

Matrix Decomposition and Applications

Matrix Decomposition and Applications

BY
Jun Lu

Matrix Decomposition and Applications

Jun Lu

JUN.LU.LOCKY@GMAIL.COM

In 1954, Alston S. Householder published *Principles of Numerical Analysis*, a pioneering work on matrix decomposition, specifically favoring (block) LU decomposition—the factorization of a matrix into the product of lower and upper triangular matrices. Over time, matrix decomposition has evolved into a core technology in machine learning, driven significantly by the advancement of the backpropagation algorithm for fitting neural networks. The primary goal of this book is to provide a self-contained introduction to concepts and mathematical tools in numerical linear algebra and matrix analysis, facilitating a seamless introduction to matrix decomposition techniques and their applications in subsequent sections. However, acknowledging the limitations of coverage, particularly regarding the analysis of Euclidean space, Hermitian space, Hilbert space, and complex domain considerations, readers are directed to the linear algebra literature for a more comprehensive exploration of related fields.

This book functions as a concise overview, emphasizing the significance of key matrix decomposition methods such as LU, QR, and SVD. It delves into the origin and complexity of these methods, shedding light on their modern applications. In contrast to many linear algebra textbooks where matrix decomposition methods are treated as incidental “byproducts,” this work focuses on these methods, with principal ideas serving as fundamental tools for them. The mathematical prerequisite is a first course in linear algebra, and beyond this foundational background, the development is self-contained, featuring rigorous proofs throughout.

Keywords

Existence and computing of matrix decompositions, Complexity, Floating point operations (flops), Low-rank approximation, Pivot, LU decomposition for nonzero leading principal minors, Data distillation, CR decomposition, CUR/Skeleton decomposition, Interpolative decomposition, Biconjugate decomposition, Coordinate transformation, Hessenberg decomposition, ULV decomposition, URV decomposition, Rank decomposition, Gram-Schmidt process, Householder reflector, Givens rotation, Rank-revealing decomposition, Cholesky decomposition and update/downdate, Eigenvalue problems, Alternating least squares, Randomized algorithm.

Acknowledgement: We express our gratitude to Gilbert Strang for posing the problem articulated in Corollary 6.2, reviewing the manuscript of the book, providing valuable insights and references regarding the three factorizations stemming from the elimination steps, and generously sharing the manuscript of [Strang and Drucker \(2021\)](#). The author acknowledges the collaboration of Joerg Osterrieder, Christine P. Chai, and Xuanyu Ye in developing the Bayesian approach for nonnegative matrix factorization and (intervened) interpolative decomposition. This collaboration has illuminated the structure of numerous sections within the book.



ix




Figure 2: Matrix Decomposition World Map Under Conditions.

Contents

Introduction and Background	1
I Gaussian Elimination	10
1 LU Decomposition	12
1.1 LU Decomposition	13
1.2 Relation to Gaussian Elimination	14
1.3 Existence of the LU Decomposition without Permutation	17
1.4 Existence of the LU Decomposition with Permutation	18
1.5 Bandwidth Preserving in the LU Decomposition without Permutation	20
1.6 Block LU Decomposition	21
1.7 Application: Linear System via the LU Decomposition	21
1.8 Application: Computing the Inverse of Nonsingular Matrices	22
1.9 Application: Computing the Determinant	22
1.10 Pivoting	23
1.10.1 Partial Pivoting	23
1.10.2 Complete Pivoting	24
1.10.3 Rook Pivoting	25
1.11 Rank-Revealing LU Decomposition	25
Chapter 1 Problems	26
2 Cholesky Decomposition	28
2.1 Cholesky Decomposition	29
2.2 Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Recursive Calculation	29
2.3 Sylvester's Criterion: Leading Principal Minors of PD Matrices	32
2.4 Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via the LU Decomposition without Permutation	34
2.4.1 Diagonal Values of the Upper Triangular Matrix	35
2.4.2 Block Cholesky Decomposition	36

2.5	Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Induction	36
2.6	Uniqueness of the Cholesky Decomposition	37
2.7	Last Words on Positive Definite Matrices	38
2.8	Decomposition for Semidefinite Matrices	38
2.9	Application: Rank-One Update/Downdate	40
2.9.1	Rank-One Update	40
2.9.2	Rank-One Downdate	42
2.10	Application: Indefinite Rank Two Update	43
Chapter 2	Problems	43
II	Triangularization, Orthogonalization, and Gram-Schmidt Process	46
3	QR Decomposition	48
3.1	QR Decomposition	49
3.2	Project a Vector Onto Another Vector	49
3.3	Project a Vector Onto a Plane	50
3.4	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process	50
3.5	Orthogonal vs Orthonormal	52
3.6	Computing the Reduced QR Decomposition via CGS and MGS	53
3.7	Computing the Full QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process . .	57
3.8	Dependent Columns	58
3.9	QR with Column Pivoting: Column-Pivoted QR (CPQR)	58
3.9.1	A Simple CPQR via CGS	59
3.9.2	A Practical CPQR via CGS	60
3.10	QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-One Deficiency	60
3.11	QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-r Deficiency*	61
3.12	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Householder Reflector	62
3.13	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Givens Rotation	66
3.14	Uniqueness of the QR Decomposition	70
3.15	LQ Decomposition	71
3.16	Two-Sided Orthogonal Decomposition	72
3.17	Rank-One Changes	73
3.18	Appending or Deleting a Column	75
3.19	Appending or Deleting a Row	77
Chapter 3	Problems	79
4	UTV Decomposition: ULV and URV Decomposition	80
4.1	UTV Decomposition	81
4.2	Complete Orthogonal Decomposition	83
4.3	Application: Row Rank equals Column Rank via UTV	83
Chapter 4	Problems	85

III	Data Interpretation and Information Distillation	86
5	CR Decomposition	88
5.1	CR Decomposition	89
5.2	Existence of the CR Decomposition	89
5.3	Reduced Row Echelon Form (RREF)	90
5.4	Rank Decomposition	92
5.5	Application: Rank and Trace of an Idempotent Matrix	93
	Chapter 5 Problems	93
6	Skeleton/CUR Decomposition	94
6.1	Skeleton/CUR Decomposition	95
6.2	Existence of the Skeleton Decomposition	95
	Chapter 6 Problems	97
7	Interpolative Decomposition (ID)	98
7.1	Interpolative Decomposition (ID)	99
7.2	Existence of the Column Interpolative Decomposition	100
7.3	Row ID and Two-Sided ID	103
	Chapter 7 Problems	104
IV	Reduction to Hessenberg, Tridiagonal, and Bidiagonal Form	106
8	Hessenberg Decomposition	108
8.1	Hessenberg Decomposition	110
8.2	Similarity Transformation and Orthogonal Similarity Transformation	111
8.3	Existence of the Hessenberg Decomposition	112
8.4	Properties of the Hessenberg Decomposition	115
	Chapter 8 Problems	117
9	Tridiagonal Decomposition	118
9.1	Tridiagonal Decomposition: Hessenberg in Symmetric Matrices	119
9.2	Properties of the Tridiagonal Decomposition	119
	Chapter 9 Problems	120
10	Bidiagonal Decomposition	122
10.1	Bidiagonal Decomposition	123
10.2	Existence of the Bidiagonal Decomposition: Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization	123
10.3	Connection to Tridiagonal Decomposition	129
	Chapter 10 Problems	130
V	Eigenvalue Problem	132
11	Eigenvalue and Jordan Decomposition	134
11.1	Eigenvalue and Jordan Decomposition	135

11.2	Existence of the Eigenvalue Decomposition	135
11.3	Jordan Decomposition	136
11.4	Application: Computing Fibonacci Numbers	138
	Chapter 11 Problems	140
12	Schur Decomposition	142
12.1	Schur Decomposition	143
12.2	Existence of the Schur Decomposition	143
12.3	Other Forms of the Schur Decomposition	145
	Chapter 12 Problems	146
13	Spectral Decomposition (Theorem)	148
13.1	Spectral Decomposition (Theorem)	149
13.2	Existence of the Spectral Decomposition	149
13.3	Uniqueness of Spectral Decomposition	155
13.4	Other Forms, Connecting Eigenvalue Decomposition*	155
13.5	Skew-Symmetric Matrix and its Properties*	162
13.6	Applications	166
13.6.1	Application: Eigenvalue of Projection Matrix	166
13.6.2	Application: An Alternative Definition of PD and PSD of Matrices	167
13.6.3	Proof for Semidefinite Rank-Revealing Decomposition	168
13.6.4	Application: Cholesky Decomposition via the QR Decomposition and the Spectral Decomposition	169
13.6.5	Application: Unique Power Decomposition of Positive Definite Matrices	169
	Chapter 13 Problems	170
14	Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)	172
14.1	Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)	173
14.2	Existence of the SVD	173
14.3	Properties of the SVD	176
14.3.1	Four Subspaces in SVD	176
14.3.2	Relationship between Singular Values and Determinant	178
14.3.3	Orthogonal Equivalence	178
14.3.4	SVD for QR	178
14.4	Polar Decomposition	179
14.5	Application: Least Squares via the Full QR Decomposition, UTV, SVD	180
14.6	Application: Principal Component Analysis (PCA) via the Spectral Decomposition and the SVD	183
14.7	Application: Low-Rank Approximation	186
	Chapter 14 Problems	188

VI	Special Topics	190
15	Transformation in Matrix Decomposition	192
15.1	An Overview of Matrix Multiplication	193
15.2	Eigenvalue Decomposition	193
15.3	Spectral Decomposition	194
15.4	SVD	195
15.5	Polar Decomposition	196
	Chapter 15 Problems	197
16	Alternating Least Squares (ALS)	198
16.1	Preliminary: Least Squares Approximations	199
16.2	Netflix Recommender and Matrix Factorization	202
16.3	Regularization: Extension to General Matrices	207
16.4	Missing Entries and Rank-One Update	208
16.5	Vector Inner Product	210
16.6	Gradient Descent	211
16.7	Regularization: A Geometrical Interpretation	214
16.8	Stochastic Gradient Descent	216
16.9	Bias Term	218
16.10	Movie Recommender	220
	Chapter 16 Problems	223
17	Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)	224
17.1	Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)	225
17.2	NMF via Multiplicative Update (MU)	225
17.3	Regularization	226
17.4	Initialization	228
17.5	Movie Recommender Context	228
	Chapter 17 Problems	229
18	Biconjugate Decomposition	230
18.1	Existence of the Biconjugate Decomposition	231
18.2	Properties of the Biconjugate Decomposition	235
18.3	Connection to Well-Known Decomposition Methods	236
18.3.1	LDU Decomposition	236
18.3.2	Cholesky Decomposition	237
18.3.3	QR Decomposition	238
18.3.4	SVD	239
18.4	Proof General Term Formula of Wedderburn Sequence	240
	Chapter 18 Problems	241

List of Figures

1	Matrix Decomposition World Map.	ix
2	Matrix Decomposition World Map Under Conditions.	x
3	Two pairs of orthogonal subspaces in \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m . $\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) + \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) = n$ and $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = m$. The null space component goes to zero as $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The row space component goes to column space as $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_r = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_r + \mathbf{x}_n) = \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$	7
2.1	Demonstration of different factorizations on positive definite matrix \mathbf{A}	39
3.1	Project a vector onto a line and a space.	50
3.2	The Gram-Schmidt process.	52
3.3	CGS vs MGS in 3-dimensional space, where \mathbf{q}'_2 is parallel to \mathbf{q}_2 so that projecting on \mathbf{q}_2 is equivalent to projecting on \mathbf{q}'_2	56
3.4	Comparison between the reduced and full QR decompositions.	58
3.5	Comparison between the reduced and full CPQR decompositions.	59
3.6	Demonstration of the Householder reflector. The Householder reflector obtained by $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$, where $\ \mathbf{u}\ = 1$ will reflect vector \mathbf{x} along the plane perpendicular to \mathbf{u} : $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{x}_u \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_v - \mathbf{x}_u$	63
3.7	Demonstration of two Givens rotations.	66
6.1	Demonstration of the skeleton decomposition of a matrix.	95
7.1	Demonstration of the column ID of a matrix, where the yellow vectors denote the linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , white entries denote zero, and purple entries denote one.	99
10.1	Demonstration of LHC bidiagonalization of a matrix.	128
10.2	Demonstration of Three-Step bidiagonalization of a matrix.	129
10.3	Comparison of the complexity among the three bidiagonal methods. When $m > 2n$, LHC is preferred; when $n < m < 2n$, the Three-Step method is preferred though the improvement is small enough.	130

14.1	Comparison between the reduced and full SVD.	174
14.2	Orthonormal bases that diagonalize \mathbf{A} from SVD.	177
15.1	Eigenvalue Decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}$: \mathbf{X}^{-1} undergoes a transformation into a different coordinate system, followed by stretching with $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, and then transforming back with \mathbf{X} . \mathbf{X}^{-1} and \mathbf{X} are nonsingular, which will change the basis of the system, and the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 will not be preserved. In other words, the angle between \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 is different from the angle between \mathbf{v}'_1 and \mathbf{v}'_2 . The lengths of \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are also not preserved, that is, $\ \mathbf{v}_1\ \neq \ \mathbf{v}'_1\ $ and $\ \mathbf{v}_2\ \neq \ \mathbf{v}'_2\ $	194
15.2	Spectral Decomposition $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$: \mathbf{Q}^\top rotates or reflects, $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ stretches the cycle to an ellipse, and \mathbf{Q} rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{Q}^\top and \mathbf{Q} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 , and their lengths.	194
15.3	SVD $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$: \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{U} rotate or reflect, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ stretches the circle to an ellipse. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{U} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 , and their lengths.	195
15.4	$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$ from SVD or Polar decomposition: \mathbf{V}^\top rotates or reflects, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ stretches the cycle to an ellipse, and \mathbf{V} rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{V} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 , and their lengths.	196
15.5	Polar decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_l\mathbf{S}$: \mathbf{V}^\top rotates or reflects, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ stretches the cycle to an ellipse, and \mathbf{V} rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top , \mathbf{V} , and \mathbf{Q}_l only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 , and their lengths.	196
16.1	Three functions.	200
16.2	Figure 16.2(a) shows surface and contour plots for a specific function (blue=low, yellow=high), where the upper graph is the surface plot, and the lower one is the projection of it (i.e., contour). Figure 16.2(b): $-\nabla L(\mathbf{z})$ pushes the loss to decrease for the convex function $L(\mathbf{z})$	215
16.3	Constrained gradient descent with $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. The green vector \mathbf{w} represents the projection of \mathbf{v}_1 into $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$, where \mathbf{v}_1 is the component of $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z})$ that is perpendicular to \mathbf{z}_1 . The image on the right illustrates the next step after the update in the left picture. \mathbf{z}^* denotes the optimal solution of $\{\min l(\mathbf{z})\}$	215
16.4	Constrained gradient descent with $\ \mathbf{z}\ _1 \leq C$, where the red dot denotes the breakpoint in ℓ_1 -norm. The right picture illustrates the next step after the update in the left picture. \mathbf{z}^* denotes the optimal solution of $\{\min l(\mathbf{z})\}$	217
16.5	Bias terms in alternating least squares, where the yellow entries denote ones (which are fixed) and cyan entries denote the added features to fit the bias terms. The dotted boxes provide an example of how the bias terms work.	219
16.6	Comparison of training and validation error for the “MovieLens 100K” data set with different reduction dimensions and regularization parameters.	221

16.7	Distribution of the insample and outsample using cosine and Pearson similarity, and the Precision-Recall curves for them.	222
18.1	“Project” a vector onto a line and onto a space. Compare to the Gram-Schmidt process in Figure 3.2 (p. 52).	233

Introduction and Background

Matrix decomposition has evolved into a fundamental technology in statistics (Banerjee and Roy, 2014; Gentle, 1998), optimization (Gill et al., 2021), and machine learning (Goodfellow et al., 2016; Bishop, 2006), particularly in deep learning. This prominence is attributed to advancements such as the backpropagation algorithm for neural network fitting and the utilization of low-rank neural networks in efficient deep learning. The primary objective of this book is to provide a self-contained introduction to the concepts and mathematical tools of numerical linear algebra and matrix analysis in order to seamlessly introduce matrix decomposition techniques and their applications in subsequent sections. However, we clearly realize our inability to cover all the useful and interesting results concerning matrix decomposition and given the paucity of scope to present this discussion, e.g., the separated analysis of the Euclidean space, Hermitian space, and Hilbert space. We refer the reader to literature in the field of linear algebra for a more detailed introduction to the related fields. Some excellent examples include Householder (2006); Trefethen and Bau III (1997); Strang (2009); Stewart (2000); Gentle (2007); Higham (2002); Quarteroni et al. (2010); Golub and Van Loan (2013); Beck (2017); Gallier and Quaintance (2017); Boyd and Vandenberghe (2018); Strang (2019); van de Geijn and Myers (2020); Strang (2021). It is crucial to emphasize that this book specifically focuses on presenting compact proofs of the existence of matrix decomposition methods. For a deeper exploration of topics such as reducing calculation complexity, rigorous discussions in various applications, examples, the practical significance of each matrix decomposition method, and preliminary insights into tensor decomposition, readers are encouraged to consult Lu (2021c).

A matrix decomposition involves breaking down a complex matrix into its constituent parts, simplifying the representation. The underlying principle of the decompositional approach to matrix computation is that it is not the business of the matrix algorithmists to solve particular problems, but it is an approach that can simplify more complex matrix operations which can be performed on the decomposed parts rather than on the original matrix itself. At a general level, a matrix decomposition task for matrix \mathbf{A} can be formulated as follows:

- $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}$: Here, \mathbf{Q} is an orthogonal matrix that contains the same column space as \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{U} is a relatively simple and sparse matrix used for reconstructing \mathbf{A} .
- $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{Q}^\top$: In this case, \mathbf{Q} is orthogonal such that \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{T} are *similar matrices*¹ that share essential properties such as same eigenvalues, and sparsity. Additionally, working with \mathbf{T} is a less complex task than working with \mathbf{A} .
- $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}$: In this formulation, \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are orthogonal matrices such that the columns of \mathbf{U} and the rows of \mathbf{V} form orthonormal bases for the column space and row space of \mathbf{A} , respectively.
- $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} \begin{smallmatrix} m \times n \\ \mathbf{C} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} m \times r \\ \mathbf{F} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} r \times n \\ \mathbf{D} \end{smallmatrix}$: Here, \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} are full-rank matrices capable of reducing the memory storage requirements for \mathbf{A} . In practical applications, a low-rank approximation, $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{D} \begin{smallmatrix} m \times k \\ \mathbf{F} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} k \times n \\ \mathbf{B} \end{smallmatrix}$, where $k < r$ is the *numerical rank* of the matrix, proves beneficial. This approximation allows more economical storage of the matrix \mathbf{A} , requiring $k(m+n)$ floats instead of mn numbers. Additionally, it facilitates efficient computation of

1. See Definition 8.2 (p. 111) for a rigorous definition.

matrix-vector products, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, through intermediate steps involving $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{c}$. This approximation method is also valuable for data interpretation and other computational tasks.

- Although typically computationally demanding, a matrix decomposition can be leveraged for solving new problems related to the original matrix in various contexts. For instance, once the factorization of \mathbf{A} is obtained, it can be reused to solve the set of linear systems, $\{\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k\}$.
- More generally, a matrix decomposition aids in understanding the internal implications and inherent logic of operations involving matrix multiplication. Each constituent contributes to a geometrical transformation, as discussed in Section 15 (p. 192).

The matrix decomposition algorithms can be categorized into several types. Here, we delineate six fundamental categories:

1. Factorizations stemming from Gaussian elimination, including the LU decomposition and its positive definite alternative - Cholesky decomposition;
2. Factorizations achieved by orthogonalizing either the columns or the rows of a matrix, allowing effective data representation on an orthonormal basis;
3. Factorizations involving skeleton matrices, where a subset of columns or rows can adequately represent the entire data with minimal reconstruction error, while preserving the sparsity and nonnegativity of the matrices;
4. Reduction to Hessenberg, tridiagonal, or bidiagonal form, as a result, the properties of the matrices can be explored in these reduced matrices such as rank, eigenvalues, and so on;
5. Factorizations derived from the computation of matrix eigenvalues;
6. The remaining methods can be characterized as a special class of decompositions involving optimization techniques and high-level concepts, where categorization may not be immediately apparent.

The visual representations of matrix decomposition in Figure 1 and 2 establish connections among various decomposition methods based on their internal relationships. Additionally, these figures distinguish between different methods according to specific criteria or prerequisites. Further details about these visualizations are provided in the accompanying text.

Notation and preliminaries In the subsequent section, we will present and review fundamental concepts in linear algebra. Additional important notions will be introduced and elaborated upon as necessary for clarity. Readers possessing a sufficient background in matrix analysis may opt to bypass this section. Throughout the text, our focus is on real matrices. In the absence of specific conditions, the eigenvalues of the matrices under discussion are considered to be real. Furthermore, we maintain the assumption that $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$, i.e., the default matrix or vector norm is the spectral norm or ℓ_2 norm.

In all cases, scalars will be represented in a non-bold font, potentially with subscripts (e.g., a , α , α_i). Vectors will be denoted using **boldface** lowercase letters, also potentially with subscripts (e.g., $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{x}_n , \mathbf{z}), while matrices will be represented by **boldface** uppercase letters, possibly with subscripts (e.g., \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{L}_j). The i -th element of a vector \mathbf{z} will be denoted by z_i in the non-bold font. For matrix \mathbf{A} , the i -th row and j -th column value is represented

as a_{ij} . Furthermore, it will be helpful to utilize the **Matlab-style notation**, the i -th row to j -th row and k -th column to m -th column submatrix of matrix \mathbf{A} will be denoted by $\mathbf{A}_{i:j,k:m}$. In cases where the index is not continuous, with ordered subindex sets I and J , $\mathbf{A}[I, J]$ indicates the submatrix of \mathbf{A} obtained by extracting the rows and columns of \mathbf{A} indexed by I and J , respectively. Similarly, $\mathbf{A}[:, J]$ denotes the submatrix of \mathbf{A} obtained by extracting the columns of \mathbf{A} indexed by J .

And in all instances, vectors are represented in column format rather than row format. A row vector is indicated by the transpose of a column vector, denoted by \mathbf{a}^\top . A specific column vector with values is delineated by the symbol “;”, for example, $\mathbf{x} = [1; 2; 3]$ is a column vector in \mathbb{R}^3 . Similarly, a row vector with specific values is separated by the symbol “,”, e.g., $\mathbf{y} = [1, 2, 3]$ is a row vector with 3 values. Further, a column vector can be expressed as the transpose of a row vector, for instance, $\mathbf{y} = [1, 2, 3]^\top$ is a column vector.

The transpose of a matrix \mathbf{A} is denoted by \mathbf{A}^\top , and its inverse is denoted by \mathbf{A}^{-1} . The $p \times p$ identity matrix is represented by \mathbf{I}_p . A vector or matrix consisting entirely of zeros is denoted by a **boldface** zero, $\mathbf{0}$, with its size inferred from context. Alternatively, $\mathbf{0}_p$ signifies a vector of all zeros with p entries.

Definition 0.1 (Eigenvalue) *Given any vector space E and any linear map $A : E \rightarrow E$, a scalar $\lambda \in K$ is called an eigenvalue, or proper value, or characteristic value of \mathbf{A} if there is some nonzero vector $\mathbf{u} \in E$ such that*

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \lambda\mathbf{u}.$$

Definition 0.2 (Spectrum and Spectral Radius) *The set of all eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} is called the spectrum of \mathbf{A} and is denoted by $\Lambda(\mathbf{A})$. The largest magnitude of the eigenvalues is known as the spectral radius $\rho(\mathbf{A})$:*

$$\rho(\mathbf{A}) = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda(\mathbf{A})} |\lambda|.$$

Definition 0.3 (Eigenvector) *A vector $\mathbf{u} \in E$ is called an eigenvector, or proper vector, or characteristic vector of \mathbf{A} if $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and if there is some $\lambda \in K$ such that*

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \lambda\mathbf{u},$$

where the scalar λ is then an eigenvalue. And we say that \mathbf{u} is an eigenvector associated with λ .

Furthermore, the pair (λ, \mathbf{u}) mentioned above is said to be an **eigenpair**. Intuitively, the above definitions mean that multiplying matrix \mathbf{A} by the vector \mathbf{u} yields a new vector in the same direction as \mathbf{u} but scaled by a factor λ . For any eigenvector \mathbf{u} , it can be scaled by a scalar s such that $s\mathbf{u}$ remains an eigenvector of \mathbf{A} . This is why we call the eigenvector an eigenvector of \mathbf{A} associated with eigenvalue λ . To avoid ambiguity, we typically assume that the eigenvector is normalized to have length 1 and the first entry is positive (or negative), as both \mathbf{u} and $-\mathbf{u}$ are eigenvectors.

In the study of linear algebra, every vector space has a basis and every vector is a linear combination of members of the basis. We then define the span and dimension of a subspace via the basis.

Definition 0.4 (Subspace) A nonempty subset \mathcal{V} of \mathbb{R}^n is called a subspace if $x\mathbf{a} + y\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ for every $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{V}$ and every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 0.5 (Span) If every vector \mathbf{v} in subspace \mathcal{V} can be expressed as a linear combination of $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$, then $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ is said to span \mathcal{V} .

In this context, we will heavily rely on the idea of the linear independence among a set of vectors. Two equivalent definitions are provided below.

Definition 0.6 (Linearly Independent) A set of vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ is called linearly independent if there is no combination can get $x_1\mathbf{a}_1 + x_2\mathbf{a}_2 + \dots + x_m\mathbf{a}_m = \mathbf{0}$ except all x_i 's are zero. An equivalent definition is that $\mathbf{a}_1 \neq \mathbf{0}$, and for every $k > 1$, the vector \mathbf{a}_k does not belong to the span of $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1}\}$.

Definition 0.7 (Basis and Dimension) A set of vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ is called a basis of \mathcal{V} if they are linearly independent and span \mathcal{V} . Every basis of a given subspace has the same number of vectors, and the number of vectors in any basis is called the dimension of the subspace \mathcal{V} . By convention, the subspace $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ is said to have dimension zero. Furthermore, every subspace of nonzero dimension has a basis that is orthogonal, i.e., the basis of a subspace can be chosen orthogonal.

Definition 0.8 (Column Space (Range)) If \mathbf{A} is an $m \times n$ real matrix, we define the column space (or range) of \mathbf{A} to be the set spanned by its columns:

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\}.$$

And the row space of \mathbf{A} is the set spanned by its rows, which is equal to the column space of \mathbf{A}^\top :

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y}\}.$$

Definition 0.9 (Null Space (Nullspace, Kernel)) If \mathbf{A} is an $m \times n$ real matrix, we define the null space (or kernel, or nullspace) of \mathbf{A} to be the set:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

And the null space of \mathbf{A}^\top is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

The column space of \mathbf{A} and the null space of \mathbf{A}^\top both constitute subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n . In fact, every vector in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ is orthogonal to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$ and vice versa.²

Definition 0.10 (Rank) The rank of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the dimension of the column space of \mathbf{A} . That is, the rank of \mathbf{A} is equal to the maximal number of linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , and is also the maximal number of linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} . The matrix \mathbf{A} and its transpose \mathbf{A}^\top have the same rank. We say that \mathbf{A} has full

2. Every vector in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ is also orthogonal to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ and vice versa.

rank if its rank is equal to $\min\{m, n\}$. Specifically, given a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then the $m \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top$ is of rank 1. In short, the rank of a matrix is equal to:

- number of linearly independent columns;
- number of linearly independent rows;
- and remarkably, these are always the same (see Theorem 0.1).

Definition 0.11 (Orthogonal Complement in General) The orthogonal complement \mathcal{V}^\perp of a subspace \mathcal{V} contains every vector that is perpendicular to \mathcal{V} . That is,

$$\mathcal{V}^\perp = \{\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{u} = 0, \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{V}\}.$$

The two subspaces are disjoint and span the entire space. The dimensions of \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}^\perp add to the dimension of the entire space. Additionally, it holds that $(\mathcal{V}^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{V}$.

Definition 0.12 (Orthogonal Complement of Column Space) If \mathbf{A} is an $m \times n$ real matrix, the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$, $\mathcal{C}^\perp(\mathbf{A})$, is the subspace defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^\perp(\mathbf{A}) &= \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{v} = 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the four fundamental spaces for any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ of rank r , as delineated in Theorem 0.3. To establish the fundamental theorem of linear algebra, we first verify a crucial result: the equality between the row rank and the column rank of a matrix. This proof holds significance for subsequent developments.

Theorem 0.1: (Row Rank Equals Column Rank) The dimension of the column space of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is equal to the dimension of its row space, i.e., the row rank and the column rank of a matrix \mathbf{A} are equal.

Proof [of Theorem 0.1] We first notice that the null space of \mathbf{A} is orthogonal complementary to the row space of \mathbf{A} : $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ (where the row space of \mathbf{A} is exactly the column space of \mathbf{A}^\top), that is, vectors in the null space of \mathbf{A} are orthogonal to vectors in the row space of \mathbf{A} . To see this, suppose \mathbf{A} has rows $\{\mathbf{a}_1^\top, \mathbf{a}_2^\top, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m^\top\}$ and $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1^\top; \mathbf{a}_2^\top; \dots; \mathbf{a}_m^\top]$ is the row partition. For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$, we have $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, that is, $[\mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{a}_2^\top \mathbf{x}; \dots; \mathbf{a}_m^\top \mathbf{x}] = \mathbf{0}$. And since the row space of \mathbf{A} is spanned by $\{\mathbf{a}_1^\top, \mathbf{a}_2^\top, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m^\top\}$. Then \mathbf{x} is perpendicular to any vectors from $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ which means $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$.

Now suppose the dimension of row space of \mathbf{A} is r . Let $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r\}$ be a set of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n and form a basis for the row space. Then the r vectors $\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r\}$ are in the column space of \mathbf{A} , which are linearly independent. To see this, suppose we have a linear combination of the r vectors: $x_1 \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1 + x_2 \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2 + \dots + x_r \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r = \mathbf{0}$, that is, $\mathbf{A}(x_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + x_2 \mathbf{r}_2 + \dots + x_r \mathbf{r}_r) = \mathbf{0}$ and the vector $\mathbf{v} = x_1 \mathbf{r}_1 + x_2 \mathbf{r}_2 + \dots + x_r \mathbf{r}_r$ is in null space of \mathbf{A} . But since $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r\}$ is a basis for the row space of \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{v} is thus also in the row space of \mathbf{A} . We have shown that vectors from the null space of \mathbf{A} is perpendicular to vectors from the row space of \mathbf{A} , thus it holds that $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v} = 0$ and $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_r = 0$. Then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r$ are in the column space of \mathbf{A} , and they are linearly independent,

which means the dimension of the column space of \mathbf{A} is larger than r . This result shows that **row rank of $\mathbf{A} \leq$ column rank of \mathbf{A}** .

If we apply this process again for \mathbf{A}^\top . We will have **column rank of $\mathbf{A} \leq$ row rank of \mathbf{A}** . This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Additional insights from this proof reveal that if $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r\}$ constitutes a vector set in \mathbb{R}^n serving as a basis for the row space, then $\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r\}$ forms a basis for the column space of \mathbf{A} . We formulate this finding into the following lemma.

Lemma 0.2: (Column Basis from Row Basis) For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, suppose that $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r\}$ is a set of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n which forms a basis for the row space, then $\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r\}$ is a basis for the column space of \mathbf{A} .

For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, it can be easily verified that any vector in the row space of \mathbf{A} is orthogonal to any vector in the null space of \mathbf{A} . Suppose $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$, then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n = \mathbf{0}$, indicating that \mathbf{x}_n is perpendicular to every row of \mathbf{A} , thus validating our assertion.

Similarly, we can also show that any vector in the column space of \mathbf{A} is perpendicular to any vector in the null space of \mathbf{A}^\top . Further, the column space of \mathbf{A} together with the null space of \mathbf{A}^\top span the whole \mathbb{R}^m which is known as the fundamental theorem of linear algebra.

The fundamental theorem contains two parts, the dimension of the subspaces and the orthogonality of the subspaces. The orthogonality can be easily verified as shown above. Additionally, when the row space has dimension r , the null space has dimension $n - r$. This cannot be easily stated and we prove it in the following theorem.

Theorem 0.3: (The Fundamental Theorem of Linear Algebra) *Orthogonal Complement and Rank-Nullity Theorem:* for any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we have

- $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ is orthogonal complement to the row space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ in \mathbb{R}^n : $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = n$;
- $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ is orthogonal complement to the column space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$ in \mathbb{R}^m : $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = m$;
- For rank- r matrix \mathbf{A} , $\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = r$, that is, $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) = n - r$ and $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = m - r$.

Proof [of Theorem 0.3] Following from the proof of Theorem 0.1. Let $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r$ be a set of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n that form a basis for the row space, then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r$ is a basis for the column space of \mathbf{A} . Let $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ form a basis for the null space of \mathbf{A} . Following again from the proof of Theorem 0.1, $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$, thus, $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r$ are perpendicular to $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k$. Then, $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k\}$ is linearly independent in \mathbb{R}^n .

For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ is in the column space of \mathbf{A} . Then it can be represented as a combination of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_r$: $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}_i$ which states that $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{r}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{r}_i$ is thus in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$. Since $\{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k\}$ is a basis for the null space of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{r}_i$ can be represented by a combination of $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k$: $\mathbf{x} - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{r}_i = \sum_{j=1}^k b_j \mathbf{n}_j$, i.e., $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \mathbf{r}_i + \sum_{j=1}^k b_j \mathbf{n}_j$. That is, any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be represented by $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k\}$ and the set forms a basis for \mathbb{R}^n . Thus




Figure 3: Two pairs of orthogonal subspaces in \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m . $\dim(\mathcal{C}(A^T)) + \dim(\mathcal{N}(A)) = n$ and $\dim(\mathcal{N}(A^T)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(A)) = m$. The null space component goes to zero as $Ax_n = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The row space component goes to column space as $Ax_r = A(x_r + x_n) = b \in \mathcal{C}(A)$.

the dimension sum to n : $r + k = n$, i.e., $\dim(\mathcal{N}(A)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(A^T)) = n$. Similarly, we can prove $\dim(\mathcal{N}(A^T)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(A)) = m$. \blacksquare

Figure 3 demonstrates two pairs of such orthogonal subspaces and shows how A takes x into the column space. The dimensions of the row space of A and the null space of A add to n . And the dimensions of the column space of A and the null space of A^T add to m . The null space component goes to zero as $Ax_n = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ which is the intersection of the column space of A and the null space of A^T . Conversely, the row space component goes to the column space as $Ax_r = A(x_r + x_n) = b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Definition 0.13 (Orthogonal Matrix) A real square matrix Q is an orthogonal matrix if the inverse of Q equals the transpose of Q , that is, $Q^{-1} = Q^T$ and $QQ^T = Q^TQ = I$. In another word, suppose $Q = [q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n]$ where $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then $q_i^T q_j = \delta(i, j)$ with $\delta(i, j)$ being the Kronecker delta function. If Q contains only γ of these columns with $\gamma < n$, then $Q^T Q = I_\gamma$ stills holds with I_γ being the $\gamma \times \gamma$ identity matrix. But $QQ^T = I$ will not be true. For any vector x , the orthogonal matrix will preserve the length: $\|Qx\| = \|x\|$.

Definition 0.14 (Permutation Matrix) A permutation matrix P is a square binary matrix that has exactly one entry of 1 in each row and each column, and 0's elsewhere.

Row Point That is, the permutation matrix \mathbf{P} has the rows of the identity \mathbf{I} in any order and the order decides the sequence of the row permutation. Suppose we want to permute the rows of matrix \mathbf{A} , we simply multiply on the left by \mathbf{PA} .

Column Point Or, equivalently, the permutation matrix \mathbf{P} has the columns of the identity \mathbf{I} in any order and the order decides the sequence of the column permutation. And now, the column permutation of \mathbf{A} is to multiply on the right by \mathbf{AP} .

The permutation matrix \mathbf{P} can be more efficiently represented via a vector $J \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ of indices such that $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}[:, J]$, where \mathbf{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and notably, the elements in vector J sum to $1 + 2 + \dots + n = \frac{n^2+n}{2}$.

