

Linear Algebra

Sartaj UI Hasan



विद्याधनं सर्वधनं प्रधानम्

**Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Jammu
Jammu, India - 181221**

Email: sartaj.hasan@iitjammu.ac.in

Lecture 38

(Nov 08, 2019)

Inner Products

Orthogonal Decomposition

- **Theorem 5 (Orthogonal Decomposition Theorem (ODT)):** Let W be any finite-dimensional subspace of V . Then each vector y in V can be written **uniquely** in the form $y = \hat{y} + z$, where \hat{y} is in W , and z is in W^\perp . In fact, if $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_p\}$ is any orthogonal basis of W , then $\hat{y} = c_1 u_1 + c_2 u_2 + \dots + c_p u_p$ with $c_j = \frac{\langle y, u_j \rangle}{\langle u_j, u_j \rangle}$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ and $z = y - \hat{y}$.
- **Theorem 5 (Alternative Statement):** Given any finite-dimensional subspace W of V , then we can express $V = W + W^\perp$, with $W \cap W^\perp = \{0\}$, i.e., $V = W \oplus W^\perp$.
- **Remark 1:** Hence, every vector can be *uniquely* expressed as the sum of a vector in W and a vector in W^\perp , i.e., as the sum of two vectors *which are orthogonal to each other* !!

- **Note 1:** The vector \hat{y} is called the **orthogonal projection of y onto W** , written $\text{proj}_W y$. In case $W = \text{Span}\{u\}$ is a one-dimensional subspace, the expression is simplified to: $\hat{y} = \frac{\langle y, u \rangle}{\langle u, u \rangle} u$, which is simply called the orthogonal projection of y onto u .
- **Note 2:** In case y belongs to W , its orthogonal projection onto W is itself, i.e. $\hat{y} = y$ for $y \in W$. This follows from Proposition 48 along with ODT (Theorem 5).

Proof of Theorem 5 (ODT)

We will prove the original version, from which the alternative version can be derived immediately.

We assume that any finite-dimensional subspace W of an inner product space has an orthogonal basis.

This assumption is due to Theorem 6 (Gram-Schmidt Process) which will be done later – however, the proof of Theorem 6 does not require Theorem 5, so assumption is logically valid.

Uniqueness: We will first prove uniqueness, i.e., any vector $y \in V$ can not be expressed in more than one way as a sum of a vector in W and a vector in W^\perp . Suppose BWOC that:

$$y = \hat{y} + z$$
$$\text{and } y = \hat{y}_1 + z_1$$

where $\hat{y}, \hat{y}_1 \in W$ and $z, z_1 \in W^\perp$.

Subtracting $0 = (\hat{y} - \hat{y}_1) + (z - z_1)$ or $(\hat{y} - \hat{y}_1) = -(z - z_1)$

Proof of Theorem 5 (ODT)(Cont'd)

LHS $\in W$, RHS $\in W^\perp$, i.e., they both are in $W \cap W^\perp = \{0\}$ by Prop 47. Therefore, $\hat{y} - \hat{y}_1 = 0 \implies \hat{y} = \hat{y}_1$ and $z - z_1 = 0 \implies z = z_1$. This proves the uniqueness.

Existence: We next prove that a decomposition exists, i.e., that $y = \hat{y} + z$, where $\hat{y} \in W$ and $z \in W^\perp$. In fact, put $\hat{y} = c_1 u_1 + \cdots + c_p u_p$, where $c_j = \frac{\langle y, u_j \rangle}{\langle u_j, u_j \rangle}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Now, put $z = y - \hat{y}$ so obviously $y = \hat{y} + z$.

It only remains to show that $z \in W^\perp$. We use Prop 47(a) for this, so it suffices to show that $\langle z, u_j \rangle = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. But,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle z, u_j \rangle &= \langle y - \hat{y}, u_j \rangle \\ &= \langle y, u_j \rangle - \langle \hat{y}, u_j \rangle \\ &= \langle y, u_j \rangle - [c_1 \langle u_1, u_j \rangle + \cdots + c_p \langle u_p, u_j \rangle] \\ &= \langle y, u_j \rangle - c_j \langle u_j, u_j \rangle \\ &= \langle y, u_j \rangle - \frac{\langle y, u_j \rangle}{\langle u_j, u_j \rangle} \langle u_j, u_j \rangle = 0, \text{ as desired.}\end{aligned}$$

Orthogonal Bases (Cont'd)

