Cost of elimination

Qn: How mony arithmetic operations
gaussian
does, elimination require, for n'equations
in n variables?

We first focus on the row exhelon form

of the nxn matrix A (and not the

augmented

matrix.)

Observe that every step involves finding what multiple of the pivot should what multiple of the pivot should be subtracted from the now we are be subtracted from the now operation to.

For example,
$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$$

Jo make $a_{21}=0$, we use $R_2 \mapsto R_2 - \frac{1}{2}R$,

The " $\frac{1}{2}$ " is just $\frac{a_{21}}{a_{11}}$.

Similarly, to make $a_{31}=0$, we use $R_3 \mapsto R_3 - \frac{3}{2}R_1$, and $\frac{3}{2} = \frac{a_{31}}{2}$.

So every now operation to get to now echelon form involves a "nultiply echelon form involves a "nultiply and subtract" combination -> call him one operation one operation To make $a_{21} = 0$, we have the following:

1. One division $\frac{\alpha_{21}}{\alpha_{11}}$

2. (n-1) subtractions $a_{2j} - \frac{a_{2j}}{a_{11}} a_{2j}$ $2 \le j \le n$

(: we don't need to perform it for j=1, since we know it is going to become zero.)

So a total of n operations.

Similarly for a_{31} , a_{41} , ..., a_{n1} .

Thus, to make the first column into now echelon form, we need

n(n-1) operations.

The next stage we do the same thing for (n-1) x (n-1) sized submatrix, and so we perform

 $(n-1)^2 - (n-1)$

number of operations.

Counting them up we have:

$$\frac{1^{2} + 2^{2} + \dots + n^{2} - (1 + 2 + \dots + n)}{6} = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6} - \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{n^{3} - n}{3}.$$

Now if we had the augmented matrix we then have additionally:

Back - substitutions: No. of operations Rown: one unknown, so one division Row n-1: one subtraction, one división Rown-2: two subtractions, one division : N-1 subtractions, Row 1 So totally: ((n-1) + ...+1) + [1+2+...+n] $\underbrace{\left(n-1\right)\left(n-2\right)}_{2}+n(n$ $= n^2$ So totally, $\frac{n^2 n}{3} + n^2$ steps to solve Ax=b.

In contrast, suppose we have the decomposition A = LU.

Then solving Az=b involves frist solving Lc=b and then Uz=c.

Land U are triangular, so the back / forward substitution takes

n(n+1) steps each, so totally

 $n^2 + n$.

Of course, to get the 1 & U matrices we need $\frac{n^3-n}{3}$ steps, but the advantage comes when we want to solve $A \times = \bar{b}$ for various

choices of \bar{b} . In using the augmented method, matrix, whe need to go therough $\frac{n^3-n}{3}$ + n^2 steps for every \bar{b} . So if we wish to solve $Ax=\bar{b}_1$, $Ax=\bar{b}_2$, ..., $Ax=\bar{b}_k$ we perform $k\left(\frac{n^3-n}{3}+n^2\right)$ operations.

But the A = LU method, we do
this ONCE, taking $\frac{n^3-n}{3}$ steps, and
the two triangular systems Lc = b, Ux = c are solved in $\frac{n^2+n}{2}$ steps
each, so a total f $\frac{n^3-n}{2} + k \cdot (n^2+n)$ steps.

Vector spaces

A (rector space is a set V on which are defined two operations:

-) addition, denoted by +
- 2) scalar multiplication, denoted by

(or omitted)

subject to the following rules:

given u, v, w in V and scalars

c, d ER:

- 1) The sum of u and v, i.e., u+v EV (closure under oddition)
- 2) U+V =V+U (commutativity
 of addition)
- 3) (u+v)+w= u+(v+w) (associativity of addition)
- 4) There is an element OEV such that

- 0+ u = u for all u & V. (additive identity)
- 5) For each us V, there is a vector
 -u in V such that u + (-u) = 0(additive inverse)
- 6) For every CER, UEV, the product

 C.U EV (dosed under

 (rater multin)
 - 7) c(u+v) = eu + ev | l distributionity of
 Scalar mult. over
 vector addition)
- 8) (c+d)u = eu +du
 - 9) c(du) = (cd)u (Associativity of scalar mult.)
- 10) 1.u = u. . (Multiplicative identity)

Examples

- 1) \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^2 , \mathbb{R}^n , $\mathbb{N}_2(\mathbb{R})$
- 2) The set P of polynomials with coefficients in IR.
- 3) The set of all functions f:[0,1] -IR
- 4) Set of all sequences { (an) no, 1 au 61R}

NOTE: Elements of a vector space are called "vectors". Ihis does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always mean we are talking about the does not always the does not always are exampled to the does not always are a