Example 0.1 (Permutation) Suppose,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 7 & 8 & 9 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} & 1 & \\ & & 1 \\ 1 & & \end{bmatrix}.$$

The row permutation is given by

$$\mathbf{PA} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 7 & 8 & 9 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the order of the rows of \mathbf{A} appearing in \mathbf{PA} matches the order of the rows of \mathbf{I} in \mathbf{P} . And the column permutation is given by

$$\mathbf{AP} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 \\ 6 & 4 & 5 \\ 9 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the order of the columns of \mathbf{A} appearing in \mathbf{AP} matches the order of the columns of \mathbf{I} in \mathbf{P} . \square

From an introductory linear algebra course, we note the following observation regarding the equivalent claims of nonsingular matrices.

Remark 0.4: List of Equivalence of Nonsingularity for a Matrix

For a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the following claims are equivalent:

- \mathbf{A} is nonsingular;
- \mathbf{A} is invertible, i.e., \mathbf{A}^{-1} exists;
- $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ has a unique solution $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b}$;
- $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{0}$ has a unique, trivial solution: $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$;
- Columns of \mathbf{A} are linearly independent;
- Rows of \mathbf{A} are linearly independent;
- $\det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 0$;
- $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) = 0$;
- $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, i.e., the null space is trivial;
- $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., the column space or row space span the whole \mathbb{R}^n ;
- \mathbf{A} has full rank $r = n$;

- The reduced row echelon form is $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}$;
- $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is symmetric positive definite;
- \mathbf{A} has n nonzero (positive) singular values;
- All eigenvalues are nonzero.

It will be shown important to take the above equivalence into mind, otherwise, we will easily get lost. On the other hand, the following remark also shows the equivalent claims for singular matrices.

Remark 0.5: List of Equivalence of Singularity for a Matrix

For a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with eigenpair (λ, \mathbf{u}) , the following claims are equivalent:

- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ is singular;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ is not invertible;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ has nonzero $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ solutions, and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$ is one of such solutions;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ has linearly dependent columns;
- $\det(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = 0$;
- $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})) > 0$;
- Null space of $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ is nontrivial;
- Columns of $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ are linearly dependent;
- Rows of $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ are linearly dependent;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ has rank $r < n$;
- Dimension of column space = dimension of row space = $r < n$;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})^\top (\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ is symmetric semidefinite;
- $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ has $r < n$ nonzero (positive) singular values;
- Zero is an eigenvalue of $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$.

Part I

Gaussian Elimination

LU Decomposition

Contents

1.1	LU Decomposition	13
1.2	Relation to Gaussian Elimination	14
1.3	Existence of the LU Decomposition without Permutation . . .	17
1.4	Existence of the LU Decomposition with Permutation	18
1.5	Bandwidth Preserving in the LU Decomposition without Permutation	20
1.6	Block LU Decomposition	21
1.7	Application: Linear System via the LU Decomposition	21
1.8	Application: Computing the Inverse of Nonsingular Matrices	22
1.9	Application: Computing the Determinant	22
1.10	Pivoting	23
1.10.1	Partial Pivoting	23
1.10.2	Complete Pivoting	24
1.10.3	Rook Pivoting	25
1.11	Rank-Revealing LU Decomposition	25
Chapter 1	Problems	26

1.1. LU Decomposition



One of the most well-known and foundational matrix decompositions is the LU decomposition. The results are outlined in the following theorem, and the proof of its existence will be discussed in subsequent sections.

Theorem 1.1: (LU Decomposition with Permutation) Every nonsingular $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U},$$

where \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix, \mathbf{L} is a unit lower triangular matrix (i.e., a lower triangular matrix with all 1's on the diagonal), and \mathbf{U} is a *nonsingular* upper triangular matrix.

Note that, in the subsequent text, we will present decomposition-related results in blue boxes, while other claims and theorems will be in gray boxes. This convention will be consistently applied throughout the remainder of the book without explicit notification.

Remark 1.2: Decomposition Notation

The above decomposition is applicable to any nonsingular matrix \mathbf{A} . We will see that this decomposition emerges from elimination steps involving row operations such as subtraction and row exchange; the subtractions are documented in the matrix \mathbf{L} , and the row exchanges are recorded in the matrix \mathbf{P} . To explicitly show row exchanges, the conventional form of this decomposition is $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$, where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{P}^\top$ precisely documents the row exchanges in \mathbf{A} . Otherwise, the \mathbf{P} would record the row exchanges of $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$. In our case, we will make the decomposition to be clear for matrix \mathbf{A} rather than for $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}$. However, to maintain clarity for matrix \mathbf{A} itself, rather than $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}$, we will consistently place the permutation matrix on the right-hand side of the equation throughout the text, without specific mention.

In certain cases, the use of the permutation matrix is unnecessary. This decomposition is dependent on the leading principal minors. We offer a precise definition, crucial for the subsequent illustration.

Definition 1.1 (Leading Principal Minors) Let \mathbf{A} be an $n \times n$ square matrix. A $k \times k$ submatrix of \mathbf{A} obtained by deleting the *last* $n - k$ columns and the *last* $n - k$ rows from \mathbf{A} is called a k -th order **leading principal submatrix** of \mathbf{A} , that is, the $k \times k$ submatrix taken from the top-left corner of \mathbf{A} . The determinant of the $k \times k$ leading principal submatrix is called a k -th order **leading principal minor** of \mathbf{A} .

Under mild conditions on the leading principal minors of matrix \mathbf{A} , the LU decomposition will not require the use of the permutation matrix.

Theorem 1.3: (LU Decomposition without Permutation) For any $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} , if all the leading principal minors are nonzero, i.e., $\det(\mathbf{A}_{1:k,1:k}) \neq 0$, for all

$k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U},$$

where \mathbf{L} is a unit lower triangular matrix (i.e., a lower triangular matrix with all 1's on the diagonal), and \mathbf{U} is a *nonsingular* upper triangular matrix. Specifically, this decomposition is **unique**. See Corollary 1.5.

Remark 1.4: Other Forms of the LU Decomposition without Permutation

In Theorem 1.3, we assume the leading principal minors are nonzero, in another word, this means the leading principal submatrices and the matrix \mathbf{A} are nonsingular.

Singular \mathbf{A} . In the above theorem, we assume \mathbf{A} is nonsingular as well. It's worth noting that the LU decomposition exists for singular matrices \mathbf{A} as well. This can be shown in the following section that, if matrix \mathbf{A} is singular, some pivots will be zero, and the corresponding diagonal values of \mathbf{U} will be zero.

Singular leading principal submatrices. Even if we assume matrix \mathbf{A} is nonsingular, the leading principal submatrices might be singular. Furthermore, in the scenario where certain leading principal minors are zero, the LU decomposition is still viable; however, it loses its uniqueness under these conditions.

We will discuss where this decomposition comes from in the next section. There are also generalizations of LU decomposition to non-square or singular matrices, such as rank-revealing LU decomposition. Interested readers are advised to consult Pan (2000); Miranian and Gu (2003); Dopico et al. (2006) for further discussion or we will have a short discussion in Section 1.11.

1.2. Relation to Gaussian Elimination

Solving the linear system equation $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is a basic problem in linear algebra. *Gaussian elimination* simplifies a linear system, transforming it into an upper triangular form through *elementary row transformations*. This process unfolds over $n - 1$ stages for a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. As a result, it is much easier to solve by a *backward substitution*. The elementary transformation is defined rigorously as follows.

Definition 1.2 (Elementary Transformation) *Given a square matrix \mathbf{A} , the following three transformations are referred to as **elementary row/column transformations**:*

1. *Interchanging two rows (or columns) of \mathbf{A} ;*
2. *Multiplying all elements of a row (or a column) of \mathbf{A} by some nonzero values;*
3. *Adding any row (or column) of \mathbf{A} multiplied by a nonzero number to any other row (or column);*

Specifically, the elementary row transformations of \mathbf{A} are unit lower triangular that multiply on the left of \mathbf{A} (e.g., $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{A}$), and the elementary column transformations of \mathbf{A} are unit upper triangular that multiply on the right of \mathbf{A} (e.g., $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{E}$).

The Gaussian elimination is then described by the third type (elementary row transformation) above. Suppose the upper triangular matrix obtained by Gaussian elimination is given by $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_{n-1}\mathbf{E}_{n-2}\dots\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$ ($n-1$ steps), and at the k -th stage, the k -th column of $\mathbf{E}_{k-1}\mathbf{E}_{k-2}\dots\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$ is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Gaussian elimination aims to introduce zeros below the diagonal of \mathbf{x} by

$$\mathbf{E}_k = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{z}_k \mathbf{e}_k^\top,$$

where $\mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the k -th unit basis vector, and $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{z}_k = [0, \dots, 0, z_{k+1}, \dots, z_n]^\top, \quad z_i = \frac{x_i}{x_k}, \quad \forall i \in \{k+1, \dots, n\}.$$

We realize that \mathbf{E}_k is a unit lower triangular matrix (with 1's on the diagonal) with only the k -th column of the lower submatrix being nonzero,

$$\mathbf{E}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & -z_{k+1} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & -z_n & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

And multiplying on the left by \mathbf{E}_k will introduce zeros below the diagonal:

$$\mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & -z_{k+1} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & -z_n & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_k \\ x_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_k \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For example, we write out the Gaussian elimination steps for a 4×4 matrix. For simplicity, we assume no row permutations. And in the following matrix, \boxtimes represents a value that may not be zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed.

A Trivial Gaussian Elimination For a 4×4 Matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_2} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_3} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.1)$$

$\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{E}_3\mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$

where $\mathbf{E}_1, \mathbf{E}_2$, and \mathbf{E}_3 are lower triangular matrices. Specifically, as discussed above, Gaussian transformation matrices \mathbf{E}_i 's are unit lower triangular matrices with 1's on the diagonal. This can be explained that for the k -th transformation \mathbf{E}_k , working on the matrix $\mathbf{E}_{k-1}\dots\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$, the transformation subtracts multiples of the k -th row from rows

$\{k+1, k+2, \dots, n\}$ to get zeros below the diagonal in the k -th column of the matrix. And never use rows $\{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$.

To be more concrete, for the transformation example above at stage 1, we multiply on the left by \mathbf{E}_1 so that multiples of the 1-st row are subtracted from rows 2, 3, 4 and the first entries of rows 2, 3, 4 are set to zero. Similar situations for step 2 and step 3. By defining $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{E}_1^{-1}\mathbf{E}_2^{-1}\mathbf{E}_3^{-1}$ and denoting the matrix after elimination as \mathbf{U} ,¹ we get $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$. Thus we obtain an LU decomposition for this 4×4 matrix \mathbf{A} .

Definition 1.3 (Pivot) *The first nonzero entry in the row after each elimination step is referred to **pivot**. For example, the blue crosses in Equation (1.1) represent pivots.*

However, it is possible for a_{11} (the entry (1,1) of matrix \mathbf{A}) to have a value of zero on occasion. No such matrix \mathbf{E}_1 can make the next elimination step successful. So we need to interchange the first row and the second row via a permutation matrix \mathbf{P}_1 . This is known as the *pivoting*, or simply *permutation*.

Gaussian Elimination With a Permutation In the Beginning:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}_1} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_2} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_3} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{E}_3\mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{A}
 \end{array}$$

By defining $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{E}_1^{-1}\mathbf{E}_2^{-1}\mathbf{E}_3^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1^{-1}$, the expression $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$ represents a comprehensive LU decomposition with permutation for the 4×4 matrix \mathbf{A} .

In some circumstances, other permutation matrices $\mathbf{P}_2, \mathbf{P}_3, \dots$ will appear in between the lower triangular \mathbf{E}_i 's. An illustration is provided below.

Gaussian Elimination With a Permutation In Between:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}_1} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_2} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}
 \end{array}$$

In this scenario, we find $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$. In Section 1.4 or Section 1.10.1, we will show that the interleaved permutations lead to the same form $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$, where \mathbf{P} accounts for all permutations.

1. The inverses of unit lower triangular matrices are also unit lower triangular matrices. And the products of unit lower triangular matrices are also unit lower triangular matrices.

The provided examples can be easily extended to any $n \times n$ matrix if we assume there are no row permutations in the process. And we will have $n - 1$ such lower triangular transformations. The k -th transformation \mathbf{E}_k introduces zeros below the diagonal in the k -th column of \mathbf{A} by subtracting multiples of the k -th row from rows $\{k + 1, k + 2, \dots, n\}$. Finally, by defining $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{E}_1^{-1} \mathbf{E}_2^{-1} \dots \mathbf{E}_{n-1}^{-1}$, we obtain the LU decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$ without permutation.

1.3. Existence of the LU Decomposition without Permutation

The Gaussian elimination or Gaussian transformation elucidates the basis of the LU decomposition. We then prove Theorem 1.3 rigorously, i.e., the existence of the LU decomposition without permutation by induction.

Proof [of Theorem 1.3: LU Decomposition without Permutation] We will prove by induction that every $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} with nonzero leading principal minors possesses the LU decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$. The 1×1 case is trivial by setting $\mathbf{L} = 1, \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}$, thus, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$.

Assuming that any $k \times k$ matrix \mathbf{A}_k with all the leading principal minors being nonzero has an LU decomposition without permutation, our goal is to establish that any $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ matrix \mathbf{A}_{k+1} can also be expressed in this LU decomposition form without permutation. This, once proven, completes the overall demonstration.

For any $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ matrix \mathbf{A}_{k+1} , suppose the k -th order leading principal submatrix of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} is \mathbf{A}_k with size $k \times k$. Then \mathbf{A}_k can be factored as $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{U}_k$ with \mathbf{L}_k being a unit lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{U}_k being a nonsingular upper triangular matrix from the assumption. Express \mathbf{A}_{k+1} as $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c}^\top & d \end{bmatrix}$. Then it admits the factorization:

$$\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c}^\top & d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{x}^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} & z \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{L}_{k+1} \mathbf{U}_{k+1},$$

where $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{c}^\top = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{U}_k$, $d = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} + z$, $\mathbf{L}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{x}^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, and $\mathbf{U}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{0} & z \end{bmatrix}$. From the assumption, \mathbf{L}_k and \mathbf{U}_k are nonsingular. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{L}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{x}^\top = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{U}_k^{-1}, \quad z = d - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}.$$

If, further, we could prove z is nonzero such that \mathbf{U}_{k+1} is nonsingular, we complete the proof.

Because all the leading principal minors of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} are nonzero, we have $\det(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}) = \det(\mathbf{A}_k) \cdot \det(d - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}) = \det(\mathbf{A}_k) \cdot (d - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}) \neq 0$ since $d - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}$ is a scalar. As $\det(\mathbf{A}_k) \neq 0$ from the assumption, we conclude $d - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b} \neq 0$. By substituting $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{c}^\top = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{U}_k$ into the formula, we have $d - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{y} = d - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{U}_k (\mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{U}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{y} = d - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} \neq 0$, which exactly matches the form of $z \neq 0$. Thus, we find \mathbf{L}_{k+1} with all the values on the diagonal being 1, and \mathbf{U}_{k+1} with all the values on the diagonal being nonzero

2. By the fact that if matrix \mathbf{M} has a block formulation: $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{A}) \det(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B})$.

which means \mathbf{L}_{k+1} and \mathbf{U}_{k+1} are nonsingular.³ This completes the proof. ■

We further prove that if no permutation involves, the LU decomposition is unique.

Corollary 1.5: (Uniqueness of the LU Decomposition without Permutation) Suppose the $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} has nonzero leading principal minors. Then, the LU decomposition is unique.

Proof [of Corollary 1.5] Assuming the LU decomposition is not unique, then we can find two decompositions such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}_1 \mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{L}_2 \mathbf{U}_2$, which implies $\mathbf{L}_2^{-1} \mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{U}_2 \mathbf{U}_1^{-1}$. The left of the equation is a unit lower triangular matrix and the right of the equation is an upper triangular matrix. This suggests both sides of the above equation are diagonal matrices. Since the inverse of a unit lower triangular matrix is also a unit lower triangular matrix, and the product of unit lower triangular matrices is also a unit lower triangular matrix, this results in that $\mathbf{L}_2^{-1} \mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{I}$. The equality implies that both sides are identity matrices such that $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}_2$ and $\mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{U}_2$, resulting in a contradiction. ■

In the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have shown that the diagonal values of the upper triangular matrix are all nonzero if the leading principal minors of \mathbf{A} are all nonzero. We then can formulate this decomposition in another form if we divide each row of \mathbf{U} by its corresponding diagonal value. This is called the *LDU decomposition*.

Corollary 1.6: (LDU Decomposition) For any $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} , if all the leading principal minors are nonzero, i.e., $\det(\mathbf{A}_{1:k,1:k}) \neq 0$, for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then \mathbf{A} can be **uniquely** decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{U},$$

where \mathbf{L} is a unit lower triangular matrix, \mathbf{U} is a **unit** upper triangular matrix, and \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix.

The proof is trivial that from the LU decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{R}$, we can find a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(r_{11}, r_{22}, \dots, r_{nn})$ such that $\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U}$ is a unit upper triangular matrix. Its uniqueness follows from the distinctiveness of the LU decomposition.

1.4. Existence of the LU Decomposition with Permutation

In Theorem 1.3, we require that matrix \mathbf{A} has nonzero leading principal minors. However, this is not necessary. Even when the leading principal minors are zero, nonsingular matrices still have an LU decomposition, but with an additional permutation. The proof still relies on induction. To elucidate this, we first define the *Schur complement* of a matrix.

³. A triangular matrix (upper or lower) is nonsingular if and only if all the entries on its main diagonal are nonzero.

Definition 1.4 (Schur Complement) For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, assume the entry $(1, 1)$ of \mathbf{A} is a_{11} and a_{11} is not zero, then $\mathbf{A}_2 = \mathbf{A}_{2:n, 2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n, 1} \mathbf{A}_{1, 2:n}$ is called the Schur complement of a_{11} in \mathbf{A} .

Proof [of Theorem 1.1: LU Decomposition with Permutation] We note that any 1×1 nonsingular matrix has a full LU decomposition $A = PLU$ by simply setting $P = 1$, $L = 1$, $U = A$. We will show that if every $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$ nonsingular matrix has a full LU decomposition, then this is also true for every $n \times n$ nonsingular matrix. Through induction, we prove that every nonsingular matrix possesses a full LU decomposition.

We will formulate the proof in the following order. If \mathbf{A} is nonsingular, then its row-permuted matrix \mathbf{B} is also nonsingular. And the Schur complement of b_{11} in \mathbf{B} is also nonsingular. Finally, we formulate the decomposition of \mathbf{A} by \mathbf{B} from this property.

We notice that at least one element in the first column of \mathbf{A} must be nonzero, otherwise \mathbf{A} will be singular. We can then apply a row permutation that makes the element in entry $(1, 1)$ to be nonzero. In specific terms, there exists a permutation \mathbf{P}_1 such that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{A}$, in which case $b_{11} \neq 0$. Since \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{P}_1 are both nonsingular and the product of nonsingular matrices is also nonsingular, then \mathbf{B} is also nonsingular.

Schur complement of \mathbf{B} is also nonsingular:

Now, let's consider the Schur complement of b_{11} in \mathbf{B} , which has dimension $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$:

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B}_{2:n, 2:n} - \frac{1}{b_{11}} \mathbf{B}_{2:n, 1} \mathbf{B}_{1, 2:n}.$$

Suppose there is an $(n - 1)$ -vector \mathbf{x} satisfies

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (1.2)$$

Then \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{y} = -\frac{1}{b_{11}} \mathbf{B}_{1, 2:n} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{B} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1, 2:n} \\ \mathbf{B}_{2:n, 1} & \mathbf{B}_{2:n, 2:n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since \mathbf{B} is nonsingular, \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} must be zero. Hence, Equation (1.2) holds only if $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ which means that the null space of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ has dimension 0 and thus $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ is nonsingular with a size of $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$.

By the induction assumption, any $(n - 1) \times (n - 1)$ nonsingular matrix can be decomposed as the full LU decomposition form

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{P}_2 \mathbf{L}_2 \mathbf{U}_2.$$

We then factor \mathbf{A} as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{P}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{B}_{2:n,2:n} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \mathbf{P}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{P}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{B}_{2:n,2:n} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \mathbf{P}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{P}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{L}_2 \mathbf{U}_2 + \mathbf{P}_2^\top \frac{1}{b_{11}} \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \mathbf{P}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{P}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b_{11}} \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{L}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_2 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we find the full LU decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$ by defining

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{P}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{b_{11}} \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{B}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{L}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

from which the result follows. ■

1.5. Bandwidth Preserving in the LU Decomposition without Permutation

The bandwidth of any matrix can be defined as follows.

Definition 1.5 (Matrix Bandwidth) *Given any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with entry (i, j) denoted by a_{ij} . Then \mathbf{A} has an **upper bandwidth** q if $a_{ij} = 0$ for $j > i + q$, and a **lower bandwidth** p if $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j + p$.*

An example of a 6×6 matrix with an upper bandwidth 2 and a lower bandwidth 3 is illustrated below:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we prove that the bandwidth after the LU decomposition without permutation is preserved.

Lemma 1.7: (Bandwidth Preserving) *Given matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with upper bandwidth q and lower bandwidth p . If \mathbf{A} admits the LU decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$, then \mathbf{U} has an upper bandwidth q and \mathbf{L} has a lower bandwidth p .*

Proof [of Lemma 1.7] The LU decomposition without permutation can be obtained as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{I}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{1,2:n} \\ 0 & \mathbf{S} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{L}_1 \mathbf{U}_1,$$

where $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}}\mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}\mathbf{A}_{1,2:n}$ is the Schur complement of a_{11} in \mathbf{A} . We can name this decomposition of \mathbf{A} the s -decomposition of \mathbf{A} . The first column of \mathbf{L}_1 and the first row of \mathbf{U}_1 have the required structure (bandwidth p and q respectively), and the Schur complement \mathbf{S} of a_{11} has an upper bandwidth $q-1$ and a lower bandwidth $p-1$ respectively. The result follows by induction on the s -decomposition of \mathbf{S} . ■

1.6. Block LU Decomposition

Another form of the LU decomposition is to factor the matrix into block triangular matrices.

Theorem 1.8: (Block LU Decomposition without Permutation) For any $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} , if the first m leading principal block submatrices are nonsingular, then \mathbf{A} can be factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & & & \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{I} & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{L}_{m1} & \dots & \mathbf{L}_{m,m-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{U}_{12} & \dots & \mathbf{U}_{1m} \\ & \mathbf{U}_{22} & & \vdots \\ & & \ddots & \mathbf{U}_{m-1,m} \\ & & & \mathbf{U}_{mm} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{i,j}$'s and \mathbf{U}_{ij} 's are some block matrices.

Specifically, this decomposition is unique.

Note that the \mathbf{U} in the above theorem is not necessarily upper triangular. An example is provided below:

$$\mathbf{A} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & 1 & 4 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 5 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 4 & -1 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & 2 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & -3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 \end{array} \right].$$

The trivial non-block LU decomposition fails on \mathbf{A} since the entry $(1,1)$ is zero. Nevertheless, the block LU decomposition is applicable in this case.

1.7. Application: Linear System via the LU Decomposition

In the case of a well-determined linear system $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ with \mathbf{A} of size $n \times n$ and nonsingular. Avoid solving the system by computing the inverse of \mathbf{A} , we solve linear equation by the LU decomposition. Suppose \mathbf{A} admits the LU decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$, the solution is given by the following algorithm.

Algorithm 1 Solving Linear Equations by LU Decomposition

Require: matrix \mathbf{A} is nonsingular and square with size $n \times n$, solve $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$;

1: LU Decomposition: factor \mathbf{A} as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{PLU}$;	▷ $(2/3)n^3$ flops
2: Permutation: $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{b}$;	▷ 0 flops
3: Forward substitution: solve $\mathbf{Lv} = \mathbf{w}$;	▷ $1 + 3 + \dots + (2n - 1) = n^2$ flops
4: Backward substitution: solve $\mathbf{Ux} = \mathbf{v}$;	▷ $1 + 3 + \dots + (2n - 1) = n^2$ flops

The complexity of the decomposition step is $(2/3)n^3$ floating point operations (flops) (Lu, 2021c), the backward and forward substitution steps both cost $1 + 3 + \dots + (2n - 1) = n^2$ flops. Therefore, the total cost for computing the linear system via the LU factorization is $(2/3)n^3 + 2n^2$ flops. Focusing on the dominant term, Algorithm 1 requires $(2/3)n^3$ flops, with the LU decomposition contributing the most to the overall complexity.

Linear system via the block LU decomposition For a block LU decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{LU}$, we need to solve $\mathbf{Lv} = \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{Ux} = \mathbf{v}$. But the latter system is non-triangular and requires some extra computations.

1.8. Application: Computing the Inverse of Nonsingular Matrices

By Theorem 1.1, for any nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we have a full LU factorization $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{PLU}$. The inverse can subsequently be derived by solving the matrix equation:

$$\mathbf{AX} = \mathbf{I},$$

which contains n linear systems computation: $\mathbf{Ax}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where \mathbf{x}_i represents the i -th column of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{e}_i is the i -th column of \mathbf{I} (i.e., the i -th unit vector).

Theorem 1.9: (Inverse of Nonsingular Matrix by Linear System) Computing the inverse of a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by n linear systems needs $\sim (2/3)n^3 + n(2n^2) = (8/3)n^3$ flops where $(2/3)n^3$ accounts for the computation of the LU decomposition of \mathbf{A} .

The proof is trivial by using Algorithm 1. However, the complexity can be reduced by taking the advantage of the structures of \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{L} . We find that the inverse of the nonsingular matrix is $\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{P}^T$. By taking this advantage, the complexity is reduced from $(8/3)n^3$ to $2n^3$ flops.

1.9. Application: Computing the Determinant

Determining the determinant of a matrix is facilitated through LU decomposition. If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{LU}$, then $\det(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{LU}) = \det(\mathbf{L}) \det(\mathbf{U}) = u_{11} u_{22} \dots u_{nn}$, where u_{ii} is the i -th diagonal of \mathbf{U} for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.⁴

Further, for the LU decomposition with permutation $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{PLU}$, $\det(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{PLU}) = \det(\mathbf{P}) u_{11} u_{22} \dots u_{nn}$. The determinant of a permutation matrix is either 1 or -1 because

4. The determinant of a lower triangular matrix (or an upper triangular matrix) is the product of its diagonal entries.

after changing rows around (which changes the sign of the determinant ⁵), a permutation matrix becomes identity matrix \mathbf{I} , whose determinant is one.

1.10. Pivoting

1.10.1 Partial Pivoting

In practice, it is desirable to pivot even when it is not necessary. When addressing a linear system using the LU decomposition, as illustrated in Algorithm 1, selecting the pivot as the largest entry, particularly when the diagonal elements of \mathbf{U} are small, helps prevent inaccuracies in the solutions. This approach, referred to as *partial pivoting*, is commonly employed to enhance numerical stability. For example,

Partial Pivoting For a 4×4 Matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{2} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{5} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{7} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{7} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & 5 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{2} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_2} \begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & 7 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.3)$$

$\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{A}$

in which case, we opt for 7 as the pivot following the transformation by \mathbf{E}_1 , even when it is not necessary. This interchange permutation guarantees that no multiplier exceeds an absolute value of 1 during the Gaussian elimination. The general procedure for calculating the LU decomposition with partial pivoting of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is given in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 LU Decomposition with Partial Pivoting

Require: Matrix \mathbf{A} with size $n \times n$;

- 1: Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}$;
 - 2: **for** $k = 1$ to $n - 1$ **do** ▷ i.e., get the k -th column of \mathbf{U}
 - 3: Find a row permutation \mathbf{P}_k that swaps u_{kk} with the largest element in $|\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k}|$;
 - 4: $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}_k\mathbf{U}$;
 - 5: Determine the Gaussian transformation \mathbf{E}_k to introduce zeros below the diagonal of the k -th column of \mathbf{U} ;
 - 6: $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_k\mathbf{U}$;
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Output \mathbf{U} ;
-

The algorithm requires $2/3(n^3)$ flops and $(n-1) + (n-2) + \dots + 1 \sim O(n^2)$ comparisons resulting from the pivoting procedure. Upon completion, the upper triangular matrix \mathbf{U} is obtained by

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_{n-1}\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{E}_2\mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{E}_1\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{A}. \quad (1.4)$$

Computing the final \mathbf{L} And we here show that Algorithm 2 computes the LU decomposition in the following form

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U},$$

⁵. The determinant changes sign when two rows are exchanged (sign reversal).

where $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{P}_2 \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}$ accounts for all interchanges, \mathbf{U} is the upper triangular matrix obtained directly from the algorithm, and \mathbf{L} is unit lower triangular with $|l_{ij}| \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. $\mathbf{L}_{k+1:n,k}$ is a permuted version of \mathbf{E}_k 's multipliers. To see this, we notice that the permutation matrices used in the algorithm fall into a special kind of permutation matrix since we only interchange two rows of the matrix. *This implies the \mathbf{P}_k 's are symmetric and $\mathbf{P}_k^2 = \mathbf{I}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$.* Suppose

$$\mathbf{M}_k = (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) \mathbf{E}_k (\mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}).$$

Then, substituting into Equation (1.4), \mathbf{U} can be written as

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{M}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{A}.$$

To see what \mathbf{M}_k is, we realize that \mathbf{P}_{k+1} is a permutation with the upper-left $k \times k$ block being an identity matrix. And thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_k &= (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{z}_k \mathbf{e}_k^\top) (\mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathbf{I}_n - (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) (\mathbf{z}_k \mathbf{e}_k^\top) (\mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathbf{I}_n - (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{z}_k) (\mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}) \\ &= \mathbf{I}_n - (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{z}_k) \mathbf{e}_k^\top. \quad (\text{since } \mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1} = \mathbf{e}_k^\top) \end{aligned}$$

This indicates that \mathbf{M}_k is unit lower triangular with the k -th column being the permuted version of \mathbf{E}_k . And the final lower triangular \mathbf{L} is thus given by

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{M}_1^{-1} \mathbf{M}_2^{-1} \dots \mathbf{M}_{n-1}^{-1}.$$

We obtain the full LU decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}$.

1.10.2 Complete Pivoting

In partial pivoting, when introducing zeros below the diagonal of the k -th column of \mathbf{U} , the k -th pivot is determined by scanning the current subcolumn $\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k}$. In *complete pivoting*, the largest absolute entry in the current submatrix $\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}$ is interchanged into the entry (k, k) of \mathbf{U} . Consequently, an additional *column permutation* \mathbf{Q}_k is applied at each step. The final upper triangular matrix \mathbf{U} is obtained by

$$\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_{n-1} \mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots (\mathbf{E}_2 \mathbf{P}_2 (\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}_1) \mathbf{Q}_2) \dots \mathbf{Q}_{n-1}.$$

The complete pivoting algorithm is presented in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 LU Decomposition with Complete Pivoting**Require:** Matrix \mathbf{A} with size $n \times n$;

- 1: Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}$;
- 2: **for** $k = 1$ to $n - 1$ **do** \triangleright the value k is to get the k -th column of \mathbf{U}
- 3: Find a row permutation matrix \mathbf{P}_k , and a column permutation \mathbf{Q}_k that swaps u_{kk} with the largest element in $|\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}|$, say $u_{ab} = \max |\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}|$;
- 4: $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}_k \mathbf{U} \mathbf{Q}_k$;
- 5: Determine the Gaussian transformation \mathbf{E}_k to introduce zeros below the diagonal of the k -th column of \mathbf{U} ;
- 6: $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{U}$;
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Output \mathbf{U} ;

The algorithm requires $2/3(n^3)$ flops and $(n^2 + (n-1)^2 + \dots + 1^2) \sim O(n^3)$ comparisons resulting from the pivoting procedure. Again, let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{P}_2 \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}$, $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_2 \dots \mathbf{Q}_{n-1}$,

$$\mathbf{M}_k = (\mathbf{P}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) \mathbf{E}_k (\mathbf{P}_{k+1} \dots \mathbf{P}_{n-1}), \quad \text{for all } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{M}_1^{-1} \mathbf{M}_2^{-1} \dots \mathbf{M}_{n-1}^{-1}.$$

The final decomposition is expressed as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{Q}^\top$ or equivalently, $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}$.

1.10.3 Rook Pivoting

The *rook pivoting* offers an alternative to the partial and complete pivoting. Instead of choosing the largest value in $|\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}|$ at the k -th step, it searches for an element of $\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}$ that is *maximal in both its row and column*. Notably, rook pivoting is not unique, and multiple entries can satisfy the criteria. For example, for a submatrix $\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{U}_{k:n,k:n} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 3 \\ 5 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the 7 will be chosen by complete pivoting. And one among 5, 4, 7 could serve as a rook pivot.

1.11. Rank-Revealing LU Decomposition

In numerous applications, a factorization obtained through Gaussian elimination with pivoting, when applied to a matrix \mathbf{A} of rank r , will manifest the rank in the following form

$$\mathbf{P} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21}^\top & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{11} & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ are nonsingular, $\mathbf{L}_{21}, \mathbf{U}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$, and \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} are permutations. Gaussian elimination with rook pivoting or complete pivoting can yield such decompositions (Hwang et al., 1992; Higham, 2002).

Chapter 1 Problems

1. Use row reduction to solve the linear system:

$$2x_1 + 3x_2 + 4x_3 = 9,$$

$$x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = 5,$$

$$3x_1 + 4x_2 + 5x_3 = 7.$$

2. Two matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are called *row equivalent* (denoted by $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$) if there is a sequence of elementary row transformations that can be performed on \mathbf{A} to obtain \mathbf{B} .
- Show that $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$ if and only if $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}$ for some nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} .
 - Show that if $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{B} \sim \mathbf{C}$, then $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$.
 - Show that if $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B} \sim \mathbf{C}$, then $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{C}$.
 - Show that if $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$, then $\mathbf{B} \sim \mathbf{A}$.
 - Show that $\mathbf{A} \sim \mathbf{B}$ if both \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are nonsingular.
3. Given two matrices \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{F} obtained from an identity matrix by adding multiples of row i to rows j and k with $i \neq j$ and $i \neq k$ respectively, show that $\mathbf{EF} = \mathbf{FE}$.
4. Show that the LU decomposition of the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ does not exist.
5. Suppose \mathbf{L}_1 and \mathbf{L}_2 are nonsingular lower triangular, and \mathbf{U}_1 and \mathbf{U}_2 are nonsingular upper triangular. Prove that $\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{U}_2$ if and only if there exists an nonsingular diagonal matrix \mathbf{D} such that $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_2$.

Cholesky Decomposition

Contents

2.1	Cholesky Decomposition	29
2.2	Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Recursive Calculation	29
2.3	Sylvester's Criterion: Leading Principal Minors of PD Matrices	32
2.4	Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via the LU Decomposition without Permutation	34
2.4.1	Diagonal Values of the Upper Triangular Matrix	35
2.4.2	Block Cholesky Decomposition	36
2.5	Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Induction	36
2.6	Uniqueness of the Cholesky Decomposition	37
2.7	Last Words on Positive Definite Matrices	38
2.8	Decomposition for Semidefinite Matrices	38
2.9	Application: Rank-One Update/Downdate	40
2.9.1	Rank-One Update	40
2.9.2	Rank-One Downdate	42
2.10	Application: Indefinite Rank Two Update	43
Chapter 2	Problems	43

2.1. Cholesky Decomposition



The status of positive definiteness or positive semidefiniteness represents a noteworthy property for a matrix. This property not only provides insights into the intrinsic nature of the matrix but also serves as a cornerstone for various mathematical and computational applications. In this section, we will introduce decompositional approaches for the two special types of matrices, exploring their unique characteristics and applications. We first illuminate the widely acclaimed Cholesky decomposition, a powerful tool that unveils the positive definiteness of a matrix through its factorization into the product of a lower triangular matrix and its transpose. This decomposition not only facilitates numerical computations but also plays a pivotal role in optimization, statistical modeling, and diverse fields where the assurance of positive definiteness is paramount.

