Assignment 7: Iterative methods

Gregory Smetana ID 1917370 ACM 106a

December 3, 2013

1 Gauss-Seidel as convex optimization

In this exercise, we will prove the following:

Suppose that the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive definite. Then the Gauss-Seidel method applied to the linear system Ax = b converges to the solution $x = A^{-1}b$.

a)

In this part, we show that if $A \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive definite, then the solution $\overline{x} = A^{-1}b$ is the unique minimizer of the unconstrained convex program

$$\min_{x \in \mathbf{R}^n} f(x) := \min_{x \in \mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} x^T A x - b^T x \tag{1}$$

For unconstrained problems, x is a global minimizer if and only if $\nabla f(x) = 0$.

$$[\nabla f(x)]_{i} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i}}$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i}} \left(\frac{1}{2} x_{j} A_{jk} x_{k} - b_{k} x_{k} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta_{ij} A_{jk} x_{k} + x_{j} A_{jk} \delta_{ik} \right) - b_{k} \delta_{ik}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(A_{ik} x_{k} + x_{j} A_{ji} \right) - b_{i}$$

$$= A_{ij} x_{j} - b_{i}$$

$$(2)$$

$$\nabla f(x) = Ax - b \tag{3}$$

where we have used the symmetry of A. Now, considering the solution $x = A^{-1}b$,

$$\nabla f(x) = A(A^{-1}b) - b$$

$$= 0$$
(4)

so we have shown that $\underline{x = A^{-1}b}$ is a minimizer of the unconstrained convex program of Equation 1. To prove uniqueness, assume we have $f(\overline{x}) = f(\overline{x} + d)$ for some $d \neq 0$

$$\overline{x}^{T} \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} - b^{T} \overline{x} = (\overline{x} + d)^{T} \frac{A}{2} (\overline{x} + d) - b^{T} (\overline{x} + d)$$

$$\overline{x}^{T} \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} - b^{T} \overline{x} = \overline{x}^{T} \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} + \overline{x}^{T} \frac{A}{2} d + d^{T} \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} + d^{T} \frac{A}{2} d - b^{T} \overline{x} - b^{T} d$$

$$0 = \overline{x}^{T} \frac{A}{2} d + d^{T} \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} + d^{T} \frac{A}{2} d - b^{T} d$$

$$(5)$$

Now substituting in $b = A\overline{x}$

$$0 = \overline{x}^T \frac{A}{2} d + d^T \frac{A}{2} \overline{x} + d^T \frac{A}{2} d - (A \overline{x})^T d$$

$$\tag{6}$$

Using the symmetry of A,

$$0 = \overline{x}^T A d + d^T \frac{A}{2} d - \overline{x}^T A d \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}d^T A d = 0 (8)$$

Recall the definition of a positive definite matrix:

$$x^T A x > 0 \qquad \forall x \neq 0 \tag{9}$$

So Equation 8 contradicts our assumption of $d \neq 0$. Therefore, \overline{x} is unique.

b)

Suppose we greedily choose the step length to maximize decrease in objective value:

$$\alpha_i = \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} f(x + \alpha e_i) \tag{10}$$

Expanding,

$$\alpha_i = \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} (x + \alpha e_i)^T \frac{A}{2} (x + \alpha e_i) - b^T (x - \alpha e_i)$$

$$= \underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} x^T \frac{A}{2} x + \alpha x^T \frac{A}{2} e_i + \alpha e_i^T \frac{A}{2} x + \alpha^2 e_i^T \frac{A}{2} e_i - b^T x - \alpha b^T e_i$$
(11)

A is a positive definite matrix, so setting the first derivative with respect to α to zero will give the minimum value

$$0 = x^{T} \frac{A}{2} e_{i} + e_{i}^{T} \frac{A}{2} x + \alpha_{i} e_{i}^{T} A e_{i} - b^{T} e_{i}$$
(12)

writing out indicies,

$$0 = x_j \frac{A_{ji}}{2} + \frac{A_{ij}}{2} x_j + \alpha_i A_{ii} - b_i$$
 (13)

$$\alpha_i = \frac{1}{A_{ii}} \left(b_i - x_j A_{ji} \right) \tag{14}$$

$$x^{new} = x + \frac{1}{A_{ii}} (b_i - A_{ij} x_j)$$
 (15)

$$x^{new} = \frac{1}{A_{ii}} \left(b_i - \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij} x_j \right)$$
 (16)

