

# IE531: Algorithms for Data Analytics

Spring, 2023

## Homework 3: SVD and Related Topics

Due Date: 3 March 2023

©Prof. R.S. Sreenivas

### Instructions

1. You will submit a PDF-version of your answers on Canvas on-or-before midnight of the due date.

### Instructions

1. (40 points) Suppose a matrix  $n \times d$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  has an SVD decomposition that can be written as

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A}}_{n \times d} = \left( \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_1}_{n \times r_1} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{\Sigma}_1}_{r_1 \times r_1} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{V}_1^T}_{r_1 \times d} \right) + \left( \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_2}_{n \times r_2} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{\Sigma}_2}_{r_2 \times r_2} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{V}_2^T}_{r_2 \times d} \right)$$

where the singular-values in  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1$  (resp.  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$ ) are greater than (resp. lesser than) some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}$ . Show that

- (a) (20 points)

$$\mathbf{U}_1^T \times \mathbf{U}_2 \times \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \times \mathbf{V}_2^T = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{r_1 \times d}, \text{ and}$$

- (b) (20 points)

$$\mathbf{U}_2 \times \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \times \mathbf{V}_2^T \times \mathbf{V}_1 = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{d \times r_1}$$

This follows from the structure of the SVD algorithm covered in class. That is,  $\mathbf{U}_1$  (resp.  $\mathbf{U}_2$ ) is a collection of  $r_1$ -many (resp.  $r_2$ -many) orthogonal, unit-vectors. That is,

$$\mathbf{U}_1^T \mathbf{U}_2 = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{r_1 \times r_2} \Leftrightarrow \left( \mathbf{U}_2^T \mathbf{U}_1 = \underbrace{\mathbf{0}}_{r_2 \times r_1} \right)$$

That is, if  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ , then  $\mathbf{U} = (\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1 \mid \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_2)$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 \mid \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2)$ , where  $\mathbf{U}_1 = (\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_1 \mid \mathbf{0})$  (resp.  $\mathbf{U}_2 = (\mathbf{0} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_2)$ ) and  $\mathbf{V}_1 = (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 \mid \mathbf{0})$  resp.  $\mathbf{V}_2 = (\mathbf{0} \mid \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_2)$ . A similar argument establishes Problem 1b, and you conclude  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  are orthogonal to each other.

2. (40 points) Suppose a matrix  $n \times d$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  with rank  $r$ , and has an SVD

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A}}_{n \times d} = \underbrace{\mathbf{U}}_{n \times r} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{r \times r} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{V}^T}_{r \times d}.$$

Let us suppose  $\mathbf{A}$  gets “corrupted” by a  $n \times d$ , *noise-matrix*  $\mathbf{E}$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{E}$ . Suppose the corrupted-matrix  $\mathbf{A}_1$  has an SVD

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A}_1}_{n \times d} = \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_1}_{n \times r_1} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{\Sigma}_1}_{r_1 \times r_1} \times \underbrace{\mathbf{V}_1^T}_{r_1 \times d}.$$

Suppose  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_1$  is obtained from  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1$  by keeping only the top  $r$ -many entries (i.e. we zero-out all diagonal-values that not in the list of top  $r$ -many SVs). Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}_1 \times \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_1 \times \mathbf{V}_1^T$ . Show that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \sqrt{8r} \times \|\mathbf{E}\|_2.$$

See this link for a [proof of this claim](#).

3. (20 points) Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an  $n \times d$  matrix (of real numbers) that can be partitioned as

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A}}_{n \times d} = \begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{\mathbf{A}_1}_{n_1 \times d_1} & \underbrace{\mathbf{A}_2}_{n_1 \times d_2} \\ \underbrace{\mathbf{A}_3}_{n_2 \times d_1} & \underbrace{\mathbf{A}_4}_{n_2 \times d_2} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $n = n_1 + n_2$  and  $d = d_1 + d_2$  (obviously).

- (a) (10 points) Show that

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_3) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_4)$$

Consider the SVD of each  $\mathbf{A}_i$ , where  $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{\Sigma}_i \mathbf{V}_i^T$ , then it follows that

$$\mathbf{A} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_3 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_4 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{X}} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_3 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_4 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_1^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{V}_3^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{V}_2^T \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{V}_4^T \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{Y}^T} \quad (1)$$

We know that  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \min(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}), \text{rank}(\mathbf{B}))$ <sup>1</sup>. The result follows from the fact that  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_3) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_4)$ .

- (b) (10 points) Suppose for each  $\{\mathbf{A}_i\}_{i=1}^4$  there is a corresponding set of matrices  $\{\mathbf{B}_i\}_{i=1}^4$  such that  $\forall i, \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{B}_i\|_F \leq \epsilon$  show that

$$\left\| \mathbf{A} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_1 & \mathbf{B}_2 \\ \mathbf{B}_3 & \mathbf{B}_4 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F \leq 4\epsilon$$

From equation 1, we note that

<sup>1</sup>Let  $\mathbf{A}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{B}$ ) be a  $n \times d$  (resp.  $d \times m$ ) matrix. The product  $\mathbf{Ax}$  for any  $d \times 1$  column vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is an  $n \times 1$  column vector that can be expressed in terms of the columns of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Therefore,  $m$ -many all columns of  $\mathbf{AB}$  can be expressed in terms of the columns of  $\mathbf{A}$  (i.e. there are no columns that could not be expressed in terms of columns of  $\mathbf{A}$ , but now can be expressed in terms of the columns of  $\mathbf{AB}$ ). Therefore  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ . If we interpreted  $\mathbf{AB}$  as  $n$ -many,  $d$ -dimensional rows, we get that all rows of  $\mathbf{AB}$  can be expressed in terms of the rows of  $\mathbf{B}$ . This would mean  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{B})$ , as well.

- i.  $\mathbf{X}$  is a  $(n_1 + n_2) \times (\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_3) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_4))$  matrix.
  - ii.  $\mathbf{Y}$  is a  $(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_3) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_4)) \times (d_1 + d_2)$  matrix.
  - iii.  $\mathbf{X}$  not orthogonal, in general– more specifically, assuming we have a lot data points (i.e.  $n \gg d$ ), there is no guarantee that  $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$  is diagonal.
  - iv.  $\mathbf{Y}$  not orthogonal, in general– more specifically, assuming we have a lot data points (i.e.  $n \gg d$ ), there is no guarantee that  $\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y}^T$  is diagonal.
- Let  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Q}_x \mathbf{R}_x$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Q}_y \mathbf{R}_y$  be the QR-Decomposition of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ , respectively. It follows that

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_x \underbrace{\mathbf{R}_x \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{R}_y^T}_{\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{U}_w \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}_w^T} \mathbf{Q}_y^t = \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}_x \mathbf{U}_w}_{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{\Sigma} \underbrace{\mathbf{V}_w^T \mathbf{Q}_y^t}_{\mathbf{V}^T} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T$$

We might have to “move-around” a few columns of  $\mathbf{U}$  (and the corresponding rows of  $\mathbf{V}^T$ ) as the singular-values listed in  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  might not necessarily be in increasing order. Regardless, if we truncated/dropped some of these elements out to get within an  $\epsilon$ -approximation of each of the  $\mathbf{A}_i$  matrices, we will not be making a error-in-approximation that exceeds  $4\epsilon$  in using these approximations to construct an approximation for  $\mathbf{A}$ .