

# PS 1 Solutions

① (i)  $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \Rightarrow n \text{ x's and } n-1 \text{ +s}$

Total of  $2n-1$  FLOPs:  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  [or  $\mathcal{O}(2n)$ ].

(ii)  $A\vec{x} = n$  dot products for a total of  $n(2n-1)$  FLOPs:  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  [or  $\mathcal{O}(2n^2)$ ]

(iii)  $A \cdot B = n^2$  dot products for a total of  $n^2(2n-1)$  FLOPs:  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  [or  $\mathcal{O}(2n^3)$ ].

(iv) Need to use Gauss-Jordan elimination on  $[A | I_n]$ :

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cccc|cccc} * & * & * & * & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right] \quad \leftarrow \text{For simplicity, count all operations (even 0's) on right side of bar.}$$

Column 1:

Scale pivot to 1:  $(n-1)+n$  x's

$(n-1)$  Eliminations:

at  $(n-1)+n$  +s ( $*-c*$ )

and  $(n-1)+n$  x's

Total:  $(n-1) \cdot 2[(n-1)+n] + [(n-1)+n]$

Column 2:

Scale pivot to 1:  $(n-2)+n$  x's

$(n-2)$  Eliminations:

at  $(n-2)+n$  +s

and  $(n-2)+n$  x's

Total:  $(n-2) \cdot 2[(n-2)+n] + [(n-2)+n]$

⋮

Column j:

Scale pivot to 1:  $(n-j)+n$  x's

$(n-j)$  Eliminations:

at  $(n-j)+n$  +s

and  $(n-j)+n$  x's

Total:  $(n-j) \cdot 2[(n-j)+n] + [(n-j)+n]$

---

Total:  $\sum_{j=1}^n 2(n-j)(2n-j) + \sum_{j=1}^n (2n-j)$

$$= 2 \sum_{j=1}^n (2n^2 - 3jn + j^2) + \sum_{j=1}^n (2n-j)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^n (4n^2 - (6n+1)j + 2j^2)$$

$$= 4n^2 \sum_{j=1}^n 1 - (6n+1) \sum_{j=1}^n j + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n j^2$$

$$= 4n^3 - (6n+1) \cdot \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + 2 \cdot \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6}$$

$$= 4n^3 - \frac{n}{2}(6n^2 + 7n + 1) + \frac{n}{3}(2n^2 + 3n + 1)$$

$$= 4n^3 - 3n^3 - \frac{7}{2}n^2 - \frac{1}{2}n + \frac{2}{3}n^3 + n^2 + \frac{1}{3}n$$

$$= (4 - 3 + \frac{2}{3})n^3 + (-\frac{7}{2} + 1)n^2 + (-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3})n$$

$$= \frac{5}{3}n^3 - \frac{5}{2}n^2 - \frac{1}{6}n : \mathcal{O}(n^3) \text{ [or } \mathcal{O}(\frac{5}{3}n^3)]$$

(v) For an  $n$ -determinant, we expand:

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ * & * & \dots & * \end{vmatrix} = \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} a_j \begin{vmatrix} * & * & \dots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ * & * & \dots & * \end{vmatrix}_{(n-1)}$$

That is, we produce  $n$  determinants of  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  matrices.

This forces  $n$  multiplications. Likewise, an  $(n-1)$ -determinant

forces  $(n-1)$  multiplications. Therefore, there must be

$n \times (n-1) \times (n-2) \times \dots \times 2 \times 1 = n!$  multiplications. There

is a comparable number of additions/subtractions.

Hence, cofactor expansion is  $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ .

However, we can use Gaussian elimination to put

the matrix in REF. The determinant is then the

product of the pivots. Therefore, we can compute

the determinant more quickly in  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  FLOPs.

(b) As a more general case of (1)(a)(iv), consider

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \end{pmatrix}_{m \times n}, \text{ a "wide matrix" with } n > m.$$

Assuming

Column 1:  $(m-1) \cdot 2(n-1) + (n-1)$

Column 2:  $(m-2) \cdot 2(n-2) + (n-2)$

⋮

Column j:  $(m-j) \cdot 2(n-j) + (n-j)$

---

Total:  $\sum_{j=1}^m 2(m-j)(n-j) + \sum_{j=1}^m (n-j)$

$$= 2 \sum_{j=1}^m (mn - (m+n)j + j^2) + \sum_{j=1}^m (n-j)$$

$$= 2 \sum_{j=1}^m j^2 - [2(m+n)+1] \sum_{j=1}^m j + (2mn+n) \sum_{j=1}^m 1$$

$$= 2 \cdot \frac{m(m+1)(2m+1)}{6} - \frac{[2m+(n+1)]}{2} \cdot m(m+1) + mn(2m+1)$$

$$= \frac{2m}{3} (2m^2 + 3m + 1) - \frac{m}{2} (2m^2 + (n+3)m + (n+1)) + 2m^2n + mn$$

$$= \frac{4}{3}m^3 + 2m^2 + \frac{2}{3}m - m^3 - \frac{(n+3)}{2}m^2 - \frac{(n+1)}{2}m + 2m^2n + mn$$

$$= \frac{1}{3}m^3 + 2m^2n + \frac{1-n}{2}m^2 + mn + (\frac{2}{3} + \frac{(n+1)}{2})m$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{3}m^3 + 2m^2n)$$