Theorem 2.1: (Cholesky Decomposition) Every *positive definite* (PD) matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R},$$

where $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an upper triangular matrix **with positive diagonal elements**. This factorization is known as the *Cholesky decomposition* of \mathbf{A} . \mathbf{R} is known as the *Cholesky factor* or *Cholesky triangle* of \mathbf{A} .

Alternatively, \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^\top$ where $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{R}^\top$ is a lower triangular matrix *with positive diagonals*.

Specifically, the Cholesky decomposition is unique (Corollary 2.7).

The Cholesky decomposition derives its name from a French military officer and mathematician, *André-Louis Cholesky* (1875-1918), credited with its development during his surveying work. Analogous to the LU decomposition for solving linear systems, the Cholesky decomposition is primarily employed for positive definite linear systems. The methodology for solving such systems aligns with that of the LU decomposition, as discussed in Section 1.7 (p. 21), and will not be reiterated here.

2.2. Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Recursive Calculation

In this section, we prove the existence of the Cholesky decomposition via recursive calculation. In Section 13.6.4 (p. 169), we will also prove the existence of the Cholesky decomposition via the QR decomposition and spectral decomposition. Prior to demonstrating the existence of Cholesky decomposition, we need the following definitions and lemmas.

Definition 2.1 (Positive Definite and Positive Semidefinite) A matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is *positive definite* (PD) if $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} > 0$ for all nonzero $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. And a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is *positive semidefinite* (PSD) if $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.^a

a. In discussions regarding positive definite or positive semidefinite matrices, it is essential to note that these matrices are symmetric. Therefore, the concept of a positive definite matrix holds significance only in the context of symmetric matrices.

One of the prerequisites for the Cholesky decomposition is the definition of the positive definiteness for a matrix, as previously defined. We sketch several properties of this PD matrix as follows:

Positive Definite Matrix Property 1 of 5

We will show the equivalent definition on the positive definiteness of a matrix \mathbf{A} is that \mathbf{A} only has *positive eigenvalues*, or on the positive semidefiniteness of a matrix \mathbf{A} is that \mathbf{A} only has *nonnegative eigenvalues*. The detailed proof is presented in Section 13.6.2 (p. 167), derived from the spectral theorem.

While not all components of a positive definite matrix need to be positive, it is assured that the diagonal components of such a matrix are positive, as asserted by the following result.

Positive Definite Matrix Property 2 of 5

Lemma 2.2: (Positive Diagonals of Positive Definite Matrices) The diagonal elements of a positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} are all *positive*. And similarly, the diagonal elements of a positive semidefinite matrix \mathbf{B} are all *nonnegative*.

Proof [of Lemma 2.2] From the definition of positive definite matrices, we have $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} > 0$ for all nonzero \mathbf{x} . In particular, let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_i$ where \mathbf{e}_i is the i -th unit basis vector with the i -th entry equal to 1 and other entries equal to 0. Then,

$$\mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_i = a_{ii} > 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

where a_{ii} represents the i -th diagonal component. The proof for the second part follows similarly, thereby completing the proof. ■

Like the LU decomposition, the existence of the Cholesky decomposition also depends on the Schur complement.

Positive Definite Matrix Property 3 of 5

Lemma 2.3: (Schur Complement of Positive Definite Matrices) For any positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, its Schur complement of a_{11} is given by $\mathbf{S}_{n-1} = \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top$, which is also positive definite.

A word on the notation. Note that the subscript $n-1$ of \mathbf{S}_{n-1} means it is of size $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ and it is a Schur complement of an $n \times n$ positive definite matrix. We will use this notation in the following sections.

Proof [of Lemma 2.3] For any nonzero vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, we can construct a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ using the following equation:

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix},$$

which is nonzero. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} &= \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{v}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \\ \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{v}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{S}_{n-1} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}_{n-1} \mathbf{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{A} is positive definite, we have $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}_{n-1} \mathbf{v} > 0$ for all nonzero \mathbf{v} . Thus, the Schur complement \mathbf{S}_{n-1} is positive definite as well. \blacksquare

The above argument can be extended to PSD matrices as well. If \mathbf{A} is PSD, then the Schur complement \mathbf{S}_{n-1} is also PSD.

A word on the Schur complement In the proof of Theorem 1.1 (p. 13), we have shown this Schur complement $\mathbf{S}_{n-1} = \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top$ is nonsingular if \mathbf{A} is nonsingular and $a_{11} \neq 0$. Similarly, the Schur complement of a_{nn} in \mathbf{A} is $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{n-1} = \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,1:n-1} - \frac{1}{a_{nn}} \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,n} \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,n}^\top$, which is also positive definite when \mathbf{A} is positive definite. This characteristic facilitates the proof that the leading principal minors of positive definite matrices are all positive; additional details are available in Section 2.3.

We now illustrate the existence of Cholesky decomposition using these lemmas.

Proof [of Theorem 2.1: Existence of Cholesky Decomposition Recursively] For any positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} , we can write out (since a_{11} is positive by Lemma 2.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \\ \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{a_{11}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{11}}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{a_{11}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{11}}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{a_{11}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{11}}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{a_{11}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{11}}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{a_{11}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{11}}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since we proved the Schur complement \mathbf{S}_{n-1} is positive definite in Lemma 2.3, then we can factor it in the same way as

$$\mathbf{S}_{n-1} = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_{n-2} \end{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{S}_{n-2} \end{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\
 &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{S}_{n-2} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_2 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\
 &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_2^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{S}_{n-2} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

The same formula can be recursively applied. This process gradually continues down to the bottom-right corner giving us the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_2^\top \dots \mathbf{R}_n^\top \mathbf{R}_n \dots \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1 \\
 &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n$ are upper triangular matrices with positive diagonal elements and $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2 \dots \mathbf{R}_n$ is also an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements from which the result follows. \blacksquare

The process in the proof can also be used to calculate the Cholesky decomposition and to compute the complexity of the algorithm.

Lemma 2.4: ($\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ is PD) Given any upper triangular matrix \mathbf{R} with positive diagonal elements, then $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ is positive definite.

Proof [of Lemma 2.4] If an upper triangular matrix \mathbf{R} has positive diagonals, it has full column rank, and the null space of \mathbf{R} is of dimension 0 by the fundamental theorem of linear algebra (Theorem 0.3, p. 6). Consequently, $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ for any nonzero vector \mathbf{x} . Therefore, $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{R}\mathbf{x}\|^2 > 0$ for any nonzero vector \mathbf{x} . \blacksquare

This lemma above works not only for the upper triangular matrices \mathbf{R} , but can be extended to any \mathbf{R} with linearly independent columns.

A word on the two claims Combine Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.4, we can claim that matrix \mathbf{A} is positive definite if and only if \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ where \mathbf{R} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonals.

2.3. Sylvester's Criterion: Leading Principal Minors of PD Matrices

In Lemma 2.3, we proved for any positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, its Schur complement of a_{11} is $\mathbf{S}_{n-1} = \mathbf{A}_{2:n,2:n} - \frac{1}{a_{11}} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1} \mathbf{A}_{2:n,1}^\top$ and it is also positive definite. This is also true for its Schur complement of a_{nn} , i.e., $\mathbf{S}'_{n-1} = \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,1:n-1} - \frac{1}{a_{nn}} \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,n} \mathbf{A}_{1:n-1,n}^\top$ is also positive definite.

We then claim that all the leading principal minors (Definition 1.1, p. 13) of a positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are positive. This is also known as Sylvester's criterion (Swamy, 1973; Gilbert, 1991). Recall that these positive leading principal minors imply the existence of the LU decomposition for positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} by Theorem 1.3 (p. 13).

To establish Sylvester's criterion, we need the following lemma.

Positive Definite Matrix Property 4 of 5

Lemma 2.5: (Quadratic PD) Let \mathbf{E} be any invertible matrix. Then \mathbf{A} is positive definite if and only if $\mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}$ is also positive definite.

Proof [of Lemma 2.5] We will prove by forward implication and reverse implication separately as follows.

Forward implication Suppose \mathbf{A} is positive definite, then for any nonzero vector \mathbf{x} , we have $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} > 0$, since \mathbf{E} is invertible such that $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{x}$ is nonzero.¹ This implies $\mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}$ is PD.

Reverse implication Conversely, suppose $\mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}$ is positive definite, for any nonzero \mathbf{x} , we have $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{E}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{x} > 0$. For any nonzero \mathbf{y} , there exists a nonzero \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{E} \mathbf{x}$ since \mathbf{E} is invertible. This implies \mathbf{A} is PD as well. ■

We then provide a rigorous proof for Sylvester's criterion.

Positive Definite Matrix Property 5 of 5

Theorem 2.6: (Sylvester's Criterion) The real symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive definite if and only if all of its leading principal minors are positive.

Proof [of Theorem 2.6] We will prove by forward implication and reverse implication separately as follows.

Forward implication: We will prove by induction for the forward implication. Suppose \mathbf{A} is positive definite. Since all the components on the diagonal of positive definite matrices are positive (Lemma 2.2). The case for $n = 1$ is trivial that $\det(\mathbf{A}) > 0$ if \mathbf{A} is a scalar.

Suppose all the leading principal minors for $k \times k$ PD matrices are all positive. To complete the proof, we need to establish that this property also holds for $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ positive definite matrices.

For a $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ matrix with the block form $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b}^\top & d \end{bmatrix}$, where \mathbf{A} is a $k \times k$ submatrix. Then its Schur complement of d , $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^\top$ is also positive definite and its determinant is positive from the assumption. Therefore, $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(d) \det(\mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^\top) =$ ² $d \cdot \det(\mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{d} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^\top) > 0$, which completes the proof.

1. Since the null space of \mathbf{E} is of dimension 0 and the only solution for $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is the trivial solution $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$.

2. By the fact that if matrix \mathbf{M} has a block formulation: $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{D}) \det(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{C})$.

Reverse implication: Conversely, suppose all the leading principal minors of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are positive, indicating that all the leading principal submatrices are nonsingular. Suppose further the (i, j) -th entry of \mathbf{A} is denoted by a_{ij} , we realize that $a_{11} > 0$ by the assumption. Subtract multiples of the first row of \mathbf{A} to zero out the entries in the first column of \mathbf{A} below the first diagonal a_{11} . That is,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ 0 & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now subtract multiples of the first column of $\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}$, from the other columns of $\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}$ to zero out the entries in the first row of $\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}$ to the right of the first column. Due to the symmetry of \mathbf{A} , we can multiply on the right by \mathbf{E}_1^\top to get what we want. We then have

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ 0 & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}_1^\top} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This operation ensures the preservation of the principal minors of \mathbf{A} . The leading principal minors of $\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}_1^\top$ are exactly the same as those of \mathbf{A} .

Continuing this process, we will transform \mathbf{A} into a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{E}_n \dots \mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}_1^\top \dots \mathbf{E}_n^\top$ whose diagonal values are exactly the same as the diagonals of \mathbf{A} and are positive. Let $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_n \dots \mathbf{E}_1$, which is an invertible matrix. Apparently, $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}^\top$ is PD, which implies \mathbf{A} is PD as well, as per Lemma 2.5. \blacksquare

2.4. Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via the LU Decomposition without Permutation

By Theorem 2.6 on Sylvester's criterion and the existence of LU decomposition without permutation in Theorem 1.3 (p. 13), there is a unique LU decomposition for positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}_0$, where \mathbf{L} is a unit lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{U}_0 is an upper triangular matrix. Additionally, it is established that *the signs of the pivots of a symmetric matrix are the same as the signs of the eigenvalues* (Strang, 2009):

$$\text{number of positive pivots} = \text{number of positive eigenvalues}.$$

And $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}_0$ has the following form

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ l_{21} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ l_{n1} & l_{n2} & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & \dots & u_{1n} \\ 0 & u_{22} & \dots & u_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & u_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This implies that the diagonals of \mathbf{U}_0 contain the pivots of \mathbf{A} . And all the eigenvalues of PD matrices are positive (refer to Lemma 13.27, p. 167, as a consequence of the spectral decomposition). Thus, the diagonals of \mathbf{U}_0 are positive.

Taking the diagonal entries of \mathbf{U}_0 and arranging them in a diagonal matrix \mathbf{D} , we can express $\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}$ in the following equation

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ l_{21} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ l_{n1} & l_{n2} & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & u_{22} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & u_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_{12}/u_{11} & \dots & u_{1n}/u_{11} \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & u_{2n}/u_{22} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U},$$

where \mathbf{U} is a *unit* upper triangular matrix. By the uniqueness of the LU decomposition without permutation in Corollary 1.5 (p. 18) and the symmetry of \mathbf{A} , we conclude that $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{L}^\top$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{L}^\top$. Given the positive diagonals of \mathbf{D} , we can set $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2}\mathbf{L}^\top$, where $\mathbf{D}^{1/2} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{u_{11}}, \sqrt{u_{22}}, \dots, \sqrt{u_{nn}})$ such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top\mathbf{R}$ is the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{R} is upper triangular with positive diagonals.

2.4.1 Diagonal Values of the Upper Triangular Matrix

Assuming \mathbf{A} is a positive definite matrix, we represent \mathbf{A} as a block matrix $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$. Its block LU decomposition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{L}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k\mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{L}_k\mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21}\mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{L}_{21}\mathbf{U}_{12} + \mathbf{L}_{22}\mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the leading principal minor (Definition 1.1, p. 13), denoted by $\Delta_k = \det(\mathbf{A}_{1:k,1:k}) = \det(\mathbf{A}_k)$, is given by

$$\Delta_k = \det(\mathbf{A}_k) = \det(\mathbf{L}_k\mathbf{U}_k) = \det(\mathbf{L}_k) \det(\mathbf{U}_k).$$

We notice that \mathbf{L}_k is a unit lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{U}_k is an upper triangular matrix. By the fact that the determinant of a lower triangular matrix (or an upper triangular matrix) is the product of the diagonal entries, we obtain

$$\Delta_k = \det(\mathbf{U}_k) = u_{11}u_{22} \dots u_{kk},$$

i.e., the k -th leading principal minor of \mathbf{A} is the determinant of the $k \times k$ submatrix of \mathbf{U}_0 . This is also equal to the product of the first k diagonals of \mathbf{D} (\mathbf{D} is the matrix from $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{L}^\top$). Let $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$, therefore, we have

$$\Delta_k = d_1d_2 \dots d_k = \Delta_{k-1}d_k.$$

This gives us an alternative form of \mathbf{D} , i.e., the **squared** diagonal values of \mathbf{R} (\mathbf{R} is the Cholesky factor from $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top\mathbf{R}$), and it is given by

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\left(\Delta_1, \frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1}, \dots, \frac{\Delta_n}{\Delta_{n-1}}\right),$$

where Δ_k is the k -th leading principal minor of \mathbf{A} , for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. That is, the diagonal values of \mathbf{R} are given by

$$\text{diag} \left(\sqrt{\Delta_1}, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1}}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_n}{\Delta_{n-1}}} \right).$$

2.4.2 Block Cholesky Decomposition

Following from the last section, suppose \mathbf{A} is a PD matrix, take \mathbf{A} as a block matrix $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, and its block LU decomposition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{L}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{U}_{12} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} \mathbf{U}_k & \mathbf{L}_{21} \mathbf{U}_{12} + \mathbf{L}_{22} \mathbf{U}_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

where the k -th leading principal submatrix \mathbf{A}_k of \mathbf{A} also has its LU decomposition, $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{L}_k \mathbf{U}_k$. Then it is trivial that the Cholesky decomposition of an $n \times n$ matrix contains $n - 1$ other Cholesky decompositions within it: $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{R}_k^\top \mathbf{R}_k$, for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$. This is particularly true that any leading principal submatrix \mathbf{A}_k of the positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} is also positive definite. This can be shown that for a positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$, and any nonzero vector $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^k$ appended by a zero element $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

It follows that

$$\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \mathbf{x}_{k+1} > 0,$$

and \mathbf{A}_k is positive definite. This recursive argument, starting from $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, demonstrates that \mathbf{A}_{n-1} is positive definite, \mathbf{A}_{n-2} is positive definite, and so forth. Moreover, each of these matrices admits a Cholesky decomposition.

2.5. Existence of the Cholesky Decomposition via Induction

In the last section, we prove the existence of the Cholesky decomposition through the LU decomposition without permutation. Following the proof of the LU decomposition in Section 1.3 (p. 17), we realize that the existence of Cholesky decomposition can be a direct consequence of induction as well.

Proof [of Theorem 2.1: Existence of Cholesky Decomposition by Induction]

We will use induction to demonstrate that every $n \times n$ positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} has a decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$. The case for 1×1 matrices is straightforward; setting $R = \sqrt{A}$ renders $A = R^2$.

Assume that for any $k \times k$ positive definite matrix \mathbf{A}_k , a Cholesky decomposition exists. If we prove any $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ PD matrix \mathbf{A}_{k+1} can also be factored as this Cholesky decomposition, then we complete the proof.

For any $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ PD matrix \mathbf{A}_{k+1} , write out \mathbf{A}_{k+1} as

$$\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_k & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b}^\top & d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Noting that \mathbf{A}_k is positive definite, we can apply the Cholesky decomposition to express it as $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{R}_k^\top \mathbf{R}_k$, as per the inductive hypothesis. Subsequently, we can form the upper triangular matrix

$$\mathbf{R}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_k & \mathbf{r} \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix},$$

resulting in

$$\mathbf{R}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{R}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_k^\top \mathbf{R}_k & \mathbf{R}_k^\top \mathbf{r} \\ \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{R}_k & \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{r} + s^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, if we can prove $\mathbf{R}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{R}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_{k+1}$ is the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} (which requires the value s to be positive), then we complete the proof. That is, we need to prove

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b} &= \mathbf{R}_k^\top \mathbf{r}, \\ d &= \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{r} + s^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{R}_k is nonsingular, we have a unique solution for \mathbf{r} and s that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r} &= \mathbf{R}_k^{-\top} \mathbf{b}, \\ s &= \sqrt{d - \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{r}} = \sqrt{d - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we assume s is nonnegative. However, we must additionally demonstrate that s is not merely nonnegative but also positive. Since \mathbf{A}_k is PD, from Sylvester's criterion, and the fact that if matrix \mathbf{M} has a block formulation: $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{A}) \det(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B})$. We have

$$\det(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}) = \det(\mathbf{A}_k) \det(d - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}) = \det(\mathbf{A}_k) (d - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}) > 0.$$

Since $\det(\mathbf{A}_k) > 0$, it follows that $(d - \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{A}_k^{-1} \mathbf{b}) > 0$, and this implies $s > 0$. This completes the proof. ■

2.6. Uniqueness of the Cholesky Decomposition

Corollary 2.7: (Uniqueness of Cholesky Decomposition) The Cholesky decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ for any positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is unique.

The uniqueness of the Cholesky decomposition follows directly from the uniqueness of the LU decomposition without permutation. Alternatively, a rigorous proof of this uniqueness is presented below.

Proof [of Corollary 2.7] Suppose the Cholesky decomposition is not unique, then we can find two decompositions such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}_2^\top \mathbf{R}_2$, which implies

$$\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_2^\top.$$

From the fact that the inverse of an upper triangular matrix is also an upper triangular matrix, and the product of two upper triangular matrices is also an upper triangular matrix,³ we realize that the left-side of the above equation is an upper triangular matrix and the right-side of it is a lower triangular matrix. This implies $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_2^\top$ is a diagonal matrix, and $\mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_2^\top = (\mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_2^\top)^\top = \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}$. Let $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}$ be the diagonal matrix. We notice that the diagonal value of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is the product of the corresponding diagonal values of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} (or \mathbf{R}_2 and \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}). That is, for

$$\mathbf{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \cdots & r_{1n} \\ 0 & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & r_{nn} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{R}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & \cdots & s_{1n} \\ 0 & s_{22} & \cdots & s_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & s_{nn} \end{bmatrix},$$

we have,

$$\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{r_{11}}{s_{11}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{r_{22}}{s_{22}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{r_{nn}}{s_{nn}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s_{11}}{r_{11}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s_{22}}{r_{22}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{s_{nn}}{r_{nn}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}.$$

Given that both \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 have positive diagonals, it follows that $r_{11} = s_{11}, r_{22} = s_{22}, \dots, r_{nn} = s_{nn}$. And $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} = \mathbf{I}$. In other words, $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}_2$, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, the Cholesky decomposition is unique. \blacksquare

Building upon the previous discussion, when the diagonal elements of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 are not constrained to positive values, we have $r_{ii} = \pm s_{ii}$ for $i \in 1, 2, \dots, n$. Consequently, the factorization $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ is *non-unique*.

2.7. Last Words on Positive Definite Matrices

In Section 13.6.2 (p. 167), we will prove that a matrix \mathbf{A} is PD if and only if \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$, where \mathbf{P} is nonsingular. And in Section 13.6.5 (p. 169), we will prove that PD matrix \mathbf{A} can be uniquely factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}^2$, where \mathbf{B} is also PD. Both results stem from the spectral decomposition of PD matrices.

To conclude, for a PD matrix \mathbf{A} , we can factor it into $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ where \mathbf{R} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonals as shown in Theorem 2.1 by Cholesky decomposition; $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$ where \mathbf{P} is nonsingular in Theorem 13.28 (p. 168); and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}^2$ where \mathbf{B} is PD in Theorem 13.29 (p. 169). For a comprehensive overview, the different factorizations of a positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} are summarized in Figure 2.1.

2.8. Decomposition for Semidefinite Matrices

For positive semidefinite matrices, the Cholesky decomposition also exists with a minor modification.

³ Same for lower triangular matrices: the inverse of a lower triangular matrix is also a lower triangular matrix, and the product of two lower triangular matrices is also a lower triangular matrix.




Figure 2.1: Demonstration of different factorizations on positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} .

Theorem 2.8: (Semidefinite Decomposition) Every positive semidefinite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R},$$

where $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an upper triangular matrix. The diagonal elements of \mathbf{R} may be zero, and it's important to note that the factorization is **not unique** in general.

In such a decomposition, the diagonal elements of \mathbf{R} may not accurately indicate the rank of \mathbf{A} . (Higham, 2009).

Example 2.1 ((Higham, 2009)) Suppose

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The semidefinite decomposition is given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}.$$

The matrix \mathbf{A} has a rank of 2, whereas \mathbf{R} only possesses a single nonzero diagonal element. \square

We observe that all PD matrices inherently possess full rank, a characteristic that significantly influences many of the aforementioned proofs. Sylvester's criterion (Theorem 2.6) establishes this property by asserting that all leading principal minors of PD matrices are positive. Alternatively, we can demonstrate that a PD matrix \mathbf{A} being rank-deficient implies the null space of \mathbf{A} has a positive dimension, and there exists a vector \mathbf{x} in the null space such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. This leads to a contradiction, violating the definition of PD matrices.

However, this assertion does not hold for positive semidefinite (PSD) matrices, where the dimension of the null space can be larger than 0. Consequently, a more general rank-revealing decomposition for semidefinite matrices is presented.

Theorem 2.9: (Semidefinite Rank-Revealing Decomposition) Any positive semidefinite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with rank r can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n},$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonal elements, and $\mathbf{R}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$.

The proof for the existence of the above rank-revealing decomposition for semidefinite matrices is delayed to Section 13.6.3 (p. 168) as a consequence of the spectral decomposition (Theorem 13.1, p. 149) and the column-pivoted QR decomposition (Theorem 3.2, p. 59). Whereas, the proof for the trivial Semidefinite Decomposition Theorem 2.8 can be straightforwardly derived from the spectral decomposition and the trivial QR decomposition (Theorem 3.1 on p. 49).

2.9. Application: Rank-One Update/Downdate

Updating linear systems after low-rank modifications of the system matrix is widespread in machine learning, statistics, and many other fields. However, it is well known that this update can lead to serious instabilities in the presence of round-off errors (Seeger, 2004). If the system matrix is positive definite, it is almost always possible to use a representation based on the Cholesky decomposition which is much more numerically stable. We will shortly provide the proof for this rank one update/downdate via Cholesky decomposition in this section.

2.9.1 Rank-One Update

A rank-one update \mathbf{A}' of matrix \mathbf{A} by vector \mathbf{x} is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}' &= \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top; \\ \mathbf{R}'^\top \mathbf{R}' &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

If we have already calculated the Cholesky factor \mathbf{R} of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then the Cholesky factor \mathbf{R}' of \mathbf{A}' can be obtained efficiently. Note that \mathbf{A}' differs from \mathbf{A} only via the symmetric rank-one matrix. Hence we can compute \mathbf{R}' from \mathbf{R} using the rank-one Cholesky update, which takes $O(n^2)$ operations each saving from $O(n^3)$ if we do know \mathbf{R} , the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A} up front, i.e., we want to compute the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A}' via that of \mathbf{A} . To see this, suppose there is a set of orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that

$$\mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{Q}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we find out the expression for the Cholesky factor of \mathbf{A}' by \mathbf{R}' . Specifically, multiply the left-hand side (l.h.s.) of the above equation by its transpose,

$$[\mathbf{v} \quad \mathbf{R}^\top] \mathbf{Q}_1 \dots \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{Q}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{Q}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top.$$

And multiply the right-hand side (r.h.s.) by its transpose,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}'^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{R}'^\top \mathbf{R}',$$

which agrees with the l.h.s. equation. *Givens rotations* are such orthogonal matrices that can transfer \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{v} into \mathbf{R}' . The fundamental significance of Givens rotations, crucial for proving the existence of QR decomposition, will be discussed shortly in Section 3.13 (p. 66). In this section, we provide the definition and results directly. For an initial reading, this section may be skipped.

Definition 2.2 (*n*-th Order Givens Rotation) *A Givens rotation is represented by a matrix of the following form*

$$\mathbf{G}_{kl} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & c & & & s & \\ & & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & \\ & & -s & & & & c & \\ & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}_{n \times n},$$

where the $(k, k), (k, l), (l, k), (l, l)$ entries are $c, s, -s, c$ respectively, and $s = \cos \theta$ and $c = \sin \theta$ for some θ .

Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the zero vector except that the k -th entry is 1. Then mathematically, the Givens rotation defined above can be denoted by

$$\mathbf{G}_{kl} = \mathbf{I} + (c - 1)(\boldsymbol{\delta}_k \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^\top + \boldsymbol{\delta}_l \boldsymbol{\delta}_l^\top) + s(\boldsymbol{\delta}_k \boldsymbol{\delta}_l^\top - \boldsymbol{\delta}_l \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^\top).$$

where the subscripts k and l indicate the **rotation is in plane k and l** . Specifically, one can also define the n -th order Givens rotation where $(k, k), (k, l), (l, k), (l, l)$ entries are $c, -s, s, c$ respectively. The ideas are the same.

It can be easily verified that the n -th order Givens rotation is an orthogonal matrix and its determinant is 1. For any vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G}_{kl}\mathbf{x}$, where

$$\begin{cases} y_k = c \cdot x_k + s \cdot x_l, \\ y_l = -s \cdot x_k + c \cdot x_l, \\ y_j = x_j, \end{cases} \quad (j \neq k, l)$$

In other words, a Givens rotation applied to \mathbf{x} rotates two components of \mathbf{x} by some angle θ and leaves all other components the same.

Now, suppose we have an $(n + 1)$ -th order Givens rotation indexed from 0 to n , and it is given by

$$\mathbf{G}_k = \mathbf{I} + (c_k - 1)(\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 \boldsymbol{\delta}_0^\top + \boldsymbol{\delta}_k \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^\top) + s_k(\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 \boldsymbol{\delta}_k^\top - \boldsymbol{\delta}_k \boldsymbol{\delta}_0^\top),$$

where $c_k = \cos \theta_k$, $s_k = \sin \theta_k$ for some θ_k , $\mathbf{G}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$, $\delta_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a zero vector except that the $(k+1)$ -th entry is 1.

Taking out the k -th column of the following equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix},$$

where we let the k -th element of \mathbf{v} be v_k , and the k -th diagonal of \mathbf{R} be r_{kk} . We realize that $\sqrt{v_k^2 + r_{kk}^2} \neq 0$, let $c_k = \frac{r_{kk}}{\sqrt{v_k^2 + r_{kk}^2}}$, $s_k = -\frac{v_k}{\sqrt{v_k^2 + r_{kk}^2}}$. Then,

$$\begin{cases} v_k \rightarrow c_k v_k + s_k r_{kk} = 0; \\ r_{kk} \rightarrow -s_k v_k + c_k r_{kk} = \sqrt{v_k^2 + r_{kk}^2} = r'_{kk}. \end{cases}$$

In other words, G_k will set the k -th element of \mathbf{v} to zero and assign a nonzero value to r_{kk} .

This finding above is essential for the rank-one update. And we obtain

$$\mathbf{G}_n \mathbf{G}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{G}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix}.$$

Each Givens rotation requires $6n$ floating-point operations (flops). With a total of n rotations, the computational cost becomes $6n^2$ flops when considering only the leading term. This reduces the complexity of calculating the Cholesky factor of \mathbf{A}' from $\frac{1}{3}n^3$ to $6n^2$ flops, assuming the Cholesky factor of \mathbf{A} is already known. The described algorithm plays a crucial role in reducing the computational complexity of posterior calculations in Bayesian inference for Gaussian mixture models (Lu, 2021a). At each stage, k new samples are added/deleted from the old cluster, equivalent to applying k rank-one updates.

2.9.2 Rank-One DOWNDATE

Now suppose we have calculated the Cholesky factor of \mathbf{A} , and the \mathbf{A}' is the downdate of \mathbf{A} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}' &= \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top; \\ \mathbf{R}'^\top \mathbf{R}' &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

The algorithm follows a similar procedure:

$$\mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{G}_2 \dots \mathbf{G}_n \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

Again, $\mathbf{G}_k = \mathbf{I} + (c_k - 1)(\delta_0 \delta_0^\top + \delta_k \delta_k^\top) + s_k(\delta_0 \delta_k^\top - \delta_k \delta_0^\top)$, can be constructed as follows:

Taking out the k -th column of the following equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix}.$$

We realize that $r_{kk} \neq 0$, and let $c_k = \frac{\sqrt{r_{kk}^2 - v_k^2}}{r_{kk}}$, $s_k = \frac{v_k}{r_{kk}}$. Then,

$$\begin{cases} 0 \rightarrow s_k r_{kk} = v_k; \\ r_{kk} \rightarrow c_k r_{kk} = \sqrt{r_{kk}^2 - v_k^2} = r'_{kk}. \end{cases}$$

To ensure the positive definiteness of \mathbf{A}' , it is necessary for $r_{kk}^2 > v_k^2$. Otherwise, c_k as defined above will not exist.

Again, one can check that by multiply the l.h.s. of Equation (2.1) by its transpose, we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_n \dots \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{G}_2 \dots \mathbf{G}_n \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}.$$

And multiplying the r.h.s. by its transpose, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} & \mathbf{R}'^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}' \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{R}'^\top \mathbf{R}'.$$

This results in $\mathbf{R}'^\top \mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top$.

2.10. Application: Indefinite Rank Two Update

Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ be the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A} , Goldfarb (1976); Seeger (2004) introduce a stable method for the indefinite rank-two update of the form

$$\mathbf{A}' = (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}^\top) \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top).$$

Let

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{R}^{-\top} \mathbf{v}, \\ \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}, \end{cases} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{z}, \\ \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{w}. \end{cases}$$

And suppose the LQ decomposition⁴ of $\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{z}\mathbf{w}^\top$ is given by $\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{z}\mathbf{w}^\top = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{Q}$, where \mathbf{L} is lower triangular and \mathbf{Q} is orthogonal. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}' &= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}^\top) \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top) \\ &= (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{z}\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-\top}) \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{w}\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{R}) \\ &= \mathbf{R}^\top (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{z}\mathbf{w}^\top) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{z}^\top) \mathbf{R} \\ &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{L}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{R} \\ &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{L}$, which is lower triangular, we determine the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A}' .

Chapter 2 Problems

⁴. We will shortly introduce in Theorem 3.10 (p. 71).

1. Given positive semidefinite matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}$ is also positive semidefinite.
2. Given symmetric matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Prove the following two claims are equivalent:
 - (a) \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are positive semidefinite.
 - (b) $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix}$ is positive semidefinite.
3. Given a matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top$, show that
 - (a) \mathbf{A} is positive semidefinite.
 - (b) \mathbf{A} is positive definite if and only if \mathbf{B} has full row rank.
4. Show that if \mathbf{A} is positive semidefinite, then \mathbf{A}^{-1} is positive definite.
5. Given a positive semidefinite matrix \mathbf{A} , show that its eigenvalue λ is nonnegative.

Part II

Triangularization, Orthogonalization, and Gram-Schmidt Process

QR Decomposition

Contents

3.1	QR Decomposition	49
3.2	Project a Vector Onto Another Vector	49
3.3	Project a Vector Onto a Plane	50
3.4	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process	50
3.5	Orthogonal vs Orthonormal	52
3.6	Computing the Reduced QR Decomposition via CGS and MGS	53
3.7	Computing the Full QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process	57
3.8	Dependent Columns	58
3.9	QR with Column Pivoting: Column-Pivoted QR (CPQR) . .	58
3.9.1	A Simple CPQR via CGS	59
3.9.2	A Practical CPQR via CGS	60
3.10	QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-One Deficiency .	60
3.11	QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-r Deficiency* . .	61
3.12	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Householder Reflector	62
3.13	Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Givens Rotation .	66
3.14	Uniqueness of the QR Decomposition	70
3.15	LQ Decomposition	71
3.16	Two-Sided Orthogonal Decomposition	72
3.17	Rank-One Changes	73
3.18	Appending or Deleting a Column	75
3.19	Appending or Deleting a Row	77
	Chapter 3 Problems	79

3.1. QR Decomposition



In many applications, we are interested in the column space of a matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The successive spaces spanned by the columns $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots$ of \mathbf{A} are

$$\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1]) \subseteq \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2]) \subseteq \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3]) \subseteq \dots,$$

where $\mathcal{C}([\dots])$ is the subspace spanned by the vectors included in the brackets. The concept behind QR decomposition involves constructing a sequence of orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots$ that span identical successive subspaces:

$$\{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1])\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2])\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3])\} \subseteq \dots$$

The result of QR decomposition is presented in the following theorem, and the discussion of its existence is deferred to the next sections.

Theorem 3.1: (QR Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ (whether it has linearly independent or dependent columns) with $m \geq n$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R},$$

where

1. **Reduced:** \mathbf{Q} is $m \times n$ with orthonormal columns, and \mathbf{R} is an $n \times n$ upper triangular matrix, known as the *reduced QR decomposition*;
2. **Full:** \mathbf{Q} is $m \times m$ with orthonormal columns, and \mathbf{R} is an $m \times n$ upper triangular matrix, known as the *full QR decomposition*. If we further restrict the upper triangular matrix to be a square matrix, the full QR decomposition can be denoted by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_0 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{R}_0 is an $n \times n$ upper triangular matrix.

Specifically, when \mathbf{A} has full rank, i.e., \mathbf{A} has linearly independent columns, \mathbf{R} also has linearly independent columns, and \mathbf{R} is nonsingular in the *reduced* case. This implies the diagonals of \mathbf{R} are nonzero. Under this condition, when we further constrain the elements on the diagonal of \mathbf{R} to be positive, the *reduced* QR decomposition is **unique**. The *full* QR decomposition is typically not unique since the right-most $(m - n)$ columns in \mathbf{Q} can be arranged in any order.

3.2. Project a Vector Onto Another Vector

Projecting a vector \mathbf{a} onto another vector \mathbf{b} involves finding the vector closest to \mathbf{a} on the line defined by \mathbf{b} . The projection vector $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is a scalar multiple of \mathbf{b} , denoted as $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = \hat{x}\mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{a} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is perpendicular to \mathbf{b} , as illustrated in Figure 3.1(a). This relationship yields the following result:

Project Vector \mathbf{a} Onto Vector \mathbf{b}

$\mathbf{a}^\perp = \mathbf{a} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is perpendicular to \mathbf{b} , so $(\mathbf{a} - \hat{\mathbf{a}})^\top \mathbf{b} = 0$: $\hat{x} = \frac{\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{b}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = \frac{\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{b}} \mathbf{b} = \frac{\mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^\top}{\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{b}} \mathbf{a}$.




Figure 3.1: Project a vector onto a line and a space.

