$$\vec{X} = \langle 3, 5, 1 \rangle$$

$$\vec{u}_1 = \langle 1, 1, 6 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{u}_2 = \langle 1, -1, 6 \rangle$$

$$So \quad \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{u}_1) = \frac{\vec{u}_1 \cdot \vec{x}}{|\vec{u}_1|^2} \vec{u}_1 = \frac{8}{2} \vec{u}_1$$

$$= \langle 4, 4, 6 \rangle$$

$$\text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{u}_2) = \frac{-2}{2} \vec{u}_2 = \langle -1, 1, 6 \rangle$$

$$\text{Take} \quad \vec{v}_1 = \langle 1, 1, 6 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}_2 = \langle 1, 6, 6 \rangle. \quad \text{Then}$$

$$\text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{v}_1) = \frac{\vec{x} \cdot \vec{v}_1}{|\vec{v}_1|^2} \vec{v}_1 = \langle 4, 4, 6 \rangle$$

$$\text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{v}_2) = \frac{3}{1} \vec{v}_2 = \langle 3, 6, 6 \rangle.$$

Now \vec{u} , \vec{u} are linearly independent, so their span is a plane U in \mathbb{R}^3 . The vector \vec{x} may be decomposed into the sum $\vec{u} + \vec{w}$ of a vector $\vec{u} \in U$ and a $\vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ perpendicular to the glane U, making $\vec{u} = \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow U)$ and \vec{w} the shortest vector from U to \vec{x} .

Clearly the plane U is what we call the xy-plane inside R3, and both {ti,,tiz}, {tr, tr} can serve as bases for U.

One might hope that, having the basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2\}$ of U, one might obtain $\vec{u} = \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow U)$ by adding the projections onto individual basis clements. If — worked generally, then using the basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2\}$, we would have

 $\vec{u} = \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{v}_1) + \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{v}_2)$ $= \langle 4, 4, 0 \rangle + \langle 3, 0, 0 \rangle$ $= \langle 7, 4, 0 \rangle,$

and we could get the perpendicular vector \vec{w} via subtraction: Since $\vec{x} = \vec{u} + \vec{w}$,

 $\vec{v} = \vec{\chi} - \vec{v} = \langle 3, 5, 1 \rangle - \langle 7, 4, 0 \rangle$ $= \langle -4, 1, 1 \rangle.$

We have broken & into parts to be sure,

$$\vec{x} = \langle 7, 4, 0 \rangle + \langle -4, 1, 1 \rangle$$

but this is not the unique splitling of x into its projection onto U and an orthogonal part, which is clear since the dot product

<7,4,0> °<-4,1,1> = -24is not 0.

However, had we built our potential \hat{u} from the projections onto the other bases elements, calling

calling
$$\vec{x} = \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{u}_1) + \text{proj}(\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{u}_2)$$

$$= \langle 4, 4, 0 \rangle + \langle -1, 1, 0 \rangle$$

$$= \langle 3, 5, 0 \rangle$$

then set

$$\frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = \langle 3, 5, 1 \rangle - \langle 3, 5, 0 \rangle$$

$$= \langle 0, 0, 1 \rangle,$$

this time not only is $\vec{x} = \vec{u} + \vec{w}$,

but $\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v} = \langle 3, 5, 6 \rangle \cdot \langle 0, 0, 1 \rangle = 0$.

making it an orthogonal decomposition, as we sought, with

 $(3,5,0) = \operatorname{proj}(\overline{X} \to U),$ and $(0,0,1) = \operatorname{proj}(\overline{X} \to U^{\perp}).$

Q: So, why does it work to add the projections outor basis vectors in order to yield the projection outor their span in the case of basis {\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2}, but not for basis {\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2}?

A: The basic elements {ti, ti, i } are orthogonal to each other, but those in {ti, i, i, are not.