# Conditioning and Error

Unit 4

For any subordinate matrix norm  $\rho(A) \leq ||A||$ 

For any subordinate matrix norm  $\rho(A) \leq ||A||$ 

$$Av = \lambda v \rightarrow$$

For any subordinate matrix norm  $\rho(A) \leq ||A||$ 

$$Av = \lambda v \rightarrow \|\lambda v\| = \|Av\| \rightarrow$$

For any subordinate matrix norm  $\rho(A) \leq ||A||$ 

Proof:

$$Av = \lambda v \rightarrow \|\lambda v\| = \|Av\| \rightarrow |\lambda| \|v\| = \|\lambda v\| = \|Av\| \le \|A\| \|v\|$$

Therefore,  $|\lambda| \leq ||A||$ , and  $\rho(A) \leq ||A||$ .

Question: why does the norm need to be subordinate?

For any Hermitian A

$$\|A\|_2=\rho(A),\quad \|A^{-1}\|_2=1/\mu, \ \text{ where } \ \mu:=\min\{|\lambda|, \ \lambda\in\sigma(A)\}$$

For any Hermitian A

$$\|A\|_2=\rho(A), \quad \|A^{-1}\|_2=1/\mu, \ \text{ where } \ \mu:=\min\{|\lambda|, \ \lambda\in\sigma(A)\}$$

$$A = A^* \rightarrow A^2 = A^*A \rightarrow$$

For any Hermitian A

$$\|A\|_2=\rho(A), \quad \|A^{-1}\|_2=1/\mu, \quad \text{where} \quad \mu:=\min\{|\lambda|, \quad \lambda\in\sigma(A)\}$$

$$A = A^* \rightarrow A^2 = A^*A \rightarrow$$

$$||A||_2 = \sqrt{\rho(A^*A)} = \sqrt{\rho(A^2)} = ^{\text{why?}} \sqrt{\rho(A)^2} = \rho(A)$$

For any Hermitian A

$$||A||_2 = \rho(A), \quad ||A^{-1}||_2 = 1/\mu, \text{ where } \mu := \min\{|\lambda|, \ \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}$$

$$A = A^* \rightarrow A^2 = A^*A \rightarrow$$

$$||A||_2 = \sqrt{\rho(A^*A)} = \sqrt{\rho(A^2)} = \text{why? } \sqrt{\rho(A)^2} = \rho(A)$$

$$A^{-1}$$
 is also Hermitian with  $\rho(A^{-1}) = 1/\mu$ . Thus  $||A^{-1}||_2 = 1/\mu$ .

•  $||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_{\infty}$ 

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_{\infty}$$

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \rightarrow$$

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_\infty$$

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \rightarrow \quad \|\lambda v\|_1 = \|A^*Av\|_1 \quad \rightarrow$$

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_\infty$$

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \rightarrow \quad \|\lambda v\|_1 = \|A^*Av\|_1 \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\lambda \|v\|_1 \leq \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1 \longrightarrow$$

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_\infty$$

Proof:

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \rightarrow \quad \|\lambda v\|_1 = \|A^*Av\|_1 \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\lambda \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1 \quad \to \quad \|A\|_2^2 \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1$$

Since  $||A^*||_1 = ||A||_{\infty}$ ,

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_\infty$$

Proof:

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \rightarrow \quad \|\lambda v\|_1 = \|A^*Av\|_1 \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\lambda \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1 \quad \to \quad \|A\|_2^2 \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1$$

Since  $||A^*||_1 = ||A||_{\infty}$ , we have  $||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_{\infty}$ 

• 
$$||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_\infty$$

Proof:

$$\lambda := \|A\|_2^2 \quad \to \quad A^*Av = \lambda v \quad \to \quad \|\lambda v\|_1 = \|A^*Av\|_1 \quad \to \quad$$

$$\lambda \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1 \quad \to \quad \|A\|_2^2 \|v\|_1 \le \|A^*\|_1 \|A\|_1 \|v\|_1$$

Since 
$$||A^*||_1 = ||A||_{\infty}$$
, we have  $||A||_2^2 \le ||A||_1 ||A||_{\infty}$ 

•  $||A||_2 \le ||A||_F \le \sqrt{n}||A||_2$  without proof

• The condition number  $cond(A) = ||A|| ||A^{-1}||$  depends on the matrix A and on the norm used. If cond(A) is large, A is called ill-conditioned.

