

Assignment 11

Note: Text in blue shows Marks. Text in green is not necessary.

Herm.

Q1. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$. Let $B = I - A$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be an arbitrary vector. Given A and y , we wish to solve the linear system of equations $Ax = y$ as follows

For $i = 1, 2, 3$

$$Do \quad x_i = Bx_{i-1} + y$$

a) Let $E_i = x_i - x$ be the error in the i^{th} iteration. Show that $E_i = B^i (x_0 - x)$

b) Conclude that if $\rho(B) < 1$, then this algorithm works

c) Use Gersgorin's theorem to show that a Hermitian A must be strictly diagonally dominant and $\|A\|_\infty < 2$ to ensure that this algorithm works.

Sol) $B = I - A$

$$Bx = x - y$$

Let's prove (a) using Mathematical induction

$$E_i = x_i - x$$

$$E_1 = x_1 - x$$

$$= Bx_0 + y - x$$

$$= Bx_0 - Bx$$

$$E_1 = B(x_0 - x)$$

Let $\epsilon_i = B^i (x_0 - x)$ be true for $i = k$

$$\therefore \epsilon_k = B^k (x_0 - x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{k+1} &= x_{k+1} - x \\ &= Bx_k + y - x \\ &= Bx_k - Bx \\ &= B(x_k - x) \\ &= B \epsilon_k \\ &= B B^k (x_0 - x)\end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon_{k+1} = B^{k+1} (x_0 - x)$$

— (2)

Thus, from the principles of mathematical Induction

$$\epsilon_i = B^i (x_0 - x)$$

— (3)

b) For the algorithm to work, $x_i \rightarrow x$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty$$

— (4)

$$\Rightarrow B^i \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty$$

i.e. B should be a convergent matrix

$$\Rightarrow \rho(B) < 1$$

— (5)

c) The question is not complete. It should have been
Show that if A is Herm. and positive definite, then
 A being strictly diagonally dominant and $\|A\|_\infty < 2$
is a sufficient condition for this algorithm to work.

$$B = I - A$$

$$\Rightarrow \lambda_i(B) = 1 - \lambda_i(A) \quad \text{where } \lambda_i \text{ is } i^{\text{th}} \text{ Eval of } A \text{ (in any order)}$$

$$\text{we have } \rho(B) < 1 \Rightarrow -1 < \lambda_i(B) < 1 \quad \forall i$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < \lambda_i(A) < 2 \quad \forall i \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \because A \text{ \& } B \text{ are Herm.} \\ \Rightarrow \lambda_i(A) \text{ \& } \lambda_i(B) \text{ are real} \end{array} \right]$$

— (6)

$$A \succeq 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_i(A) > 0 \quad \forall i$$

A being Herm. and strictly diagonally dominant

\Rightarrow All Gershgorin discs are centered on \mathbb{R}^+ and are completely contained in the right half of complex plane

\therefore Eval's are in the region

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n \left[a_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|, a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right]$$

$$\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left(0, a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right] \quad [\because A \text{ is strictly diag. dom.}]$$

$$= \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left(0, \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}| \right]$$

$$= \left(0, \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}| \right]$$

$$= \left(0, \|A\|_{\infty} \right]$$

$$\subseteq (0, 2)$$

$$[\because \|A\|_{\infty} < 2]$$

\therefore The given conditions imply that $\lambda_i(A) \in (0, 2) \quad \forall i$

Hence, this is a sufficient condition for the algorithm to work.

— (7)

2) Let y & x be unit l_2 -norm left and right Evecs respectively of $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ corresponding to a simple Eval λ . Let $S(\lambda) \triangleq |y^H x|$. Prove that $S(\lambda) \neq 0$

So) Let's prove by contradiction.

Assume $S(\lambda) = 0$

$$\therefore y^H x = 0 \Rightarrow x \perp y$$

We have $y^H A = \lambda y^H$ & $Ax = \lambda x$

$$\therefore y \in N((A - \lambda I)^H) \text{ \& } x \in N(A - \lambda I)$$

$$x \perp y \Rightarrow x \in R(A - \lambda I)$$

$$\Rightarrow \exists z \in \mathbb{C}^n \text{ s.t. } x = (A - \lambda I)z$$

————— ①

Since $x \in N(A - \lambda I)$

$$(A - \lambda I)x = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow (A - \lambda I)^2 z = 0$$

$\Rightarrow x$ & z are generalized Evecs of A corresp to λ

Since λ is a simple Eigenvalue, alg. mult = 1

\Rightarrow There exists only 1 L.I generalized Evec

$$\Rightarrow z = \alpha x \text{ for some } \alpha \neq 0$$

————— ②

But we have $x = (A - \lambda I)z$

$$= (A - \lambda I)2x$$
$$= 2(A - \lambda I)x$$
$$= 0$$

which is a contradiction since Evecs cannot be zero
 \Rightarrow Our assumption that $S(\lambda) = 0$ is incorrect
Hence $S(\lambda) \neq 0$. — (3)