

#6.19.(a) By writing $R\Omega = \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix}$ and henceforth

$$R\Omega e_1 = \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} e_1 = \lambda_2 \Omega e_1$$

and noting that Ω is invertible so $\Omega e_1 \neq 0$ we see that Ωe_1 is an eigenvector of R corresponding to eigenvalue λ_2 . As $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$

we have $R - \lambda_2 I = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ so $\begin{bmatrix} * \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ becomes an eigenvector of

R corresponding to λ_2 in \mathbb{R}^2 . That is, we can set $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ so that

$\begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{bmatrix}$ becomes an eigenvector of R corresponding to λ_2 . We claim

that $\begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}$ is the desired Givens rotation Ω . To show

this claim it suffices to show that the equation $R\Omega = \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix}$ holds.

On the left hand side we have

$$R\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \cos \theta + * \sin \theta & -\lambda_1 \sin \theta + * \cos \theta \\ \lambda_2 \sin \theta & \lambda_2 \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}$$

and since $R\Omega e_1 = \lambda_2 \Omega e_1 = \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{bmatrix}$ we see that $\lambda_2 \cos \theta = \lambda_1 \cos \theta + * \sin \theta$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 \cos \theta & * \cos \theta - \lambda_1 \sin \theta \\ \lambda_2 \sin \theta & * \sin \theta + \lambda_1 \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \cos \theta + * \sin \theta & * \cos \theta - \lambda_1 \sin \theta \\ \lambda_2 \sin \theta & \lambda_2 \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \\ &= R\Omega \end{aligned}$$

so indeed our assertion holds.

(b) Even if R was a complex 2×2 matrix, still we can make Ω to be a (complex) Givens rotation matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -e^{-i\varphi} \sin \theta \\ e^{i\varphi} \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}$ so that its first row Ωe_1 is parallel to $\begin{bmatrix} * \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ by adjusting the phase by φ and the ratio of entries by θ . Then, as we had $R\Omega = \Omega \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix}$ under the assumption that $R\Omega e_1 = \lambda_2 \Omega e_1$ only, we also would have $\Omega^H R \Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 & * \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix}$.

Now we get back to the given situation where $R \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$.

For any $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ partition R into $\begin{bmatrix} R_1 & * & * \\ 0 & R_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & R_3 \end{bmatrix}$ so that $R_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(j-1) \times (j-1)}$, $R_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$, and $R_3 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-j-1) \times (n-j-1)}$. As R_2 is in the form $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j & * \\ 0 & \lambda_{j+1} \end{bmatrix}$ there exists a Givens rotation Ω'_j such that $(\Omega'_j)^H R_2 \Omega'_j$ is in the form $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{j+1} & * \\ 0 & \lambda_j \end{bmatrix}$. This is because if $\lambda_j = \lambda_{j+1}$ then we can let $\Omega'_j = I$. Now define a block diagonal matrix $\Omega_j = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Omega'_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$ so that the block pattern matches that of R . Then by simple calculation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_j^H R \Omega_j &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\Omega'_j)^H & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & * & * \\ 0 & R_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & R_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Omega'_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & * & * \\ 0 & (\Omega'_j)^H R_2 \Omega'_j & * \\ 0 & 0 & R_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\Omega_j^H R \Omega_j$ is an upper triangular matrix with diagonal $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{j+1}, \lambda_j, \lambda_{j+2}, \dots, \lambda_n)$.

Decomposing a permutation $(1 \ 2 \ \dots \ i)$ into composition of transpositions

$$(1 \ 2)(2 \ 3) \dots (i-1 \ i), \text{ we see that } \tilde{R} = \Omega_1^H \Omega_2^H \dots \Omega_{i-1}^H R \Omega_{i-1} \Omega_{i-2} \dots \Omega_1$$

suffices, and hence putting $U = \Omega_{i-1} \Omega_{i-2} \dots \Omega_1$ we are done.

#6.20. We prove both by induction. That $A - k_1 I = P_1 U_1 = Q_1 R_1$ is immediate from the definitions, and $R_1 = Q_1^{-1}(A - k_1 I)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= R_1 Q_1 + k_1 I = Q_1^{-1} A Q_1 - Q_1^{-1}(k_1 I) Q_1 + k_1 I \\ &= Q_1^{-1} A Q_1 \end{aligned}$$

follows from that Q_1 is orthogonal. Now, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then as Q_i is also orthogonal we have $R_i = Q_i^{-1}(A_i - k_i I)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i+1} - k_i I &= R_i Q_i = Q_i^{-1} A_i Q_i - k_i Q_i^{-1} Q_i \\ &= Q_i^{-1} A_i Q_i - k_i I \end{aligned}$$

hence $A_{i+1} = Q_i^{-1} A_i Q_i$, and by induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i+2} &= Q_{i+1}^{-1} A_{i+1} Q_{i+1} \\ &= Q_{i+1}^{-1} P_i^H A P_i Q_{i+1} \\ &= Q_{i+1}^H Q_i^H \dots Q_1^H A Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_i Q_{i+1} \\ &= P_{i+1}^H A P_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second equation, first observe that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (A - k_{i+1} I) P_i U_i &= (A_1 - k_{i+1} I) Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_i R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= (A_1 Q_1 - k_{i+1} Q_1) Q_2 \dots Q_i R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= (Q_1 A_2 - k_{i+1} Q_1) Q_2 \dots Q_i R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= Q_1 (A_2 - k_{i+1} I) Q_2 \dots Q_i R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= \dots \\ &= Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_i (A_{i+1} - k_{i+1} I) R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_i Q_{i+1} R_{i+1} R_i \dots R_1 \\ &= P_{i+1} U_{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

so $P_{i+1} U_{i+1} = (A - k_{i+1} I)(A - k_1 I)(A - k_2 I) \dots (A - k_i I)$. But each k_i are constants, and because $(x - k_{i+1})(x - k_1)(x - k_2) \dots (x - k_i)$ and $(x - k_1)(x - k_2) \dots (x - k_i)$ are same polynomials, we must have $P_{i+1} U_{i+1} = (A - k_1 I)(A - k_2 I) \dots (A - k_i I)(A - k_{i+1} I)$.

#6.23. First we look at the example. Using numpy we get that $\delta'_n \approx 0.9993$ and $\gamma'_n \approx 7.445 \times 10^{-5}$. Indeed numpy says that the minimum of $\lambda_i(B)$ is roughly 3.382, hence $d \approx 2.382$ and

$$\frac{\|A\|^3}{d^2} \approx 1.762 \times 10^{-4} > \gamma'_n,$$

$$\frac{\|A\|^2}{d} \approx 4.198 \times 10^{-3} \geq 2.677 \times 10^{-3} = |\delta'_n - \delta_n|.$$

As indicated in the hint, we construct Q as a product of Givens rotations, mimicing the tridiagonalization by Givens rotation but here using Givens rotations in order to eliminate subdiagonal entries. Indexing according to the columns which a given Givens rotation affects, we name them so that $\Omega_{n-1,n} \cdots \Omega_{2,3} \Omega_{1,2} (A - \delta_n I) = R$ hence $Q^H = \Omega_{n-1,n} \cdots \Omega_{1,2}$.

This is the farthest I could get in this problem, and I tried only to fail deriving a complete solution.