3.3. Project a Vector Onto a Plane

The projection of a vector \mathbf{a} onto a space spanned by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n$ involves determining the vector closest to \mathbf{a} within the column space of $[\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$. The projection vector $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is expressed as a linear combination of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n$: $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = \hat{x}_1 \mathbf{b}_1 + \hat{x}_2 \mathbf{b}_2 + \dots + \hat{x}_n \mathbf{b}_n$. This is actually a least squares problem. To find the projection, we just solve the normal equation $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{a}$, where $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = [\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \dots, \hat{x}_n]$. Further details on this projection, within the context of least squares, can be found in works by Strang (2009); Trefethen and Bau III (1997); Yang (2000); Golub and Van Loan (2013); Lu (2022a). For each vector \mathbf{b}_i , the projection of \mathbf{a} in the direction of \mathbf{b}_i can be analogously obtained by

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i = \frac{\mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{b}_i^\top}{\mathbf{b}_i^\top \mathbf{b}_i} \mathbf{a}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$, this yields

$$\mathbf{a}^\perp = (\mathbf{a} - \hat{\mathbf{a}}) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}),$$

meaning that $(\mathbf{a} - \hat{\mathbf{a}})$ is perpendicular to the column space of $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$, as shown in Figure 3.1(b).

3.4. Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process

For three linearly independent vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3\}$ and the space spanned by the three linearly independent vectors, denoted by $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3])$, which corresponds to the column space of the matrix $[\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3]$, we aim to construct three orthogonal vectors $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3\}$ such that $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3])$. Subsequently, we normalize the orthogonal vectors

by dividing each by its length. This process yields three mutually orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{q}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_1}{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|}$, $\mathbf{q}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_2}{\|\mathbf{b}_2\|}$, and $\mathbf{q}_3 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_3}{\|\mathbf{b}_3\|}$.

For the first vector, we directly choose $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{a}_1$. The second vector \mathbf{b}_2 must be perpendicular to the first one. This is actually the vector \mathbf{a}_2 subtracting its projection along \mathbf{b}_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_2 &= \mathbf{a}_2 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \mathbf{a}_2 = \left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \right) \mathbf{a}_2 && \text{(Projection view)} \\ &= \mathbf{a}_2 - \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{a}_2}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \mathbf{b}_1}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_2}, && \text{(Combination view)} \end{aligned}$$

where the first equation shows \mathbf{b}_2 is a multiplication of the matrix $\left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \right)$ and the vector \mathbf{a}_2 , i.e., projecting \mathbf{a}_2 onto the orthogonal complement space of $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1])$. The second equality in the above equation expresses \mathbf{a}_2 as a linear combination of \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 . It is evident that the space spanned by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ is the same space spanned by $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2$. The situation is shown in Figure 3.2(a) in which case we choose **the direction of \mathbf{b}_1 as the x -axis in the Cartesian coordinate system**. $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_2$ is the projection of \mathbf{a}_2 onto line \mathbf{b}_1 . It can be clearly shown that the component of \mathbf{a}_2 perpendicular to \mathbf{b}_1 is $\mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{a}_2 - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2$ from the figure.

For the third vector \mathbf{b}_3 , it must be perpendicular to both \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 , which is actually the vector \mathbf{a}_3 subtracting its projection along the plane spanned by \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_3 &= \mathbf{a}_3 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \mathbf{a}_3 - \frac{\mathbf{b}_2 \mathbf{b}_2^\top}{\mathbf{b}_2^\top \mathbf{b}_2} \mathbf{a}_3 = \left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_2 \mathbf{b}_2^\top}{\mathbf{b}_2^\top \mathbf{b}_2} \right) \mathbf{a}_3 && \text{(Projection view)} \\ &= \mathbf{a}_3 - \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{a}_3}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} \mathbf{b}_1}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}_3} - \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{b}_2^\top \mathbf{a}_3}{\mathbf{b}_2^\top \mathbf{b}_2} \mathbf{b}_2}_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_3}, && \text{(Combination view)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where the first equation shows that \mathbf{b}_3 is a multiplication of the matrix $\left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_1^\top}{\mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_1} - \frac{\mathbf{b}_2 \mathbf{b}_2^\top}{\mathbf{b}_2^\top \mathbf{b}_2} \right)$ and the vector \mathbf{a}_3 , i.e., projecting \mathbf{a}_3 onto the orthogonal complement space of $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2])$. The second equality in the above equation expresses \mathbf{a}_3 as a linear combination of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3$. We will see this property is essential in the idea of the QR decomposition. Again, it can be shown that the space spanned by $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3$ is the same space spanned by $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3$. The situation is shown in Figure 3.2(b) in which case we choose **the direction of \mathbf{b}_2 as the y -axis in the Cartesian coordinate system**. $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_3$ is the projection of \mathbf{a}_3 onto line \mathbf{b}_1 , while $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_3$ is the projection of \mathbf{a}_3 onto line \mathbf{b}_2 . The figure shows that the component of \mathbf{a}_3 perpendicular to both \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 is $\mathbf{b}_3 = \mathbf{a}_3 - \hat{\mathbf{a}}_3 - \bar{\mathbf{a}}_3$.

Finally, we normalize each vector by dividing its length, which produces three orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{q}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_1}{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|}$, $\mathbf{q}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_2}{\|\mathbf{b}_2\|}$, and $\mathbf{q}_3 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_3}{\|\mathbf{b}_3\|}$.




Figure 3.2: The Gram-Schmidt process.

This idea can be extended to a set of vectors rather than only three. And we call this process *Gram-Schmidt process*. After this process, matrix \mathbf{A} will be triangularized. The method is named after *Jørgen Pedersen Gram* and *Erhard Schmidt*, but it appeared earlier in the work of *Pierre-Simon Laplace* in the theory of Lie group decomposition.

As we mentioned previously, the idea of behind the QR decomposition is the construction of a sequence of orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots$ that span the same successive subspaces.

$$\{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1])\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2])\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3]) = \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3])\} \subseteq \dots$$

This implies any vector \mathbf{a}_k is in the space spanned by $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_k])$.¹ As long as we have found these orthonormal vectors, to reconstruct \mathbf{a}_i 's from the orthonormal matrix $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n]$, an upper triangular matrix \mathbf{R} is needed such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$.

The Gram-Schmidt process is not the only algorithm for finding the QR decomposition. Other QR decomposition algorithms, such as *Householder reflections* and *Givens rotations*, are available, demonstrating increased robustness in the presence of round-off errors. These QR decomposition methods may also change the order in which the columns of \mathbf{A} are processed.

3.5. Orthogonal vs Orthonormal

The vectors $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are *mutually orthogonal* when their dot products $\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{q}_j$ are zero whenever $i \neq j$. After normalizing each vector by its length, the vectors become orthogonal unit vectors. Then the vectors $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n$ are *mutually orthonormal*. We put the orthonormal vectors into a matrix \mathbf{Q} :

- When $m \neq n$: the matrix \mathbf{Q} is easy to work with because $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Such a matrix \mathbf{Q} with $m \neq n$ is sometimes referred to as a *semi-orthogonal* matrix.
- When $m = n$: the matrix \mathbf{Q} is square, the condition $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}$ means that $\mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}$, meaning the transpose of \mathbf{Q} serves as its inverse. Then we also have $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{I}$, i.e., \mathbf{Q}^\top is the *two-sided inverse* of \mathbf{Q} . We call this \mathbf{Q} an *orthogonal matrix*.²

1. And also, any vector \mathbf{q}_k is in the space spanned by $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k])$.

2. Note that we use the term *orthogonal matrix* to mean the matrix \mathbf{Q} has orthonormal columns. The term *orthonormal matrix* is **not** used for historical reasons.

To see this, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_1^\top \\ \mathbf{q}_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{q}_n^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_1 & \mathbf{q}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{q}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In other words, $\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{q}_j = \delta_{ij}$, where δ_{ij} is the *Kronecker delta*. The columns of an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ constitute an *orthonormal basis* for \mathbb{R}^n .

Orthogonal matrices can be viewed as matrices transforming the basis of other matrices. Hence they preserve the angle (inner product) between the vectors:

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{u})^\top (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}).$$

This invariance of the inner products of angles between the vectors also relies on the invariance of their lengths:

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{u}\|.$$

In real cases, multiplication by an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} induces rotation (if $\det(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$) or reflection (if $\det(\mathbf{Q}) = -1$) in the original vector space. Many decomposition algorithms yield two orthogonal matrices, leading to two of such rotations or reflections.

3.6. Computing the Reduced QR Decomposition via CGS and MGS

Expressing the reduced QR decomposition in the form $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we have:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 & \mathbf{a}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{a}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{q}_1 & \mathbf{q}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{q}_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \cdots & r_{1n} \\ & r_{22} & \cdots & r_{2n} \\ 0 & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & r_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} can be easily calculated by the Gram-Schmidt process. To see why we obtain the upper triangular matrix \mathbf{R} , we explicitly write out these equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_1 &= r_{11}\mathbf{q}_1 \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_k &= r_{1k}\mathbf{q}_1 + r_{2k}\mathbf{q}_2 + \cdots + r_{kk}\mathbf{q}_k \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=1}^1 r_{i1}\mathbf{q}_i, \\ & \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k r_{ik}\mathbf{q}_i, \end{aligned}$$

which aligns with the second equation of Equation (3.1) and conforms to the form of an upper triangular matrix \mathbf{R} . And if we extend the idea of Equation (3.1) to the k -th term,

we will get

$$\mathbf{a}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k) \mathbf{q}_i + \mathbf{a}_k^\perp = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k) \mathbf{q}_i + \|\mathbf{a}_k^\perp\| \cdot \mathbf{q}_k,$$

which implies we can gradually orthonormalize \mathbf{A} to obtain an orthonormal set $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n]$ by

$$\begin{cases} r_{ik} = \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}; \\ \mathbf{a}_k^\perp = \mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i; \\ r_{kk} = \|\mathbf{a}_k^\perp\|; \\ \mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{a}_k^\perp / r_{kk}. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

The procedure is formulated in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 Reduced QR Decomposition via Gram-Schmidt Process

Require: Matrix \mathbf{A} has linearly independent columns with size $m \times n$ and $m \geq n$;

- 1: **for** $k = 1$ to n **do** ▷ compute k -th column of \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R}
- 2: **for** $i = 1$ to $k-1$ **do**
- 3: $r_{ik} = \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k$; ▷ entry (i, k) of \mathbf{R}
- 4: **end for**
- 5: $\mathbf{a}_k^\perp = \mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i$;
- 6: $r_{kk} = \|\mathbf{a}_k^\perp\|$; ▷ main diagonal of \mathbf{R}
- 7: $\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{a}_k^\perp / r_{kk}$;
- 8: **end for**
- 9: Output $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n]$ and \mathbf{R} with entry (i, k) being r_{ik} ;

Orthogonal projection. We notice again from Equation (3.2), i.e., step 2 to step 6 in Algorithm 4, that the first two equalities imply that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} r_{ik} &= \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\} \\ \mathbf{a}_k^\perp &= \mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i \end{aligned} \right\} \rightarrow \mathbf{a}_k^\perp = \mathbf{a}_k - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top \mathbf{a}_k = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top) \mathbf{a}_k, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_{k-1} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}]$. This implies \mathbf{q}_k can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{q}_k = \frac{\mathbf{a}_k^\perp}{\|\mathbf{a}_k^\perp\|} = \frac{(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top) \mathbf{a}_k}{\|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top) \mathbf{a}_k\|}.$$

The matrix $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)$ in the above equation is known as an *orthogonal projection matrix* that projects \mathbf{a}_k **along** the column space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} , ensuring the projected vector is perpendicular to the column space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} (Lu, 2021c). The net result is that the \mathbf{a}_k^\perp or \mathbf{q}_k calculated in this manner will be orthogonal to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1})$, i.e., in the null space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top : $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)$ as per the fundamental theorem of linear algebra (Theorem 0.3, p. 6).

Let $\mathbf{P}_1 = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)$, and we assert that $\mathbf{P}_1 = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)$ is an orthogonal projection matrix such that $\mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{v}$ will project the vector \mathbf{v} onto the null space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top . Additionally, let $\mathbf{P}_2 = \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top$, then \mathbf{P}_2 is also an orthogonal projection matrix such that $\mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{v}$ will project the vector \mathbf{v} onto the column space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} .

Why can the matrices \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 effectively project a vector onto the corresponding subspaces? It can be easily shown that the column space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} is equal to the column space of $\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top$:

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{P}_2).$$

Therefore, the result of $\mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{v}$ represents a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{P}_2 , which is in the column space of \mathbf{P}_2 or the column space of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} . The formal definition of a *projection matrix* \mathbf{P} states that it is idempotent $\mathbf{P}^2 = \mathbf{P}$ such that applying the projection twice is equal to projecting once. What distinguishes $\mathbf{P}_2 = \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top$ is that the projection $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ of any vector \mathbf{v} is perpendicular to $\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}$:

$$(\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{v}) \perp (\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}).$$

This aligns with the initial definition we presented: the *orthogonal projection matrix*. To avoid confusion, one may use the term *oblique projection matrix* in the nonorthogonal case. When \mathbf{P}_2 is an orthogonal projection matrix, $\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_2$ is also an orthogonal projection matrix that will project any vector onto the space perpendicular to the $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1})$, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)$. Therefore, we conclude the presence of two orthogonal projections:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{P}_1 : & \text{project onto } \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top), \text{ along the column space of } \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}; \\ \mathbf{P}_2 : & \text{project onto } \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}), \text{ onto the column space of } \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}. \end{cases}$$

An additional noteworthy result emerges when the columns of \mathbf{Q}_{k-1} are mutually orthonormal. In such instances, we can observe the following decomposition:

$$\boxed{\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^\top)(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^\top) \dots (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\mathbf{q}_{k-1}^\top),} \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_{k-1} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}]$ and each $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_i\mathbf{q}_i^\top)$ functions to project a vector onto the space perpendicular to \mathbf{q}_i . This finding is crucial for advancing towards a *modified Gram-Schmidt process (MGS)*, where we project and subtract on the fly. To avoid ambiguity, the traditional Gram-Schmidt is called the *classical Gram-Schmidt process (CGS)*. The difference lies in the fact that in the CGS, we project the same vector onto the orthonormal ones and subsequently subtract. However, in the MGS, the projection and subtraction occur interleaved. A three-column example $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3]$ is shown in Figure 3.3, where each step is denoted in a different color. We summarize the difference between the CGS and MGS processes for obtaining \mathbf{q}_k from the k -th column \mathbf{a}_k of \mathbf{A} and the orthonormalized vectors $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(CGS) : obtain } \mathbf{q}_k & \text{ by normalizing } \mathbf{a}_k^\perp = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}\mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^\top)\mathbf{a}_k; \\ \text{(MGS) : obtain } \mathbf{q}_k & \text{ by normalizing } \mathbf{a}_k^\perp = \left\{ (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\mathbf{q}_{k-1}^\top) \dots \left[(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^\top) \left((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q}_1^\top)\mathbf{a}_k \right) \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the parentheses of the MGS indicate the order of the computation.




Figure 3.3: CGS vs MGS in 3-dimensional space, where q_2' is parallel to q_2 so that projecting on q_2 is equivalent to projecting on q_2' .

What's the difference? Consider a three-column matrix $A = [a_1, a_2, a_3]$ for illustration. Suppose we have computed $\{q_1, q_2\}$ satisfying $\text{span}\{q_1, q_2\} = \text{span}\{a_1, a_2\}$, our objective is to further compute q_3 .

In the CGS algorithm, the orthogonalization of column a_3 against column $\{q_1, q_2\}$ is accomplished by simultaneously projecting the original column a_3 of A onto q_1 and q_2 , followed by subtraction at once:

$$\begin{cases} a_3^\perp = a_3 - (q_1^\top a_3)q_1 - (q_2^\top a_3)q_2 \\ \quad = a_3 - (q_1 q_1^\top) a_3 - \boxed{(q_2 q_2^\top) a_3}; \\ q_3 = \frac{a_3^\perp}{\|a_3^\perp\|}, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

as shown in Figure 3.3(a).

In the MGS algorithm, on the other hand, the components along each $\{q_1, q_2\}$ are immediately subtracted out of the rest of the column a_3 as soon as the $\{q_1, q_2\}$ are computed. Therefore the orthogonalization of column a_3 against $\{q_1, q_2\}$ is not performed by projecting the original column a_3 against $\{q_1, q_2\}$ as it is in the CGS, but rather against a vector obtained by subtracting from that column a_3 of A the components in the direction of q_1, q_2 successively. This distinction is crucial because it leads to smaller error components of q_3 in $\text{span}\{q_1, q_2\}$ will be smaller (further discussed in the following paragraphs).

More precisely, in the MGS algorithm, the orthogonalization of column a_3 against q_1 is accomplished by subtracting the component of q_1 from the vector a_3 :

$$a_3^{(1)} = (I - q_1 q_1^\top) a_3 = a_3 - (q_1 q_1^\top) a_3,$$

where $a_3^{(1)}$ represents the component of a_3 orthogonal to q_1 . The subsequently step is then executed by

$$\begin{aligned} a_3^{(2)} &= (I - q_2 q_2^\top) a_3^{(1)} = a_3^{(1)} - (q_2 q_2^\top) a_3^{(1)} \\ &= a_3 - (q_1 q_1^\top) a_3 - \boxed{(q_2 q_2^\top) a_3^{(1)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathbf{a}_3^{(2)}$ denotes the component of $\mathbf{a}_3^{(1)}$ orthogonal to \mathbf{q}_2 , and we emphasize the distinction from the CGS in Equation (3.5) using blue text. Consequently, $\mathbf{a}_3^{(2)}$ corresponds to the component of \mathbf{a}_3 orthogonal to $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2\}$, as shown in Figure 3.3(b).

Main difference and catastrophic cancellation. The key difference is that the \mathbf{a}_3 can in general have large components in $\text{span}\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2\}$ in which case one starts with large values and ends up with small values that results in large relative errors in them. This is known as *catastrophic cancellation*. Conversely, $\mathbf{a}_3^{(1)}$ is in the direction perpendicular to \mathbf{q}_1 and has only a small “error” component in the direction of \mathbf{q}_1 . A comparison of the boxed text in Equation (3.5) and (3.6) reveals that $(\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{q}_2^\top)\mathbf{a}_3^{(1)}$ in Equation (3.6) is more accurate from the above argument. And thus, due to the much smaller error in this projection factor, the MGS introduces smaller orthogonalization error at each subtraction step compared to the CGS method. In fact, it can be shown that the final \mathbf{Q} obtained in the CGS satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top\| \leq O(\epsilon\kappa^2(\mathbf{A})),$$

where $\kappa(\mathbf{A})$ is a value larger than 1 determined by \mathbf{A} . Whereas, in the MGS, the error satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top\| \leq O(\epsilon\kappa(\mathbf{A})).$$

That is, the \mathbf{Q} obtained in the MGS is “more orthogonal”.

More to go, preliminaries for Householder and Givens methods. While we assert that, in practice, the MGS generally outperforms the CGS, it is not immune to the *catastrophic cancellation* issue. Suppose, in iteration k of the MGS algorithm, \mathbf{a}_k is almost in the span of $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\}$, the resulting \mathbf{a}_k^\perp will have only a small component perpendicular to $\text{span}\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\}$. Consequently, the “error” component in the $\text{span}\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}\}$ will be amplified, leading to a less orthogonal \mathbf{Q} . In such cases, if we can find a successive set of orthogonal matrices $\{\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_l\}$ such that $\mathbf{Q}_l \dots \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{A}$ is triangularized, then $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{Q}_l \dots \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_1)^\top$ will be “more” orthogonal than those in both the CGS and the MGS methods. This method will be explored in Section 3.12 and 3.13 via Householder reflectors and Givens rotations.

3.7. Computing the Full QR Decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt Process

A full QR decomposition of an $m \times n$ matrix with linearly independent columns is extended by appending additional $m - n$ orthonormal columns to \mathbf{Q} so that it becomes an $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix. In addition, rows of zeros are appended to \mathbf{R} so that it becomes an $m \times n$ upper triangular matrix. We call the additional columns in \mathbf{Q} **silent columns** and additional rows in \mathbf{R} **silent rows**. Figure 3.4 illustrates the comparison between the reduced QR decomposition and the full QR decomposition, where silent columns in \mathbf{Q} are denoted in gray, blank entries are zero, and blue entries are elements that are not necessarily zero.




Figure 3.4: Comparison between the reduced and full QR decompositions.

3.8. Dependent Columns

Previously, we assumed matrix \mathbf{A} has linearly independent columns. However, this assumption is not always a prerequisite. Suppose in step k of CGS or MGS, \mathbf{a}_k is in the plane spanned by $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}$ which is equivalent to the space spanned by $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1}$, i.e., vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k$ are dependent. When such dependency occurs, r_{kk} becomes zero (see Equation (3.2) or Algorithm 4), rendering \mathbf{q}_k indeterminate due to division by zero. In such scenarios, one can arbitrarily select \mathbf{q}_k as any normalized vector orthogonal to $\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}])$ and continue the Gram-Schmidt process. Again, for matrix \mathbf{A} with dependent columns, we have both reduced and full QR decomposition algorithms. We rephrase the procedure for step k in the algorithm as follows:

$$\mathbf{q}_k = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i) / r_{kk}, & r_{ik} = \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_k, r_{kk} = \left\| \mathbf{a}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i \right\|, \text{ if } r_{kk} \neq 0, \\ \text{pick one in } \mathcal{C}^\perp([\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{k-1}]), \text{ and normalize,} & \text{if } r_{kk} = 0. \end{cases}$$

This concept extends even when \mathbf{q}_k is non-existent. In such instances, we simply proceed to the next step, incorporating the silent columns at the end of the process. Consequently, the QR decomposition of a matrix with dependent columns lacks uniqueness. However, adhering to a systematic approach ensures the uniqueness of the QR decomposition for any matrix.

This finding can also help to decide whether a set of vectors are linearly independent or not. Whenever r_{kk} in CGS or MGS is zero, we report that the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k$ are dependent and stop the algorithm for “independence checking”.

3.9. QR with Column Pivoting: Column-Pivoted QR (CPQR)

If the columns of \mathbf{A} are linearly dependent, we can obtain a column-pivoted QR (CPQR) decomposition as follows.

Theorem 3.2: (Column-Pivoted QR Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ with $m \geq n$ and rank r can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is upper triangular, $\mathbf{R}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is an orthogonal matrix, and \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix. This is also known as the *full* CPQR decomposition. Similarly, the *reduced* version is given by

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{Q}_r [\mathbf{R}_{11} \quad \mathbf{R}_{12}],$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is upper triangular, $\mathbf{R}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$, $\mathbf{Q}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ contains orthonormal columns, and \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix.

3.9.1 A Simple CPQR via CGS

The CPQR decomposition can be computed using the classical Gram-Schmidt process. In the QR decomposition for dependent columns, when $r_{kk} = 0$, it indicates that column k of \mathbf{A} is dependent on the previous $k-1$ columns. In such cases, we perform a column permutation, moving this column to the last position, and then continue with the Gram-Schmidt process. Here, \mathbf{P} represents the permutation matrix that interchanges the dependent columns into the last $n-r$ columns. Suppose the first r columns of \mathbf{AP} are $[\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_r]$, and the span of these columns is just the same as the span of \mathbf{Q}_r (in the reduced version) or the span of $\mathbf{Q}_{:,1:r}$ (in the full version):

$$\mathcal{C}([\hat{\mathbf{a}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_r]) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_r) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Q}_{:,1:r}).$$

And \mathbf{R}_{12} is a matrix that recovers the dependent $n-r$ columns from the column space of \mathbf{Q}_r or column space of $\mathbf{Q}_{:,1:r}$. The comparison between the reduced and full CPQR decompositions is shown in Figure 3.5, where silent columns in \mathbf{Q} are denoted in gray, blank entries are zero, and blue/orange entries are elements that are not necessarily zero.




Figure 3.5: Comparison between the reduced and full CPQR decompositions.

3.9.2 A Practical CPQR via CGS

We observe that the simple CPQR algorithm pivots the first r independent columns to the first r columns of \mathbf{AP} . Let \mathbf{A}_1 be the first r columns of \mathbf{AP} , and \mathbf{A}_2 be the remaining columns. Subsequently, in the context of the full CPQR, we obtain:

$$\mathbf{AP} = [\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2] = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right].$$

It is evident that

$$\|\mathbf{A}_2\| = \left\| \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \|\mathbf{R}_{12}\|,$$

where the penultimate equality comes from the orthogonal equivalence under the matrix norm. Therefore, the norm of \mathbf{R}_{12} is determined by the norm of \mathbf{A}_2 . For a well-conditioned CPQR, it is desirable for \mathbf{R}_{12} to have a small norm. And a practical CPQR decomposition is to permute columns of the matrix \mathbf{A} firstly such that the columns are ordered decreasingly in vector norm:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{AP}_0 = [\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_n}],$$

where $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n\}$ is a permuted index set of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and

$$\|\mathbf{a}_{j_1}\| \geq \|\mathbf{a}_{j_2}\| \geq \dots \geq \|\mathbf{a}_{j_n}\|.$$

Then, we apply the “simple” reduced CPQR decomposition to $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, yielding $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_r[\mathbf{R}_{11}, \mathbf{R}_{12}]$. The “practical” reduced CPQR of \mathbf{A} is then recovered as

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_0 \mathbf{P}_1}_{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{Q}_r[\mathbf{R}_{11}, \mathbf{R}_{12}].$$

The CPQR algorithm can be further optimized using the MGS, providing the additional advantage of halting when the factorization operates on a rank-deficient submatrix. Through this MGS-enhanced CPQR, the numerical rank can be determined. This approach is recognized as *partial factorization*, and we will not delve into the details here (Lu, 2021c).

3.10. QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-One Deficiency

We notice that column-pivoted QR is just one method among several used to identify the column permutation when \mathbf{A} is rank-deficient. In this process, we rearrange the first r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} to occupy the first r columns of the matrix \mathbf{AP} . If \mathbf{A} is nearly rank-one deficient, our objective is to determine a column permutation of \mathbf{A} that minimizes the pivotal element r_{nn} in the resulting QR decomposition. This is known as the *revealing rank-one deficiency* problem.

Theorem 3.3: (Revealing Rank-One Deficiency (Chan, 1987)) If $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a unit 2-norm vector (i.e., $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$), then there exists a permutation \mathbf{P} such that the reduced QR decomposition

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{QR}$$

satisfies $r_{nn} \leq \sqrt{n}\epsilon$, where $\epsilon = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}\|$, and r_{nn} is the n -th diagonal of \mathbf{R} . Note the sizes of $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ in the reduced QR decomposition.

Proof [of Theorem 3.3] Suppose $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a permutation matrix such that if $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{v}$, where

$$|w_n| = \max |v_i|, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

That is, we swap the entry with the largest magnitude to the last position, ensuring that the last component of \mathbf{w} equals the maximal component of \mathbf{v} in absolute value. Then we have $|w_n| \geq 1/\sqrt{n}$. Suppose the QR decomposition of \mathbf{AP} is $\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{QR}$, then

$$\epsilon = \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}\| = \|(\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{AP})(\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{v})\| = \|\mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}\| = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ r_{nn}w_n \end{bmatrix} \geq |r_{nn}w_n| \geq |r_{nn}|/\sqrt{n},$$

where the second equality follows from the preservation of length under orthogonal transformation, and \mathbf{P} is an orthogonal matrix satisfying $\mathbf{PP}^\top = \mathbf{I}$. This concludes the proof. ■

The following discussion relies on the existence of the singular value decomposition (SVD), which will be introduced in Section 14.1 (p. 173). Feel free to skip at a first reading. Suppose the SVD of \mathbf{A} is given by $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, where σ_i 's are singular values with $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n$, i.e., σ_n is the smallest singular value, and \mathbf{u}_i 's and \mathbf{v}_i 's are the left and right singular vectors, respectively. Then, if we let $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_n$ such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_n = \sigma_n \mathbf{u}_n$,³ we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}\| = \sigma_n.$$

By constructing a permutation matrix \mathbf{P} satisfying

$$|\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{v}|_n = \max |\mathbf{v}_i|, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

we will find a QR decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$ with a pivot r_{nn} smaller than $\sqrt{n}\sigma_n$. If \mathbf{A} is rank-one deficient, then σ_n will be close to 0, the resulting pivot r_{nn} is constrained to a small magnitude near 0.

3.11. QR with Column Pivoting: Revealing Rank-r Deficiency*

Following from the last section, we now delve into the computation of the reduced QR decomposition when $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is approximately rank- r deficient⁴ with $r > 1$. Our goal now is to find a permutation \mathbf{P} satisfying

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{QR} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, and $\|\mathbf{N}\|$ is small in some norm. A recursive algorithm can be applied to achieve this. Suppose we have already isolated a small $k \times k$ block \mathbf{N}_k , based on which,

3. We will prove that the right singular vector of \mathbf{A} is equal to the right singular vector of \mathbf{R} if the \mathbf{A} has QR decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$ in Lemma 14.9 (p. 178). The claim can also be applied to the singular values. So \mathbf{v}_n here is also the right singular vector of \mathbf{R} .

4. Note that rank r here implies that the matrix has a rank of $(\min\{m, n\} - r)$, not r .

if we can isolate a small $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ block \mathbf{N}_{k+1} , then we can find the permutation matrix recursively. To reiterate, assuming the existence of the permutation \mathbf{P}_k such that $\mathbf{N}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ possesses a small norm:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_k = \mathbf{Q}_k\mathbf{R}_k = \mathbf{Q}_k \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_k & \mathbf{M}_k \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N}_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

We want to identify a permutation \mathbf{P}_{k+1} such that $\mathbf{N}_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$ also exhibits a small norm:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \mathbf{Q}_{k+1}\mathbf{R}_{k+1} = \mathbf{Q}_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{k+1} & \mathbf{M}_{k+1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Utilizing the algorithm outlined in the preceding section, there is an $(n-k) \times (n-k)$ permutation matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{k+1}$ such that $\mathbf{L}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-k) \times (n-k)}$ has the QR decomposition $\mathbf{L}_k\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{k+1}\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_k$, where the entry $(n-k, n-k)$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_k$ is small. By constructing

$$\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \mathbf{P}_k \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{k+1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Q}_{k+1} = \mathbf{Q}_k \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{k+1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \mathbf{Q}_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_k & \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{M}_k \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N}_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

We know that entry $(n-k, n-k)$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_k$ is small, if we can prove the last row of $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{M}_k$ is small in norm, then we find the QR decomposition revealing rank- $(k+1)$ deficiency (see (Chan, 1987) for a proof).

3.12. Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Householder Reflector

Householder matrices, also known as *Householder reflectors*, that can reflect vectors play an important role in numerical linear algebra for tasks such as solving linear systems, estimating least squares problem, and obtaining Hessenberg forms. In this section, we present how Householder reflectors can be used to prove the existence of QR decomposition.

Let's begin with the formal definition of a Householder reflector, exploring its properties thereafter.

Definition 3.1 (Householder Reflector) Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector of unit length (i.e., $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$). Then $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$ is termed a Householder reflector, also known as a Householder transformation. We refer to this \mathbf{H} as the Householder reflector associated with the unit vector \mathbf{u} , where the unit vector \mathbf{u} is also known as the Householder vector. When a vector \mathbf{x} undergoes multiplication by \mathbf{H} , it undergoes reflection across the hyperplane $\text{span}\mathbf{u}^\perp$.

Note that if $\|\mathbf{u}\| \neq 1$, we can define $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\frac{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top}{\mathbf{u}^\top\mathbf{u}}$ as the Householder reflector.

Derived from the definition of the Householder reflector, we obtain the following corollary, indicating that specific vectors remain unaltered when subjected to the Householder reflector.




Figure 3.6: Demonstration of the Householder reflector. The Householder reflector obtained by $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$, where $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$ will reflect vector \mathbf{x} along the plane perpendicular to \mathbf{u} : $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{x}_u \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_v - \mathbf{x}_u$.

Corollary 3.4: (Unreflected by Householder) Assuming $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, we define the Householder reflector $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$. Any vector \mathbf{v} perpendicular to \mathbf{u} remains unaltered under the Householder transformation, that is, $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ if $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v} = 0$.

The proof is trivial since $(\mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top)\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$.

Let \mathbf{u} be a unit vector with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, and let \mathbf{v} be a vector perpendicular to \mathbf{u} . Then any vector \mathbf{x} in the plane can be decomposed into two parts: $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{x}_u$, where the first component \mathbf{x}_u is parallel to \mathbf{u} and the second one \mathbf{x}_v is perpendicular to \mathbf{u} (i.e., parallel to \mathbf{v}). As discussed in Section 3.2 regarding vector projection, the computation of \mathbf{x}_u involves $\mathbf{x}_u = \frac{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top}{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{x}$, signifying the projection of \mathbf{x} onto the vector \mathbf{u} . We then transform this \mathbf{x} by the Householder reflector associated with \mathbf{u} , $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top)(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{x}_u) = \mathbf{x}_v - \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_v - \mathbf{x}_u$. That is, the space perpendicular to \mathbf{u} acts as a mirror and any vector \mathbf{x} is reflected by the Householder reflector associated with \mathbf{u} (i.e., reflected by the hyperplane $\text{span}\{\mathbf{u}\}^\perp$). The situation is shown in Figure 3.6.

The preceding explanation elucidates the process of determining the reflected vector through the Householder reflector. Nevertheless, an additional question arises: If forewarned that two vectors undergo a Householder reflection, how can we determine the corresponding Householder reflector? This property holds paramount significance in QR decomposition computations, where the objective is to reflect/transform a column into a predetermined form.

Corollary 3.5: (Finding the Householder Reflector) Suppose \mathbf{x} is reflected to \mathbf{y} by a Householder reflector with $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{y}\|$, then the Householder reflector is obtained by

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top, \text{ where } \mathbf{u} = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|}.$$

Proof [of Corollary 3.5] Write out the equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} &= \mathbf{x} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} - 2 \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})(\mathbf{x}^\top - \mathbf{y}^\top)}{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})} \mathbf{x} \\ &= \mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the condition $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{y}\|$ is required to prove the result. ■

The Householder reflectors are useful to set a block of components of a given vector to zero. Specifically, there is often a need to reset all elements of the vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to zero except the i -th element. In such instances, the Householder vector can be chosen as follows:

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{\mathbf{a} - r\mathbf{e}_i}{\|\mathbf{a} - r\mathbf{e}_i\|}, \quad \text{where } r = \pm \|\mathbf{a}\|$$

which is a reasonable Householder vector since $\|\mathbf{a}\| = \|r\mathbf{e}_i\| = |r|$. We carefully notice that when $r = \|\mathbf{a}\|$, the Householder reflector $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$ reflects \mathbf{a} to $\|\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{e}_i$; conversely, when $r = -\|\mathbf{a}\|$, \mathbf{a} is reflected to $-\|\mathbf{a}\|\mathbf{e}_i$ via the Householder reflector.

In the following remark, we elucidate additional properties of the Householder reflector.

Remark 3.6: Householder Properties

If \mathbf{H} is a Householder reflector, then it has the following properties:

- $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I}$: reflecting a vector twice is equivalent to not reflecting it at all;
- Symmetry: $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}^\top$;
- Orthogonality: $\mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{I}$ such that Householder reflector is an orthogonal matrix;
- $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{u}$, if $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$.

In the Gram-Schmidt section, we emphasized that QR decomposition involves using a triangular matrix to orthogonalize a matrix \mathbf{A} . The further idea is that, if we have a set of orthogonal matrices that can transform \mathbf{A} into a triangular form step by step, then we can also recover the QR decomposition. Specifically, if we have an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q}_1 that can introduce zeros to the 1-st column of \mathbf{A} except the entry (1,1); and an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q}_2 that can introduce zeros to the 2-nd column except the entries (2,1), (2,2); and so forth. Then, we can also find the QR decomposition. To achieve this zero introduction, we utilize reflections of the matrix columns with respect to a basis vector \mathbf{e}_1 whose entries are all zero except the first entry.

