

The Singular Value Decomposition

We are interested in more than just sym+def matrices. But the eigenvalue decompositions discussed in the last section of notes will play a major role in solving general systems of equations

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M, \quad \mathbf{A} \text{ is } M \times N, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We have seen that a symmetric positive definite matrix can be decomposed as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^T$, where \mathbf{V} is an orthogonal matrix ($\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{I}$) whose columns are the eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} , and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . Because both orthogonal and diagonal matrices are trivial to invert, this eigenvalue decomposition makes it very easy to solve systems of equations $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ and analyze the stability of these solutions.

The **singular value decomposition** (SVD) takes apart an arbitrary $M \times N$ matrix \mathbf{A} in a similar manner. The SVD of a $M \times N$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank¹ R is

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$$

where

1. \mathbf{U} is a $M \times R$ matrix

$$\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1 \mid \mathbf{u}_2 \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{u}_R],$$

whose columns $\mathbf{u}_m \in \mathbb{R}^M$ are orthonormal. Note that while $\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$, in general $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T \neq \mathbf{I}$ when $R < M$.

¹Recall that the rank of a matrix is the number of linearly independent columns of a matrix (which is always equal to the number of linearly independent rows).

2. \mathbf{V} is a $N \times R$ matrix

$$\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \mid \mathbf{v}_2 \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{v}_R],$$

whose columns $\mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are orthonormal. Again, while $\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}$, in general $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^T \neq \mathbf{I}$ when $R < N$.

3. $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a $R \times R$ diagonal matrix with positive entries:

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \sigma_2 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \sigma_R \end{bmatrix}.$$

We call the σ_r the **singular values** of \mathbf{A} . By convention, we will order them such that $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_R$.

4. The $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_R$ are eigenvectors of the positive semi-definite matrix $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$. Note that

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{V}^T,$$

and so the singular values $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_R$ are the square roots of the non-zero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$.

5. Similarly,

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{U}^T,$$

and so the $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_R$ are eigenvectors of the positive semi-definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T$. Since the non-zero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T$ are the same, the σ_r are also square roots of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T$.

6. The rank R is the number of linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} ; this is the same as the number of linearly independent rows. Thus $R \leq \min(M, N)$. We say \mathbf{A} is **full rank** if $R = \min(M, N)$.

7. As \mathbf{A} is rank R , its rows span an R -dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^N . As we have seen, this is called the **row space** of \mathbf{A} :

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Row}(\mathbf{A}) &= \text{Col}(\mathbf{A}^T) \\ &= \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{z} \text{ for some } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^M\}.\end{aligned}$$

The columns of \mathbf{V} form an orthobasis for $\text{Row}(\mathbf{A})$.

8. Recall that the **null space** of \mathbf{A} ,

$$\text{Null}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}\},$$

is orthogonal to the row space. For $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \text{Row}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \text{Null}(\mathbf{A})$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{0} \rangle = 0.$$

The null space has dimension $N - R$, and so is spanned by some set of orthonormal basis vectors $\mathbf{v}_{R+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N$ that we can collect into an $N \times (N - R)$ matrix \mathbf{V}_0 :

$$\mathbf{V}_0 = [\mathbf{v}_{R+1} \mid \mathbf{v}_{R+2} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{v}_N].$$

Note that $\mathbf{V}_0^T \mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{V}_0^T \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{0}$.

9. As \mathbf{A} is rank R , its columns span an R -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^M . As we have seen, this is called the **column space** of \mathbf{A} :

$$\text{Col}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^M : \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} \text{ for some } \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N\}.$$

The columns of \mathbf{U} form an orthobasis for $\text{Col}(\mathbf{A})$.

10. The null space of \mathbf{A}^T , sometimes referred to as the **left null space** of \mathbf{A} ,

$$\text{Null}(\mathbf{A}^T) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^M : \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}\},$$

is orthogonal to the column space. For $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \text{Range}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \text{Null}(\mathbf{A}^T)$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{y}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{0} \rangle = 0.$$

The left null space has dimension $M - R$, and so is spanned by some set of orthonormal basis vectors $\mathbf{u}_{R+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_M$ that we can collect into an $M \times (M - R)$ matrix \mathbf{U}_0 :

$$\mathbf{U}_0 = [\mathbf{u}_{R+1} \mid \mathbf{u}_{R+2} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{u}_M].$$

Note that $\mathbf{U}_0^T \mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{U}_0^T \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{0}$.