Consider now a "tall matrix" with  $m > n$ :

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ * & * & * \end{pmatrix}_{m \times n} \quad \text{Gaussian elimination produces} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Specifically, we do Gauss-Jordan elimination to get

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right], \text{ the } n \times n \text{ identity augmented with } \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ * \end{bmatrix}.$$

We don't need to eliminate the entries in  $*$  because

we know they are zeroed out. Hence, this will take

$\mathcal{O}(n^3)$  flops.

To summarize: If  $m > n$ , this is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .

If  $m < n$ , this is  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{3}m^3 + 2m^2n)$ .

PROBLEM 2 (a)

---

```
function [ L, U ] = myLU( A )
% Author - Kevin Lamb
% Date - 1/26/19
%
% myLU() takes in an n x n matrix A and, if A is regular,
%     constructs the LU factorization of A, where
%     U is an upper-triangular matrix, L is a lower-
%     unitriangular matrix, and A = LU.

%% Input checks

[m n] = size(A);

% Initialize L and U matrices
L = zeros(n,n);
U = zeros(n,n);

% Check for square input
if m ~= n
    disp('Matrix must be a square!');
    return
end

%% Perform Gaussian elimination

for j = 1:n    % Loop over columns

    % Check if A is regular
    if A(j,j) == 0
        disp('Matrix is not regular!');
        disp('Ignore output. ');
        return
    end        % End if

    for i = (j+1):n    % Loop over rows below j.

        % Get the entry for L
        mult = A(i,j)/A(j,j);

        % Row i -> Row i - mult * Row j
        for k = (j+1):n
            A(i,k) = A(i,k) - mult*A(j,k);
            L(i,j) = mult;
        end    % End k-for

    end;        % End i-for

    % Put a 1 on the diagonal for L
    L(j,j) = 1;

end;    % End j-for

%% Don't forget about U!

for i = 1:n
    for j = i:n
        U(i,j) = A(i,j);
    end
end
```

end

-----  
-----

TESTING "BAD INPUTS"

EDU>> A = [1 2 3; 4 5 6]

A =

1	2	3
4	5	6

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(A)  
Matrix must be a square!

L =

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

U =

0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	0

EDU>> A = [1 1;1 1]

A =

1	1
1	1

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(A)  
Matrix is not regular!  
Ignore output.

L =

1	0
1	0

U =

0	0
0	0

-----  
--

DEMONSTRATING WORKING ALGORITHM

EDU>> A = [1 2;2 1]

A =

1	2
---	---

```

      2      1
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(A)

L =

      1      0
      2      1

U =

      1      2
      0     -3

EDU>> L*U == A

ans =

      1      1
      1      1

EDU>> A = [1 2 3;4 5 6;7 9 8]

```

```

A =

      1      2      3
      4      5      6
      7      9      8

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(A)

L =

      1.0000      0      0
      4.0000      1.0000      0
      7.0000      1.6667      1.0000

```

```

U =

      1      2      3
      0     -3     -6
      0      0     -3

```

```

EDU>> L*U == A

ans =

      1      1      1
      1      1      1
      1      1      1

```

---

PROBLEM 2 (b)

---

For n = 5:

```
EDU>> M
```

```
M =
```

5	4	3	2	1
4	5	4	3	2
3	4	5	4	3
2	3	4	5	4
1	2	3	4	5

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(M); U(5,5)
```

```
ans =
```

```
1.7143
```

So that 1.7143 approximates the smallest pivot of  $M_5$ .

For  $n = 10$ :

```
EDU>> M
```

```
M =
```

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
9	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
8	9	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
7	8	9	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
6	7	8	9	10	9	8	7	6	5
5	6	7	8	9	10	9	8	7	6
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	9	8	7
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	9	8
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(M); U(10,10)
```

```
ans =
```

```
1.8333
```

So that 1.833 approximates the smallest pivot of  $M_{10}$ .

For  $n = 100$ , we simply show:

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(M); U(100,100)
```

```
ans =
```

```
1.9804
```

And for  $n = 1000$ , we have:

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(M); U(1000,1000)
```

```
ans =
```

```
1.9980
```

where we also remark that the program begins to noticeably hang for more time.

-----  
-----

It would seem that the smallest pivot is approaching a limit of 2.

