

1 Condition Numbers & Perturbation (2.2, 2.3)

We are now interested in the *sensitivity* of $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ with respect to perturbations (i.e., error). In other words, does noise in A or \mathbf{b} strongly affect the solution \mathbf{x} ? Here, we'll deal with two types of perturbations: in \mathbf{b} , and in A . Eventually, we'll talk about the case when there's noise in both.

1.1 Motivating Example

To see what we mean, consider the following two examples.

(Example.) Consider the system

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

1. Solve for \mathbf{x} .

Note that

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

by backwards substitution.

2. Suppose we introduce a very small error to the entries of \mathbf{b} such that $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix}$. Our system now becomes

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}.$$

Solve for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. In other words, what happens to \mathbf{x} if we perturb \mathbf{b} ?

Here, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.999 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is known as a perturbed solution. Notice how the difference between the solution and the perturbed solution is very small, to the point that both \mathbf{x} and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ are *similar*.

3. Compute the error in \mathbf{b} and in \mathbf{x} .

The error in \mathbf{b} can be found by using the L_2 -norm. So, for \mathbf{b} , we have

$$\|\mathbf{b} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -0.001 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = 0.001$$

Likewise, for \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1.999 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0.001 \\ -0.001 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = \sqrt{2} \cdot 0.001 \approx 0.0014.$$

(Example.) Consider a similar system

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0.001 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

1. Solve for \mathbf{x} .

We have

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which we found by backwards substitution.

2. Suppose we introduce a very small error to the entries of \mathbf{b} such that $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix}$. Our system now becomes

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0.001 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \\ \hat{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0.001 \end{bmatrix}}_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}.$$

Solve for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

Here, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

One important thing to notice is that the perturbed solution is *quite different* from the actual solution. So, unlike the previous example, \mathbf{x} and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ are *different*.

3. Compute the error in \mathbf{b} and in \mathbf{x} .

The error in \mathbf{b} is the same as in the previous example; therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{b} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\|_2 = 0.001$$

But, for \mathbf{x} , notice how

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 = \sqrt{2} \approx 1.41.$$

In particular, 0.001 is 10^3 larger than 1.41. So, in this linear system, when we perturb \mathbf{b} a little, we can cause a *large* error.

Remark: From this, it follows that the error in \mathbf{x} depends on the matrix A as well.

1.2 Condition Number

How do we measure the dependence on the matrix A ? This is related to the **condition number**, known as $\text{cond}(A)$ in MATLAB. The condition number is a simple but useful measure of the sensitivity of the linear system $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$. Although we haven't defined the condition number yet, consider the following examples, which showcase the difference in condition number:

- $\text{cond}\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right) \approx 2.1618$, which is a small condition number.
- $\text{cond}\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0.001 \end{bmatrix}\right) \approx 2 \cdot 10^3$, which is a large condition number, and the error is amplified by this

large condition number.

1.3 Perturbation of \mathbf{b}

Now, we want to solve $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$, where A is invertible. Instead of \mathbf{b} , we only have access to

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{b} + \delta\mathbf{b},$$

where $\delta\mathbf{b}$ is the (very small) error, known as the perturbation in \mathbf{b} . Then, we can consider the linear system

$$A\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\mathbf{b}}.$$

If $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ is close to \mathbf{b} , is it true that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is close to \mathbf{x} as well? **This depends** on the condition number of A . In particular, we'll later see that

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \leq \kappa(A) \frac{\|\mathbf{b} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\|}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}. \quad (1)$$

Here,

- $\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$ is the *relative error* of \mathbf{x} ,
- $\frac{\|\mathbf{b} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}\|}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}$ is the *relative error* of \mathbf{b} .
- $\kappa(A)$ is the condition number of the invertible matrix A .

The relative error of \mathbf{x} is bounded by the condition number of matrix A multiplied by the relative error of \mathbf{b} .

What is $\kappa(A)$? We can define it like so:

$$\kappa(A) = \|A\| \cdot \|A^{-1}\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ can be any vector norm. We will use the notation

- κ_p for the p -norm; that is,

$$\kappa_p(A) = \|A\|_p \cdot \|A^{-1}\|_p.$$

- κ_∞ for the ∞ -norm; that is,

$$\kappa_\infty(A) = \|A\|_\infty \cdot \|A^{-1}\|_\infty.$$

With this in mind, let's prove the inequality in (1).

