

**LECTURE 18****DIRECT SOLUTIONS TO LINEAR ALGEBRAIC SYSTEMS - CONTINUED****Ill-conditioning of Matrices**

- There is no clear cut or precise definition of an ill-conditioned matrix.

**Effects of ill-conditioning**

- Roundoff error accrues in the calculations
- Can potentially result in very inaccurate solutions
- Small variation in matrix coefficients causes large variations in the solution

**Detection of ill-conditioning in a matrix**

- An inaccurate solution for  $X$  can satisfy an ill-conditioned matrix quite well!
  - Apply back substitution to check for ill-conditioning
    - Solve  $AX = B$  through Gauss or other direct method  $\rightarrow X_{poor}$
    - Back substitute  $AX_{poor} \rightarrow B_{poor}$
    - Comparing we find that  $B_{poor} \approx B$

- Back substitution is *not* a good detection technique.
- The effects of ill-conditioning are very subtle!
- Examine the inverse of matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ 
  - If there are elements of  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  which are many orders of magnitude larger than the original matrix,  $\mathbf{A}$ , then  $\mathbf{A}$  is probably ill-conditioned
  - It is always best to normalize the rows of the original matrix such that the maximum magnitude is of order 1
  - Evaluate  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}$  using the same method with which you are solving the system of equations. Now compute  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$  and compare the results to  $\mathbf{I}$ . If there's a significant deviation, then the presence of serious roundoff exists!
  - Compute  $(\mathbf{A}^{-1})^{-1}$  using the same method with which you are solving the system of equations. This is a more severe test of roundoff since it is accumulated both in the original inversion and the re-inversion.

- Can also evaluate ill-conditioning by examining the *normalized determinant*. The matrix may be ill-conditioned when:

$$\frac{\det \mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}^2}} \ll 1$$

where

$$\text{Euclidean Norm of } \mathbf{A} \equiv \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}^2}$$

- If the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is *diagonally dominant*, i.e. the absolute values of the diagonal terms  $\geq$  the sum of the off-diagonal terms for each row, then the matrix is not ill-conditioned

$$|a_{ii}| \geq \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N |a_{ij}| \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

- Effects of ill-conditioning are most serious in large dense matrices (e.g. especially those obtained in such problems as curve fitting by least squares)
- Sparse banded matrices which result from Finite Difference and Finite Element methods are typically much better conditioned (i.e. can solve fairly large sets of equations without excessive roundoff error problems)
- Ways to overcome ill-conditioning
  - Make sure you pivot!
  - Use large word size (use double precision)
  - Can use error correction schemes to improve the accuracy of the answers
  - Use iterative methods

## Factor Method (Cholesky Method)

- Problem with Gauss elimination
  - Right hand side “load” vector,  $\mathbf{B}$ , must be available at the time of matrix triangulation
  - If  $\mathbf{B}$  is not available during the triangulation process, the entire triangulation process must be repeated!
  - Procedure is not well suited for solving problems in which  $\mathbf{B}$  changes

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{B}_1 \Rightarrow O(N^3) + O(N^2) \text{ steps}$$

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{B}_2 \Rightarrow O(N^3) + O(N^2) \text{ steps}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{B}_R \Rightarrow O(N^3) + O(N^2) \text{ steps}$$

- Using Gauss elimination,  $O(N^3R)$  operations, where  $N$  = size of the system of equation and  $R$  = the number of different load vectors which must be solved for
- Concept of the factor method is to facilitate the solution of multiple right hand sides without having to go through a re-triangulation process for each  $\mathbf{B}_r$

**Factorization step**

- Given  $\mathbf{A}$ , find  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  such that

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Q}$$

where  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  are all  $N \times N$  matrices

- We note that  $|\mathbf{A}| \neq 0 \Rightarrow |\mathbf{P}||\mathbf{Q}| \neq 0$  and therefore neither  $\mathbf{P}$  nor  $\mathbf{Q}$  can be singular