Let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be the column partition of \mathbf{A} , and let

$$r_1 = \|\mathbf{a}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{a}_1 - r_1\mathbf{e}_1}{\|\mathbf{a}_1 - r_1\mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{H}_1 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_1\mathbf{u}_1^\top. \quad (3.8)$$

Here, \mathbf{e}_1 denotes the first unit basis in \mathbb{R}^m , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then

$$\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{a}_n] = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & \mathbf{R}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

which reflects \mathbf{a}_1 to $r_1\mathbf{e}_1$ and introduces zeros below the diagonal in the 1-st column. We observe that the entries below r_1 become zero now after this specific reflection. Notice that we reflect \mathbf{a}_1 to $\|\mathbf{a}_1\|\mathbf{e}_1$, where the two vectors have the same length, rather than reflect \mathbf{a}_1 to \mathbf{e}_1 directly. This choice is made to ensure **numerical stability** and aligns with the criteria outlined in Corollary 3.5.

Choice of r_1 : moreover, the choice of r_1 is **not unique**. For **numerical stability**, a suitable choice is $r_1 = -\text{sign}(a_{11}) \|\mathbf{a}_1\|$, where a_{11} denotes the first component of \mathbf{a}_1 . An alternative option is $r_1 = \text{sign}(a_{11}) \|\mathbf{a}_1\|$, provided that $\|\mathbf{a}_1\|$ is equal to $\|r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|$. A comprehensive exploration of this matter, however, extends beyond the scope of the present section.

We can then apply this process to \mathbf{B}_2 in Equation (3.9) to make the entries below the entry (2,2) to be all zeros. Note that this process is selectively applied to the submatrix \mathbf{B}_2 within $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$, not to the entire matrix. This strategic limitation is imposed to avoid reintroducing nonzero values into the first column, thereby preserving the achieved progress.

Suppose $\mathbf{B}_2 = [\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$ is the column partition of \mathbf{B}_2 , and let

$$r_2 = \|\mathbf{b}_2\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_2 - r_2 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\mathbf{b}_2 - r_2 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_2^\top, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{H}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this context, \mathbf{e}_1 denotes the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{m-1} , and \mathbf{H}_2 represents another orthogonal matrix, given the orthogonality of $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2$. Consequently, we deduce that

$$\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{a}_n] = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & r_{12} & \mathbf{R}_{1,3:n} \\ 0 & r_2 & \mathbf{R}_{2,3:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The same process can go on, and we will finally triangularize $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{H}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}$. And since the \mathbf{H}_i 's are symmetric and orthogonal, we have $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{H}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} = \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_2 \dots \mathbf{H}_n$.

An illustrative 5×4 matrix is presented below, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_1} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_3} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array}$$

A closer look at the QR factorization. The Householder algorithm is a method for transforming a matrix into a triangular form through a series of orthogonal matrix operations. In the Gram-Schmidt process (both CGS and MGS), we use a triangular matrix to orthogonalize the matrix. However, in the Householder algorithm, we use orthogonal matrices to triangularize. This distinction can be summarized as follows:

- Gram-Schmidt algorithm: triangular orthogonalization;

- Householder algorithm: orthogonal triangularization.

We further notice that, in the Householder algorithm or the Givens algorithm that we will shortly see, a set of orthogonal matrices are applied so that the QR decomposition obtained is a *full* QR decomposition. Whereas, the direct QR decomposition obtained by CGS or MGS is a *reduced* one (although the silent columns or rows can be added later to find the full version).

3.13. Existence of the QR Decomposition via the Givens Rotation

We have defined the Givens rotation in Definition 2.2 (p. 41) to find the rank-one update/-downdate of the Cholesky decomposition. Let's delve into the specific outcomes achieved by Givens rotations through some illustrative examples. Consider the following 2×2 orthogonal matrices:

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} -c & s \\ s & c \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} c & -s \\ s & c \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{bmatrix},$$

where $s = \sin \theta$ and $c = \cos \theta$ for some θ . The first matrix has $\det(\mathbf{F}) = -1$ and is a special case of a Householder reflector in 2-dimension such that $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$, where $\mathbf{u} = \left[\sqrt{\frac{1+c}{2}}, \sqrt{\frac{1-c}{2}} \right]^\top$ or $\mathbf{u} = \left[-\sqrt{\frac{1+c}{2}}, -\sqrt{\frac{1-c}{2}} \right]^\top$. The latter two matrices have $\det(\mathbf{J}) = \det(\mathbf{G}) = 1$ and effect rotations instead of reflections. Such a matrix is called a **Givens rotation**.




Figure 3.7: Demonstration of two Givens rotations.

Figure 3.7 demonstrate a rotation of vector \mathbf{x} under the action of \mathbf{J} , yielding $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{x}$ with

$$\begin{cases} y_1 = c \cdot x_1 - s \cdot x_2, \\ y_2 = s \cdot x_1 + c \cdot x_2. \end{cases}$$

We aim to verify that the angle between vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is indeed θ (indicating counter-clockwise rotation) under the Givens rotation \mathbf{J} , as illustrated in Figure 3.7(a). Firstly, we have

$$\begin{cases} \cos(\alpha) = \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}}; \\ \sin(\alpha) = \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \cos(\theta) = c; \\ \sin(\theta) = s. \end{cases}$$

This implies that $\cos(\theta + \alpha) = \cos(\theta)\cos(\alpha) - \sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha)$. If we can show that $\cos(\theta + \alpha) = \cos(\theta)\cos(\alpha) - \sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha)$ is equal to $\frac{y_1}{\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}}$, then we complete the proof.

For the former one, $\cos(\theta + \alpha) = \cos(\theta)\cos(\alpha) - \sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha) = \frac{c \cdot x_1 - s \cdot x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}}$. For the latter one, it can be verified that $\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$, and $\frac{y_1}{\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2}} = \frac{c \cdot x_1 - s \cdot x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}}$. This completes the proof. Similarly, we can also show that the angle between vectors $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}$ and \mathbf{x} is also θ in Figure 3.7(b), and the rotation is clockwise.

It can be easily verified that the n -th order Givens rotation (Definition 2.2, p. 41) is an orthogonal matrix and its determinant is 1. For any vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G}_{kl}\mathbf{x}$, where

$$\begin{cases} y_k = c \cdot x_k + s \cdot x_l, \\ y_l = -s \cdot x_k + c \cdot x_l, \\ y_j = x_j, \end{cases} \quad (j \neq k, l)$$

That is, a Givens rotation applied to \mathbf{x} rotates two components of \mathbf{x} by an angle θ and keeps all other components the same. When $\sqrt{x_k^2 + x_l^2} \neq 0$, let $c = \frac{x_k}{\sqrt{x_k^2 + x_l^2}}$ and $s = \frac{x_l}{\sqrt{x_k^2 + x_l^2}}$. Then,

$$\begin{cases} y_k = \sqrt{x_k^2 + x_l^2}, \\ y_l = 0, \\ y_j = x_j. \end{cases} \quad (j \neq k, l)$$

This finding is essential for executing the QR decomposition using Givens rotation.

Corollary 3.7: (Basis From Givens Rotations Forwards) For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist a set of Givens rotations $\{\mathbf{G}_{12}, \mathbf{G}_{13}, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{1n}\}$ such that $\mathbf{G}_{1n} \dots \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$, where $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the first unit basis in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof [of Corollary 3.7] From the finding above, we can find a set of Givens rotations $\mathbf{G}_{12}, \mathbf{G}_{13}$, and \mathbf{G}_{14} such that

$$\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}, 0, x_3, \dots, x_n \right]^\top,$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{13}\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}, 0, 0, x_4, \dots, x_n \right]^\top,$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{14}\mathbf{G}_{13}\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2}, 0, 0, 0, x_5, \dots, x_n \right]^\top.$$

Continue this process, we obtain $\mathbf{G}_{1n} \dots \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$. ■

Remark 3.8: Basis From Givens Rotations Backwards

In Corollary 3.7, we derive the Givens rotation for introducing zeros from the 2-nd entry to the n -th entry (i.e., forward order). However, there are cases where we desire the

reverse order, i.e., introducing zeros from the n -th entry to the 2-nd entry such that $\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{13}\dots\mathbf{G}_{1n}\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$, where $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the first unit basis in \mathbb{R}^n .

The procedure is similar. We can find $\mathbf{G}_{1n}, \mathbf{G}_{1,(n-1)}, \mathbf{G}_{1,(n-2)}$ using a similar approach, such that

$$\mathbf{G}_{1n}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_n^2}, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0 \right]^\top,$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{1,(n-1)}\mathbf{G}_{1n}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2}, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-2}, 0, 0 \right]^\top,$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{1,(n-2)}\mathbf{G}_{1,(n-1)}\mathbf{G}_{1n}\mathbf{x} = \left[\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_{n-2}^2 + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2}, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-3}, 0, 0, 0 \right]^\top.$$

Continue this process, we will obtain $\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{13}\dots\mathbf{G}_{1n}\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$.

An alternative form. Alternatively, there are rotations $\{\mathbf{G}_{12}, \mathbf{G}_{23}, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\}$ such that $\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23}\dots\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$, where

$$\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\mathbf{x} = \left[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-2}, \sqrt{x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2}, 0 \right]^\top,$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{(n-2),(n-1)}\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\mathbf{x} = \left[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-3}, \sqrt{x_{n-2}^2 + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2}, 0, 0 \right]^\top,$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{(n-3),(n-2)}\mathbf{G}_{(n-2),(n-1)}\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\mathbf{x} =$$

$$\left[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-4}, \sqrt{x_{n-3}^2 + x_{n-2}^2 + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n^2}, 0, 0, 0 \right]^\top.$$

Continue this process, we will obtain $\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23}\dots\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \mathbf{e}_1$.

The backward Givens rotation basis update discussed above will prove useful in the context of rank-one changes of the QR decomposition (Section 3.17).

From Corollary 3.7 mentioned earlier, to introduce zeros, we could **rotate** the columns of the matrix to a basis vector \mathbf{e}_1 , where all entries except the first entry are zero. Let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be the column partition of \mathbf{A} , and let

$$\mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbf{G}_{1m} \dots \mathbf{G}_{13}\mathbf{G}_{12}, \quad (3.10)$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 here is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^m , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then

$$\mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{a}_n] = \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{a}_1\| & \mathbf{R}_{1,2:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.11)$$

which rotates \mathbf{a}_1 to $\|\mathbf{a}_1\| \mathbf{e}_1$ and introduces zeros below the diagonal in the 1-st column.

We can then apply this process to \mathbf{B}_2 in Equation (3.11) to make the entries below the (2,2)-th entry to be all zeros. Suppose $\mathbf{B}_2 = [\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$, and let

$$\mathbf{G}_2 = \mathbf{G}_{2m} \dots \mathbf{G}_{24} \mathbf{G}_{23},$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{2n}, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{24}, \mathbf{G}_{23}$ can be implied from context. Then

$$\mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{a}_n] = \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{a}_1\| & r_{12} & \mathbf{R}_{1,3:n} \\ 0 & \|\mathbf{b}_2\| & \mathbf{R}_{2,3:n} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The same process can go on, and we will finally triangularize $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{G}_n \mathbf{G}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{G}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}$. And since \mathbf{G}_i 's are orthogonal, we have $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{G}_n \mathbf{G}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{G}_1)^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_1^\top \mathbf{G}_2^\top \dots \mathbf{G}_n^\top$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_1^\top \mathbf{G}_2^\top \dots \mathbf{G}_n^\top &= (\mathbf{G}_n \dots \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1)^\top \\ &= \{(\mathbf{G}_{nm} \dots \mathbf{G}_{n,(n+1)}) \dots (\mathbf{G}_{2m} \dots \mathbf{G}_{23})(\mathbf{G}_{1m} \dots \mathbf{G}_{12})\}^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

In practice, the Givens rotation algorithm outperforms the Householder algorithm when \mathbf{A} already contains many zeros below the main diagonal. Therefore, the Givens rotations are particularly suitable for rank-one changes in the QR decomposition, as such changes introduce only a small number of nonzero values (Section 3.17). An example of a 5×4 matrix is presented as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed.

Givens rotations in \mathbf{G}_1 . For a 5×4 example, we realize that $\mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbf{G}_{15} \mathbf{G}_{14} \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12}$. And the process is shown as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{12}} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{13}} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{A} \\ & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{14}} & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{15}} \\ & & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ & & \mathbf{G}_{14} \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{G}_{15} \mathbf{G}_{14} \mathbf{G}_{13} \mathbf{G}_{12} \mathbf{A} \end{array}$$

Givens rotation as a big picture. Take G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 as a single matrix, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{G_1} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{G_2} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{G_3} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{G}_3 \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{A} \\
 & & \xrightarrow{G_4} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{G}_4 \mathbf{G}_3 \mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{A}
 \end{array}$$

Orders to introduce the zeros. Utilizing Givens rotations for the QR decomposition provides flexibility in choosing the order to introduce zeros in \mathbf{R} . In our approach, we introduce zeros column by column, but an alternative is to introduce zeros row by row.

3.14. Uniqueness of the QR Decomposition

The results of the QR decomposition from the Gram-Schmidt process, the Householder algorithm, and the Givens algorithm may vary. Even within the Householder algorithm, different approaches exist for selecting the sign of r_1 in Equation (3.8). Consequently, the QR decomposition of a matrix is not unique.

However, if we use the procedure described in the Gram-Schmidt process, or systematically choose the sign in the Householder algorithm, then the decomposition is unique. The uniqueness of the *reduced* QR decomposition for full column rank matrix \mathbf{A} is assured when \mathbf{R} has positive diagonals by inductive analysis (Lu, 2021c). We here provide an alternative proof for the uniqueness of the *reduced* QR decomposition for matrices if the diagonal values of \mathbf{R} are positive, which will shed light on the implicit Q theorem in Hessenberg decomposition (Section 8.4, p. 115) or tridiagonal decomposition (Theorem 9.2, p. 119).

Corollary 3.9: (Uniqueness of the reduced QR Decomposition) Suppose the matrix \mathbf{A} is an $m \times n$ matrix with full column rank n and $m \geq n$. Then, the *reduced* QR decomposition is unique if the main diagonal values of \mathbf{R} are positive.

Proof [of Corollary 3.9] Suppose the *reduced* QR decomposition is not unique, we can complete it into a *full* QR decomposition, then we can find two such full decompositions so that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{R}_2$. This implies $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_1^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{R}_2 = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{R}_2$, where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Q}_1^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_2$ is an

orthogonal matrix. Write out the equation, we have

$$\mathbf{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} & \dots & r_{1n} \\ & r_{22} & \dots & r_{2n} \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & r_{nn} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v_{11} & v_{12} & \dots & v_{1m} \\ v_{21} & v_{22} & \dots & v_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ v_{m1} & v_{m2} & \dots & v_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & \dots & s_{1n} \\ & s_{22} & \dots & s_{2n} \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & s_{nn} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{R}_2,$$

This implies

$$r_{11} = v_{11}s_{11}, \quad v_{21} = v_{31} = v_{41} = \dots = v_{m1} = 0.$$

Since \mathbf{V} contains mutually orthonormal columns and the first column of \mathbf{V} is of norm 1, it follows that $v_{11} = \pm 1$. We notice that $r_{ii} > 0$ and $s_{ii} > 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by assumption. Therefore, $r_{11} > 0$ and $s_{11} > 0$, implying that v_{11} can only be positive 1. Since \mathbf{V} is an orthogonal matrix, we also have

$$v_{12} = v_{13} = v_{14} = \dots = v_{1m} = 0.$$

Applying this process to the submatrices of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{V} , and \mathbf{R}_2 , we will find the upper-left submatrix of \mathbf{V} is an identity: $\mathbf{V}_{1:n,1:n} = \mathbf{I}_n$, indicating $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}_2$. This implies $\mathbf{Q}_1[:, 1:n] = \mathbf{Q}_2[:, 1:n]$ and leads to a contradiction such that the reduced QR decomposition is unique. ■

3.15. LQ Decomposition

We previously established the existence of the QR decomposition via the Gram-Schmidt process in which case we are interested in the column space of a matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. However, in many applications (see [Schilders \(2009\)](#)), there is also interest in the row space of a matrix $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}_1^\top; \mathbf{b}_2^\top; \dots; \mathbf{b}_m^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where \mathbf{b}_i is the i -th row of \mathbf{B} . The successive spaces spanned by the rows $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots$ of \mathbf{B} are

$$\mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1]) \subseteq \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2]) \subseteq \mathcal{C}([\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3]) \subseteq \dots$$

The QR decomposition has a counterpart that characterizes the orthogonal row space. When we perform the QR decomposition on $\mathbf{B}^\top = \mathbf{Q}_0 \mathbf{R}$, we obtain the LQ decomposition of the matrix $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{Q}$, where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_0^\top$ and $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{R}^\top$.

Theorem 3.10: (LQ Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{B} (whether it has linearly independent or dependent rows) with $n \geq m$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{Q},$$

where

1. **Reduced:** \mathbf{L} is an $m \times m$ lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{Q} is $m \times n$ with orthonormal rows, known as the **reduced LQ decomposition**;
2. **Full:** \mathbf{L} is an $m \times n$ lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{Q} is $n \times n$ with orthonormal rows, known as the **full LQ decomposition**. If we further restrict the lower triangular matrix

to be a square matrix, the full LQ decomposition can be denoted by

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_0 & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q},$$

where \mathbf{L}_0 is an $m \times m$ square lower triangular matrix.

Row-pivoted LQ (RPLQ). Similar to the column-pivoted QR discussed in Section 3.9, there exists a row-pivoted LQ (RPLQ) decomposition:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{Reduced RPLQ:} & \mathbf{PB} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} \end{bmatrix}}_{m \times r} \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}_r}_{r \times n}; \\ \text{Full RPLQ:} & \mathbf{PB} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{m \times m} \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}}_{m \times n}, \end{array} \right.$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is lower triangular, \mathbf{Q}_r or $\mathbf{Q}_{1:r,:}$ spans the same row space as \mathbf{B} , and \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix that interchanges independent rows into the upper-most rows.

3.16. Two-Sided Orthogonal Decomposition

To this end, an immediate consequence of the CPQR and RPLQ decompositions is known as the *two-sided orthogonal decomposition*, which simultaneously finds the orthonormal row basis and orthonormal column basis.

Theorem 3.11: (Two-Sided Orthogonal Decomposition) Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with rank r , the full CPQR and RPLQ of \mathbf{A} are given by

$$\mathbf{AP}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{P}_2 \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_2$$

respectively. Then we would find out

$$\mathbf{APA} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}\mathbf{L}_{11} + \mathbf{R}_{12}\mathbf{L}_{21} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{rank } r} \mathbf{Q}_2,$$

where the first r columns of \mathbf{Q}_1 span the same column space as \mathbf{A} , the first r rows of \mathbf{Q}_2 span the same row space as \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix. We name this decomposition as *two-sided orthogonal decomposition*.

This decomposition exhibits a similarity with the singular value decomposition (SVD): $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where the first r columns of \mathbf{U} span the same column space as \mathbf{A} and the first r columns of \mathbf{V} span the same row space as \mathbf{A} (we shall see in Lemma 14.7, p. 176). Therefore, the two-sided orthogonal decomposition can be regarded as an inexpensive alternative in this sense.

Proposition 3.12: (Four Orthonormal Basis) Given the two-sided orthogonal decomposition of matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with rank r : $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{F}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} respectively. Then, we have the following property:

- $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$;
- $\{\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \mathbf{v}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$;
- $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$;
- $\{\mathbf{u}_{r+1}, \mathbf{u}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$.

3.17. Rank-One Changes

We previously discussed the rank-one update/downdate of the Cholesky decomposition in Section 2.9 (p. 40). The rank-one change \mathbf{A}' of matrix \mathbf{A} in the QR decomposition is defined in a similar form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}' & = & \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top, \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{R}' & = & \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top, \end{array}$$

where if we set $\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A} - (-\mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}^\top$, we recover the downdate form such that the update and downdate in the QR decomposition are the same. To reiterate, the rank-one update/downdate problem entails determining the QR decomposition of \mathbf{A}' if we have already calculated the QR decomposition of \mathbf{A} . Let $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{u}$, we have

$$\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{v}^\top).$$

From the second form in Remark 3.8 regarding the introduction of zeros in reverse order, there exist a set of Givens rotations $\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23} \dots \mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}$ such that

$$\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23} \dots \mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n} \mathbf{w} = \pm \|\mathbf{w}\| \mathbf{e}_1,$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{(k-1),k}$ is the Givens rotation in plane $k-1$ and k , which introduces zero in the k -th entry of \mathbf{w} . Applying this rotation to \mathbf{R} , we have

$$\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23} \dots \mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{H}_0,$$

where the Givens rotations in this *reverse order* (*backward rotations*) are useful to transform the upper triangular \mathbf{R} into a “simple” *upper Hessenberg matrix*, which is close to upper triangular matrices (see Definition 8.1, p. 110 that we will introduce in the Hessenberg decomposition). However, if the rotations transforms \mathbf{w} into $\pm \|\mathbf{w}\| \mathbf{e}_1$ from *forward order* (*forward rotations*) as demonstrated in Corollary 3.7, we will not obtain this upper Hessenberg \mathbf{H}_0 . To see this, consider the matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$, an example is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed. The backward rotations result in the upper Hessenberg \mathbf{H}_0 , which

is relatively simple to handle:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Backward:} \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{45}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{34}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{45}\mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{34}\mathbf{G}_{45}\mathbf{R} \\
 \\
 \xrightarrow{G_{23}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{12}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{G}_{23}\mathbf{G}_{34}\mathbf{G}_{45}\mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23}\mathbf{G}_{34}\mathbf{G}_{45}\mathbf{R}
 \end{array}
 .$$

And the forward rotations result in a **full matrix**:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Forward:} \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{12}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{23}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{23}\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{R} \\
 \\
 \xrightarrow{G_{34}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}
 \xrightarrow{G_{45}}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{G}_{34}\mathbf{G}_{23}\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{R} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{G}_{45}\mathbf{G}_{34}\mathbf{G}_{23}\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{R}
 \end{array}
 .$$

That is, the backward rotations will preserve many of the zeros as they are, whereas the forward rotations will eliminate these zeros. Generally, the backward rotations result in

$$\mathbf{G}_{12}\mathbf{G}_{23}\dots\mathbf{G}_{(n-1),n}(\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{v}^\top) = \mathbf{H}_0 \pm \|\mathbf{w}\| \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{v}^\top = \mathbf{H},$$

which is also upper Hessenberg. Similar to triangularization via the Givens rotation in Section 3.13, there exist a set of rotations $\mathbf{J}_{12}, \mathbf{J}_{23}, \dots, \mathbf{J}_{(n-1),n}$ such that

$$\mathbf{J}_{(n-1),n} \dots \mathbf{J}_{23} \mathbf{J}_{12} \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{R}',$$

is upper triangular. Following the example of a 5×5 matrix, the triangularization is shown as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underbrace{H_0 \pm \|w\| e_1 v^\top}_{H} &= \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{12}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{23}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 &\quad \quad \quad H \quad \quad \quad J_{12}H \quad \quad \quad J_{23}J_{12}H \\
 &\quad \quad \quad \xrightarrow{J_{34}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{45}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 &\quad \quad \quad J_{34}J_{23}J_{12}H \quad \quad \quad J_{45}J_{34}J_{23}J_{12}H
 \end{aligned}$$

And the QR decomposition of A' is thus given by

$$A' = Q'R',$$

where

$$\begin{cases} R' = (J_{(n-1),n} \dots J_{23}J_{12})(G_{12}G_{23} \dots G_{(n-1),n})(R + ww^\top); \\ Q' = Q \{(J_{(n-1),n} \dots J_{23}J_{12})(G_{12}G_{23} \dots G_{(n-1),n})\}^\top. \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

3.18. Appending or Deleting a Column

In specific applications, such as the F -test for least squares via QR decomposition (Lu, 2022a), we want to delete or append a column to the observed matrix. The goal is to find the QR decomposition of the modified matrix efficiently.

Deleting a column. Suppose the QR decomposition of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is given by $A = QR$, where the column partition of A is $A = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]$. Now, if we delete the k -th column of A such that $A' = [a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-1)}$, we want to find the QR decomposition of A' efficiently. Moreover, let R have the following form:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & a & R_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & r_{kk} & b^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} k-1 \\ 1 \\ m-k \end{matrix} \cdot \begin{matrix} k-1 \\ 1 \\ n-k \end{matrix}$$

Apparently,

$$Q^\top A' = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & b^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix} = H$$

is upper Hessenberg. An illustrative example is presented below, demonstrating the scenario of a 6×5 matrix. Here, $k = 3$, and the column corresponding to k has been removed:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A}'$$

Again, for columns k to $n - 1$ of \mathbf{H} , there exists a set of rotations $\mathbf{G}_{k,k+1}$, $\mathbf{G}_{k+1,k+2}$, \dots , $\mathbf{G}_{n-1,n}$ that could introduce zeros in the elements $h_{k+1,k}$, $h_{k+2,k+1}$, \dots , $h_{n,n-1}$ of \mathbf{H} . Subsequently, the resulting triangular matrix \mathbf{R}' is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{G}_{n-1,n} \dots \mathbf{G}_{k+1,k+2} \mathbf{G}_{k,k+1} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A}'.$$

And the orthogonal matrix can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{Q}' = (\mathbf{G}_{n-1,n} \dots \mathbf{G}_{k+1,k+2} \mathbf{G}_{k,k+1} \mathbf{Q}^\top)^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{G}_{k,k+1}^\top \mathbf{G}_{k+1,k+2}^\top \dots \mathbf{G}_{n-1,n}^\top, \quad (3.14)$$

such that $\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{R}'$. The 6×5 example is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{k=3} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{34}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}_{45}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A}' \qquad \mathbf{G}_{34} \mathbf{H} \qquad \mathbf{G}_{45} \mathbf{G}_{34} \mathbf{H}$$

Appending a column. Similarly, suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$, where we append vector \mathbf{w} into the $(k + 1)$ -th column of \mathbf{A} . We can obtain

$$\mathbf{Q}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = [\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{a}_n] = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}.$$

A set of Givens rotations $\mathbf{J}_{m-1,m}$, $\mathbf{J}_{m-2,m-1}$, \dots , $\mathbf{J}_{k+1,k+2}$ can introduce zeros in the elements $\tilde{h}_{m,k+1}$, $\tilde{h}_{m-1,k+1}$, \dots , $\tilde{h}_{k+2,k+1}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{J}_{k+1,k+2} \dots \mathbf{J}_{m-2,m-1} \mathbf{J}_{m-1,m} \mathbf{Q}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{A}},$$

is upper triangular. Suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ is of size 6×5 and $k = 2$, an example is shown as follows where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value

has just been changed:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{56}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{45}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{J_{34}} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \\
 & \quad \widetilde{H} \quad \quad \quad J_{56}\widetilde{H} \rightarrow \widetilde{h}_{63} = 0 \quad \quad \quad J_{45}J_{56}\widetilde{H} \rightarrow \widetilde{h}_{53} = 0 \quad \quad \quad J_{34}J_{45}J_{56}\widetilde{H} \rightarrow \widetilde{h}_{43} = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

And finally, we obtain the orthogonal matrix

$$\widetilde{Q} = (J_{k+1,k+2} \cdots J_{m-2,m-1} J_{m-1,m} Q^\top)^\top = Q J_{m-1,m}^\top J_{m-2,m-1}^\top \cdots J_{k+1,k+2}^\top, \quad (3.15)$$

such that $\widetilde{A} = \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{R}$.

Real world application. The method introduced above is useful for efficient variable selection in the least squares problem via the QR decomposition. In each step, a column of the data matrix \mathbf{A} is removed, and an F -test is applied to assess the significance of the variable. If the variable is found to be insignificant, it is eliminated, promoting a simpler model (Lu, 2022a).

3.19. Appending or Deleting a Row

Similarly, we may also want to append or delete a row from the observed matrix. The goal now is to find the efficient way to obtain the QR decomposition for this new matrix.

Appending a row. Suppose the full QR decomposition of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is given by $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-k) \times n}$. Now, if we add a row such that

$$\mathbf{A}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}^\top \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times n}, \text{ we want to find the full QR decomposition of } \mathbf{A}' \text{ efficiently.}$$

Construct a permutation matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ I_k & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I_{m-k} \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow P \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}^\top \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \\ \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & Q^\top \end{bmatrix} P \mathbf{A}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \\ \mathbf{R} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{H}$$

is upper Hessenberg. Similarly, a set of rotations $\mathbf{G}_{12}, \mathbf{G}_{23}, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n,n+1}$ can be applied to introduce zeros in the elements $h_{21}, h_{32}, \dots, h_{n+1,n}$ of \mathbf{H} . The triangular matrix \mathbf{R}' is given by

$$\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{G}_{n,n+1} \cdots \mathbf{G}_{23} \mathbf{G}_{12} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & Q^\top \end{bmatrix} P \mathbf{A}'.$$

And the orthogonal matrix is obtained by

$$Q' = \left(G_{n,n+1} \dots G_{23} G_{12} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q^\top \end{bmatrix} P \right)^\top = P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{bmatrix} G_{12}^\top G_{23}^\top \dots G_{n,n+1}^\top,$$

such that $A' = Q'R'$.

Deleting a row. Suppose $A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ w^\top \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-k-1) \times n}$

with the full QR decomposition given by $A = QR$, where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We want to compute the full QR decomposition of $\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix}$ efficiently (assume $m-1 \geq n$).

Analogously, we can construct a permutation matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ I_k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{m-k-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

such that

$$PA = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ I_k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{m-k-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ w^\top \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w^\top \\ A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix} = PQR = MR,$$

where $M = PQ$ is an orthogonal matrix. Let m^\top be the first row of M , and construct a set of Givens rotations $G_{m-1,m}, G_{m-2,m-1}, \dots, G_{1,2}$ introducing zeros in the elements m_m, m_{m-1}, \dots, m_2 of m respectively such that $G_{1,2} \dots G_{m-2,m-1} G_{m-1,m} m = \alpha e_1$, where $\alpha = \pm 1$. Therefore, we have

$$G_{1,2} \dots G_{m-2,m-1} G_{m-1,m} R = \begin{bmatrix} v^\top \\ R_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ m-1 \end{matrix},$$

which is upper Hessenberg with $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times n}$ being upper triangular. And

$$MG_{m-1,m}^\top G_{m-2,m-1}^\top \dots G_{1,2}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & Q_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $Q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times (m-1)}$ is an orthogonal matrix. The bottom-left block of the above matrix is a zero vector since $\alpha = \pm 1$ and M is orthogonal. To see this, let $G = G_{m-1,m}^\top G_{m-2,m-1}^\top \dots G_{1,2}^\top$ with the first column being g and $M = [m^\top; m_2^\top; m_3^\top; \dots, m_m^\top]$ being the row partition of M . We have

$$\begin{aligned} m^\top g &= \pm 1 & \rightarrow & g = \pm m, \\ m_i^\top m &= 0, & \forall i &\in \{2, 3, \dots, m\}. \end{aligned}$$

This results in

$$\begin{aligned} PA &= MR \\ &= (MG_{m-1,m}^\top G_{m-2,m-1}^\top \dots G_{1,2}^\top)(G_{1,2} \dots G_{m-2,m-1} G_{m-1,m} R) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & Q_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v^\top \\ R_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha v^\top \\ Q_1 R_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w^\top \\ \tilde{A} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{R}_1$ is the full QR decomposition of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix}$.

Chapter 3 Problems

1. Given orthogonal unit vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , prove that $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ is orthogonal to $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$.
2. Consider the rank of matrices:
 - Suppose matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} have full column ranks, prove that \mathbf{AB} has full column rank.
 - Suppose \mathbf{AB} has full column ranks, show that \mathbf{B} also has full column rank. However, it cannot be guaranteed that \mathbf{A} will have full column rank.
 - Discuss the rank of the upper triangular matrices obtained from the QR decompositions of \mathbf{AB} , \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{B} in various cases of the matrices involved.
3. We have stated in Theorem 3.1 that \mathbf{R} is nonsingular in the reduced QR decomposition when \mathbf{A} has full column rank n . Suppose \mathbf{A} does not have full column rank, examine the relationship between the rank of \mathbf{A} and the number of nonzero entries of \mathbf{R} .
4. Use Gram-Schmidt process, Householder transformation, Givens rotation methods to find the orthonormal basis for the space spanned by the vectors

$$\mathbf{v}_1 = [1, 3, 7, 5]^\top,$$

$$\mathbf{v}_2 = [6, 3, 6, 3]^\top,$$

$$\mathbf{v}_3 = [5, 2, 7, 4]^\top.$$

5. **Distance between a vector and a hyperplane.** Given a nonzero vector $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a scalar β , we define the hyperplane $H(\mathbf{a}, \beta) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} + \beta = 0\}$. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be any vector, equipped with the projection along a line in Section 3.2, show that the distance between the vector \mathbf{y} and the hyperplane $H(\mathbf{a}, \beta)$ is given by

$$d(\mathbf{y}, H(\mathbf{a}, \beta)) = \frac{|\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{y} + \beta|}{\|\mathbf{a}\|}. \quad (3.16)$$

Hint: choose two random points on the plane, and first show that \mathbf{a} is orthogonal to the plane.

UTV Decomposition: ULV and URV Decomposition

Contents

4.1	UTV Decomposition	81
4.2	Complete Orthogonal Decomposition	83
4.3	Application: Row Rank equals Column Rank via UTV	83
Chapter 4 Problems		85

4.1. UTV Decomposition



The UTV decomposition extends the factorization of a matrix \mathbf{A} into two orthogonal matrices \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , along with a (upper/lower) triangular matrix \mathbf{T} : $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{UTV}$.¹ The resulting \mathbf{T} supports rank estimation. Moreover, \mathbf{T} can be either lower triangular, leading to the ULV decomposition, or upper triangular, resulting in the URV decomposition. The UTV framework shares a similar form with the singular value decomposition (SVD, see Section 14.1, p. 173) and it can be regarded as an inexpensive alternative to the SVD.

Theorem 4.1: (Full ULV Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V},$$

where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are orthogonal matrices, and $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a lower triangular matrix.

The existence of the ULV decomposition is from those of the QR and LQ decomposition. **Proof** [of Theorem 4.1] For any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$, a column permutation matrix \mathbf{P} (Definition 0.14, p. 7) can be employed to arrange the linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} in the first r columns of \mathbf{AP} . Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r$ are the r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} and

$$\mathbf{AP} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r, \mathbf{b}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n].$$

Let $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$. Since each \mathbf{b}_i lies in the column space of \mathbf{Z} , we can find a matrix $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$ such that

$$[\mathbf{b}_{r+1}, \mathbf{b}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n] = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{E}.$$

In other words,

$$\mathbf{AP} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_r, \mathbf{b}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n] = \mathbf{Z} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{E} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{I}_r is an $r \times r$ identity matrix. Moreover, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ has full column rank such that its full QR decomposition is given by $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is an upper triangular matrix with full rank and \mathbf{U} is an orthogonal matrix. This implies

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{Z} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{E} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{E} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{RE} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

Since \mathbf{R} has full rank, this means $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{RE} \end{bmatrix}$ also has full rank such that its full LQ decomposition is given by $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_0$, where $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a lower triangular matrix and \mathbf{V}_0 is an orthogonal matrix. Substitute this into Equation (4.1), we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{P}^{-1}.$$

1. These decompositions fall into a category known as the *double-sided orthogonal decomposition*. We will see the UTV decomposition, complete orthogonal decomposition (Theorem 4.3), and singular value decomposition all fall under this notion.

Let $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_0 \mathbf{P}^{-1}$, which is a product of two orthogonal matrices, resulting in an orthogonal matrix. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

A second way to see the proof of the ULV decomposition will be discussed in the proof of Theorem 4.3 shortly via the rank-revealing QR decomposition and trivial QR decomposition.

Now suppose the ULV decomposition of matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}.$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{U}_{:,1:r}$ and $\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{V}_{1:r,:}$, i.e., \mathbf{U}_0 contains only the first r columns of \mathbf{U} , and \mathbf{V}_0 contains only the first r rows of \mathbf{V} . Then, we still have $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{V}_0$. This form is known as the *reduced ULV decomposition*. Similarly, we can also claim the URV decomposition as follows.

Theorem 4.2: (Full URV Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V},$$

where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are two orthogonal matrices, and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is an upper triangular matrix.