The update formula for Gauss-Seidel is

$$x_i^{k+1} = \frac{1}{A_{ii}} \left(b_i - \sum_{j < i} A_{ij} x_j^{k+1} - \sum_{j > i} A_{ij} x_j^k \right)$$
 (17)

In Gauss-Seidel iteration, the entries of x are updated one by one. If you overwrite the old entries using the new entry at each step, the updating formula is

$$x^{new} = \frac{1}{A_{ii}} \left(b_i - \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij} x_j \right)$$
 (18)

And we see that the optimization approach uses the same operation to update x_i as Gauss-Seidel.

c)

Suppose that $x = \overline{x} + e$ is an approximation of $\overline{x} = A^{-1}b$. In this part, we show that the A-norm defined by

$$||e||_A = \sqrt{e^T A e} \tag{19}$$

of the error e satisfies

$$|f(x) - f(\overline{x})| = \frac{1}{2} ||e||_A^2$$
 (20)

Starting with the left hand side,

$$|f(x) - f(\overline{x})| = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x - \frac{1}{2}\overline{x}^T A \overline{x} + b^T \overline{x}$$
 (21)

Now substituting in $b = A\overline{x}$ and using symmetry of A,

$$|f(x) - f(\overline{x})| = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - (A\overline{x})^T x - \frac{1}{2}\overline{x}^T A \overline{x} + (A\overline{x})^T \overline{x}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - \overline{x}^T A x - \frac{1}{2}\overline{x}^T A \overline{x} + \overline{x}^T A \overline{x}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\left(x^T A x - 2\overline{x}^T A x + \overline{x}^T A \overline{x}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\left(x^T A x - \overline{x}^T A x - x^T A \overline{x} + \overline{x}^T A \overline{x}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}(x - \overline{x})^T A (x - \overline{x})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}e^T A e$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}||e||_A^2$$

$$(22)$$

Therefore, it has been shown that

$$|f(x) - f(\overline{x})| = \frac{1}{2} ||e||_A^2$$
 (23)

Completing the proof: Parts (a), (b), and (c) in tandem prove the theorem. Indeed, Parts (a) and (b) establish that the function value of f decreases during each Gauss-Seidel step (because it decreases during each cycle of coordinate descent unless we have already converged to the solution) and that this value of f is bounded below by the optimal value $f(\overline{x})$. Because these function values form a monotonically decreasing x sequence with infimum $f(\overline{x})$, Part (c) implies that the sequence of errors converge to 0 (with respect to the A-norm) or, equivalently, that the sequence of iterates $\{x^{(k)}\}$ generated by Gauss-Seidel converges to \overline{x}

2 Early convergence of Arnoldi iteration

Suppose that at the nth step of Arnoldi iteration (applied to the matrix $A \in C^{m \times m}$ with vector $b \in C^m$) we obtain $H_{n+1,n} = 0$ in the recurrence relation

$$AQ_n = Q_{n+1}\tilde{H}_n \tag{24}$$

The following exercises will establish that we can stop the Arnoldi iteration after this step; that is, we've found a basis for all Krylov subspaces of A generated by b, and the maximal such subspace contains our desired matrix equation solutions.

a)

We let $H_n = H(1:n,1:n)$, $\tilde{H}_n = H(1:n+1,1:n)$, and $Q_n = [q_1,q_2,...,q_n]$ be the first n columns of Q. Then Equation 24 may be rewritten

$$AQ_n = Q_n H_n + q_{n+1} H_{n+1,n} e_n^T (25)$$

where $e_n^T = [0, 0, ..., 0, 1] \in \mathbf{R}^n$. In the case of $H_{n+1,n} = 0$, the equation is

$$AQ_n = Q_n H_n \tag{26}$$

b)

Using Part (a), we now show that \mathcal{K}_n is an invariant subspace of A, i.e., $A\mathcal{K}_n \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n$.

