{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

For ease of writing, $a=x_1, b=x_2, c=x_3$:

$$(1 + \epsilon^{2})a + b + c = 1$$

$$a + (1 + \epsilon^{2})b + c = 1$$

$$a + b + (1 + \epsilon^{2})c = 1$$

$$a = 1 - b - (1 + \epsilon^{2})c$$

$$\begin{split} (1+\epsilon^2)(1-b-(1+\epsilon^2)c) + b + c &= 1 \\ 1-b-(1+\epsilon^2)c + (1+\epsilon^2)b + c &= 1 \\ -b-(1+\epsilon^2)c + (1+\epsilon^2)b + c &= 0 \\ \epsilon^2b + \epsilon^2c &= 0 \\ b &= -c \\ (1+\epsilon^2)(1+c-(1-\epsilon^2)c) &= 1 \\ 1+c-(1-\epsilon^2)c &= \frac{1}{1+\epsilon^2} \\ c\epsilon^2 &= \frac{1}{1+\epsilon^2} - 1 \\ c &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^2+\epsilon^4} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \\ a &= 1+c-(1-\epsilon^2)c \end{split}$$

$$a = 1 + \epsilon^2 c$$
$$a = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon^2}$$

Thus,

$$x_1 = \frac{1}{1+\epsilon^2}$$

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^4} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$$

$$x_3 = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^4} - \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}$$

TODO: check this

3.b

4. Regularization

4.a

$$A = U\Sigma V^T$$

$$A^TA + \gamma I = (U\Sigma V^T)^T U\Sigma V^T + \gamma I$$

$$A^TA + \gamma I = (U\Sigma V^T)^T U\Sigma V^T + \gamma I$$

Since U is an orthogonal matrix, $U^T U = U U^T = I$.

$$A^T A + \gamma I = V \Sigma^T \Sigma V^T + \gamma I$$

Since V is likewise an orthogonal matrix, we can represent $\gamma I = V \gamma V^T.$

$$A^TA + \gamma I = V\Sigma^T\Sigma V^T + V\gamma V^T$$

$$A^TA + \gamma I = V(\Sigma^T\Sigma + \gamma I)V^T$$

Since this is a $m \times n$ matrix of rank n,

$$\kappa_2 = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_n}$$

Thus, the condition number of A is just the largest singular value of A divided by the smallest singular value.

$$\begin{split} \kappa_2^2(A) &= (\frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_n})^2 \\ \kappa_2(A^TA + \gamma I) &= \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \gamma}{\sigma_n^2 + \gamma} \end{split}$$

Thus,

$$\kappa_2^2(A) \ge \kappa_2(A^T A + \gamma I)$$
$$\frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_n^2} \ge \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \gamma}{\sigma_n^2 + \gamma}$$

Thus $+\gamma$ term makes the condition number closer to 1, and thus, we see that

$$\kappa_2^2(A) \ge \kappa_2(A^TA + \gamma I)$$

4.b

Normal equations

$$A^T A x = A^T b$$

becomes

$$\min_x ||b - Ax||_2$$

We want to convert $(A^TA + \gamma I)x_{\gamma} = A^Tb$ into something similar.

$$(A^TA + \gamma I)x_{\gamma} = A^Tb$$

$$(A + \gamma (A^T)^{-1})x_{\gamma} = b$$

Now we have something in the form Cx=d where our new $C=A+\gamma(A^T)^{-1}$.

Thus,

$$\min_{x_{\gamma}}||b-(A+\gamma(A^T)^{-1})x_{\gamma}||_2$$

4.c

We can use the normal equations and the regularized normal equations to show that $||x_{\gamma}||_2 \leq ||x||_2$.

$$A^TAx = A^Tb$$

$$(A^TA + \gamma I)x_{\gamma} = A^Tb$$

$$(A^TA + \gamma I)x_{\gamma} = A^TAx$$

$$(I + \gamma(A^TA)^{-1})x_{\gamma} = x$$

We know that A^TA is positive definite, so it's inverse must also be positive definite. Adding another positive definite matrix (the identity matrix in this case) results in it being a positive definite matrix.

Thus, $||I+\gamma(A^TA)^{-1}||_2\geq 1$ and $I+\gamma(A^TA)^{-1}$ is positive definite.

Since positive definite is an extension of a scalar to matrixes, we know that since the coefficient A is positive definite that given Ab=c, $b\leq c$. Thus, $x_{\gamma}\leq x$.

4.d

Running the regularized least squares it for the specified values gives us:

- err = 5.025

We can't directly compute $\gamma=0$ using Matlab since A is very close to singular. However, some small non-zero value of γ for regularization gives decent results. If it's too large it increases the error.

Using TSVD gives a very similar result to using regularization. Both TSVD and regularization seem to give decent results for close to singular matrices that you wouldn't be otherwise able to solve.

5. Compressing Image Information

5.a

TSVD Mandrill

TSVD Durer

5.b

Mandrill requires 480 * 500 = 240000 locations. The compressed version requires r * (480 + 500 + 1) storage locations.

Durer requires 648*509=329832 storage locations. The compressed version requires r*(648+509+1) storage locations.

It seems to be more effective for Mandrill. If we look at how much data is lost for a given r value we see that for mandrill it's 26.1% (64*(480+500+1)/(480*500)=0.2616) of the original storage size. For durer it's 22.5% (64*(648+509+1)/(648*509)=0.2247) of the original size. This is due to the fact that mandrill is lower rank to start with so it doesn't have to lose as much data to get to rank 64. Mandrill appears better at a given r value since it's closer to the original image and it has fewer small details.