11. An equivalent way to write the SVD is as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}}^T,$$

where

$$\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} = [\mathbf{U} \mid \mathbf{U}_0], \quad \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}} = [\mathbf{V} \mid \mathbf{V}_0], \quad \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma} & \mathbf{0}_{R \times (N-R)} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(M-R) \times R} & \mathbf{0}_{(M-R) \times (N-R)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, \mathbf{U}_{full} is an $M \times M$ orthonormal matrix with $\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{U}_{\text{full}}^T = \mathbf{I}$, similarly \mathbf{V}_{full} is $N \times N$ with $\mathbf{V}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}}^T = \mathbf{I}$, and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}$ is $M \times N$ (the same sizes as \mathbf{A}) with a diagonal matrix in its upper left corner. In fact, this is the factorization the MATLAB command **svd** returns.

As before, we will often times find it useful to write the SVD as the sum of R rank-1 matrices:

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T = \sum_{r=1}^R \sigma_r \mathbf{u}_r \mathbf{v}_r^T.$$

When \mathbf{A} is **overdetermined** ($M > N$), the decomposition looks like this

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \sigma_R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \end{bmatrix}$$

When \mathbf{A} is **underdetermined** ($M < N$), the SVD looks like this

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \sigma_R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \end{bmatrix}$$

When \mathbf{A} is **square** and full rank ($M = N = R$), the SVD looks like

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \sigma_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \end{bmatrix}$$

The SVD and Least-Squares

We can use the SVD to “solve” the general system of linear equations

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and \mathbf{A} is an $M \times N$ matrix.

Recall our **least-squares** framework that revolves the optimization program

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the standard Euclidean norm. Given \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{A} , solving (1) has the advantages that

1. when there is a \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, unique solution, it is one of the solutions;
2. when there is no solution, we return something reasonable.

When there are an infinite number, we need a procedure for choosing one of them. In this case, we will return the solution with smallest norm; we have seen before that this corresponds to solving

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{y}.$$

We will see that the SVD of \mathbf{A} :

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T, \quad (2)$$

immediately reveals the solution to this problem.

Our analysis starts by showing how a vector in \mathbb{R}^N can be decomposed in an orthobasis related to the right singular vectors of \mathbf{A} . For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we can write

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{V}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{V}_0\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{V} is the $N \times R$ matrix appearing in the SVD decomposition (2), and \mathbf{V}_0 is a $N \times (N-R)$ matrix whose columns are an orthobasis for the null space of \mathbf{A} . We have the relations²

$$\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{V}_0^T \mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^T + \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{V}_0^T = \mathbf{I}.$$

Using these, we can compute the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$ using

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{x}, \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 = \mathbf{V}_0^T \mathbf{x},$$

and we have that

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{V}_0 \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0\|_2^2.$$

Similarly, we can decompose \mathbf{y} as

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{U}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \tag{4}$$

where \mathbf{U} is the $M \times R$ matrix from the SVD decomposition, and \mathbf{U}_0 is a $M \times (M-R)$ orthogonal basis for the left null space of \mathbf{A} (everything in \mathbb{R}^M that is orthogonal to the range of \mathbf{A}). Again,

$$\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{U}_0^T \mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^T + \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{U}_0^T = \mathbf{I}.$$

We can calculate the decomposition above using

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{y}, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \mathbf{U}_0^T \mathbf{y},$$

and we have that

$$\|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{U}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2.$$

²In short, the decomposition (3) is possible since $\text{Row}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\text{Null}(\mathbf{A})$ are orthogonal complements in \mathbb{R}^N for any $M \times N$ matrix \mathbf{A} . Every vector in \mathbb{R}^N can be written as a sum of components from $\text{Row}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\text{Null}(\mathbf{A})$, and these two components will be orthogonal to one another.

Using the decompositions (2), (3), and (4) for \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{x} , and \mathbf{y} , we can write the residual for a fixed \mathbf{x} as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Ax} &= \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T(\mathbf{V}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{V}_0\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) \\ &= \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ &= \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}).\end{aligned}$$

(The second equality above follows from $\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{0}$.) The size of the residual is:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Ax}\|_2^2 &= \langle \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \rangle + 2\langle \mathbf{U}_0\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from the facts that $\mathbf{U}_0^T\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$, and $\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{0}$.

Thus we can solve (1) by solving

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^R, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-R)}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2, \quad (5)$$

and then taking $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{V}\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} + \mathbf{V}_0\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0$.

Note the following:

1. We have no control over the $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2$ term in (5), this term is determined entirely by the observation \mathbf{y} .
2. Since $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is invertible (diagonal with $\sigma_r > 0$), we make the second term in (5) zero by taking

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{y}.$$

3. The vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$, representing the component in the null space of \mathbf{A} , plays no role in the optimization program (5). This means that the solution to our original least-squares problem (1) is not unique unless $R = N$ (i.e. \mathbf{A} only has $\mathbf{0}$ in its null space). Combining this with the note above, we see that every vector of the form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{V}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{V}_0\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \quad (6)$$

is a minimizer of (1). When $R = N$, there is no \mathbf{V}_0 matrix, and the minimizer is unique.