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \operatorname{span}\{q_1, q_2, ..., q_n\} \tag{27}$$

$$A\mathcal{K}_n = \operatorname{span}\{Aq_1, Aq_2, ..., Aq_n\}$$

=
$$\operatorname{span}\{AQ_n\}$$
 (28)

It was shown in Part (a) that $AQ_n = Q_n H_n$

$$Q_n H_n(:,i) = Q_n \begin{bmatrix} H_{1i} \\ \vdots \\ H_{ni} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= [q_1, ..., q_n] \begin{bmatrix} H_{1i} \\ \vdots \\ H_{ni} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= H_{1i}q_1 + ... + H_{ni}q_n$$

$$(29)$$

which is a linear combination of the vectors $\{q_1, q_2, ..., q_n\}$. Therefore, $A\mathcal{K}_n = \text{span}\{q_1, q_2, ..., q_n\}$ and it has been shown that

$$A\mathcal{K}_n \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n \tag{30}$$

c)

Using Part (b), we now show that we have $K_n = K_{n+1} = ...$

It was shown in Part (b) that $A\mathcal{K}_n \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n$, where

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \operatorname{span}\{b, Ab, \dots, A^{n-1}b\} \tag{31}$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{n+1} = \operatorname{span}\{b, Ab, \dots, A^n b\}$$
(32)

Examining the last element

$$A^n b = A(A^{n-1}b) (33)$$

$$A^{n-1}b \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n \tag{34}$$

SO

$$A^n b \subseteq A \mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_n \tag{35}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_{n+1} = \dots$$
 (36)

d)

Suppose that λ is an eigenvalue of H_n with corresponding eigenvector v

$$H_n v = \lambda v \tag{37}$$

$$Q_n H_n v = \lambda Q_n v \tag{38}$$

$$A_n Q_n v = \lambda Q_n v \tag{39}$$

$$A_n w = \lambda w \tag{40}$$

Therefore, λ is also an eigenvalue of A, with corresponding eigenvalue

$$w = Q_n v \tag{41}$$

e)

For any nonsingular matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$, it is known that we may decompose its inverse as the matrix polynomial

$$A^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k A^k \tag{42}$$

for some scalars $c_0, c_1, ..., c_{m-1}$.

$$x = A^{-1}b = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k A^k b \tag{43}$$

$$span(x) = \{b, Ab, A^{2}b, ..., A^{m-1}b\} = \mathcal{K}_{m}$$
(44)

In part c), it was shown that $\mathcal{K}_m = \mathcal{K}_n$. Therefore, the solution of Ax = b belongs to \mathcal{K}_n

Practical convergence of Gauss-Seidel and Jacobi

Consider the linear system Ax = b defined by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & -5 & 2 \\ 5 & 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 5 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \qquad b = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{45}$$

a)

The spectral radius of a matrix A is defined as

$$\rho(A) = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A\}$$
 (46)

The update matrix of the Jacobi method is

$$R_J = D^{-1}(\tilde{L} + \tilde{U}) \tag{47}$$

The update matrix of Gauss-Seidel is

$$R_{GS} = (D - \tilde{L})^{-1} \tilde{U} \tag{48}$$

where we adopt the Demmel notation of

$$A = D - \tilde{L} - \tilde{U} \tag{49}$$

where $-\tilde{L}$ is the strictly lower triangular part of A and $-\tilde{U}$ is the strictly upper triangular part of A.