- The condition number  $cond(A) = ||A|| ||A^{-1}||$  depends on the matrix A and on the norm used. If cond(A) is large, A is called ill-conditioned.
- Since  $||A|| ||A^{-1}|| \ge ||AA^{-1}|| = ||I|| = 1$ , we always have

$$cond(A) \ge 1$$

- The condition number  $cond(A) = ||A|| ||A^{-1}||$  depends on the matrix A and on the norm used. If cond(A) is large, A is called ill-conditioned.
- Since  $||A|| ||A^{-1}|| \ge ||AA^{-1}|| = ||I|| = 1$ , we always have

$$cond(A) \ge 1$$

• Since all matrix norms are equivalent, the dependence of cond(A) on the norm chosen is less important than the dependence on A.

- The condition number  $cond(A) = ||A|| ||A^{-1}||$  depends on the matrix A and on the norm used. If cond(A) is large, A is called ill-conditioned.
- Since  $||A|| ||A^{-1}|| \ge ||AA^{-1}|| = ||I|| = 1$ , we always have

$$cond(A) \geq 1$$

- Since all matrix norms are equivalent, the dependence of cond(A) on the norm chosen is less important than the dependence on A.
- $\bullet$  The spectral norm is usually the choice for analyzing properties of the condition number. The 1- and  $\infty\text{-}$  norms are used in computations.

### **Examples**

• Almost singular

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 - 10^{-6} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$cond_2(A) \approx cond_1(A) \approx cond_{\infty}(A) \approx 4 \times 10^6$$

### **Examples**

Almost singular

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1-10^{-6} \end{pmatrix}$$
 
$$cond_2(A) \approx cond_1(A) \approx cond_\infty(A) \approx 4 \times 10^6$$

• Hilbert matrix H(n),  $h_{ij} := \frac{1}{i+j+1}$ .

$$H(3) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/3 \\ 1/2 & 1/3 & 1/4 \\ 1/3 & 1/4 & 1/5 \end{pmatrix}$$

 $cond_2(H(10)) \approx 10^{13}, \quad cond_1(A) \approx cond_{\infty}(A) \approx 3 \times 10^{13}$ 

HW: produce a picture similar to Fig. 4.1 for Hilbert matrix

## Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

# Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

A small change now

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 + 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

# Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

A small change now

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 + 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can still find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = 30$ ,  $x_2 = -10$ .

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

• a small change in A would be ....

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

• a small change in *A* would be ....  $\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-6}}{2 - 10^{-6}} \approx 10^{-6}$ 

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

- a small change in *A* would be ....  $\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-6}}{2 10^{-6}} \approx 10^{-6}$
- ullet a significant change in the solution would be  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|}=\frac{20}{10}=2$
- We have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \approx 2 \times 10^6 \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} \approx$

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

- a small change in *A* would be ....  $\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-6}}{2 10^{-6}} \approx 10^{-6}$
- a significant change in the solution would be  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} = \frac{20}{10} = 2$
- We have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \approx 2 \times 10^6 \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} \approx 0.5 cond(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$

In general, we have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \leq 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$  or...

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

- a small change in *A* would be ....  $\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-6}}{2 10^{-6}} \approx 10^{-6}$
- a significant change in the solution would be  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} = \frac{20}{10} = 2$
- We have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \approx 2 \times 10^6 \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} \approx 0.5 cond(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$

In general, we have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$  or...

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x+\delta x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

But ... a very small change in one coefficient seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

- a small change in *A* would be ....  $\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-6}}{2 10^{-6}} \approx 10^{-6}$
- a significant change in the solution would be  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} = \frac{20}{10} = 2$
- We have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \approx 2 \times 10^6 \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|} \approx 0.5 cond(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$

In general, we have  $\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$  or...