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & p_{13} \\ p_{21} & p_{22} & p_{23} \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} \end{bmatrix} \bullet \begin{bmatrix} q_{11} & q_{12} & q_{13} \\ q_{21} & q_{22} & q_{23} \\ q_{31} & q_{32} & q_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

- We can only have  $N^2$  unknowns!
  - Define  $\mathbf{P}$  as lower triangular
  - Define  $\mathbf{Q}$  as upper triangular
- Now we have  $N^2 + N$  unknowns

- Reduce the number of unknowns by selecting either
  - $p_{ii} = 1 \quad i = 1, N \Rightarrow$  Doolittle Method
  - $q_{ii} = 1 \quad i = 1, N \Rightarrow$  Crout Method
- Now we only have  $N^2$  unknowns! We can solve for all unknown elements of  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  by proceeding from left to right and top to bottom

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ p_{21} & 1 & 0 \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \bullet \begin{bmatrix} q_{11} & q_{12} & q_{13} \\ 0 & q_{22} & q_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & q_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_{11} & q_{12} & q_{13} \\ p_{21}q_{11} & p_{21}q_{12} + q_{22} & p_{21}q_{13} + q_{23} \\ p_{31}q_{11} & p_{31}q_{12} + p_{32}q_{22} & p_{31}q_{13} + p_{32}q_{23} + q_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

- Factorization proceeds from left to right and then top to bottom as:
  - Red → current unknown being solved
  - Blue → unknown value *already* solved

$$a_{11} = q_{11}$$

$$a_{12} = q_{12}$$

$$a_{13} = q_{13}$$

$$a_{21} = p_{21}q_{11}$$

$$a_{22} = p_{21}q_{12} + q_{22}$$

$$a_{23} = p_{21}q_{13} + q_{23}$$

$$a_{31} = p_{31}q_{11}$$

$$a_{32} = p_{31}q_{12} + p_{32}q_{22}$$

$$a_{33} = p_{31}q_{13} + p_{32}q_{23} + q_{33}$$



- We can compute the elements of **P** and **Q** and store them directly into the old **A** matrix as the procedure progresses

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{PQ}$$

where

**P** = lower triangular matrix → rename **L**

**Q** = upper triangular matrix → rename **U**

- Therefore renaming these matrices

$$\mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}$$

$$\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$$

we note that **A** has been factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{LU}$$

- Now considering the equation to be solved

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{B}$$

- However  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{LU}$  where  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  are known

$$(\mathbf{LU})\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}$$

**Forward/backward substitution procedures to obtain a solution**

- Changing the order in which the product is formed

$$\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{UX}) = \mathbf{B}$$

- Now let

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{UX}$$

- Hence we have two systems of simultaneous equations

$$\mathbf{LY} = \mathbf{B}$$

$$\mathbf{UX} = \mathbf{Y}$$

- Apply a forward substitution sweep to solve for  $Y$  for the system of equations

$$LY = B$$

- Apply a backward substitution sweep to solve for  $X$  for the system of equations

$$UX = Y$$

### Notes on Factorization Methods

- Procedure
  - Perform the factorization by solving for  $L$  and  $U$
  - Perform the sequential forward and backward substitution procedures to solve for  $Y$  and  $X$
- The factor method is very similar to Gauss elimination although the order in which the operations are carried out is somewhat different.
- Number of operations
  - $O(N^3)$  for LU decomposition (same as triangulation for Gauss)
  - $O(N^2)$  for forward/backward substitution (same as backward sweep for Gauss)

### Advantages of LU factorization over Gauss Elimination

- Can solve for any load vector  $\mathbf{B}$  at any time with  $O(N^2)$  operations (other than triangulation which is done *only once* with  $O(N^3)$  operations)
- Generally has somewhat smaller roundoff error