Computing the spectral radius of the update matrices corresponding with the system of Equation 45,

$$\rho(R_J) = 0.913$$

$$\rho(R_{GS}) = 2.163$$
(50)

$$\rho(R_{GS}) = 2.163 \tag{51}$$

A splitting method converges if and only if the update matrix has spectral radius satisfying

$$\rho(R) < 1 \tag{52}$$

Therefore, we expect that the Jacobi method with converge and the Gauss-Seidel method will diverge. The Gauss-Seidel method will not be useful, but the Jacobi method may be used to solve the linear system.

b)

Four Matlab functions were written implementing Jacobi and Gauss-Seidel methods using for loops and update matrices. The inputs are A, b, initial iterate $x^{(0)}$, and the relative residual error tolerance. They are attached in the Appendix.

c)

Each of the codes was used to solve the system Ax = b with $x^{(0)} = (0, 0, 0)$, $tol = 10^{-3}$, and a maximum of 100 iterations. A aggregate time was calculated using "tic/toc" over 1000 experiment runs. The results are displayed in Table 1.

	Relative error	Number of iterates	Total time [s]
Jacobi Matrix	1.4306e-03	77	3.3907e-01
Jacobi Sequential	1.4306e-03	77	4.0913e-01
Gauss-Seidel Matrix	7.4055e + 32	100	4.3540e-01
Gauss-Seidel Sequential	7.4055e + 32	100	3.7104e-01

Table 1

The convergence phenomena matches that predicted in Part (a). The Jacobi method converges to the correct solution, while the Gauss-Seidel method diverges. It was found that the Jacobi method using matrices and the Gauss-Seidel using for loops were the fastest. It must be that the time required to assemble the Gauss-Seidel update matrix and store it in memory was a large component of the algorithm run time. For most problems, it is much quicker to use matrix-vector multiplication (optimized by Matlab) than for-loops.

d)

The experiment was repeated for a few randomly chosen values of b and $x^{(0)}$. The observed convergence phenomena did not change, with the Jacobi method converging and the Gauss-Seidel method diverging. These results coincide with that predicted by theory. The convergence of a splitting method depends only on the update matrix R, not on the value of b or the initial iterate.

A jacobi_mat.m

```
%Smetana_Gregory_1917370_A6_P3
function [ x, k ] = jacobi_mat( A, b, x0, tol, maxiterations )
%JACOBI_MAT jacobi method using matrices
n = length(b);
%% calculate update matrix
D = diag(A);
Lt = -\text{tril}(A, -1);
Ut = -\text{triu}(A, 1);
Rj = diag(1./D) * (Lt + Ut);
c = diag(1./D) * b;
%rhoJ = max(abs(eig(Rj))) % output spectral radius
k = 0;
err = 1;
x = x0;
while k < maxiterations && err > tol
    x = Rj*x + c;
    err = norm(A*x - b)/norm(b);
    k=k+1;
end
```

B jacobi_seq.m

```
end
    end
    x_new(i) = (b(i)-sigma)/A(i,i);
  end
  x = x_new;
  err = norm(A*x - b)/norm(b);
  k=k+1;
end
C gs_mat.m
function [ x, k ] = gs_mat(A, b, x0, tol, maxiterations)
%GS_MAT gauss—seidel method using matrices
n = length(b);
%% calculate update matrix
D = diag(A);
Lt = -tril(A, -1);
Ut = -\text{triu}(A, 1);
Rgs = (diag(D) - Lt) \setminus Ut;
c = (diag(D) - Lt) \setminus b;
%rhoGS = max(abs(eig(Rgs))) % output spectral radius
k = 0;
err = 1;
x = x0;
while k < maxiterations \&\& err > tol
   x = Rgs * x + c;
    err = norm(A*x - b)/norm(b);
    k=k+1;
end
D gs_seq.m
function [ x, k ] = gs\_seq(A, b, x0, tol, maxiterations)
%GS_SEQ gauss—seidel method using for loops
n = length(b);
k = 0;
err = 1;
x = x0;
while k < maxiterations \&\& err > tol
 for i = 1 : n
```

```
sigma =0;
for j = 1:n
    if j ~= i
        sigma = sigma + A(i,j)*x(j);
    end
end
x(i) = (b(i)-sigma)/A(i,i);
end
err = norm(A*x - b)/norm(b);
k=k+1;
end
```