4. The solutions in (6) all have the minimal residual value of

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{U}_0^T\mathbf{y}\|_2^2.$$

When $R = M$ (i.e. \mathbf{A}^T has only $\mathbf{0}$ in its null space), there is no \mathbf{U}_0 matrix, and $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 = 0$ for all minimizers. That is, we can always find at least one \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ exactly.

5. The solutions in (6) have size

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{V}\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{V}_0\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0\|_2^2 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0\|_2^2.$$

Thus we can choose the **minimum norm solution** of (1) by taking $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. by taking

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}} = \mathbf{V}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{y}.$$

Taking $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ also ensures that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}}$ is in the row space of \mathbf{A} .

To summarize, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{y}$ has the desired properties stated at the beginning of this section of the notes, since

1. when $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ has a unique exact solution, it must be $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}}$,
2. when an exact solution is not available, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}}$ is a minimizer of (1),
3. when there are an infinite number of minimizers to (1), $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{ls}}$ is the one with smallest norm.

Because the matrix $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T$ gives us such an elegant solution to this problem, we give it a special name: the **pseudo-inverse**.

The Pseudo-Inverse

The **pseudo-inverse** of a matrix \mathbf{A} with singular value decomposition (SVD) $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ is

$$\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T. \quad (7)$$

Other names for \mathbf{A}^\dagger include **natural inverse**, **Lanczos inverse**, and **Moore-Penrose inverse**.

Given an observation \mathbf{y} , taking $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{y}$ gives us the **least squares** solution to $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$. The pseudo-inverse \mathbf{A}^\dagger always exists, since every matrix (with rank R) has an SVD decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as an $R \times R$ diagonal matrix with $\Sigma[r, r] > 0$.

When \mathbf{A} is full rank ($R = \min(M, N)$), then we can calculate the pseudo-inverse without using the SVD. There are three cases:

- When \mathbf{A} is square and invertible ($R = M = N$), then

$$\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{A}^{-1}.$$

This is easy to check, as here

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \quad \text{where both } \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \text{ are } N \times N,$$

and since in this case $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T \\ &= \mathbf{I}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{I}$, and so \mathbf{A}^\dagger is both a left and right inverse of \mathbf{A} , and thus $\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$.

- When \mathbf{A} more rows than columns and has full column rank ($R = N \leq M$), then $\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A}$ is invertible, and

$$\mathbf{A}^\dagger = (\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T. \quad (8)$$

This type of \mathbf{A} is “tall and skinny”

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \end{bmatrix},$$

and its columns are linearly independent. To verify equation (8), recall that

$$\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^2\mathbf{V}^T,$$

and so

$$(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-2}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T,$$

which is exactly the content of (7).

- When \mathbf{A} has more columns than rows and has full row rank ($R = M \leq N$), then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T$ is invertible, and

$$\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{A}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

This occurs when \mathbf{A} is “short and fat”

$$\begin{bmatrix} & & \\ & \mathbf{A} & \\ & & \end{bmatrix}$$

and its rows are linearly independent. To verify equation (9), recall that

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}^2\mathbf{U}^T,$$

and so

$$\mathbf{A}^T(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)^{-1} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-2}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{U}^T,$$

which again is exactly (7).

\mathbf{A}^\dagger is as close to an inverse of \mathbf{A} as possible

As discussed in the last section, when \mathbf{A} is square and invertible, \mathbf{A}^\dagger is exactly the inverse of \mathbf{A} . When \mathbf{A} is not square, we can ask if there is a better right or left inverse. We will argue that there is not.

Left inverse Given $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, we would like $\mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for any \mathbf{x} . That is, we would like \mathbf{A}^\dagger to be a *left inverse* of \mathbf{A} : $\mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$. Of course, this is not always possible, especially

when \mathbf{A} has more columns than rows, $M < N$. But we can ask if any other matrix \mathbf{H} comes closer to being a left inverse than \mathbf{A}^\dagger . To find the “best” left-inverse, we look for the matrix which minimizes

$$\min_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}} \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|_F^2. \quad (10)$$

Here, $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the *Frobenius norm*, defined for an $N \times M$ matrix \mathbf{Q} as the sum of the squares of the entries:

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\|_F^2 = \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{m=1}^N |Q[m, n]|^2$$

(It is also true, and you can and should prove this at home, that $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_F^2$ is the sum of the squares of the singular values of \mathbf{Q} : $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_F^2 = \lambda_1^2 + \cdots + \lambda_p^2$.) With (10), we are finding \mathbf{H} such that $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{A}$ is as close to the identity as possible in the least-squares sense.