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x+\delta x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
 and 
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract b = Ax from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract b = Ax from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain

$$\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract 
$$b = Ax$$
 from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain

$$\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow -\delta x = A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x).$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract 
$$b = Ax$$
 from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain  $\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow -\delta x = A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x).$ 

$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x)\| \rightarrow$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract 
$$b = Ax$$
 from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain  $\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow -\delta x = A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x).$  
$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x)\| \rightarrow \|\delta x\| < \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta A\| \|x + \delta x\|.$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

Proof: Subtract 
$$b = Ax$$
 from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain  $\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow -\delta x = A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x).$ 

$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x)\| \rightarrow \|\delta x\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta A\| \|x + \delta x\|.$$

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x+\delta x\|} \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta A\| \to$$

If A and  $A + \delta A$  are both invertible, then

$$\|\delta x\| < \|x\| \quad \to \quad \frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le 2cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|},$$
and
$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x + \delta x\|} \le cond(A)\frac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

*Proof:* Subtract b = Ax from  $(A + \delta A)(x + \delta x) = b$  to obtain

$$\delta A(x + \delta x) + A\delta x = 0 \rightarrow -\delta x = A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x).$$

$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}(\delta A)(x + \delta x)\| \to \|\delta x\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta A\| \|x + \delta x\|.$$

$$\tfrac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x+\delta x\|} \leq \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta A\| \ \rightarrow \ \tfrac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x+\delta x\|} \leq \|A^{-1}\| \|A\| \tfrac{\|\delta A\|}{\|A\|}$$

and the second inequality follows.

#### HW: prove the first inequality

## Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

# Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

A small change now

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 + 10^{-5}$ 

# Linear systems, example

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 - 10^{-5}$ 

We can find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = x_2 = 10$ 

A small change now

$$x_1 + x_2 = 20$$
  
 $x_1 + (1 - 10^{-6})x_2 = 20 + 10^{-5}$ 

We can still find the exact analytic solution easily  $x_1 = 30$ ,  $x_2 = -10$ .

Once again, a very small change in b seems to yield a significant change in the solution. Can we quantify this?

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow$$

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow ||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$$
.

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow ||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$$
.

On the other hand,  $A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow$ 

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow ||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$$
.

On the other hand,  $A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b$ .

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow ||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$$
.

On the other hand,

$$A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b.$$

Then, 
$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}\delta b\| \rightarrow$$

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax$$
 →  $||b|| = ||Ax||$  →  $||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$ .

On the other hand,

$$A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b.$$

Then, 
$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}\delta b\| \to \|\delta x\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta b\|.$$

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax \rightarrow ||b|| = ||Ax|| \rightarrow ||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$$
.

On the other hand,

$$A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b.$$

Then, 
$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}\delta b\| \to \|\delta x\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta b\|.$$

Multiplying the two inequalities, we have

$$||b|||\delta x|| \le ||A|||A^{-1}|||x|||\delta b|| \to$$

If A is invertible, then

$$\frac{\|\delta x\|}{\|x\|} \le cond(A) \frac{\|\delta b\|}{\|b\|}$$

*Proof:* 
$$b = Ax$$
 →  $||b|| = ||Ax||$  →  $||b|| \le ||A|| ||x||$ .

On the other hand,

$$A(x + \delta x) = b + \delta b \rightarrow A\delta x = \delta b \rightarrow \delta x = A^{-1}\delta b.$$

Then, 
$$\|\delta x\| = \|A^{-1}\delta b\| \to \|\delta x\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|\delta b\|.$$

Multiplying the two inequalities, we have

$$||b|||\delta x|| \le ||A|||A^{-1}|||x|||\delta b|| \to ||b|||\delta x|| \le cond(A)||x|||\delta b||$$