### Example comparing costs

- If we are solving  $R$  systems of  $N \times N$  equations in which the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  stays the same and only the vector  $\mathbf{B}$  changes, compare the overall costs for Gauss elimination and LU factorization
- Gauss Elimination costs

$$\text{Triangulation Cost} = R [O(N^3)]$$

$$\text{Back Substitution Cost} = R[O(N^2)]$$

$$\text{Total Cost} = R[O(N^3) + O(N^2)]$$

$$\text{Total Cost for Large } N \cong R O(N^3)$$

- LU factorization costs

$$\text{LU Factorization Cost} = [O(N^3)]$$

$$\text{Back/Forward Substitution Cost} = R[O(N^2)]$$

$$\text{Total Cost} = [O(N^3) + R O(N^2)]$$

$$\text{Total Cost for } R \gg N \cong R O(N^2)$$

- Considering some typical values for  $N$  and  $R$

$N$	$R$	Gauss Elim.	LU Factorization	Ratio of Costs
$N$	$R$	$O(RN^3)$	$O(RN^2)$	$O(N)$
1,000	5,000	$5 \times 10^{12}$	$5 \times 10^9$	1,000
$10^5$	$10^6$	$10^{21}$	$10^{16}$	100,000

- We can also implement LU factorization (decomposition) in banded mode and the savings compared to banded Gauss elimination would be  $O(M)$  (where  $M$  = bandwidth)

## Other Factorization Methods for Symmetrical Matrices

- Solve  $\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{B}$  assuming that  $\mathbf{A}$  is symmetrical, i.e

$$\mathbf{A}^T = \mathbf{A} \quad \text{or} \quad a_{ij} = a_{ji}$$

### Cholesky Square Root Method

- Requires that  $\mathbf{A}$  is symmetrical ( $\mathbf{A}^T = \mathbf{A}$ ) and positive definite ( $\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U} > c$  where  $\mathbf{U}$  = any vector and  $c$  is a positive number.
- First step is to decompose the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^T \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}$$

- Diagonal terms on  $\mathbf{L}$  or  $\mathbf{U}$  don't equal unity

- We note that  $\mathbf{A}$  contains 6 independent entries and that  $\mathbf{L}$  contains 6 unknowns and therefore we can perform the factorization

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} l_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ l_{21} & l_{22} & 0 \\ l_{31} & l_{32} & l_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

- Substituting the factored form of the matrix and changing the order in which products are taken

$$\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{L}^T\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{B}$$

- Let  $\mathbf{L}^T\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Y}$  and substitute
- Now sequentially solve

$$\mathbf{L}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{B} \quad \text{by forward substitution}$$

$$\mathbf{L}^T\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Y} \quad \text{by backward substitution}$$

### LDL<sup>T</sup> Method

- Decompose  $A = LDL^T$ 
  - Where  $L$  is a lower triangular matrix
  - Where  $D$  = diagonal matrix
- Set the diagonal terms of  $L$  to unity
- Solving for the elements of  $L$  and  $D$

$$A = LDL^T$$

- Substituting and changing the order in which the products are formed

$$L(DL^T X) = B$$

- Now let

$$DL^T X = Y$$



- Now sequentially solve

$$\mathbf{LY} = \mathbf{B} \quad \text{by forward substitution}$$

$$\mathbf{L}^T\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{Y} \quad \text{by backward substitution}$$

- Note that  $\mathbf{D}^{-1} = 1/\text{diagonal terms}$  and are easily computed

## Computation of the Determinant for Factorization Methods

- Notes

- If  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{LU} \Rightarrow |\mathbf{A}| = |\mathbf{L}||\mathbf{U}|$

- The determinant of a triangularized matrix equals the product of the diagonal terms

- In case of LU factorization

$$|\mathbf{A}| = \prod_{i=1}^n l_{ii} \quad (\text{Crout})$$

$$|\mathbf{A}| = \prod_{i=1}^n u_{ii} \quad (\text{Doolittle})$$

- In case of  $\mathbf{LDL}^T$  decomposition

$$|\mathbf{A}| = |\mathbf{D}| = \prod_{i=1}^n d_{ii}$$

- For Gauss Elimination, simply keep a running product of the *pivot elements*.