Nicholas Livingstone HW9 Math-375 4/13/20

1.

a)

```
n = 6;
H = hilb(10);
A = H(1:10,1:n);
c = transpose(ones(1, n));
b = A*c;
[Q, R] = qr(A);
QtB = Q'*b;
c_apprx = R(:,:)\QtB(:)
```

```
c_apprx = 6 1
0.99999999999910
1.000000000001625
0.999999999992104
1.000000000015688
0.999999999986252
1.0000000000004415
```

This method is correct to 10 decimal places

b)

```
n = 8;
H = hilb(10);
A = H(1:10,1:n);
c = transpose(ones(1, n));
b = A*c;
[Q, R] = qr(A);
QtB = Q'*b;
c_apprx = R(:,:)\QtB(:)
```

```
c_apprx = 8 1
    0.99999999998164
    1.000000000077673
    0.99999999193717
    1.000000003486769
    0.999999992488604
    1.000000008476126
    0.999999995232271
    1.000000001046109
```

In this case, QR factorization is correct to 8 decimal places. I hypothesize that our digits of accuracy are the machine epsilon's accuracy - n, where n is the number of colums of A i.e. in this matlab environment 16-6 = 10, 16-8 = 8. Compared to homework 8, this method provides much more accurate approximations even in the case of having a poorly conditioned matrix to begin with.

```
A = [-4, -4; -2, 7; 4, -5];
b = [3; 9; 0];
[Q, R] = qr(A);
QtB = Q'*b;
c_apprx = rats(R(:,:)\QtB(:))
c_apprx = 2�14 char array
       -11/18 '
         4/9
Q = rats(Q)
Q = 3 242 char array
                                   1/3 '
2/3 '
        -2/3
                    2/3
         -1/3
                     -2/3
          2/3
                      1/3
                                   2/3
R = rats(R)
R = 3  28 char array
          6
                      -3
           0
                      -9
           0
                      0
```

Compared to the results produced by hand, The approximated x is the same in the matlab.