Proof. We can break this down into two steps.

- Let $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{b} + \delta\mathbf{b}$ (the perturbed \mathbf{b}) and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} + \delta\mathbf{x}$ (the perturbed \mathbf{x}). So,

$$\begin{aligned} A\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\mathbf{b}} &\implies A(\mathbf{x} + \delta\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b} + \delta\mathbf{b} \\ &\implies A\mathbf{x} + A\delta\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} + \delta\mathbf{b} \\ &\implies A\delta\mathbf{x} = \delta\mathbf{b} && \text{Recall that } A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \\ &\implies \delta\mathbf{x} = A^{-1}\delta\mathbf{b} && A \text{ is invertible} \\ &\implies \|\delta\mathbf{x}\| = \|A^{-1}\delta\mathbf{b}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|A\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$ is the matrix norm induced by the vector norm. Additionally, note that $\|A^{-1}\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A^{-1}\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$. Then,

$$\|A^{-1}\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A^{-1}\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \geq \frac{\|A^{-1}\delta\mathbf{b}\|}{\|\delta\mathbf{b}\|} \implies \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\delta\mathbf{b}\| \geq \|A^{-1}\delta\mathbf{b}\|.$$

So,

$$\|\delta\mathbf{x}\| = \|A^{-1}\delta\mathbf{b}\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\delta\mathbf{b}\| \implies \|\delta\mathbf{x}\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\delta\mathbf{b}\|.$$

- Recall that $\mathbf{b} = A\mathbf{x}$. So,

$$\mathbf{b} = A\mathbf{x} \implies \|\mathbf{b}\| = \|A\mathbf{x}\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|.$$

Then, we can divide both sides by $\|\mathbf{b}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|$ to get

$$\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \leq \|A\| \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}.$$

With all this, we can combine the inequalities

$$\|\delta\mathbf{x}\| \leq \|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|\delta\mathbf{b}\|$$

$$\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \leq \|A\| \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}$$

to get

$$\underbrace{\frac{\|\delta\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}}_{\text{Relative error in } \mathbf{x}} \leq \underbrace{\|A^{-1}\| \cdot \|A\|}_{\kappa(A) \text{ Condition number}} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\|\delta\mathbf{b}\|}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}}_{\text{Relative error in } \mathbf{b}}.$$

This simplifies to $\frac{\|\delta\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \leq \kappa(A) \frac{\|\delta\mathbf{b}\|}{\|\mathbf{b}\|}$, as desired. \square

Remarks:

- The matrix norm is the induced matrix norm, e.g., if the vector norm is 2-norm, then the matrix norm is 2-norm. That is,

$$\|A\|_p = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}\|_p}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_p}$$

$$\|A\|_\infty = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}$$

This means that we can use whatever vector norm we want for (1) as long as all vectors use the same norm. Additionally, the induced matrix norm for A should be the same as the one used for the vector norm. **The norms must be consistent in the inequality.**

- When interpreting $\kappa(A)$,
 - If $\kappa(A)$ is small (close to 1), then A is called “well-conditioned.”
 - If $\kappa(A)$ is large, then A is called “ill-conditioned.”
- A tall matrix does not have a condition matrix because it's not invertible.

1.4 Properties of the Induced Matrix Norm

Proposition. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be an induced matrix norm

$$\|A\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}.$$

Then,

- $\|I\| = 1$. Here, I is the identity matrix; the condition number of the identity matrix is 1.
- $\kappa(A) \geq 1$. In particular, the condition number of some matrix will be at least 1.

Proof. Note that

$$\|I\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|I\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} = 1.$$

Also,

$$I = AA^{-1} \implies 1 = \|I\| = \|AA^{-1}\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \|A^{-1}\| = \kappa(A),$$

so we're done. \square

Remarks:

- For #2 of the proposition, if we introduce an error in \mathbf{b} , the condition number will not make the error smaller.
- $\kappa(I) = 1$.
- The Frobenius norm is not an induced matrix norm. In particular, the above results do not hold for the Frobenius norm $\|I\|_F$ as $\|I\|_F \neq 1$.