The proof closely resembles that of the ULV decomposition, and we omit the details. Additionally, there exists a version of the reduced URV decomposition, with the distinction between the full and reduced URV implied by the context. The ULV and URV are collectively referred to as the UTV decomposition framework (Fierro and Hansen, 1997; Golub and Van Loan, 2013).

We will soon observe that the structures of ULV and URV closely resemble the singular value decomposition (SVD). All three decompositions factor the matrix \mathbf{A} into two orthogonal matrices. Specifically, the ULV and URV provide bases for the four subspaces of \mathbf{A} in the fundamental theorem of linear algebra. Taking ULV as an example, the first r columns of \mathbf{U} form an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$, and the last $(m - r)$ columns of \mathbf{U} constitute an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$. Similarly, the first r rows of \mathbf{V} serve as an orthonormal basis for the row space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$, while the last $(n - r)$ rows form an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ (resembling the two-sided orthogonal decomposition):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}) &= \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}, \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) &= \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \mathbf{v}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}, \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top) &= \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}, \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top) &= \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{r+1}, \mathbf{u}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The SVD goes even further by establishing a connection between the two pairs of orthonormal bases: the transformation from the column basis to the row basis, and from the left null space basis to the right null space basis. Further elaboration on this connection will be provided in the SVD section.

4.2. Complete Orthogonal Decomposition

The UTV decomposition is related to what is known as the *complete orthogonal decomposition*, which also involves factoring into two orthogonal matrices.

Theorem 4.3: (Complete Orthogonal Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V},$$

where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are two orthogonal matrices, and $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a rank- r matrix.

Proof [of Theorem 4.3] By rank-revealing QR decomposition (Theorem 3.2, p. 59), \mathbf{A} can be factored as

$$\mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is upper triangular, $\mathbf{R}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$, $\mathbf{Q}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is an orthogonal matrix, and \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix.

Then, it is not hard to find a decomposition satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.3)$$

where \mathbf{Q}_2 is an orthogonal matrix, and \mathbf{S} is a rank- r matrix. The decomposition is reasonable because the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ has rank r of which the columns stay in a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . Nevertheless, the columns of \mathbf{Q}_2 span the whole space of \mathbb{R}^n , where we can assume the first r columns of \mathbf{Q}_2 span the same space as that of $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix}$. The matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ serves to transform \mathbf{Q}_2 into $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix}$.

Then, it follows that

$$\mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{Q}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^\top & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{Q}_1$, $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{P}^\top$, and $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{S}^\top$, we complete the proof. ■

We note that when Equation (4.3) is taken as the reduced QR decomposition of $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix}$, then the complete orthogonal decomposition reduces to the ULV decomposition.

4.3. Application: Row Rank equals Column Rank via UTV

The UTV framework enables the proof of a fundamental theorem in linear algebra, establishing the equality of row rank and column rank for a matrix. It is noteworthy that, for

the proof employing the UTV decomposition, a slight adjustment is necessary in framing the existence claim. For example, in Theorem 4.1, the initial assumption about the matrix \mathbf{A} is its rank being r . Given that rank r inherently implies equality of row rank and column rank, a more precise assertion in this context would be to state that matrix \mathbf{A} has a column rank of r in Theorem 4.1. For a more detailed explanation, refer to Lu (2021b).

Proof [of Theorem 0.1, p. 5, A Second Way] Any $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r can be factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_0 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_0,$$

where $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are two orthogonal matrices, and $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a lower triangular matrix². Let $\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, the row rank and column rank of \mathbf{D} are apparently the same. If we could prove the column rank of \mathbf{A} equals the column rank of \mathbf{D} , and the row rank of \mathbf{A} equals the row rank of \mathbf{D} , then we complete the proof.

Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_0^\top$ and $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_0^\top$, we have $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}$. Decompose the above idea into two steps, a moment of reflexion reveals that, if we could first prove the row rank and column rank of \mathbf{A} are equal to those of $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}$, and then, if we further prove the row rank and column rank of $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}$ are equal to those of $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}$, we could also complete the proof.

Row rank and column rank of \mathbf{A} are equal to those of $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}$. Let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}$, and further consider $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ and $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n]$ as the column partitions of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , respectively. Therefore, it follows that $[\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n] = [\mathbf{U}\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{U}\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{U}\mathbf{a}_n]$. If $x_1\mathbf{a}_1 + x_2\mathbf{a}_2 + \dots + x_n\mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{0}$, then we also have

$$\mathbf{U}(x_1\mathbf{a}_1 + x_2\mathbf{a}_2 + \dots + x_n\mathbf{a}_n) = x_1\mathbf{b}_1 + x_2\mathbf{b}_2 + \dots + x_n\mathbf{b}_n = \mathbf{0}.$$

Let j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r be distinct indices between 1 and n , if the set $\{\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}\}$ is independent, the set $\{\mathbf{b}_{j_1}, \mathbf{b}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{j_r}\}$ must also be linearly independent. This implies

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})).$$

Similarly, by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{B}$, it follows that

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})).$$

This implies

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})) = \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})).$$

Apply the process to \mathbf{B}^\top and \mathbf{A}^\top , we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}^\top)) = \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)).$$

This implies the row rank and column rank of \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}$ are the same.

². Instead of using the ULV decomposition, in some texts, the authors use elementary transformations \mathbf{E}_1 and \mathbf{E}_2 such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_2$, to prove the result.

Row rank and column rank of UA are equal to those of UAV . Similarly, by applying above discussion to UA and UAV , we can also demonstrate that the row rank and column rank of UA and UAV are the same. This concludes the proof. ■

Chapter 4 Problems

1. Prove the four spaces in Equation (4.2) can be spanned using the UTV decomposition.

Part III

Data Interpretation and Information Distillation

CR Decomposition

Contents

5.1	CR Decomposition	89
5.2	Existence of the CR Decomposition	89
5.3	Reduced Row Echelon Form (RREF)	90
5.4	Rank Decomposition	92
5.5	Application: Rank and Trace of an Idempotent Matrix	93
	Chapter 5 Problems	93

5.1. CR Decomposition



The CR decomposition is introduced in [Strang \(2021\)](#); [Strang and Moler \(2022\)](#). As usual, we firstly present the result, deferring the discussion of its existence and derivation to subsequent sections.

Theorem 5.1: (CR Decomposition) Any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\underset{m \times n}{\mathbf{A}} = \underset{m \times r}{\mathbf{C}} \underset{r \times n}{\mathbf{R}}$$

where \mathbf{C} contains the first r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{R} is an $r \times n$ matrix used to reconstruct the columns of \mathbf{A} from the columns of \mathbf{C} . In particular, \mathbf{R} is the reduced row echelon form (RREF) of \mathbf{A} without the zero rows.

The storage for the decomposition is then reduced or potentially increased from mn floating-point numbers to $r(m+n)$ floating-point numbers.

5.2. Existence of the CR Decomposition

Since the matrix \mathbf{A} has rank r , it contains r linearly independent columns. We proceed by selecting r linearly independent columns from \mathbf{A} and assembling them into the matrix \mathbf{C} :

Find r Linearly Independent Columns from \mathbf{A}

1. If column 1 of \mathbf{A} is nonzero, include it in the columns of \mathbf{C} ;
2. If column 2 of \mathbf{A} is not a multiple of column 1, add it to the columns of \mathbf{C} ;
3. If column 3 of \mathbf{A} is not a linear combination of columns 1 and 2, append it to the columns of \mathbf{C} ;
4. Repeat this procedure until r linearly independent columns are identified (or until all linearly independent columns are determined if the rank r is unknown beforehand).

When we have identified the set of r linearly independent columns from \mathbf{A} , the existence of the CR decomposition can be demonstrated through the column space perspective of matrix multiplication.

Column space view of matrix multiplication. The multiplication of two matrices, $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, can be expressed as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{DE} = \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n] = [\mathbf{De}_1, \mathbf{De}_2, \dots, \mathbf{De}_n]$, meaning that each column of \mathbf{A} is a linear combination of columns from \mathbf{D} .

Proof [of Theorem 5.1] As the rank of matrix \mathbf{A} is r and \mathbf{C} contains r linearly independent columns from \mathbf{A} , the column space of \mathbf{C} is equivalent to the column space of \mathbf{A} . If we take any other column \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{a}_i can be represented as a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{C} , i.e., there exists a vector \mathbf{r}_i such that $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{r}_i$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Put these \mathbf{r}_i 's into the columns of matrix \mathbf{R} , we obtain

$$\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] = [\mathbf{C}\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{C}\mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{C}\mathbf{r}_n] = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R},$$

from which the result follows. ■

5.3. Reduced Row Echelon Form (RREF)

In Section 1.2 (p. 14), Gaussian elimination was presented, involving the use of an elimination matrix (a lower triangular matrix) and a permutation matrix to convert \mathbf{A} into an upper triangular form. We apply the Gaussian elimination to a 4×4 square matrix, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

Gaussian Elimination for a Square Matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{P_1} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_2} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}.$$

\mathbf{A} $E_1 \mathbf{A}$ $P_1 E_1 \mathbf{A}$ $E_2 P_1 E_1 \mathbf{A}$

Furthermore, the Gaussian elimination can also be applied to rectangular matrices, we provide an example for a 4×5 matrix as follows:

Gaussian Elimination for a Rectangular Matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & 10 & 9 & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & 10 & 9 & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{5} & \mathbf{6} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & 10 & 9 & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{5} & \mathbf{6} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{3} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

\mathbf{A} $E_1 \mathbf{A}$ $E_2 E_1 \mathbf{A}$

where the blue-colored numbers are *pivots*, as we defined previously (Definition 1.3, p. 16). And we call the final matrix above *row echelon form* of matrix \mathbf{A} . It is noteworthy that, in this specific instance, the 4-th row becomes a zero row. To refine the form further, row operations can be applied by subtracting multiples of each row from the succeeding row, ensuring that all entries above the pivots become zero:

Reduced Row Echelon Form: Get Zero Above Pivots

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & 10 & 9 & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{5} & \mathbf{6} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{3} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_3} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{-3} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{5} & \mathbf{6} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{3} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{E_4} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{2} & \boxtimes & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{5} & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{3} & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

$E_2 E_1 \mathbf{A}$ $E_3 E_2 E_1 \mathbf{A}$ $E_4 E_3 E_2 E_1 \mathbf{A}$

where \mathbf{E}_3 subtracts twice the 2-nd row from the 1-st row, and \mathbf{E}_4 adds the 3-rd row to the 1-st row while subtracting twice the 3-rd row from the 2-nd row. Ultimately, achieving the full *reduced row echelon form* involves ensuring that the pivots are set to 1:

Reduced Row Echelon Form: Make The Pivots To Be 1

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 5 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{E}_4 \mathbf{E}_3 \mathbf{E}_2 \mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{E}_5}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{E}_5 \mathbf{E}_4 \mathbf{E}_3 \mathbf{E}_2 \mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{A}
 \end{array}
 ,$$

where \mathbf{E}_5 is used to set the pivots to be 1. Note here, it is not necessary for the transformation matrices $\mathbf{E}_1, \mathbf{E}_2, \dots, \mathbf{E}_5$ to be lower triangular matrices, as required in LU decomposition; they can also take the form of permutation matrices or other types. We call this resulting matrix the *reduced row echelon form* (RREF) of \mathbf{A} , where it has 1's as pivots and zeros above the pivots.

Lemma 5.2: (Rank and Pivots) The rank of \mathbf{A} is equal to the number of pivots.

Lemma 5.3: (RREF in CR) The reduced row echelon form of the matrix \mathbf{A} without zero rows is the matrix \mathbf{R} in the CR decomposition.

In summary, we begin by computing the reduced row echelon form of the matrix \mathbf{A} using $\text{rref}(\mathbf{A})$. Subsequently, matrix \mathbf{C} is derived by excluding all non-pivotal columns from \mathbf{A} (identified by columns in $\text{rref}(\mathbf{A})$ lacking pivots). Simultaneously, matrix \mathbf{R} is obtained by eliminating zero rows from $\text{rref}(\mathbf{A})$. This process represents a specific instance of the *rank decomposition* (see Theorem 5.4) for matrix \mathbf{A} . However, CR decomposition is so special that it involves the reduced row echelon form so that we introduce it here particularly.

Matrix \mathbf{R} exhibits a notable structure, with its r columns, housing the pivotal elements, constituting an $r \times r$ identity matrix. It is essential to reiterate that this matrix \mathbf{R} can be obtained by simply excluding the zero rows from the reduced row echelon form. In the work by Strang (2021), the author introduces a specific notation for the reduced row echelon form, including zero rows, denoted as \mathbf{R}_0 :

$$\mathbf{R}_0 = \text{rref}(\mathbf{A}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P},^1$$

where the $n \times n$ permutation matrix \mathbf{P} arranges the columns of the $r \times r$ identity matrix \mathbf{I}_r into their proper positions, aligning with the first r linearly independent columns of the original matrix \mathbf{A} .

The CR decomposition reveals a fundamental theorem of linear algebra, establishing the equality between the row rank and column rank of any matrix.

¹. Permutation matrix \mathbf{P} on the right side of a matrix is to interchange the columns of that matrix.

Proof [of Theorem 0.1, A Third Way] For the CR decomposition of matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R}$, we have $\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{I}_r, \mathbf{F}]\mathbf{P}$, where \mathbf{P} is an $n \times n$ permutation arranging the columns of the $r \times r$ identity matrix \mathbf{I}_r into their correct positions, as shown above. It can be easily verified that the r rows of \mathbf{R} are linearly independent (since the submatrix \mathbf{I}_r in \mathbf{R} is nonsingular) such that the row rank of \mathbf{R} is r .

Firstly, from the definition of the CR decomposition, the r columns of \mathbf{C} are from r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , and the column rank of \mathbf{A} is r . Further,

- Since $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R}$, all rows of \mathbf{A} are linear combinations of the rows of \mathbf{R} . That is, the row rank of \mathbf{A} is not greater than the row rank of \mathbf{R} ;
- From $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R}$, we also have $(\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{A}$, that is, $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{A}$. $\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{C}$ is nonsingular since \mathbf{C} has full column rank r . Then all rows of \mathbf{R} are also linear combinations of the rows of \mathbf{A} . That is, the row rank of \mathbf{R} is not greater than the row rank of \mathbf{A} ;
- By “sandwiching”, the row rank of \mathbf{A} is equal to the row rank of \mathbf{R} , which is r .

Therefore, both the row rank and column rank of \mathbf{A} are equal to r from which the result follows. \blacksquare

5.4. Rank Decomposition

As mentioned earlier, the CR decomposition is a specific instance of rank decomposition. Formally, we rigorously establish the existence of the rank decomposition in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4: (Rank Decomposition) Any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \underset{m \times n}{\mathbf{D}} \underset{m \times r}{\mathbf{D}} \underset{r \times n}{\mathbf{F}},$$

where $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ has rank r , and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ also has rank r , i.e., \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{F} have full rank r .

The storage for the decomposition is then reduced or potentially increased from mn floating-point numbers to $r(m+n)$ floating-point numbers.

Proof [of Theorem 5.4] By ULV decomposition in Theorem 4.1 (p. 81), we can decompose \mathbf{A} by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}.$$

Let $\mathbf{U}_0 = \mathbf{U}_{:,1:r}$ and $\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{V}_{1:r,:}$, i.e., \mathbf{U}_0 contains only the first r columns of \mathbf{U} , and \mathbf{V}_0 contains only the first r rows of \mathbf{V} . Then, we still have $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{V}_0$, where $\mathbf{U}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $\mathbf{V}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$. This is also known as the reduced ULV decomposition. Let $\{\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{V}_0\}$ or $\{\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{U}_0$ and $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{V}_0\}$, we find such a rank decomposition. \blacksquare

The rank decomposition is not unique. Even by elementary transformations, we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Z} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_2,$$

where $\mathbf{E}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{E}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ represent elementary row and column operations, and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$. The transformation is rather general, and there are dozens of these \mathbf{E}_1 , \mathbf{E}_2 , and \mathbf{Z} matrices. Using a construction analogous to the one illustrated in the preceding proof, we can derive an alternative rank decomposition.

Analogously, we can find such \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{F} by SVD, URV, CR, CUR, and many other decomposition algorithms. However, we may connect different rank decompositions by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5: (Connection Between Rank Decompositions) For any two rank decompositions of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{F}_2$, there exists a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} such that

$$\mathbf{D}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{P} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_2.$$

Proof [of Lemma 5.5] Since $\mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{F}_2$, we have $\mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^\top = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_1^\top$. It is trivial that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^\top) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{F}_1) = r$ such that $\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^\top$ is a square matrix with full rank and thus is nonsingular. This implies $\mathbf{D}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_1^\top (\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^\top)^{-1}$. Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_1^\top (\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^\top)^{-1}$, we have $\mathbf{D}_1 = \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_2$. ■

5.5. Application: Rank and Trace of an Idempotent Matrix

The CR decomposition is quite useful to prove the rank property of an idempotent matrix. See also how it works in the orthogonal projection in Lu (2021c, 2022a).

Lemma 5.6: (Rank and Trace of an Idempotent Matrix) For any $n \times n$ idempotent matrix \mathbf{A} (i.e., $\mathbf{A}^2 = \mathbf{A}$), the rank of \mathbf{A} equals its trace.

Proof [of Lemma 5.6] Any $n \times n$ rank- r matrix \mathbf{A} has CR decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ with \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} having full rank r . Then,

$$\mathbf{A}^2 = \mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R} \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R} \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}_r,$$

where \mathbf{I}_r is an $r \times r$ identity matrix. Thus

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{R}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{R} \mathbf{C}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{I}_r) = r,$$

which equals the rank of \mathbf{A} . The equality above is from the invariance of cyclic permutation of trace. ■

Chapter 5 Problems

1. Determine the reduced row echelon form and the CR decomposition for the matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 2 \\ 3 & 7 & 6 \\ 4 & 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

6

Skeleton/CUR Decomposition

Contents

6.1	Skeleton/CUR Decomposition	95
6.2	Existence of the Skeleton Decomposition	95
	Chapter 6 Problems	97

6.1. Skeleton/CUR Decomposition



The CR decomposition utilizes the actual columns of the matrix, while the skeleton decomposition extends this by incorporating both the actual columns and rows of the matrix.

Theorem 6.1: (Skeleton Decomposition) Any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A}_{m \times n} = \mathbf{C}_{m \times r} \mathbf{U}_{r \times r}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{r \times n},$$

where \mathbf{C} contains some r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{R} contains some r linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{U} is the nonsingular submatrix at the intersection.

- The storage for the decomposition is then reduced or potentially increased from mn floating-point numbers to $r(m+n) + r^2$ floating-point numbers.
- Or further, if we only record the position of the indices, it requires mr and nr floating-point numbers for storing \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} , respectively, and extra $2r$ integers to remember the position of each column of \mathbf{C} in that of \mathbf{A} and each row of \mathbf{R} in that of \mathbf{A} (i.e., construct \mathbf{U} from \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R}).

Skeleton decomposition is also known as the *CUR decomposition*, as indicated by the notation. Figure 6.1 illustrates the skeleton decomposition, where the yellow vectors represent the linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} and green vectors represent the linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} . In case of a square and invertible matrix \mathbf{A} , the skeleton decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{R}$ simplifies to $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}$. Specifically, given index vectors I, J , both of size r , containing the indices of rows and columns selected from \mathbf{A} into \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{C} respectively, \mathbf{U} can be denoted as $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}[I, J]$.




Figure 6.1: Demonstration of the skeleton decomposition of a matrix.

6.2. Existence of the Skeleton Decomposition

In Corollary 0.1 (p. 5), we established the equality between the row rank and the column rank of a matrix. In other words, it can be asserted that the dimension of the column space is equal to the dimension of the row space. This property is crucial for the existence of the skeleton decomposition. We are now prepared to demonstrate the existence of the skeleton decomposition, and the proof is rather elementary.

Proof [of Theorem 6.1] The proof relies on the existence of such a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{U} , which is central to this decomposition method.

Existence of such a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{U} . Since matrix \mathbf{A} is of rank r , we can pick r linearly independent columns from \mathbf{A} . Suppose we put the specific r linearly independent columns $\mathbf{a}_{i1}, \mathbf{a}_{i2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{ir}$ into the columns of an $m \times r$ matrix $\mathbf{N} = [\mathbf{a}_{i1}, \mathbf{a}_{i2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{ir}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$. The column space of \mathbf{N} has a dimension of r , implying, by Corollary 0.1 (p.5), that the row space of \mathbf{N} also has a dimension of r . Again, we can pick r linearly independent rows $\mathbf{n}_{j1}^\top, \mathbf{n}_{j2}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{jr}^\top$ from \mathbf{N} and put the specific r rows into the rows of an $r \times r$ matrix $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{n}_{j1}^\top; \mathbf{n}_{j2}^\top; \dots; \mathbf{n}_{jr}^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$. Using Corollary 0.1 (p. 5) again, the column space of \mathbf{U} also has a dimension of r , indicating there are r linearly independent columns within \mathbf{U} . So \mathbf{U} is such a nonsingular matrix with size $r \times r$.

Main proof. Upon identifying a nonsingular $r \times r$ matrix \mathbf{U} within \mathbf{A} , the existence of the skeleton decomposition can be established as follows.

Suppose $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}[I, J]$, where I, J are index vectors of size r . Since \mathbf{U} is a nonsingular matrix, its columns are linearly independent. Thus the columns of matrix \mathbf{C} based on the columns of \mathbf{U} are also linearly independent (i.e., select the r columns of \mathbf{A} with the same entries of the matrix \mathbf{U} . Here \mathbf{C} is equal to the \mathbf{N} we construct above and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J]$).

As the rank of the matrix \mathbf{A} is r , if we take any other column \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{a}_i can be represented as a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{C} , i.e., there exists a vector \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}$, for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let r rows (entries) of $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ corresponding to the row entries of \mathbf{U} be $\mathbf{r}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ (i.e., \mathbf{r}_i contains r entries of \mathbf{a}_i). That is, select the r entries of \mathbf{a}_i 's corresponding to the entries of \mathbf{U} as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathbf{A}[I, :] = [\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}.$$

Since $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}$, \mathbf{U} is a submatrix inside \mathbf{C} , and \mathbf{r}_i is a subvector inside \mathbf{a}_i , we have $\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}$, which states that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{r}_i$. Thus, for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{r}_i$. Combining the n columns of such \mathbf{r}_i into $\mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n]$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n] = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{R},$$

from which the result follows.

In summary, we first find r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} and place them into $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$. Subsequently, we extract an $r \times r$ nonsingular submatrix \mathbf{U} from \mathbf{C} . The r rows of \mathbf{A} corresponding to entries of \mathbf{U} contribute to reconstruct the columns of \mathbf{A} . Again, the situation is illustrated in Figure 6.1. ■

CR decomposition vs skeleton decomposition. We note that the CR decomposition and the skeleton decomposition share a similar form, even extending to the notation used, with $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{R}$ for CR decomposition and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{R}$ for skeleton decomposition.

In both CR and skeleton decompositions, we have the flexibility to choose the **first** r independent columns to form the matrix \mathbf{C} (the symbol for both the CR decomposition and the skeleton decomposition). Consequently, \mathbf{C} 's in the CR decomposition and the skeleton decomposition are exactly the same (in this specific selection of columns). However, the

distinction arises in the interpretation of \mathbf{R} : in CR decomposition, it represents the reduced row echelon form without zero rows, while in skeleton decomposition, it corresponds to selected rows from \mathbf{A} , imparting different meanings to \mathbf{R} in the two methods.

A word on the uniqueness of CR decomposition and skeleton decomposition.

As mentioned above, in both the CR decomposition and the skeleton decomposition, we can select the first r linearly independent columns to obtain the matrix \mathbf{C} . In this sense, the CR and skeleton decompositions have a unique form. However, if we select the last r linearly independent columns, we will get a different CR decomposition or skeleton decomposition. We will not discuss this situation here, as it lies beyond the primary focus of this text.

To repeat, in the proof for the existence of the skeleton decomposition, we first find the r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} to construct the matrix \mathbf{C} . Subsequently, from \mathbf{C} , we extract an $r \times r$ nonsingular submatrix \mathbf{U} . Finally, from the submatrix \mathbf{U} , we find the row submatrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$. A further question can be posed that if matrix \mathbf{A} has rank r , matrix \mathbf{C} contains r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , and matrix \mathbf{R} contains r linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} , is the $r \times r$ “intersection” of \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} invertible or not ¹.

Corollary 6.2: (Nonsingular Intersection) If matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has rank r , matrix \mathbf{C} contains r linearly independent columns, and matrix \mathbf{R} contains r linearly independent rows, then the $r \times r$ “intersection” matrix \mathbf{U} of \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} is invertible.

Proof [of Corollary 6.2] If I, J are the indices of rows and columns selected from \mathbf{A} into \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{C} respectively, then \mathbf{R} can be denoted as $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{A}[I, :]$, \mathbf{C} can be represented as $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J]$, and \mathbf{U} can be denoted as $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}[I, J]$.

Since \mathbf{C} contains r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , any column \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbf{A} can be represented as $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{A}[:, J]\mathbf{x}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. This implies the r entries of \mathbf{a}_i corresponding to the I indices can be represented by the columns of \mathbf{U} such that $\mathbf{a}_i[I] = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{A}[:, J]\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathbf{a}_i[I] = \mathbf{A}[I, J]\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r.$$

Since \mathbf{R} contains r linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} , the row rank and column rank of \mathbf{R} are equal to r . Combining the facts above, the r columns of \mathbf{R} corresponding to indices J (i.e., the r columns of \mathbf{U}) are linearly independent.

Again, by applying Corollary 0.1 (p. 5), the dimension of the row space of \mathbf{U} is also equal to r , which means there are the r linearly independent rows from \mathbf{U} , and \mathbf{U} is invertible. ■

Chapter 6 Problems

1. Find the CUR decomposition for the matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 2 \\ 3 & 7 & 6 \\ 4 & 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

¹. We express our gratitude to Gilbert Strang for posing this question.

Interpolative Decomposition (ID)

Contents

7.1	Interpolative Decomposition (ID)	99
7.2	Existence of the Column Interpolative Decomposition	100
7.3	Row ID and Two-Sided ID	103
Chapter 7 Problems		104

7.1. Interpolative Decomposition (ID)



The column interpolative decomposition (ID) factors a matrix as the product of two matrices, one of which contains selected columns from the original matrix, and the other of which has a subset of columns consisting of the identity matrix and all its values are no greater than 1 in absolute value. Formally, we have the following theorem describing the details of the column ID.

Theorem 7.1: (Column Interpolative Decomposition) Any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\underset{m \times n}{\mathbf{A}} = \underset{m \times r}{\mathbf{C}} \underset{r \times n}{\mathbf{W}},$$

where $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ contains r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ is the matrix used to reconstruct \mathbf{A} . The factor \mathbf{W} contains an $r \times r$ identity submatrix (under a mild column permutation). Specifically, entries in \mathbf{W} have values no larger than 1 in magnitude:

$$\max |w_{ij}| \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in [1, r], j \in [1, n].$$

The storage for the decomposition is then reduced or potentially increased from mn floating-point numbers to mr and $(n - r)r$ floating-point numbers for storing \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{W} , respectively. And an extra r integers are required to track the position of each column of \mathbf{C} in that of \mathbf{A} .




Figure 7.1: Demonstration of the column ID of a matrix, where the yellow vectors denote the linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , white entries denote zero, and purple entries denote one.

The illustration of the column ID is shown in Figure 7.1, where the yellow vectors denote the linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , and the purple vectors in \mathbf{W} form an $r \times r$ identity submatrix. The positions of the purple vectors inside \mathbf{W} are exactly the same as the positions of the corresponding yellow vectors inside \mathbf{A} . The column ID is very similar to the CR decomposition (Theorem 5.1, p. 89), both methods select r linearly independent columns into the first factor, and the second factor contains an $r \times r$ identity submatrix. However, the CR decomposition precisely chooses the first r linearly independent columns, and the identity submatrix is associated with the pivots (Definition 1.3, p. 16). Notably,

the second factor in the CR decomposition is derived from the RREF (Lemma 5.3, p. 91). Consequently, the column ID finds applications in CR decomposition scenarios, such as proving the rank equals trace in idempotent matrices (Lemma 5.6, p. 93), and establishing the fundamental linear algebra theorem that the column rank equals the row rank of a matrix (Corollary 0.1, p. 5). Moreover, the column ID also serves as a special case of the rank decomposition (Theorem 5.4, p. 92) and is apparently not unique. The connection between different column IDs is given by Lemma 5.5 (p. 93).

Notations that will be extensively used in the sequel. Following again the Matlab-style notation, suppose J_s is an index vector of size r containing the indices of columns selected from \mathbf{A} into \mathbf{C} , then \mathbf{C} can be denoted by $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_s]$. The matrix \mathbf{C} contains “skeleton” columns of \mathbf{A} , hence the subscript s in J_s . From the “skeleton” index vector J_s , the $r \times r$ identity matrix inside \mathbf{W} can be recovered by

$$\mathbf{W}[:, J_s] = \mathbf{I}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}.$$

Suppose further we place the remaining indices of \mathbf{A} into an index vector J_r , where

$$J_s \cap J_r = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad J_s \cup J_r = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

The remaining $n - r$ columns in \mathbf{W} consist of an $r \times (n - r)$ *expansion matrix* since the matrix contains *expansion coefficients* for reconstructing the columns of \mathbf{A} from \mathbf{C} :

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{W}[:, J_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)},$$

where the entries of \mathbf{E} are known as the *expansion coefficients*. Moreover, let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a (column) permutation matrix (Definition 0.14, p. 7) defined by $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_n[:, (J_s, J_r)]$ so that

$$\mathbf{AP} = \mathbf{A}[:, (J_s, J_r)] = [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]],$$

and

$$\mathbf{WP} = \mathbf{W}[:, (J_s, J_r)] = [\mathbf{I}_r, \mathbf{E}] \quad \underline{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{I}_r, \mathbf{E}] \mathbf{P}^\top. \quad (7.1)$$

7.2. Existence of the Column Interpolative Decomposition

Cramer’s rule. The proof of the existence of the column ID relies on the Cramer’s rule, which we shall discuss shortly. Consider a system of n linear equations for n unknowns, represented in matrix multiplication form as follows:

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{l},$$

where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is nonsingular and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the theorem states that, in this case, the system has a unique solution, whose individual values for the unknowns are given by:

$$x_i = \frac{\det(\mathbf{M}_i)}{\det(\mathbf{M})}, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

where \mathbf{M}_i is the matrix formed by replacing the i -th column of \mathbf{M} with the column vector \mathbf{l} . In full generality, the Cramer’s rule considers the matrix equation

$$\mathbf{MX} = \mathbf{L},$$

where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is nonsingular and $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Let $I = [i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k]$ and $J = [j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k]$ be two index vectors, where $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$ and $1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \dots \leq j_k \leq n$. Then, $\mathbf{X}[I, J]$ is a $k \times k$ submatrix of \mathbf{X} . Let further $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{L}}(I, J)$ be the $n \times n$ matrix formed by replacing the (i_s) -th column of \mathbf{M} with (j_s) -th column of \mathbf{L} for all $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Then

$$\det(\mathbf{X}[I, J]) = \frac{\det(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{L}}(I, J))}{\det(\mathbf{M})}.$$

When I and J are of size 1, it follows that

$$x_{ij} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{L}}(i, j))}{\det(\mathbf{M})}. \quad (7.2)$$

Now we are ready to prove the existence of the column ID.

Proof [of Theorem 7.1] We have mentioned above the proof relies on the Cramer's rule. If we can show the entries of \mathbf{W} can be denoted by the Cramer's rule equality in Equation (7.2) and the numerator is smaller than the denominator, then we can complete the proof. However, we notice that the matrix in the denominator of Equation (7.2) is a square matrix. Here comes the trick.

Step 1: column ID for full row rank matrix. For a start, we first consider the full row rank matrix \mathbf{A} (which implies $r = m$, $m \leq n$, and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ such that the matrix $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a square matrix in the column ID $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{W}$ that we want to obtain). Determine the “skeleton” index vector J_s by

$$J_s = \arg \max_J \{ |\det(\mathbf{A}[:, J])| : J \text{ is a subset of } \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ with size } r = m \}, \quad (7.3)$$

i.e., J_s is the index vector that is determined by maximizing the magnitude of the determinant of $\mathbf{A}[:, J_s]$. As we have discussed in the last section, there exists a (column) permutation matrix such that

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{A}[:, J_s] \quad \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]].$$

Since $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_s]$ has full column rank $r = m$, it is then nonsingular. The above equation can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= [\mathbf{A}[:, J_s] \quad \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]] \mathbf{P}^\top \\ &= \mathbf{A}[:, J_s] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{A}[:, J_s]^{-1} \mathbf{A}[:, J_r] \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^\top, \\ &= \mathbf{C} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{A}[:, J_r] \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{P}^\top \end{aligned}$$

where the matrix \mathbf{W} is given by $[\mathbf{I}_r \quad \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]] \mathbf{P}^\top = [\mathbf{I}_r \quad \mathbf{E}] \mathbf{P}^\top$, from Equation (7.1). To prove the claim that the magnitude of \mathbf{W} is not greater than 1 is equivalent to proving that entries in $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{A}[:, J_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$ are not greater than 1 in absolute value.

Define the index vector $[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n]$ as a permutation of $[1, 2, \dots, n]$ such that

$$[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n] = [1, 2, \dots, n] \mathbf{P} = [J_s, J_r]. \quad ^1$$

¹. Note here $[j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n]$, $[1, 2, \dots, n]$, J_s , and J_r are row vectors.

Thus, it follows from $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]$ that

$$\underbrace{[\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}]}_{=\mathbf{C}=\mathbf{A}[:, J_s]} \mathbf{E} = \underbrace{[\mathbf{a}_{j_{r+1}}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{r+2}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_n}]}_{=\mathbf{A}[:, J_r] := \mathbf{B}},$$

where \mathbf{a}_i is the i -th column of \mathbf{A} , and we let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_r]$. Therefore, by Cramer's rule in Equation (7.2), we have

$$e_{kl} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{C}_B(k, l))}{\det(\mathbf{C})}, \quad (7.4)$$

where e_{kl} is the entry (k, l) of \mathbf{E} , and $\mathbf{C}_B(k, l)$ is the $r \times r$ matrix formed by replacing the k -th column of \mathbf{C} with the l -th column of \mathbf{B} . For example,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{11} &= \frac{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_{r+1}}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}, & e_{12} &= \frac{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_{r+2}}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}, \\ e_{21} &= \frac{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{r+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}, & e_{22} &= \frac{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{r+2}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}{\det([\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_r}])}. \end{aligned}$$

Since J_s is chosen to maximize the magnitude of $\det(\mathbf{C})$ in Equation (7.3), it follows that

$$|e_{kl}| \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - r\}.$$

Step 2: apply to general matrices. To summarize what we have proved above and to abuse the notation. For any matrix $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ with **full** rank $r \leq n$, the column ID exists that $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{W}$, where the values in \mathbf{W} are not greater than 1 in absolute value.

Apply the finding to the full general matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank $r \leq \{m, n\}$, it is trivial that the matrix \mathbf{A} admits a rank decomposition (Theorem 5.4, p. 92):

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{F}, \quad \begin{matrix} m \times n & m \times r & r \times n \end{matrix}$$

where \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{F} have full column rank r and full row rank r , respectively. For the column ID of $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{W}$, where $\mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{F}[:, J_s]$ contains r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{F} . We notice from $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}$ such that

$$\mathbf{A}[:, J_s] = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}[:, J_s],$$

i.e., the columns indexed by J_s of $(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F})$ can be obtained by $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}[:, J_s]$, which in turn are the columns of \mathbf{A} indexed by J_s . This makes

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{A}[:, J_s]}_{\mathbf{C}} = \underbrace{\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}[:, J_s]}_{\mathbf{D}\mathbf{C}_0},$$

and

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{W} = \underbrace{\mathbf{D}\mathbf{F}[:, J_s]}_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{W}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

The above proof reveals an intuitive way to compute the “optimal” column ID of a matrix \mathbf{A} . However, any algorithm that is guaranteed to find such an optimally-conditioned factorization must have combinatorial complexity (Martinsson, 2019; Lu, 2022b,c). Therefore, randomized algorithms, approximation by column-pivoted QR (Section 3.9, p. 58) and rank-revealing QR (Section 3.11, p. 61) are applied to find a relatively well-conditioned decomposition for the column ID, where \mathbf{W} is small in norm rather than having entries all smaller than 1 in magnitude. While, the Bayesian approach can constrain the components in \mathbf{W} in the range of -1 to 1 strictly (Lu, 2022b,c). And we shall not go into the details.

