CENG 371 - Scientific Computing
Fall' 2024 - 2025
Homework 4

Karaçanta, Kaan
e244854@metu.edu.tr

Question 2

1. **Plots of the relative errors for both images:**



Figure 1: Cameraman – Relative Error vs. k.



Figure 2: Fingerprint – Relative Error vs. k.

Let A be your image matrix (e.g., using `A = io.imread('cameraman.jpg')` in Python). We define:

$$\text{RelErr}_{\text{approx}}(k) = \frac{\| u_k \, \sigma_k \, v_k^T - U \, \Sigma \, V^T \|_2}{\| U \, \Sigma \, V^T \|_2}, \quad \text{RelErr}_{\text{svds}}(k) = \frac{\| u'_k \, \sigma'_k \, v'^T_k - U \, \Sigma \, V^T \|_2}{\| U \, \Sigma \, V^T \|_2},$$

where (U, Σ, V) is the full SVD of A, (u_k, σ_k, v_k) is from `approximate_svd`, and (u'_k, σ'_k, v'_k) from the built-in `svds`. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate these relative errors for `cameraman.jpg` and `fingerprint.jpg` respectively, plotted against various ranks k.

Observations for Cameraman.

- Both methods continue to show decreasing error as k increases, with `svds` consistently yielding lower error at the same k (as expected for exact/truncated SVD methods).
- At very small k (e.g., until 10), `approximate_svd` has errors around 25–15%, while `svds` is around 20–10%. The gap is very small for $k = 1$ or $k = 2$, then there is a noticable one but narrows rapidly as k grows.
- Around $k = 50$–100, `approximate_svd` converges closer, with errors often near or below 3%. By $k = 125$–200, the error for both methods becomes extremely small (near or below 1%).
- In some tests, when the k is 1 or 2, the `approximate_svd` error can even slightly cross below `svds` due to numerical and floating-point nuances (though typically `svds` remains the lower bound in theory).

Observations for Fingerprint.

- The fingerprint image remains more challenging. For $k = 5$ or 10, `approximate_svd` can show errors around 35–25%, whereas `svds` is around 25–15%.
- As k increases, both curves decrease steadily. `svds` remains below the randomized approach, but `approximate_svd` approaches it more closely by $k > 100$.
- By $k = 200$, `approximate_svd` is under 5% error, while `svds` can reach near 0–1%.
- The gap is still more pronounced than in the cameraman image, reflecting the fingerprint's possibly higher effective rank or more complex structure.

2. **Plots of the run times for both images:**



Figure 3: Cameraman – Run Time vs. k.



Figure 4: Fingerprint – Run Time vs. k.

We measure how long each method takes (wall-clock time) for each rank k. Figures 3 and 4 show run times for the two images.

Observations for Cameraman.

- For small k (5–25), both methods can be extremely fast, most of the time under 0.01 s. `svds` might even outperform `approximate_svd` at the smallest ranks, depending on the internal routines used by `svds` (e.g., specialized partial SVD algorithms).
- We see a notable "spike" in the `svds` timing at $k = 50$–75. This is possibly where `svds` switches factorization strategies or where iterative methods become more costly. Meanwhile, `approximate_svd` dips slightly or has small bumps near those ranks, possibly due to random draws or QR overhead.
- Beyond $k \approx 100$, `svds` climbs more sharply, and by $k = 200$ may take 0.05–0.06 s, while `approximate_svd` is around 0.01–0.02 s. These results confirm the randomized approach can be beneficial at higher ranks.

Observations for Fingerprint.

- A significant spike for `approximate_svd` can occur around $k = 25$ or 50 (sometimes reaching 0.1–0.2 s), while `svds` can have a large jump (0.4–0.5 s) also near those ranks. Such spikes often reflect how iterative solvers or partial factorization techniques change strategies internally.
- After the spike, `svds` grows steadily, reaching up to 0.6 s by $k = 200$. `approximate_svd` remains closer to 0.2 s at that rank, indicating a faster growth rate for `svds`.
- Despite random fluctuations, `approximate_svd` consistently maintains an advantage in speed for mid-to-large k values on this image. Minor irregularities (spikes/dips) can happen with random sampling or specialized BLAS calls.

3. **Qualitative comparisons.**
For selected ranks ($k = 10, 50, 100, ...$), we can reconstruct the images:

$$\hat{A}_k = u_k \, \sigma_k \, v_k^T \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{A}'_k = u'_k \, \sigma'_k \, v_k'^T,$$

then display them with `imshow`.

Discussion points.

- At $k = 10$, images are usually quite blurry for both methods; `svds` retains slightly more structure (edges, contrasts).
- At $k = 50$, the images become much clearer. While a pixel-wise difference might show `svds` is still better, `approximate_svd` is visually close.
- By $k = 100$ or 150, the randomized approach is nearly indistinguishable from the exact truncated SVD in normal viewing.

4. **Suggested use cases.**
Based on these updated error trends and timing behaviors:

- **Large-scale image/data compression:** The speed benefits of `approximate_svd` grow with matrix size or rank, making it ideal for compressing big data.
- **Real-time / streaming SVD computations:** Its relative speed and one-pass nature in certain algorithms allow for frequent updates without a full recomputation.
- **Exploratory data analysis (PCA-like tasks):** For large datasets (e.g., thousands/millions of rows), an approximate basis is often sufficient to capture the main variance.
- **Machine learning pipelines:** Dimensionality reduction (feature extraction) with approximate SVD saves both memory and time, critical in big-data ML.