Theorem 6 (The Gram-Schmidt Orthogonalization Process): Given a basis $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$ for a subspace W of V , we can generate an orthogonal basis $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ for W such that $\text{Span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\} = \text{Span}\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$. In fact, the vectors v_j are defined as follows:

$$v_1 = x_1$$

$$v_2 = x_2 - \frac{\langle x_2, v_1 \rangle}{\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle} v_1$$

$$v_3 = x_3 - \frac{\langle x_3, v_1 \rangle}{\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle} v_1 - \frac{\langle x_3, v_2 \rangle}{\langle v_2, v_2 \rangle} v_2$$

\vdots

$$v_p = x_p - \frac{\langle x_p, v_1 \rangle}{\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle} v_1 - \frac{\langle x_p, v_2 \rangle}{\langle v_2, v_2 \rangle} v_2 - \dots \\ \dots - \frac{\langle x_p, v_{p-1} \rangle}{\langle v_{p-1}, v_{p-1} \rangle} v_{p-1}$$

Obtaining an Orthogonal Basis

- **Description of the Gram-Schmidt Process:** At each stage, subtract from the original basis vector x_i its projection onto the span of the previously obtained orthogonal vectors v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{i-1} .
- **Remark 1:** The process uses the idea we already used in ODT, of subtracting the orthogonal projection onto a subspace from the original vector. A formal proof that the vectors $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ form an orthogonal set and that $\text{Span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\} = \text{Span}\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ can be done by induction on k .
- **Remark 2:** We can obtain an orthonormal basis for every subspace W of V by normalizing each vector in an orthogonal basis (dividing each of the vectors by its norm). Each vector in an orthonormal basis has norm 1.
Note: This step is usually left to the end, because square roots can emerge.

Example for Gram-Schmidt Process

Construct an orthonormal basis for \mathbb{R}^3 starting with the basis:

$$x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}, x_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}, x_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Put } v_1 = x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Then } v_2 = x_2 - \frac{\langle v_1, x_2 \rangle}{\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle} v_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{13}{14} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -6/7 \\ 15/14 \\ 3/14 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

Example for Gram-Schmidt Process (Cont'd)

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Then } v_3 &= x_3 - \frac{\langle v_1, x_3 \rangle}{\langle v_1, v_1 \rangle} v_1 - \frac{\langle v_2, x_3 \rangle}{\langle v_2, v_2 \rangle} v_2 \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{3}{7} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{2}{9} \begin{bmatrix} -6/7 \\ 15/14 \\ 3/14 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 \\ 1/3 \\ -1/3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)\end{aligned}$$

→ We can check that v_1, v_2, v_3 are orthogonal (where as the original basis vectors were not!)

$$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = -12/7 + 15/14 + 9/14 = 0$$

$$\langle v_1, v_3 \rangle = 2/3 + 1/3 - 3/3 = 0$$

$$\langle v_2, v_3 \rangle = -6/21 + 15/42 - 3/42 = 0$$

Example for Gram-Schmidt Process (Cont'd)

→ If we desire an orthonormal basis, we divide each vector v_i by its length to get:

$$v_1' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{14}} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}, v_2' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{42}} \begin{bmatrix} -4 \\ 5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, v_3' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Some Other Results Related to Orthogonality

Proposition 49 (Pythagorean Theorem): u and v are orthogonal to each other if and only if $\|u + v\|^2 = \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}\|u + v\|^2 &= \langle u + v, u + v \rangle = \langle u, u \rangle + \langle v, v \rangle + 2 \langle u, v \rangle \\ &= \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + 2 \langle u, v \rangle\end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \|u + v\|^2 = \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 \iff 2 \langle u, v \rangle = 0 \iff u \perp v$$

Proposition 50 (Best Approximation Theorem): Let W be any finite-dimensional subspace of V , y any vector in V , and \hat{y} be the orthogonal projection of y onto W . Then $\|y - \hat{y}\| < \|y - v\|$ for all v in W distinct from \hat{y} , in other words, \hat{y} is the closest vector (point) in W to y .

Some Other Results Related to Orthogonality (Cont'd)

Proof of Proposition 50: Let $v \in W$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|y - v\|^2 &= \langle y - v, y - v \rangle \\ &= \langle (y - \hat{y}) + (\hat{y} - v), (y - \hat{y}) + (\hat{y} - v) \rangle \\ &= \langle y - \hat{y}, y - \hat{y} \rangle + \langle \hat{y} - v, \hat{y} - v \rangle + \\ &\quad 2 \langle y - \hat{y}, \hat{y} - v \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Now, $y - \hat{y} \in W^\perp$ whereas $\hat{y} - v \in W$. Hence, the 3rd term on RHS of (4) is 0. Therefore,

$$\|y - v\|^2 = \|y - \hat{y}\|^2 + \|\hat{y} - v\|^2 \tag{5}$$

Now, if $y = v$, then $y \in W \implies y = \hat{y} = v$, which is not allowed. Hence, $\|\hat{y} - v\|^2 > 0$ whence $\|y - v\| > \|y - \hat{y}\|$ from (5).