The pseudo-inverse \mathbf{A}^\dagger minimizes (10). To see this, recognize (see the exercise below) that the solution $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ to (10) must obey

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\mathrm{T}\hat{\mathbf{H}}^\mathrm{T} = \mathbf{A}. \quad (11)$$

We can see that this is indeed true for $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{A}^\dagger$:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\mathrm{T}\mathbf{A}^{\dagger\mathrm{T}} = \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}^\mathrm{T}\mathbf{V}\Sigma\mathbf{U}^\mathrm{T}\mathbf{U}\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\mathrm{T} = \mathbf{U}\Sigma\mathbf{V}^\mathrm{T} = \mathbf{A}.$$

So there is no $N \times M$ matrix that is closer to being a left inverse than \mathbf{A}^\dagger .

Right inverse If we re-apply \mathbf{A} to our solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{y}$, we would like it to be as close as possible to our observations \mathbf{y} . That is, we would like $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\dagger$ to be as close to the identity as possible. Again, achieving this goal exactly is not always possible, especially if \mathbf{A} has more rows than columns. But we can attempt to find the “best” right inverse, in the least-squares sense, by solving

$$\underset{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{I}\|_F^2. \quad (12)$$

The solution $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ to (12) (see the exercise below) must obey

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \hat{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{A}^T. \quad (13)$$

Again, we show that \mathbf{A}^\dagger satisfies (13), and hence is a minimizer to (12):

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{V} \Sigma^2 \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{V} \Sigma \mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{A}^T.$$

Moral:

$\mathbf{A}^\dagger = \mathbf{V} \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{U}^T$ is as close (in the least-squares sense) to an inverse of \mathbf{A} as you could possibly have.

Exercise:

1. Show that the minimizer $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ to (10) must obey (11). Do this by using the fact that the derivative of the functional $\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|_F^2$ with respect to an entry $H[k, \ell]$ in \mathbf{H} must obey

$$\frac{\partial \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}\|_F^2}{\partial H[k, \ell]} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq N, 1 \leq \ell \leq M,$$

to be a solution to (10). Do the same for (12) and (13).

Technical Details: Existence of the SVD

In this section we will prove that any $M \times N$ matrix \mathbf{A} with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = R$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$$

where \mathbf{U} , $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, \mathbf{V} have the five properties listed at the beginning of the last section.

Since $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$ is symmetric positive semi-definite, we can write:

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} = \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n \mathbf{v}_n \mathbf{v}_n^T,$$

where the \mathbf{v}_n are orthonormal and the λ_n are real and non-negative. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = R$, we also have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}) = R$, and so $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_R$ are all strictly positive above, and $\lambda_{R+1} = \dots = \lambda_N = 0$.

Set

$$\mathbf{u}_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_m}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_m, \quad \text{for } m = 1, \dots, R, \quad \mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{u}_R].$$

Notice that these \mathbf{u}_m are orthonormal, as

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_m, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_m \lambda_\ell}} \mathbf{v}_\ell^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_m = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_\ell}} \mathbf{v}_\ell^T \mathbf{v}_m = \begin{cases} 1, & m = \ell, \\ 0, & m \neq \ell. \end{cases}$$

These \mathbf{u}_m also happen to be eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T$, as

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_m}} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_m = \sqrt{\lambda_m} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_m = \lambda_m \mathbf{u}_m.$$

Now let $\mathbf{u}_{R+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_M$ be an orthobasis for the null space of \mathbf{U}^T — concatenating these two sets into $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_M$ forms an orthobasis for all of \mathbb{R}^M .

Let

$$\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{v}_R], \quad \mathbf{V}_0 = [\mathbf{v}_{R+1} \ \mathbf{v}_{R+2} \ \cdots \ \mathbf{v}_N], \quad \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}} = [\mathbf{V} \ \mathbf{V}_0]$$

and

$$\mathbf{U}_0 = [\mathbf{u}_{R+1} \ \mathbf{u}_{R+2} \ \cdots \ \mathbf{u}_M], \quad \mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} = [\mathbf{U} \ \mathbf{U}_0].$$

It should be clear that \mathbf{V}_{full} is an $N \times N$ orthonormal matrix and \mathbf{U}_{full} is a $M \times M$ orthonormal matrix. Consider the $M \times N$ matrix $\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}}$ — the entry in the m th rows and n th column of this matrix is

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}})[m, n] &= \mathbf{u}_m^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_n = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_n} \mathbf{u}_m^T \mathbf{u}_n & n = 1, \dots, R \\ 0, & n = R + 1, \dots, N. \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_n}, & m = n = 1, \dots, R \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\text{full}}[m, n] = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_n}, & m = n = 1, \dots, R \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{U}_{\text{full}}^T = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}}^T = \mathbf{I}$, we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{full}}^T.$$

Since $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\text{full}}$ is non-zero only in the first R locations along its main diagonal, the above reduces to

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T, \quad \mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda_1} & & & \\ & \sqrt{\lambda_2} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \sqrt{\lambda_R} \end{bmatrix}.$$