7.3. Row ID and Two-Sided ID

The decomposition mentioned above is termed the column ID. This nomenclature is not coincidental, as it has sibling decompositions:

Theorem 7.2: (The Whole Interpolative Decomposition) Any rank- r matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Column ID:} \quad \mathbf{A}_{m \times n} &= \boxed{\mathbf{C}}_{m \times r} \mathbf{W}_{r \times n}; \\ \text{Row ID:} \quad &= \mathbf{Z}_{m \times r} \boxed{\mathbf{R}}_{r \times n}; \\ \text{Two-Sided ID:} \quad &= \mathbf{Z}_{m \times r} \boxed{\mathbf{U}}_{r \times r} \mathbf{W}_{r \times n}, \end{aligned}$$

where

- $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_s] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ contains some r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ is the matrix used to reconstruct \mathbf{A} , which contains an $r \times r$ identity submatrix (under a mild column permutation): $\mathbf{W}[:, J_s] = \mathbf{I}_r$;
- $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{A}[I_s, :] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ contains some r linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ is the matrix used to reconstruct \mathbf{A} , which contains an $r \times r$ identity submatrix (under a mild row permutation): $\mathbf{Z}[I_s, :] = \mathbf{I}_r$;
- Entries in \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z} have values no larger than 1 in magnitude: $\max |w_{ij}| \leq 1$ and $\max |z_{ij}| \leq 1$;
- $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is the nonsingular submatrix at the intersection of \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} ;
- The three matrices \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{R} , and \mathbf{U} in the boxed texts share same notation as the skeleton decomposition (Theorem 6.1, p. 95), where they even have the same meanings such that the three matrices make the skeleton decomposition of \mathbf{A} : $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{R}$.

The proof of the row ID is just similar to that of the column ID. Suppose the column ID of \mathbf{A}^\top is given by $\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{W}_0$, where \mathbf{C}_0 contains r linearly independent columns of \mathbf{A}^\top (i.e., r linearly independent rows of \mathbf{A}). Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{C}_0$ and $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{W}_0$, the row ID is obtained by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}$.

For the two-sided ID, recall from the skeleton decomposition (Theorem 6.1, p. 95). When \mathbf{U} is the intersection of \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{R} , it follows that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{R}$. Consequently, employing the row ID yields $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}^{-1} = \mathbf{Z}$. And this implies $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{U}$. By column ID, it follows that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}$, which proves the existence of the two-sided ID.

Data storage In terms of data storage requirements for each ID, we can summarize as follows:

- *Column ID*. It requires mr and $(n - r)r$ floating-point numbers to store \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{W} , respectively, and r integers to store the indices of the selected columns in \mathbf{A} ;
- *Row ID*. It requires nr and $(m - r)r$ floating-point numbers to store \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{Z} , respectively, and r integers to store the indices of the selected rows in \mathbf{A} ;
- *Two-Sided ID*. It requires $(m - r)r$, $(n - r)r$, and r^2 floating-point numbers to store \mathbf{Z} , \mathbf{W} , and \mathbf{U} , respectively. And an extra $2r$ integers are required to store the indices of the selected rows and columns in \mathbf{A} .

Further reduction in storage for two-sided ID of sparse matrix \mathbf{A} Consider the column ID of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{W}$, where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}[:, J_s]$, and a good spanning rows index I_s set of \mathbf{C} could be found:

$$\mathbf{A}[I_s, :] = \mathbf{C}[I_s, :]\mathbf{W}.$$

We observe that $\mathbf{C}[I_s, :] = \mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s] \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, which is nonsingular (since full rank r in the sense of both row rank and column rank). It follows that

$$\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s])^{-1} \mathbf{A}[I_s, :].$$

Therefore, there is no need to store the matrix \mathbf{W} explicitly. We only need to store $\mathbf{A}[I_s, :]$ and $(\mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s])^{-1}$. Alternatively, when we can compute the inverse of $\mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s]$ dynamically, it only requires r integers to store J_s and we can recover $\mathbf{A}[I_s, J_s]$ from $\mathbf{A}[I_s, :]$. The storage of $\mathbf{A}[I_s, :]$ is cheap if \mathbf{A} is sparse.

Chapter 7 Problems

1. Determine the column ID for the matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 3 & 2 \\ 3 & 7 & 6 \\ 4 & 5 & 8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Part IV

Reduction to Hessenberg, Tridiagonal, and Bidiagonal Form

8

Hessenberg Decomposition

Contents

8.1	Hessenberg Decomposition	110
8.2	Similarity Transformation and Orthogonal Similarity Transformation	111
8.3	Existence of the Hessenberg Decomposition	112
8.4	Properties of the Hessenberg Decomposition	115
Chapter 8 Problems		117

Preliminary

In real applications, we often want to factor matrix \mathbf{A} into two orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is diagonal or upper triangular, e.g., eigen analysis via the Schur decomposition, and principal component analysis (PCA) via the spectral decomposition. This can be computed via a sequence of *orthogonal similarity transformations*:

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{Q}_k^\top \dots \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top}_{\mathbf{Q}^\top} \mathbf{A} \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_2 \dots \mathbf{Q}_k}_{\mathbf{Q}},$$

which converges to $\mathbf{\Lambda}$. However, this transformation will always be very hard to handle in practice, for example, via the Householder reflectors. Following the QR decomposition via the Householder example,¹ the sequence of orthogonal similarity transformation can be constructed via the Householder reflectors:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{H_1 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} & & H_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\times H_1^\top} \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}, \\ H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top \end{array}$$

where the left Householder ($H_1 \times$) introduces zeros in the first column below the main diagonal (see Section 3.12, p. 62), and unfortunately the right Householder ($\times H_1^\top$) will destroy the zeros introduced by the left Householder.

However, if we are less ambitious to modify the algorithms into two phases, where the first phase transforms the matrix into a Hessenberg matrix (Definition 8.1, p. 110) or a tridiagonal matrix (Definition 9.1, p. 119). And if we find a second phase algorithm to transform the results from the first one to the goal we want to find, then we complete the algorithm:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{H_1 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} & & H_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\times H_1^\top} \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}, \\ H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top \end{array}$$

where the left Householder will not influence the first row, and the right Householder will not influence the first column. A phase two² algorithm for finding the triangular matrix is

-
1. where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed.
 2. which is usually an iterative algorithm.

shown as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\text{Phase 2}} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_2^\top \mathbf{H}_3^\top & & \mathbf{\Lambda}
 \end{array}$$

From the discussion above, to compute the spectral decomposition, Schur decomposition, or singular value decomposition (SVD), we usually reach a compromise to calculate the Hessenberg, tridiagonal, or bidiagonal form in the first phase and leave the second phase to finish the rest (Van Zee et al., 2012, 2014; Trefethen and Bau III, 1997).

8.1. Hessenberg Decomposition



The Hessenberg decomposition is a procedure employed to convert a matrix into an upper Hessenberg form. This transformation simplifies the matrix, making it suitable for use as a first phase in various algorithms, thereby reducing the computational complexity. To begin, let's offer a precise definition of upper Hessenberg matrices.

Definition 8.1 (Upper Hessenberg Matrix) An *upper Hessenberg matrix* is a square matrix, where all the entries below the first diagonal (i.e., the ones below the **main diagonal**, a.k.a., **lower subdiagonal**) are zeros. Similarly, a lower Hessenberg matrix is a square matrix, where all the entries above the first diagonal (i.e., the ones above the main diagonal) are zeros.

The definition of the upper Hessenberg can also be extended to rectangular matrices, and the form can be implied from the context.

In matrix language, for any matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and the entry (i, j) denoted by h_{ij} for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then \mathbf{H} with $h_{ij} = 0$ for all $i \geq j + 2$ is known as a Hessenberg matrix.

Let i denote the smallest positive integer for which $h_{i+1,i} = 0$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, then \mathbf{H} is **unreduced** if $i = n - 1$.

Taking a 5×5 matrix as an example, the lower triangular below the lower subdiagonal are zero in the upper Hessenberg matrix:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \text{or} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \color{blue}{\boxtimes} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \text{possibly unreduced} & & \text{reduced}
 \end{array}$$

Then we have the following Hessenberg decomposition:

Theorem 8.1: (Hessenberg Decomposition) Every $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{Q}^\top \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q},$$

where \mathbf{H} is an upper Hessenberg matrix, and \mathbf{Q} is an orthogonal matrix.

It's not hard to find that a lower Hessenberg decomposition of \mathbf{A}^\top is given by $\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{Q}^\top$ if \mathbf{A} admits the Hessenberg decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{Q}^\top$. The Hessenberg decomposition shares a similar form as the QR decomposition in that they both reduce a matrix into a sparse form, where the lower parts of both are zero.

Remark 8.2: Why Hessenberg Decomposition

We will see that the zeros introduced into \mathbf{H} from \mathbf{A} is accomplished by the left orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} (same as the QR decomposition), and the right orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q}^\top here does not transform the matrix into any better or simpler form. Then why do we want the Hessenberg decomposition rather than just a QR decomposition, which has a simpler structure in that it even has zeros in the lower subdiagonal? As mentioned above, the answer is that the Hessenberg decomposition is usually used by other algorithms as a phase one step to find a decomposition that factors the matrix into two orthogonal matrices, e.g., SVD, UTV, and so on. And if we employ an aggressive algorithm that even favors zeros in the lower subdiagonal (again, as in the QR decomposition), the right orthogonal transform \mathbf{Q}^\top will destroy the zeros that can be seen very shortly.

On the other hand, the form $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ on \mathbf{H} is known as the *orthogonal similarity transformation* (Definition 8.2) on \mathbf{A} such that the eigenvalues, rank, and trace of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{H} are the same (Lemma 8.3). Then if we want to study the properties of \mathbf{A} , exploration on \mathbf{H} can be a relatively simpler task.

8.2. Similarity Transformation and Orthogonal Similarity Transformation

As mentioned previously, the Hessenberg decomposition introduced in this section, the tridiagonal decomposition in the next section, the Schur decomposition (Theorem 12.1, p. 143), and the spectral decomposition (Theorem 13.1, p. 149) share a similar form that transforms the matrix into a *similar matrix*. We now give the rigorous definition of similar matrices and similarity transformations.

Definition 8.2 (Similar Matrices and Similarity Transformation) \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are called **similar matrices** if there exists a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} such that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$.

In words, for any nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} , the matrices \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$ are similar matrices. And in this sense, given the nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} , $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$ is called a **similarity transformation** applied to matrix \mathbf{A} .

Moreover, when \mathbf{P} is orthogonal, then $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^\top$ is also known as the **orthogonal similarity transformation** of \mathbf{A} .

The difference between the similarity transformation and orthogonal similarity transformation is partly explained in the sense of coordinate transformation (Chapter 15, p. 192).

Next, we prove the important properties of similar matrices that will be shown very useful in the sequel.

Lemma 8.3: (Eigenvalue, Trace and Rank of Similar Matrices) Any eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} is also an eigenvalue of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} . The converse is also true that any eigenvalue of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} is also an eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} . I.e., $\Lambda(\mathbf{A}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{B})$, where $\Lambda(\mathbf{X})$ is the spectrum of matrix \mathbf{X} (Definition 0.2, p. 3).

Moreover, the trace and rank of \mathbf{A} are equal to those of matrix \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} for any nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} .

Proof [of Lemma 8.3] For any eigenpair (λ, \mathbf{x}) of \mathbf{A} , we have $\mathbf{Ax} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$. Then we have $\lambda\mathbf{Px} = \mathbf{PAP}^{-1}\mathbf{Px}$ such that \mathbf{Px} is an eigenvector of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} corresponding to λ .

Similarly, for any eigenpair (λ, \mathbf{x}) of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} , we have $\mathbf{PAP}^{-1}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$. Then we have $\mathbf{AP}^{-1}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ such that $\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ is an eigenvector of \mathbf{A} corresponding to λ .

For the trace of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} , we have $\text{tr}(\mathbf{PAP}^{-1}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{AP}^{-1}\mathbf{P}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$, where the first equality comes from the fact that the trace of a product is invariant under cyclical permutations of the factors:

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{ABC}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{BCA}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{CAB}),$$

if all \mathbf{ABC} , \mathbf{BCA} , and \mathbf{CAB} exist.

For the rank of \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} , we separate it into two claims as follows.

Rank claim 1: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{ZA}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ if \mathbf{Z} is nonsingular. We will first show that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{ZA}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ if \mathbf{Z} is nonsingular. For any vector \mathbf{n} in the null space of \mathbf{A} , that is, $\mathbf{An} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{ZAn} = \mathbf{0}$; that is, \mathbf{n} is also in the null space of \mathbf{ZA} . And this implies $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{ZA})$.

Conversely, for any vector \mathbf{m} in the null space of \mathbf{ZA} , i.e., $\mathbf{ZAm} = \mathbf{0}$, we have $\mathbf{Am} = \mathbf{Z}^{-1}\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$. That is, \mathbf{m} is also in the null space of \mathbf{A} . And this indicates $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{ZA}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$.

By “sandwiching”, the above two arguments imply

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{ZA}) \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{rank}(\mathbf{ZA}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}).$$

Rank claim 2: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AZ}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ if \mathbf{Z} is nonsingular. We notice that the row rank is equal to the column rank for any matrix (Corollary 0.1, p. 5). Therefore, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AZ}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top)$. Since \mathbf{Z}^\top is nonsingular, by claim 1, we have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, where the last equality is again from the fact that the row rank is equal to the column rank for any matrix. This results in $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AZ}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, as claimed.

Since \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{P}^{-1} are nonsingular, we then have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{PAP}^{-1}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{AP}^{-1}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, where the first equality is from claim 1 and the second equality is from claim 2. We complete the proof. \blacksquare

8.3. Existence of the Hessenberg Decomposition

We will prove that any $n \times n$ matrix can be reduced to Hessenberg form via a sequence of Householder transformations that are applied from the left and the right to the matrix

in an interleaved manner. Previously, we utilized a Householder reflector to triangularize matrices and introduce zeros below the diagonal to obtain the QR decomposition. A similar approach can be applied to introduce zeros below the subdiagonal.

Before introducing the mathematical construction of such a decomposition, we emphasize the following remark which will be very useful in the finding of the decomposition.

Remark 8.4: Left and Right Multiplied by a Matrix with Block Identity

Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and a matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}_{n-k} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{I}_k is a $k \times k$ identity matrix. Then $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$ will not change the first k rows of \mathbf{A} , and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}$ will not change the first k columns of \mathbf{A} .

The proof of this remark is trivial.

First Step: Introduce Zeros for the First Column

Let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ be the column partition of \mathbf{A} , and each $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_2, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ are vectors removing the first component in \mathbf{a}_i 's. Let

$$r_1 = \|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_1 = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_1 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)},$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 here is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. To introduce zeros below the subdiagonal and operate on the submatrix $\mathbf{A}_{2:n,1:n}$, we append the Householder reflector into

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

in which case, $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$ will introduce zeros in the first column of \mathbf{A} below entry (2,1). The first row of \mathbf{A} will not be affected at all and kept unchanged by Remark 8.4. And we can easily verify that both \mathbf{H}_1 and $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_1$ are orthogonal matrices and they are symmetric (from the definition of the Householder reflector). To have the form in Theorem 8.1, we multiply $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$ on the right by \mathbf{H}_1^\top , which results in $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$. The \mathbf{H}_1^\top on the right will not change the first column of $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$ and thus keep the zeros introduced in the first column.

An example of a 5×5 matrix is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_1 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} & \mathbf{\boxtimes} \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array} \quad \xrightarrow{\times \mathbf{H}_1^\top} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & & \\ & & \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top \end{array}$$

Second Step: Introduce Zeros for the Second Column

Let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$, where the entries in the first column below entry (2,1) are all zeros. And the goal is to introduce zeros in the second column below entry (3,2). Let $\mathbf{B}_2 = \mathbf{B}_{2:n,2:n} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-1}]$. Suppose again $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_2, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ are vectors removing the first component in \mathbf{b}_i 's. We can again construct a Householder reflector

$$r_1 = \|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_2 = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_2^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-2) \times (n-2)}, \quad (8.1)$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 now is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{n-2} . To introduce zeros below the subdiagonal and operate on the submatrix $\mathbf{B}_{3:n,1:n}$, we append the Householder reflector into

$$\mathbf{H}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{I}_2 is a 2×2 identity matrix. We can see that $\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$ will not change the first two rows of $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$, and as the Householder cannot reflect a zero vector such that the zeros in the first column will be kept. Again, applying \mathbf{H}_2^\top to the right of $\mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$ will not change the first 2 columns so that the zeros will be kept.

Following the example of a 5×5 matrix, the second step is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_2^\top} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_2} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top & & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top & & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_2^\top \end{array}$$

The same process can go on, and there are $n-2$ such steps. We will finally triangularize by

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_{n-2} \mathbf{H}_{n-3} \dots \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_2^\top \dots \mathbf{H}_{n-2}^\top.$$

And since \mathbf{H}_i 's are symmetric and orthogonal, the above equation can be simply reduced to

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_{n-2} \mathbf{H}_{n-3} \dots \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_2 \dots \mathbf{H}_{n-2}.$$

Note here only $n-2$ such stages exist rather than $n-1$ or n . We will verify this number of steps by the example below. The example of a 5×5 matrix as a whole is shown as follows where again \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed.

A Complete Example of Hessenberg Decomposition

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{H_1 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
\mathbf{A} & & H_1 \mathbf{A} \\
& & \xrightarrow{\times H_1^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
& & H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top \\
& & \xrightarrow{H_2 \times} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
& & H_2 H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top \\
& & \xrightarrow{\times H_2^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
& & H_2 H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top H_2^\top \\
& & \xrightarrow{H_3 \times} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
& & H_3 H_2 H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top H_2^\top \\
& & \xrightarrow{\times H_3^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}, \\
& & H_3 H_2 H_1 \mathbf{A} H_1^\top H_2^\top H_3^\top
\end{array}$$

8.4. Properties of the Hessenberg Decomposition

The Hessenberg decomposition is not unique in the different ways to construct the Householder reflectors (say Equation (8.1)). However, under mild conditions, we can claim a similar structure in different decompositions.

Theorem 8.5: (Implicit Q Theorem for Hessenberg Decomposition) Suppose two Hessenberg decompositions of matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{U}^\top = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , respectively. Suppose further that k is the smallest positive integer for which $h_{k+1,k} = 0$, where h_{ij} is the entry (i, j) of \mathbf{H} . Then

- If $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1$, then $\mathbf{u}_i = \pm \mathbf{v}_i$ and $|h_{i,i-1}| = |g_{i,i-1}|$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$.
- When $k = n - 1$, the Hessenberg matrix \mathbf{H} is known as *unreduced*. However, if $k < n - 1$, then $g_{k+1,k} = 0$.

Proof [of Theorem 8.5] Define the orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U}$ and we have

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{G}\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U} \\ \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U} \end{array} \right\} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{G}\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H},$$

the $(i - 1)$ -th column of each can be represented as

$$\mathbf{G}\mathbf{q}_{i-1} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{h}_{i-1},$$

where \mathbf{q}_{i-1} and \mathbf{h}_{i-1} are the $(i-1)$ -th column of \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{H} , respectively. Since $h_{l,i-1} = 0$ for $l \geq i+1$ (by the definition of upper Hessenberg matrices), $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{h}_{i-1}$ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{h}_{i-1} = \sum_{j=1}^i h_{j,i-1} \mathbf{q}_j = h_{i,i-1} \mathbf{q}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} h_{j,i-1} \mathbf{q}_j.$$

Combining the two findings above, it follows that

$$h_{i,i-1} \mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{q}_{i-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} h_{j,i-1} \mathbf{q}_j.$$

A moment of reflexion reveals that $[\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_k]$ is upper triangular. And since \mathbf{Q} is orthogonal, it must be diagonal and each value on the diagonal is in $\{-1, 1\}$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$. Then, $\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{e}_1$ and $\mathbf{q}_i = \pm \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$. Furthermore, since $\mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{u}_i$ and $h_{i,i-1} = \mathbf{q}_i^\top (\mathbf{G}\mathbf{q}_{i-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} h_{j,i-1} \mathbf{q}_j) = \mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{G}\mathbf{q}_{i-1}$. For $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$, $\mathbf{q}_i^\top \mathbf{G}\mathbf{q}_{i-1}$ is just $\pm g_{i,i-1}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{i,i-1}| &= |g_{i,i-1}|, & \forall i \in \{2, \dots, k\}, \\ \mathbf{u}_i &= \pm \mathbf{v}_i, & \forall i \in \{2, \dots, k\}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part. For the second part, if $k < n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k+1,k} &= \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_k = \pm \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \underbrace{\mathbf{G}\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{QH}} \mathbf{e}_k = \pm \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{e}_k}_{\text{k-th column of } \mathbf{QH}} \\ &= \pm \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{h}_k = \pm \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} h_{jk} \mathbf{q}_j = \pm \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^\top \sum_{j=1}^k h_{jk} \mathbf{q}_j = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality is from the assumption that $h_{k+1,k} = 0$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

We observe from the above theorem, when two Hessenberg decompositions of matrix \mathbf{A} are both unreduced and have the same first column in the orthogonal matrices, then the Hessenberg matrices \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G} are similar matrices such that $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\pm 1, \pm 1, \dots, \pm 1)$. Moreover, and most importantly, if we restrict the elements in the lower subdiagonal of the Hessenberg matrix \mathbf{H} to be positive (if possible), then the Hessenberg decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QH}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ is uniquely determined by \mathbf{A} and the first column of \mathbf{Q} . This is similar to what we have claimed on the uniqueness of the QR decomposition (Corollary 3.9, p. 70), and it is important to reduce the complexity of the QR algorithm for computing the singular value decomposition or eigenvalues of a matrix in general (Lu, 2021c).

The next finding involves a Krylov matrix defined as follows:

Definition 8.3 (Krylov Matrix) Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and a scalar k , the Krylov matrix is defined to be

$$\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{q}, k) = [\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{q}, \dots, \mathbf{A}^{k-1}\mathbf{q}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}.$$

Theorem 8.6: (Unreduced Hessenberg) Suppose there exists an orthogonal matrix Q such that $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be factored as $A = QHQ^\top$. Then $Q^\top AQ = H$ is an unreduced upper Hessenberg matrix if and only if $R = Q^\top K(A, q_1, n)$ is nonsingular and upper triangular, where q_1 is the first column of Q .

If R is singular and k is the smallest index such that $r_{kk} = 0$, then k is also the smallest index satisfying $h_{k,k-1} = 0$.

Proof [of Theorem 8.6] We prove by forward implication and converse implication separately as follows:

Forward implication. Suppose H is unreduced, write out the following matrix

$$R = Q^\top K(A, q_1, n) = [e_1, He_1, \dots, H^{n-1}e_1],$$

where, obviously, R is upper triangular with $r_{11} = 1$. Observe that $r_{ii} = h_{21}h_{32} \dots h_{i,i-1}$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$. When H is unreduced, R is nonsingular as well.

Converse implication. Now suppose R is upper triangular and nonsingular, we observe that $r_{k+1} = Hr_k$ such that the $(k+2 : n)$ -th rows of H are zero and $h_{k+1,k} \neq 0$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. Then H is unreduced.

If R is singular and k is the smallest index satisfying $r_{kk} = 0$, then

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} r_{k-1,k-1} = h_{21}h_{32} \dots h_{k-1,k-2} & \neq 0 \\ r_{kk} = h_{21}h_{32} \dots h_{k-1,k-2}h_{k,k-1} & = 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad h_{k,k-1} = 0,$$

from which the result follows. ■

Chapter 8 Problems

1. Show that if $A = ECE^{-1}$ and $B = FCF^{-1}$, then A and B are similar matrices.

9

Tridiagonal Decomposition

Contents

9.1	Tridiagonal Decomposition: Hessenberg in Symmetric Matrices	119
9.2	Properties of the Tridiagonal Decomposition	119
Chapter 9	Problems	120

9.1. Tridiagonal Decomposition: Hessenberg in Symmetric Matrices



Similar to the Hessenberg decomposition, the tridiagonal decomposition can also simplify a matrix and serve as a preliminary step for other algorithms, thereby reducing their computational burden. We will begin by providing a formal definition of tridiagonal matrices.

Definition 9.1 (Tridiagonal Matrix) A tridiagonal matrix is a square matrix, where all the entries below the lower subdiagonal and the entries above the upper subdiagonal are zeros. In other words, the tridiagonal matrix is a **band matrix**.

The definition of the tridiagonal matrix can also be extended to rectangular matrices, and the form can be implied from the context.

In matrix language, consider any matrix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with the entry (i, j) denoted by t_{ij} for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then \mathbf{T} with $t_{ij} = 0$ for all $i \geq j + 2$ and $i \leq j - 2$ is known as a tridiagonal matrix.

Let i denote the smallest positive integer for which $h_{i+1,i} = 0$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, then \mathbf{T} is **unreduced** if $i = n - 1$.

Taking a 5×5 matrix as an example, the lower triangular below the lower subdiagonal and upper triangular above the upper subdiagonal are zero in the tridiagonal matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \textcolor{blue}{\boxed{\times}} & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxed{\times} & \boxed{\times} \end{bmatrix}.$$

possibly unreduced *reduced*

Clearly, a tridiagonal matrix represents a specific instance of an upper Hessenberg matrix. Subsequently, we can formulate the tridiagonal decomposition as follows:

Theorem 9.1: (Tridiagonal Decomposition) Every $n \times n$ symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{Q}^\top \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q},$$

where \mathbf{T} is a *symmetric* tridiagonal matrix, and \mathbf{Q} is an orthogonal matrix.

The existence of the tridiagonal matrix is straightforward by applying the Hessenberg decomposition to the symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} .

9.2. Properties of the Tridiagonal Decomposition

Similarly, the tridiagonal decomposition is not unique. However, and most importantly, if we restrict the elements in the lower subdiagonal of the tridiagonal matrix \mathbf{T} to be positive (if possible), then the tridiagonal decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ is uniquely determined by \mathbf{A} and the first column of \mathbf{Q} .

Theorem 9.2: (Implicit Q Theorem for Tridiagonal) Suppose two tridiagonal decompositions of a symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{U}^\top = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , respectively. Suppose further that k is the smallest positive integer for which $t_{k+1,k} = 0$, where t_{ij} is the entry (i, j) of \mathbf{T} . Then

- If $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1$, then $\mathbf{u}_i = \pm \mathbf{v}_i$ and $|t_{i,i-1}| = |g_{i,i-1}|$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$.
- When $k = n - 1$, the tridiagonal matrix \mathbf{T} is known as unreduced. However, if $k < n - 1$, then $g_{k+1,k} = 0$.

From the above theorem, we observe that if we restrict the elements in the lower subdiagonal of the tridiagonal matrix \mathbf{T} to be positive (if possible), i.e., *unreduced*, then the tridiagonal decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ is uniquely determined by \mathbf{A} and the first column of \mathbf{Q} . This again is similar to what we have claimed on the uniqueness of the QR decomposition (Corollary 3.9, p. 70).

Similarly, a reduced tridiagonal decomposition can be obtained from the implication of the Krylov matrix (Definition 8.3, p. 116).

Theorem 9.3: (Reduced Tridiagonal) Suppose there exists an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} such that $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{Q}^\top$. Then $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{T}$ is an unreduced tridiagonal matrix if and only if $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{q}_1, n)$ is nonsingular and upper triangular, where \mathbf{q}_1 is the first column of \mathbf{Q} .

If \mathbf{R} is singular and k is the smallest index satisfying $r_{kk} = 0$, then k is also the smallest index that $t_{k,k-1} = 0$.

Chapter 9 Problems

1. Following the proof of Theorem 8.5 and 8.6 (p. 115 and p. 117), prove Theorem 9.2 and 9.3.
2. (Golub and Van Loan, 2013) Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{S} + \sigma \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is skew-symmetric (satisfying $\mathbf{A}^\top = -\mathbf{A}$), $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. Show that there exists an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} such that $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{T} + \sigma \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^\top$, where \mathbf{T} is tridiagonal and skew-symmetric.

10

Bidiagonal Decomposition

Contents

10.1	Bidiagonal Decomposition	123
10.2	Existence of the Bidiagonal Decomposition: Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization	123
10.3	Connection to Tridiagonal Decomposition	129
Chapter 10	Problems	130

10.1. Bidiagonal Decomposition



In the case of a non-square symmetric matrix, obtaining the tridiagonal form becomes a non-trivial task. However, we can take a step backward and seek a decomposition involving two different orthogonal matrices. We firstly provide the rigorous definition of upper bidiagonal matrices as follows.

Definition 10.1 (Upper Bidiagonal Matrix) *An upper bidiagonal matrix is a square matrix characterized by a banded structure with nonzero entries along the **main diagonal** and the **upper subdiagonal** (i.e., the ones above the main diagonal). This means there are exactly two nonzero diagonals in the matrix.*

Furthermore, when the diagonal below the main diagonal has the nonzero entries, the matrix is lower bidiagonal.

The definition of bidigonal matrices can also be extended to rectangular matrices, and the form can be implied from the context.

Taking a 7×5 matrix as an example, the lower triangular below the main diagonal and the upper triangular above the upper subdiagonal are zero in the upper bidiagonal matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have the following bidiagonal decomposition:

Theorem 10.1: (Bidiagonal Decomposition) Every $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{UBV}^\top \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V},$$

where \mathbf{B} is an upper bidiagonal matrix, and $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are orthogonal matrices.

The process of bidiagonalization exhibits a resemblance to the structure of a singular value decomposition (SVD). The primary distinction lies in the entries of \mathbf{B} in bidiagonal form, featuring nonzero values on the upper subdiagonal. This distinction holds significance in the computation of the singular value decomposition (Golub and Van Loan, 2013; Lu, 2021c).

10.2. Existence of the Bidiagonal Decomposition: Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization

In previous instances, we employed Householder reflectors to triangularize matrices, introducing zeros below the diagonal to achieve the QR decomposition, and zeros below the subdiagonal to attain the Hessenberg decomposition. This analogous approach can be applied to obtain the bidiagonal decomposition.

First Step 1.1: Introduce Zeros for the First Column

Let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ be the column partition of \mathbf{A} , and each $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We can construct the Householder reflector as follows:

$$r_1 = \|\mathbf{a}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{a}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\mathbf{a}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{H}_1 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m},$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 here is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^m , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^m$. In this case, $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$ will introduce zeros in the first column of \mathbf{A} below entry (1,1), i.e., reflect \mathbf{a}_1 to $r_1 \mathbf{e}_1$. We can easily verify that \mathbf{H}_1 is a symmetric and orthogonal matrix (from the definition of Householder reflectors).

An example of a 7×5 matrix is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{A} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_1} \begin{array}{c} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \end{array}.$$

Up to this point, our procedure aligns with the steps outlined in the QR decomposition using Householder reflectors, as detailed in Section 3.12 (p. 62). Expanding on this, the introduction of zeros above the upper subdiagonal of $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$ is analogous to introducing zeros below the lower subdiagonal of $(\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A})^\top$.

First Step 1.2: Introduce Zeros for the First Row

Now suppose we are looking at the *transpose* of $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$, that is $(\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A})^\top = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and the column partition is given by $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_m]$, where each $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ are vectors removing the first component in \mathbf{z}_i 's. Let

$$r_1 = \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)},$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 now is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. To introduce zeros below the subdiagonal and operate on the submatrix $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top)_{2:n, 1:m}$, we append the Householder reflector into

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

in which case, $\mathbf{L}_1 (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top)$ will introduce zeros in the first column of $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top)$ below entry (2,1), i.e., reflect $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1$ to $r_1 \mathbf{e}_1$. The first row of $(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top)$ will not be affected at all and kept unchanged by Remark 8.4 (p. 113) such that the zeros introduced in Step (1.1) will be kept. And we can easily verify that both \mathbf{L}_1 and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1$ are orthogonal matrices and they are symmetric (from the definition of Householder reflectors).

Coming back to the original *untransposed* matrix $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}$, multiplying on the right by \mathbf{L}_1^\top can introduce zeros in the first row to the right of entry (1,2). Again, following the example above, a 7×5 matrix is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{L_1^\top \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top & & \mathbf{L}_1 \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{H}_1^\top
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{(\cdot)^\top}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top
 \end{array}$$

In short, $\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top$ accomplishes the first step of introducing zeros to the first column and the first row of \mathbf{A} .

Second Step 2.1: Introduce Zeros for the Second Column

Let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top$, where the entries in the first column below entry (1,1) are all zeros, and similarly, the entries in the first row to the right of entry (1,2) are all zeros as well. In this step, the goal is to introduce zeros in the second column below entry (2,2). Let $\mathbf{B}_2 = \mathbf{B}_{2:m,2:n} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times (n-1)}$. We can again construct a Householder reflector

$$r_1 = \|\mathbf{b}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{u}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1}{\|\mathbf{b}_1 - r_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_2^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-1) \times (m-1)},$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 now is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{m-1} i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. To introduce zeros below the main diagonal and operate on the submatrix $\mathbf{B}_{2:m,2:n}$, we append the Householder reflector into

$$\mathbf{H}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

in which case, we can see that $\mathbf{H}_2(\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top)$ will not change the first row of $(\mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top)$ by Remark 8.4 (p. 113). And since the Householder cannot reflect a zero vector such that the zeros in the first column will be kept as well.

Following the example above, a 7×5 matrix is shown as follows, where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{H_2 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top & & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top
 \end{array}$$

Second Step 2.2: Introduce Zeros for the Second Row

Same as step (1.2), now suppose we are looking at the *transpose* of $\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top$, that is $(\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top)^\top = \mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and the column partition is given by $\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m]$, where each $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_2, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ are vectors removing the first two components in \mathbf{x}_i 's. Construct the Householder reflector as follows:

$$r_1 = \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1\|, \quad \mathbf{v}_2 = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 - r_1\mathbf{e}_1}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1 - r_1\mathbf{e}_1\|}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2 = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{v}_2\mathbf{v}_2^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-2) \times (n-2)},$$

where \mathbf{e}_1 now is the first unit basis for \mathbb{R}^{n-2} , i.e., $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1; 0; 0; \dots; 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$. To introduce zeros below the subdiagonal and operate on the submatrix $(\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{H}_2)_{3:n,1:m}$, we append the Householder reflector into

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{I}_2 is a 2×2 identity matrix. In this case, $\mathbf{L}_2(\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top)$ will introduce zeros in the second column of $(\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top)$ below entry (3,2). The first two rows of $(\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top)$ will not be affected at all and kept unchanged by Remark 8.4 (p. 113). **Furthermore, its first column will be kept unchanged as well.** And we can easily verify that both \mathbf{L}_1 and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1$ are orthogonal matrices and they are symmetric (from the definition of Householder reflectors).