$E \quad Smetana_Gregory_1917370_A7_P3_DIARY.txt$

```
run('Smetana_Gregory_1917370_A7_P3.m');
tjmat =
    3.3907e-01

kjmat =
    77

xjmat_err =
    1.4306e-03

tjseq =
    4.0913e-01

kjseq =
    77

xjseq_err =
    1.4306e-03

tgsmat =
```

4.3540e-01

kgsmat =

100

xgsmat_err =

7.4055e+32

tgsseq =

3.7104e-01

kgsseq =

100

xgsseq_err =

7.4055e+32

b =

2

9

x0 =

6

4

xjmat_err =

1.6049e-03

xjseq_err =

1.6049e-03

xgsmat_err =

7.5550e+33

xgsseq_err =

7.5550e+33

b =

4 7

1

x0 =

5 0

2

xjmat_err =

1.5330e-03

xjseq_err =

1.5330e-03

xgsmat_err =

2.4590e+32

xgsseq_err =

2.4590e+32

b =

7

9

```
8
x0 =
    2
5
6

xjmat_err =
    1.9766e-03

xjseq_err =
    1.9766e-03

xgsmat_err =
    9.9964e+33

xgsseq_err =
    9.9964e+33

diary off
```

$F \quad Smetana_Gregory_1917370_A6_P3.m$

```
%Smetana_Gregory_1917370_A6_P3
clear;
clc;
close all;
path(path,'export_fig/');

A = [3, -5, 2;
    5, 4, 3;
    2, 5, 3];

b = [1;1;1];

xc = A\b;
x0=[0;0;0];
```

```
tol = 1E-3;
maxiterations = 100;
tic
for i = 1:1000
    [xjmat, kjmat] = jacobi_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
tjmat = toc
kjmat
xjmat\_err = norm(xc - xjmat)/norm(xc)
tic
for i = 1:1000
    [xjseq, kjseq] = jacobi_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
end
tjseq = toc
kjseq
xjseq\_err = norm(xc- xjseq)/norm(xc)
for i = 1:1000
    [xgsmat, kgsmat] = gs_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
end
tgsmat = toc
kgsmat
xqsmat_err = norm(xc-xqsmat)/norm(xc)
tic
for i = 1:1000
    [xgsseq, kgsseq] = gs_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
tgsseq = toc
kassea
xgsseq\_err = norm(xc - xgsseq)/norm(xc)
b = [2; 9; 3]
xc = A b;
x0 = [6; 4; 3]
[xjmat, kjmat] = jacobi_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjmat_err = norm(xc - xjmat)/norm(xc)
[xjseq, kjseq] = jacobi_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjseq\_err = norm(xc- xjseq)/norm(xc)
[xgsmat, kgsmat] = gs_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xgsmat_err = norm(xc-xgsmat)/norm(xc)
[xgsseq, kgsseq] = gs_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
```

```
xgsseq\_err = norm(xc - xgsseq)/norm(xc)
b = [4;7;1]
xc = A b;
x0 = [5; 0; 2]
[xjmat, kjmat] = jacobi_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjmat_err = norm(xc - xjmat)/norm(xc)
[xjseq, kjseq] = jacobi_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjseq_err = norm(xc- xjseq)/norm(xc)
[xgsmat, kgsmat] = gs_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xgsmat_err = norm(xc-xgsmat)/norm(xc)
[xgsseq, kgsseq] = gs_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xgsseq\_err = norm(xc - xgsseq)/norm(xc)
b = [7; 9; 8]
xc = A \ b;
x0 = [2; 5; 6]
[xjmat, kjmat] = jacobi_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjmat_err = norm(xc - xjmat)/norm(xc)
[xjseq, kjseq] = jacobi_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xjseq_err = norm(xc- xjseq)/norm(xc)
[xgsmat, kgsmat] = gs_mat(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xgsmat_err = norm(xc-xgsmat)/norm(xc)
[xgsseq, kgsseq] = gs_seq(A,b,x0, tol, maxiterations);
xgsseq\_err = norm(xc - xgsseq)/norm(xc)
```