Some Other Results Related to Orthogonality (Cont'd)

Corollary 50.1: If v is any vector, and W is a finite-dimensional subspace, then: $\|\text{proj}_W v\| \leq \|v\|$.

Proof: We have that $v = \text{Proj}_W v + z$, where $z \in W^\perp$

Applying Pythagorean Theorem yields the following,

$$\|v\|^2 = \|\text{Proj}_W v + z\|^2 = \|\text{Proj}_W v\|^2 + \|z\|^2$$

Since $\|z\|^2 \geq 0$, the result follows.

Proposition 51: (The Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality): For all u, v in V , $|\langle u, v \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|v\|$.

Proof: Clearly result holds if either u or $v = 0$. So we may assume both u and v are non-zero, and apply Cor 50.1 above, taking $W = \text{Span}\{v\}$.

$$\therefore \|\text{Proj}_W u\| \leq \|u\| \quad (6)$$

$$\text{In (6), LHS} = \|\text{Proj}_W u\| = \left\| \frac{\langle u, v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} v \right\| = \frac{|\langle u, v \rangle| \|v\|}{\|v\|^2} \quad (7)$$

From (6) and (7), $|\langle u, v \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|v\|$ as required.

Some Other Results Related to Orthogonality (Cont'd)

Proposition 52 (The Triangle Inequality): For all u, v in V ,
 $\|u + v\| \leq \|u\| + \|v\|$.

Proof: We have,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u + v\|^2 &= \langle u + v, u + v \rangle \\ &= \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + 2 \langle u, v \rangle \\ &\leq \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + 2|\langle u, v \rangle| \\ &\leq \|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 + 2\|u\| \|v\|, \text{ using C-S inequality} \\ &= (\|u\| + \|v\|)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the result follows.

Best Approximation; Least squares

- First we shall observe and prove the following facts about a rectangular matrix $A_{m \times n}$:

- $(\text{Row } A)^\perp = \text{Nul } A$.
- $(\text{Col } A)^\perp = \text{Nul } A^T$.
- The matrix $A^T A$ is symmetric matrix and $\text{Nul } (A^T A) = \text{Nul } A$.

Proof: Certainly if $AX = 0$ then $A^T AX = 0$. Vectors X in the nullspace of A are also in the nullspace of $A^T A$. To go in the other direction, start by supposing that $A^T AX = 0$, and take the inner product with X to show that

$$\langle X, A^T AX \rangle = X^T A^T AX = 0, \quad \text{or } \|AX\|^2 = 0, \quad \text{or } AX = 0.$$

Thus, the two nullspaces are identical.

- If the columns of A are linearly independent, then $\text{Nul } A = \{0\}$.
- A has independent columns $\iff A^T A$ is square, symmetric, and invertible.

Proof: Since columns of A are LI, we have $\text{Nul } A = \{0\}$. Thus, $\text{Nul } A^T A = \{0\}$, and hence $A^T A$ is invertible by TIMT.

Best Approximation; Least squares

- Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Suppose the system $AX = b$ is an *inconsistent* system. So no exact solution is possible, so we will look for a vector X that comes “as close as possible” to being a solution in the sense that it minimizes $\|b - AX\|$ with respect to the usual inner product (dot product) on \mathbb{R}^m . One may think of AX as an approximation to b and $\|b - AX\|$ as the *error* in that approximation—the smaller the error, the better the approximation.

Definition

If $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, a **least-squares solution** of $AX = b$ is an \hat{X} in \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$\|b - A\hat{X}\| \leq \|b - AX\|$$

for all X in \mathbb{R}^n .

- The adjective “least-squares” arises from the fact that $\|b - AX\|$ is the square root of a sum of squares.

Best Approximation; Least squares

- **Proposition 53:** The set of least-squares solutions of $AX = b$ coincides with the non-empty set of solution of the **normal equations** $A^T AX = A^T b$.
- **Example:** Find the least-squares solution of the inconsistent system $AX = b$ for

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 11 \end{bmatrix}$$

Ans: $\hat{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$

- **Proposition 54:** The matrix $A^T A$ is invertible if and only if the columns of A are linearly independent. In this case, the equation $AX = b$ has only one least-squares solution \hat{X} , and it is given by

$$\hat{X} = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T b.$$

(Proof of this proposition is left as an exercise!)

- **Definition:** When a least-squares solution \hat{X} is used to produce $A\hat{X}$ as an approximation to b , the distance from b to $A\hat{X}$ is called the **least-squares error** of this approximation.
 - **Example:** Given A and b as below, determine the least-squares error in the least-square solution of $AX = b$.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 11 \end{bmatrix}$$