---

#### PROBLEM 2 (c)

---

EDU>> H = hilb(2)

H =

1.0000	0.5000
0.5000	0.3333

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U

U =

1.0000	0.5000
0	0.0833

EDU>> H = hilb(3)

H =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333
0.5000	0.3333	0.2500
0.3333	0.2500	0.2000

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U

U =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333
0	0.0833	0.0833
0	0	0.0056

EDU>> H = hilb(4)

H =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333	0.2500
0.5000	0.3333	0.2500	0.2000
0.3333	0.2500	0.2000	0.1667
0.2500	0.2000	0.1667	0.1429

EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U

U =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333	0.2500
0	0.0833	0.0833	0.0750
0	0	0.0056	0.0083
0	0	0	0.0004

EDU>> H = hilb(5)

H =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333	0.2500	0.2000
0.5000	0.3333	0.2500	0.2000	0.1667
0.3333	0.2500	0.2000	0.1667	0.1429
0.2500	0.2000	0.1667	0.1429	0.1250
0.2000	0.1667	0.1429	0.1250	0.1111

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U
```

U =

1.0000	0.5000	0.3333	0.2500	0.2000
0	0.0833	0.0833	0.0750	0.0667
0	0	0.0056	0.0083	0.0095
0	0	0	0.0004	0.0007
0	0	0	0	0.0000

```
EDU>> U(5,5)
```

ans =

2.2676e-05

The last pivot of this matrix is a strong indicator of the singularity of the Hilbert matrices. The product of the pivots of U yields the determinant of H, so we should track it as we increase n. Observe that indeed the four matrices are indeed nonisingular, but it appears that this will be hard to determine even for the next few values of n. Indeed, observe that

```
EDU>> H = hilb(100);
```

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U(100,100)
```

ans =

1.7136e-17

```
EDU>> H = hilb(500);
```

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U(500,500)
```

ans =

-1.2819e-17

```
EDU>> H = hilb(1000);
```

```
EDU>> [L,U] = myLU(H); U(1000,1000)
```

ans =

6.1862e-18

This pivot is getting much smaller. More importantly, the other pivots in U are getting ever smaller as well. We should not trust these values going forward because they might be critically affecting the factorization.

For example:

$$L =$$

1.0000	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.5000	1.0000	0	0	0	0	0
0.3333	1.0000	1.0000	0	0	0	0
0.2500	0.9000	1.5000	1.0000	0	0	0
0.2000	0.8000	1.7143	2.0000	1.0000	0	0
0.1667	0.7143	1.7857	2.7778	2.5000	1.0000	0
0.1429	0.6429	1.7857	3.3333	4.0909	3.0000	1.0000
0.1250	0.5833	1.7500	3.7121	5.5682	5.6538	3.5000
0.1111	0.5333	1.6970	3.9596	6.8531	8.6154	7.4667
0.1000	0.4909	1.6364	4.1119	7.9301	11.6308	12.6000
0.0909	0.4545	1.5734	4.1958	8.8112	14.5385	18.5294
0.0833	0.4231	1.5110	4.2308	9.5192	17.2466	24.9118
0.0769	0.3956	1.4505	4.2308	10.0792	19.7104	31.4675
0.0714	0.3714	1.3929	4.2059	10.5147	21.9149	37.9858
0.0667	0.3500	1.3382	4.1634	10.8467	23.8628	44.3167
0.0625	0.3309	1.2868	4.1086	11.0933	25.5673	50.3599
0.0588	0.3137	1.2384	4.0454	11.2693	27.0464	56.0528
0.0556	0.2982	1.1930	3.9766	11.3876	28.3204	61.3608
0.0526	0.2842	1.1504	3.9043	11.4583	29.4096	66.2697
0.0500	0.2714	1.1104	3.8300	11.4901	30.3339	70.7791

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.0000	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.0000	1.0000	0	0	0	0	0
9.5294	4.5000	1.0000	0	0	0	0
17.6471	11.8421	4.9998	1.0000	0	0	0
28.0960	23.8815	14.4040	5.4961	1.0000	0	0
40.4582	40.9398	31.4266	17.1989	5.9204	1.0000	0
54.2654	62.8983	57.7289	40.3601	19.8412	6.1256	1.0000
69.0650	89.3339	94.2900	79.0918	49.5831	20.8855	2.4844
84.4545	119.6436	141.4344	136.8714	102.8804	53.2158	1.7978
100.0942	153.1437	198.9400	216.2677	187.5455	112.7978	-6.3265
115.7089	189.1391	266.1736	318.8569	310.7399	210.2243	-30.3041
131.0828	226.9669	342.2223	445.2685	478.4763	356.1750	-80.9837
146.0522	266.0228	426.0069	595.3048	695.3453	560.6547	-171.0185

[illegible]



0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
1.0000	0	0	0	0	0
5.3490	1.0000	0	0	0	0
16.9203	2.5159	1.0000	0	0	0
41.1625	2.8560	5.0716	1.0000	0	0
84.6933	-3.0898	15.9262	1.4350	1.0000	0
154.8687	-24.2039	39.1507	-1.0538	4.6245	1.0000

This factorization may not be trustworthy after  $n$  gets too large.  
In order to properly answer this question for arbitrary values of  $n$ ,  
we may need to appeal to some theory to study this question further.