Coming back to the original *untransposed* matrix $\mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top$, multiplying on the right by \mathbf{L}_2^\top can introduce zeros in the second row to the right of entry (2,3). Following the example above, a 7×5 matrix is shown as follows where \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}_2^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{(\cdot)^\top} \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix}.$$

$\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top \qquad \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{H}_1^\top\mathbf{H}_2^\top \qquad \mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top\mathbf{L}_2^\top$

In short, $\mathbf{H}_2(\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top)\mathbf{L}_2^\top$ finishes the second step of introducing zeros for the second column and the second row of \mathbf{A} . The same process can go on, and we shall notice that there are n such \mathbf{H}_i Householder reflectors on the left and $n - 2$ such \mathbf{L}_i Householder reflectors on the right (suppose $m > n$ for simplicity). The interleaved Householder factorization is known as the *Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization* (Golub and Kahan, 1965). We will finally bidiagonalize by

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{H}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1^\top\mathbf{L}_2^\top \dots \mathbf{L}_{n-2}^\top.$$

And since the \mathbf{H}_i 's and \mathbf{L}_i 's are symmetric and orthogonal, we have

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{H}_{n-1} \dots \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{L}_2 \dots \mathbf{L}_{n-2}.$$

A full example of a 7×5 matrix is shown as follows, where again \boxtimes represents a value that is not necessarily zero, and **boldface** indicates the value has just been changed:

A Complete Example of Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & \xrightarrow{H_1 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 \mathbf{A} & & \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A}
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{\times \mathbf{L}_1^\top}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} & & \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \xrightarrow{H_2 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{\times \mathbf{L}_2^\top}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top \mathbf{L}_2^\top
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \xrightarrow{H_3 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top \mathbf{L}_2^\top
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{\times \mathbf{L}_3^\top}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top \mathbf{L}_2^\top \mathbf{L}_3^\top
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \xrightarrow{H_4 \times} & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top \mathbf{L}_2^\top \mathbf{L}_3^\top
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{H_5 \times}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \begin{bmatrix} \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \boxtimes \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 & & \mathbf{H}_5 \mathbf{H}_4 \mathbf{H}_3 \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L}_1^\top \mathbf{L}_2^\top \mathbf{L}_3^\top
 \end{array} .$$

We present in a way, where a right Householder reflector \mathbf{L}_i follows from a left one \mathbf{H}_i . However, a trivial error that might be employed is that we do the left ones altogether, and the right ones follow. That is, a bidiagonal decomposition is a combination of a QR decomposition and a Hessenberg decomposition. Nevertheless, this is problematic, the right Householder reflector \mathbf{L}_1 will destroy the zeros introduced by the left ones. Therefore, the

left and right reflectors need to be employed in an interleaved manner to introduce back the zeros.

The Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization is not the most efficient way to calculate the bidiagonal decomposition. It requires $\sim 4mn^2 - \frac{4}{3}n^3$ flops to compute a bidiagonal decomposition of an $m \times n$ matrix with $m > n$. Furthermore, if \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are required explicitly, additional $\sim 4m^2n - 2mn^2 + 2n^3$ flops are required (Lu, 2021c).

LHC Bidiagonalization. Nevertheless, when $m \gg n$, we can extract the square triangular matrix (i.e., the QR decomposition) and apply the Golub-Kahan diagonalization on the square $n \times n$ matrix. This is known as the *Lawson-Hanson-Chan (LHC) bidiagonalization* (Lawson and Hanson, 1995; Chan, 1982), and the procedure is shown in Figure 10.1. The




Figure 10.1: Demonstration of LHC bidiagonalization of a matrix.

LHC bidiagonalization starts by computing the QR decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$. It is then followed by applying the Golub-Kahan process to $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ is the square $n \times n$ triangular submatrix inside \mathbf{R} . Append $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ into

$$\mathbf{U}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{U}} \\ \mathbf{I}_{m-n} \end{bmatrix},$$

which results in $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U}_0\mathbf{B}\mathbf{V}^\top$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}_0\mathbf{B}\mathbf{V}^\top$. Let $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}_0$, we obtain the bidiagonal decomposition. The QR decomposition requires $2mn^2 - \frac{2}{3}n^3$ flops and the Golub-Kahan process now requires $\frac{8}{3}n^3$ (operating on an $n \times n$ submatrix) (Lu, 2021c). Thus the total complexity to obtain the bidiagonal matrix \mathbf{B} is then reduced to

$$\text{LHC bidiagonalization: } \sim 2mn^2 + 2n^3 \text{ flops.}$$

The LHC process creates zeros and then destroys them again in the lower triangle of the upper $n \times n$ square of \mathbf{R} , but the zeros in the lower $(m - n) \times n$ rectangular matrix of \mathbf{R} will be kept. Thus when $m - n$ is large enough (or $m \gg n$), there is a net gain. Simple calculations can show that the LHC bidiagonalization costs less when $m > \frac{5}{3}n$ compared to the Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization (Lu, 2021c).

Three-Step Bidiagonalization. The LHC procedure is advantageous only when $m > \frac{5}{3}n$. A further trick is to apply the QR decomposition not at the beginning of the computation, but at a suitable point in the middle (Trefethen and Bau III, 1997). In particular, the procedure is shown in Figure 10.2, where we apply the first k steps of left and right

Householder reflectors as those in the Golub-Kahan process, while leaving the bottom-right $(m-k) \times (n-k)$ submatrix “unreflected”. Then following the same LHC process on the submatrix to obtain the final bidiagonal decomposition. By doing so, the complexity reduces when $n < m < 2n$.




Figure 10.2: Demonstration of Three-Step bidiagonalization of a matrix.

To conclude, the costs of the three methods are shown as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Golub-Kahan: } \sim 4mn^2 - \frac{4}{3}n^3 \text{ flops,} \\ \text{LHC: } \sim 2mn^2 + 2n^3 \text{ flops,} \\ \text{Three-Step: } \sim 2mn^2 + 2m^2n - \frac{2}{3}m^3 - \frac{2}{3}n^3 \text{ flops.} \end{cases}$$

When $m > 2n$, LHC is preferred; when $n < m < 2n$, the Three-Step method is preferred though the improvement is small enough as shown in Figure 10.3, where the operation counts for the three methods are plotted as a function of $\frac{m}{n}$. Notice that the complexity discussed here does not involve the extra computations of factors U and V . We shall not discuss the issue for simplicity.

10.3. Connection to Tridiagonal Decomposition

We first illustrate the connection between the tridiagonal and bidiagonal decompositions by the following lemma, which reveals how to construct a tridiagonal matrix from a bidiagonal one.

Lemma 10.2: (Construct Tridiagonal From Bidiagonal) Suppose $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is upper bidiagonal, then $T_1 = B^\top B$ and $T_2 = BB^\top$ are *symmetric* triangular matrices.


The lemma above reveals an important property. Suppose $A = UBV^\top$ is the bidiagonal decomposition of A , then the symmetric matrix AA^\top has a tridiagonal decomposition

$$AA^\top = UBV^\top VB^\top U^\top = UBB^\top U^\top.$$

And the symmetric matrix $A^\top A$ has a tridiagonal decomposition

$$A^\top A = VB^\top U^\top UBV^\top = VB^\top BV^\top.$$

Figure 10.3: Comparison of the complexity among the three bidiagonal methods. When $m > 2n$, LHC is preferred; when $n < m < 2n$, the Three-Step method is preferred though the improvement is small enough.



As a final result in this section, we state a theorem giving the tridiagonal decomposition of a symmetric matrix with special eigenvalues.

Theorem 10.3: (Tridiagonal Decomposition for Nonnegative Eigenvalues) Suppose an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} has nonnegative eigenvalues, then there exists a matrix \mathbf{Z} such that

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top.$$

Moreover, the tridiagonal decomposition of \mathbf{A} can be reduced to a problem to find the bidiagonal decomposition of $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{V}^\top$ such that the tridiagonal decomposition of \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{U}^\top.$$

Proof [of Theorem 10.3] The eigenvectors of symmetric matrices can be chosen to be orthogonal (Lemma 13.3, p. 150) such that symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed into $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ (spectral theorem 13.1, p. 149), where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . When eigenvalues are nonnegative, $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ can be factored as $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}$. Let $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}$, \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top$. Thus, combining our findings yields the result. ■

Chapter 10 Problems

1. Prove Lemma 10.2.

Part V

Eigenvalue Problem

11

Eigenvalue and Jordan Decomposition

Contents

11.1 Eigenvalue and Jordan Decomposition	135
11.2 Existence of the Eigenvalue Decomposition	135
11.3 Jordan Decomposition	136
11.4 Application: Computing Fibonacci Numbers	138
Chapter 11 Problems	140

11.1. Eigenvalue and Jordan Decomposition

Theorem 11.1: (Eigenvalue Decomposition) Any square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with linearly independent eigenvectors can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1},$$

where \mathbf{X} contains the eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} as its columns, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ denoting the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} .

Eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) is also known as to diagonalize the matrix \mathbf{A} . When no eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} are repeated, the eigenvectors are guaranteed to be linearly independent, enabling the diagonalization of \mathbf{A} . Note here without n linearly independent eigenvectors, we cannot diagonalize. In Section 13.4 (p. 155), we will further discuss conditions under which the matrix has linearly independent eigenvectors.

11.2. Existence of the Eigenvalue Decomposition

Proof [of Theorem 11.1] Let $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]$ be the linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} . Clearly, we have

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1 = \lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1, \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_2 = \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_2, \quad \dots, \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n = \lambda_n\mathbf{x}_n.$$

In the matrix form, we can express this as:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n] = [\lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1, \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \lambda_n\mathbf{x}_n] = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}.$$

Since we assume the eigenvectors are linearly independent, then \mathbf{X} has full rank and is invertible. We obtain

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

We will discuss some similar forms of eigenvalue decomposition in the spectral decomposition section (Section 13.1, p. 149), where the matrix \mathbf{A} is required to be symmetric, and the \mathbf{X} is not only nonsingular but also orthogonal. Alternatively, the matrix \mathbf{A} is required to be a *simple matrix*, that is, the algebraic multiplicity and geometric multiplicity are the same for \mathbf{A} , and \mathbf{X} will be a trivial nonsingular matrix that may not contain the eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} . The decomposition also has a geometric meaning, which we will discuss in Section 15 (p. 192).

A matrix decomposition of the form $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}$ possesses a notable property, allowing for efficient computation of the m -th power.

Remark 11.2: m -th Power

The m -th power of \mathbf{A} is $\mathbf{A}^m = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}^m\mathbf{X}^{-1}$ if the matrix \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}$.

We observe that to establish the existence of the eigenvalue decomposition, it is necessary for \mathbf{A} to possess linearly independent eigenvectors. This requirement is inherently satisfied under certain specific conditions.

Lemma 11.3: (Different Eigenvalues) Suppose the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are all different. Then the corresponding eigenvectors are inherently linearly independent. In other words, any square matrix with different eigenvalues can be diagonalized.

Proof [of Lemma 11.3] Suppose the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ are all different, and the eigenvectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ are linearly dependent. That is, there exists a nonzero vector $\mathbf{c} = [c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n-1}]^\top$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{x}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i \mathbf{x}_i.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n &= \mathbf{A} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i \mathbf{x}_i \right) \\ &= c_1 \lambda_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + c_2 \lambda_2 \mathbf{x}_2 + \dots + c_{n-1} \lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{x}_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_n &= \lambda_n \mathbf{x}_n \\ &= \lambda_n (c_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + c_2 \mathbf{x}_2 + \dots + c_{n-1} \mathbf{x}_{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two equations, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\lambda_n - \lambda_i) c_i \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

This leads to a contradiction since $\lambda_n \neq \lambda_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, from which the result follows. ■

Remark 11.4: Limitation of Eigenvalue Decomposition

The constraints of eigenvalue decomposition include:

- The eigenvectors in \mathbf{X} are usually not orthogonal and there are not always enough eigenvectors (i.e., some eigenvalues are equal).
- To compute the eigenvalues and eigenvectors $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$ requires \mathbf{A} to be square. Rectangular matrices cannot be diagonalized by eigenvalue decomposition.

11.3. Jordan Decomposition

In eigenvalue decomposition, we suppose the matrix \mathbf{A} has n linearly independent eigenvectors. However, this is not necessarily true for all square matrices. We introduce further a generalized version of eigenvalue decomposition, which is called the *Jordan decomposition*, named after *Camille Jordan* (Jordan, 1870).

We first introduce the definition of *Jordan blocks* and *Jordan form* for the further description of Jordan decomposition.

Definition 11.1 (Jordan Block) An $m \times m$ upper triangular matrix $B(\lambda, m)$ is called a Jordan block provided all m diagonal elements are the same value λ , and all upper subdiagonal elements are ones:

$$B(\lambda, m) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix}_{m \times m}$$

Definition 11.2 (Jordan Form) Given an $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} , a Jordan form \mathbf{J} for \mathbf{A} is a block diagonal matrix defined as

$$\mathbf{J} = \text{diag}(B(\lambda_1, m_1), B(\lambda_2, m_2), \dots, B(\lambda_k, m_k))$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$ are eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} (duplicates possible) and $m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_k = n$.

Then, the Jordan decomposition follows:

Theorem 11.5: (Jordan Decomposition) Any square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{J} \mathbf{X}^{-1},$$

where \mathbf{X} is a nonsingular matrix containing the *generalized eigenvectors* of \mathbf{A} as its columns, and \mathbf{J} is a Jordan form matrix $\text{diag}(\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2, \dots, \mathbf{J}_k)$, where

$$\mathbf{J}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_i & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_i & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda_i & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \lambda_i & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \lambda_i \end{bmatrix}_{m_i \times m_i}$$

is an $m_i \times m_i$ square matrix with m_i being the number of repetitions of the eigenvalue λ_i , and $m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_k = n$. The \mathbf{J}_i 's are referred to as Jordan blocks.

Furthermore, the nonsingular matrix \mathbf{X} is called the *matrix of generalized eigenvectors* of \mathbf{A} .

As an example, a Jordan form can have the following structure:

$$\mathbf{J} = \text{diag}(B(\lambda_1, m_1), B(\lambda_2, m_2), \dots, B(\lambda_k, m_k))$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} & & & \\ & [\lambda_2] & & \\ & & \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_3 & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda_3 \end{bmatrix} & \\ & & & \ddots \\ & & & & \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_k & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda_k \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Decoding a Jordan decomposition. Note that zeros can appear on the upper sub-diagonal of \mathbf{J} and the first column is always a vector containing only eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} in each block. Taking out one block to decode, without loss of generality, we take out the first block \mathbf{J}_1 . We shall show the columns $1, 2, \dots, m_1$ of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{J}$ with $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_1 &= \lambda_1 \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_2 &= \lambda_1 \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{x}_1 \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{m_1} &= \lambda_1 \mathbf{x}_{m_1} + \mathbf{x}_{m_1-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For more details about Jordan decomposition, please refer to [Gohberg and Goldberg \(1996\)](#); [Hales and Passi \(1999\)](#).

The Jordan decomposition is not particularly interesting in practice as it is extremely sensitive to perturbation. Even with the smallest random change to a matrix, the matrix can be made diagonalizable ([van de Geijn and Myers, 2020](#)). As a result, there is no practical mathematical software library or tool that computes it. And the proof takes dozens of pages to discuss. For this reason, we leave the proof to interested readers.

11.4. Application: Computing Fibonacci Numbers

Eigenvalue decomposition can be utilized in the computation of Fibonacci numbers. This particular example is derived and adapted from [Strang \(2009\)](#). Each new Fibonacci number, denoted as F_{k+2} , is the sum of the two preceding Fibonacci numbers, $F_{k+1} + F_k$. The sequence is represented as $0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, \dots$. Now, the question is: What is the value of F_{100} ? Utilizing eigenvalue decomposition can assist in determining the general formula for the sequence.

Let $\mathbf{u}_k = \begin{bmatrix} F_{k+1} \\ F_k \end{bmatrix}$. Then it follows that $\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{k+2} \\ F_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_k$ by the rule that $F_{k+2} = F_{k+1} + F_k$ and $F_{k+1} = F_{k+1}$.

Let $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, we then have the general formula $\mathbf{u}_{100} = \mathbf{A}^{100} \mathbf{u}_0$, where $\mathbf{u}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

We will see in Lemma 12.2 (p. 143) that $\det(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = 0$, where λ is the eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} . Simple calculation reveals $\det(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = \lambda^2 - \lambda + 1 = 0$, and

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

The corresponding eigenvectors are

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Remark 11.2, $\mathbf{A}^{100} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{100} \mathbf{X}^{-1} = \mathbf{X} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1^{100} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{100} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}^{-1}$, where \mathbf{X}^{-1} can be easily calculated as $\mathbf{X}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} & \frac{-\lambda_2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} & \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{5}}{5} & \frac{5 - \sqrt{5}}{10} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{5} & \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{10} \end{bmatrix}$. We notice that $\mathbf{u}_{100} = \mathbf{A}^{100} \mathbf{u}_0$ is just the first column of \mathbf{A}^{100} , which is

$$\mathbf{u}_{100} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{101} \\ F_{100} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda_1^{101} - \lambda_2^{101}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \\ \frac{\lambda_1^{100} - \lambda_2^{100}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

A simple check on the calculation, we have $F_{100} = 3.542248481792631e + 20$. Or more generally,

$$\mathbf{u}_K = \begin{bmatrix} F_{K+1} \\ F_K \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda_1^{K+1} - \lambda_2^{K+1}}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \\ \frac{\lambda_1^K - \lambda_2^K}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the general form of F_K is given by $F_K = \frac{\lambda_1^K - \lambda_2^K}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}$.

Extension to general 2 by 2 matrices. The above matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is special in that it has two linearly independent eigenvectors so that it admits eigenvalue decomposition. However, it is also interesting to compute the n -th power of general 2 by 2 matrices, say

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Suppose α and β are eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} so that α and β are two roots of the characteristic polynomial

$$-\det(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = \lambda^2 + a_1 \lambda + a_0 = 0 \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \alpha, \beta = \frac{-a_1 \pm \sqrt{a_1^2 - 4a_0}}{2}.$$

This reveals that $a_1 = -(\alpha + \beta)$ and $a_0 = \alpha\beta$. According to the *Cayley-Hamilton theorem*, a matrix satisfies its own characteristic equation:

$$\mathbf{A}^2 + a_1 \mathbf{A} + a_0 \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0},$$

so that

$$\mathbf{A}^2 - (\alpha + \beta) \mathbf{A} + \alpha\beta \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (11.1)$$

Following the tricks in Williams (1992), we define matrices $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X} = \frac{\mathbf{A} - \beta \mathbf{I}}{\alpha - \beta}, & \mathbf{Y} = \frac{\mathbf{A} - \alpha \mathbf{I}}{\beta - \alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta; \\ \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{A} - \alpha \mathbf{I}, & & \text{if } \alpha = \beta, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \alpha \mathbf{X} + \beta \mathbf{Y}$, and we have properties from Equation (11.1), for any $k \geq 2$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}^k = \mathbf{X}, & \mathbf{XY} = \mathbf{YX} = \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{Y}^k = \mathbf{Y}, & \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta; \\ \mathbf{Z}^k = \mathbf{0}, & & & \text{if } \alpha = \beta. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{A}^n = \begin{cases} (\alpha \mathbf{X} + \beta \mathbf{Y})^n = \alpha^n \mathbf{X} + \beta^n \mathbf{Y} = \alpha^n \left(\frac{\mathbf{A} - \beta \mathbf{I}}{\alpha - \beta} \right) + \beta^n \left(\frac{\mathbf{A} - \alpha \mathbf{I}}{\beta - \alpha} \right), & \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta; \\ (\mathbf{Z} + \alpha \mathbf{I})^n = n\alpha^{n-1} \mathbf{Z} + \alpha^n \mathbf{I} = \alpha^{n-1} (n\mathbf{A} - \alpha(n-1)\mathbf{I}), & \text{if } \alpha = \beta. \end{cases} \quad (11.2)$$

Hence, if matrix \mathbf{A} is nonsingular, $\alpha \neq 0$, and $\beta \neq 0$, Equation (11.2) holds for all integer values of n ; if matrix \mathbf{A} is real, but the eigenvalues are complex with some power of them is real, e.g., $\alpha^m = \beta^m = f$ is real, then we have $\mathbf{A}^m = f\mathbf{I}$.

The n -th power for general matrices results in the general form of any sequence, e.g.,

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_k.$$

And we shall repeat the details.

Chapter 11 Problems

1. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with all entries equal to 1, find the n eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} .
2. Given an idempotent matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{A}^2 = \mathbf{A}$), show that \mathbf{BA} and \mathbf{ABA} share the same eigenvalues.
3. Given a Householder transformation matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, show that \mathbf{u} is an eigenvector of \mathbf{H} and determine its corresponding eigenvalue. Provide a geometric interpretation of the eigenvalues of \mathbf{H} . Suppose further $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{u} = 0$, where \mathbf{v} is nonzero, show that \mathbf{v} is also an eigenvector of \mathbf{H} and find its corresponding eigenvalue.
4. Suppose λ is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that $\lambda - \mu$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A} - \mu \mathbf{I}$.
5. Suppose λ is an eigenvalue of a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that λ^{-1} is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{A}^{-1} .

12

Schur Decomposition

Contents

12.1	Schur Decomposition	143
12.2	Existence of the Schur Decomposition	143
12.3	Other Forms of the Schur Decomposition	145
Chapter 12	Problems	146

12.1. Schur Decomposition

Theorem 12.1: (Schur Decomposition) Any real square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with real eigenvalues can be decomposed as

$$A = QUQ^\top,$$

where Q is an (real) orthogonal matrix, and U is an (real) upper triangular matrix. That is, any real square matrix A with real eigenvalues can be triangularized.

A close look at Schur decomposition. The first columns of AQ and QU are given by Aq_1 and $u_{11}q_1$, respectively. Consequently, u_{11} corresponds to an eigenvalue of A , while q_1 serves as its associated eigenvector. However, the other columns of Q may not necessarily be eigenvectors of A .

Schur decomposition for symmetric matrices. For a symmetric matrix $A = A^\top$, the relation $QUQ^\top = QU^\top Q^\top$ holds. Then U is a diagonal matrix. And this diagonal matrix actually contains the eigenvalues of A . All the columns of Q are eigenvectors of A . Consequently, we conclude that all symmetric matrices are diagonalizable, even in the presence of repeated eigenvalues.

12.2. Existence of the Schur Decomposition

To validate Theorem 12.1, we need to employ the following lemmas.

Lemma 12.2: (Determinant Intermezzo) We have the following properties for determinant of matrices:

- The determinant of the product of two matrices is given by $\det(AB) = \det(A)\det(B)$;
- The determinant of the transpose is $\det(A^\top) = \det(A)$;
- Suppose matrix A has an eigenvalue λ , then $\det(A - \lambda I) = 0$;
- Determinant of any identity matrix is 1;
- Determinant of an orthogonal matrix Q :

$$\det(Q) = \det(Q^\top) = \pm 1, \quad \text{since } \det(Q^\top)\det(Q) = \det(Q^\top Q) = \det(I) = 1;$$

- For any square matrix A , and given an orthogonal matrix Q :

$$\det(A) = \det(Q^\top)\det(A)\det(Q) = \det(Q^\top A Q);$$

- Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then $\det(-A) = (-1)^n \det(A)$.

Lemma 12.3: (Submatrix with Same Eigenvalue) Suppose the square matrix $A_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$ has real eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}$. Then we can construct a $k \times k$ matrix

\mathbf{A}_k with eigenvalues $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}$ by

$$\mathbf{A}_k = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{p}_2^\top & - \\ -\mathbf{p}_3^\top & - \\ \vdots & \\ -\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^\top & - \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_2 & \mathbf{p}_3 & \dots & \mathbf{p}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{p}_1 is a eigenvector of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} with norm 1 corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_1 , and $\mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{k+1}$ denote any orthonormal vectors orthogonal to \mathbf{p}_1 .

Proof [of Lemma 12.3] Let $\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = [\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{k+1}]$. It follows that $\mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \mathbf{I}$, and

$$\mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

For any eigenvalue $\lambda \in \{\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}\}$, by Lemma 12.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{A}_{k+1} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) &= \det(\mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top (\mathbf{A}_{k+1} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) \\ &= \det(\mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} - \lambda \mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{P}_{k+1}) \\ &= \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 - \lambda & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_k - \lambda \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda) \det(\mathbf{A}_k - \lambda \mathbf{I}). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is from the fact that if matrix \mathbf{M} has a block formulation: $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E} & \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{G} & \mathbf{H} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{E}) \det(\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{G}\mathbf{E}^{-1}\mathbf{F})$. Since λ is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} and $\lambda \neq \lambda_1$, then $\det(\mathbf{A}_{k+1} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda) \det(\mathbf{A}_k - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = 0$ means λ is also an eigenvalue of \mathbf{A}_k . ■

We establish the existence of the Schur decomposition through an inductive proof.

Proof [of Theorem 12.1: Existence of Schur Decomposition] We note that the theorem is trivial when $n = 1$ by simply setting $\mathbf{Q} = 1$ and $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}$. Suppose the theorem holds true for $n = k$ for some $k \geq 1$. If we prove the theorem is also true for $n = k + 1$, then we complete the proof.

Suppose for $n = k$, the theorem is valid for $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top$.

Suppose further \mathbf{P}_{k+1} contains orthogonal vectors $\mathbf{P}_{k+1} = [\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{k+1}]$ as constructed in Lemma 12.3, where \mathbf{p}_1 is an eigenvector of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} corresponding to eigenvalue λ_1 and its norm is 1, and $\mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{k+1}$ are orthonormal to \mathbf{p}_1 . Let the other k eigenvalues of \mathbf{A}_{k+1} be $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}$. Since we suppose the theorem is true for $n = k$, we can find a matrix \mathbf{A}_k with eigenvalues $\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}$. So we have the following property by Lemma 12.3:

$$\mathbf{P}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_k \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}_{k+1} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $Q_{k+1} = P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k \end{bmatrix}$. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{k+1}Q_{k+1} &= A_{k+1}P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_k Q_k \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k U_k \end{bmatrix} && (\text{By the assumption for } n = k) \\
 &= P_{k+1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & U_k \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= Q_{k+1} U_{k+1}. && (U_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & U_k \end{bmatrix})
 \end{aligned}$$

We then have $A_{k+1} = Q_{k+1} U_{k+1} Q_{k+1}^\top$, where U_{k+1} is an upper triangular matrix, and Q_{k+1} is an orthogonal matrix since P_{k+1} and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_k \end{bmatrix}$ are both orthogonal matrices. ■

12.3. Other Forms of the Schur Decomposition

In the proof of the Schur decomposition, we obtain the upper triangular matrix U_{k+1} by appending the eigenvalue λ_1 to U_k . This ensures that the values on the diagonal consistently represent eigenvalues. Therefore, we can decompose the upper triangular into two parts.

Corollary 12.4: (Form 2 of Schur Decomposition) Any square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with real eigenvalues can be decomposed as

$$Q^\top A Q = \Lambda + T, \quad \text{or} \quad A = Q(\Lambda + T)Q^\top,$$

where Q is an orthogonal matrix, $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is a diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues of A , and T is a *strictly upper triangular* matrix (with zeros on the diagonal).

A strictly upper triangular matrix is an upper triangular matrix having 0's along the diagonal as well as the lower portion. Another proof of this decomposition is that A and U (where $U = Q^\top A Q$) are similar matrices so that they have the same eigenvalues (Lemma 8.3, p. 112). Moreover, the eigenvalues of any upper triangular matrices are on the diagonal. To see this, for any upper triangular matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where the diagonal values are r_{ii} for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We have

$$R e_i = r_{ii} e_i,$$

where e_i is the i -th basis vector in \mathbb{R}^n (i.e., e_i is the i -th column of the $n \times n$ identity matrix I_n). So we can decompose U into the sum of Λ and T .

A final observation on the second form of the Schur decomposition is shown as follows. From $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{\Lambda} + \mathbf{T})$, it follows that

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{q}_k = \lambda_k \mathbf{q}_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_{ik} \mathbf{q}_i,$$

where t_{ik} is the (i, k) -th entry of \mathbf{T} . The form is quite close to the eigenvalue decomposition. Nevertheless, the columns become orthonormal bases and these orthonormal bases are correlated.

Chapter 12 Problems

1. We have shown several important results regarding the determinant of a matrix in Lemma 12.2. Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that
 - $\det(c\mathbf{A}) = c^n \det(\mathbf{A})$; (*Hint: use induction.*)
 - $\det(\mathbf{A}^{-1}) = 1/\det(\mathbf{A})$;
 - $\det(\mathbf{A}^m) = \det(\mathbf{A})^m$;
 - $\det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top) = 1 + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v}$.
2. Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, for $n = 2$, show that
 - $\det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) = 1 + \det(\mathbf{A}) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$.
 For $n = 3$, show that
 - $\det(\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) = 1 + \det(\mathbf{A}) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2)$.
3. Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and let \mathbf{B} be the matrix obtained by interchanging two rows of \mathbf{A} . Prove that $\det(\mathbf{B}) = -\det(\mathbf{A})$. *Hint: use induction.*
4. Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and let \mathbf{B} be the matrix obtained by multiplying a row of \mathbf{A} by nonnegative scalar γ . Prove that $\det(\mathbf{B}) = \gamma \det(\mathbf{A})$.

Spectral Decomposition (Theorem)

Contents

13.1	Spectral Decomposition (Theorem)	149
13.2	Existence of the Spectral Decomposition	149
13.3	Uniqueness of Spectral Decomposition	155
13.4	Other Forms, Connecting Eigenvalue Decomposition*	155
13.5	Skew-Symmetric Matrix and its Properties*	162
13.6	Applications	166
13.6.1	Application: Eigenvalue of Projection Matrix	166
13.6.2	Application: An Alternative Definition of PD and PSD of Matrices	167
13.6.3	Proof for Semidefinite Rank-Revealing Decomposition	168
13.6.4	Application: Cholesky Decomposition via the QR Decomposition and the Spectral Decomposition	169
13.6.5	Application: Unique Power Decomposition of Positive Definite Matrices	169
Chapter 13	Problems	170

13.1. Spectral Decomposition (Theorem)



The spectral theorem, also known as the spectral decomposition for symmetric matrices, states that symmetric matrices possess real eigenvalues and can be diagonalized over an (real) orthonormal basis ¹. As usual, in the following sections, we will present the main result and defer detailed discussions.

Theorem 13.1: (Spectral Decomposition) A real matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric if and only if there exists an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} and a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ such that

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top,$$

where the columns of $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n]$ are eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} and are mutually orthonormal, and the entries of $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ are the corresponding eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , which are real. And the rank of \mathbf{A} is equal to the number of nonzero eigenvalues. This is known as the *spectral decomposition* or *spectral theorem* of real symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} . Specifically, we have the following properties:

1. A symmetric matrix has only **real eigenvalues**;
2. The eigenvectors are orthogonal such that they can be chosen **orthonormal** by normalization;
3. The rank of \mathbf{A} is equal to the number of nonzero eigenvalues;
4. If the eigenvalues are distinct, the eigenvectors are linearly independent.

Spectral theorem vs eigenvalue decomposition. In the eigenvalue decomposition (Theorem 11.1, p. 135), we require the matrix \mathbf{A} to be square and the eigenvectors to be linearly independent. Whereas in the spectral theorem, any symmetric matrix can be diagonalized, and the eigenvectors are chosen to be orthonormal.

A word on the spectral decomposition. In Lemma 8.3 (p. 112), we proved that the eigenvalues of similar matrices are the same. From the spectral decomposition, we notice that \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ are similar matrices such that their eigenvalues are the same. For any diagonal matrices, the eigenvalues correspond to the diagonal components. ² To see this, we realize that

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{e}_i = \lambda_i\mathbf{e}_i,$$

where \mathbf{e}_i is the i -th basis vector. Therefore, the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ contains the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} .

13.2. Existence of the Spectral Decomposition

We will prove the theorem in several steps.

1. Note that the spectral decomposition for *Hermitian matrices* states that Hermitian matrices also have real eigenvalues and that they can be diagonalized over a complex orthonormal basis.
 2. Actually, we have shown in the last section that the diagonal values for triangular matrices are the eigenvalues of it.

Symmetric Matrix Property 1 of 4

Lemma 13.2: (Real Eigenvalues) The eigenvalues of any symmetric matrix are all real.

Proof [of Lemma 13.2] Suppose eigenvalue λ is a complex number $\lambda = a + ib$, where a and b are real. Its complex conjugate is $\bar{\lambda} = a - ib$. Similarly, for the corresponding complex eigenvector $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c} + i\mathbf{d}$, its complex conjugate is $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{c} - i\mathbf{d}$, where \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} are real vectors. We then have the following property

$$\mathbf{Ax} = \lambda\mathbf{x} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{transpose to}} \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{A} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top.$$

We take the dot product of the first equation with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and the last equation with \mathbf{x} :

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{Ax} = \lambda\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{Ax} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}.$$

Then we have the equality $\lambda\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}$. Since $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{c} - i\mathbf{d})^\top (\mathbf{c} + i\mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{d}$ is a real number. Therefore, the imaginary part of λ is zero and λ is real. ■

Symmetric Matrix Property 2 of 4

Lemma 13.3: (Orthogonal Eigenvectors) The eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues of any symmetric matrix are orthogonal. Therefore, we can normalize eigenvectors to make them orthonormal since $\mathbf{Ax} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$ leads to $\mathbf{A}\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} = \lambda\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$, which corresponds to the same eigenvalue.

Proof [of Lemma 13.3] Suppose eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 correspond to eigenvectors \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 , respectively, satisfying $\mathbf{Ax}_1 = \lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{Ax}_2 = \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_2$. We have the following equality:

$$\mathbf{Ax}_1 = \lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1 \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{A} = \lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1^\top \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{Ax}_2 = \lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2,$$

and

$$\mathbf{Ax}_2 = \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_2 \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{Ax}_2 = \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2,$$

which implies $\lambda_1\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2 = \lambda_2\mathbf{x}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_2$. Since eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, the eigenvectors are orthogonal. ■

In Lemma 13.3 above, we prove that the eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues of symmetric matrices are orthogonal. More generally, we prove the important theorem that eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues of any matrix are linearly independent.

Theorem 13.4: (Independent Eigenvector Theorem) If a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has k distinct eigenvalues, then any set of k corresponding (nonzero) eigenvectors are linearly independent.

Proof [of Theorem 13.4] We will prove by induction. Firstly, we will prove that any two eigenvectors corresponding to distinct eigenvalues are linearly independent. Suppose eigenvectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 correspond to distinct eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 , respectively. Suppose further there exists a nonzero vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2] \neq \mathbf{0}$ satisfying

$$x_1\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13.1)$$

That is, we assume \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are linearly dependent. Multiply Equation (13.1) on the left by \mathbf{A} , we get

$$x_1\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13.2)$$

Multiply Equation (13.1) on the left by λ_2 , we get

$$x_1\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13.3)$$

Subtract Equation (13.2) from Equation (13.3) to find

$$x_1(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{0}.$$

Since $\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_1$ and $\mathbf{v}_1 \neq \mathbf{0}$, we must have $x_1 = 0$. From Equation (13.1), $\mathbf{v}_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$, we must also have $x_2 = 0$, which arrives at a contradiction. Thus \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are linearly independent.

Now, suppose any $j < k$ eigenvectors are linearly independent, if we could prove that any $j + 1$ eigenvectors are also linearly independent, we finish the proof. Suppose $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j$ are linearly independent, and \mathbf{v}_{j+1} is dependent on the first j eigenvectors. That is, there exists a nonzero vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j] \neq \mathbf{0}$ such that

$$\mathbf{v}_{j+1} = x_1\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\mathbf{v}_2 + \dots + x_j\mathbf{v}_j. \quad (13.4)$$

Suppose the $j + 1$ eigenvectors correspond to distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1}$. Multiply Equation (13.4) on the left by \mathbf{A} , we get

$$\lambda_{j+1}\mathbf{v}_{j+1} = x_1\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2 + \dots + x_j\lambda_j\mathbf{v}_j. \quad (13.5)$$

Multiply Equation (13.4) on the left by λ_{j+1} , we get

$$\lambda_{j+1}\mathbf{v}_{j+1} = x_1\lambda_{j+1}\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2\lambda_{j+1}\mathbf{v}_2 + \dots + x_j\lambda_{j+1}\mathbf{v}_j. \quad (13.6)$$

Subtract Equation (13.6) from Equation (13.5), we find

$$x_1(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_1)\mathbf{v}_1 + x_2(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_2)\mathbf{v}_2 + \dots + x_j(\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j)\mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{0}.$$

From assumption, $\lambda_{j+1} \neq \lambda_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$, and $\mathbf{v}_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$. We must have $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_j = 0$, which leads to a contradiction. Then $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1}$ are linearly independent. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

An immediate consequence of the above theorem is as follows:

Corollary 13.5: (Independent Eigenvector Theorem, CNT.) If a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has n distinct eigenvalues, then any set of n corresponding eigenvectors form a basis for \mathbb{R}^n .

Symmetric Matrix Property 3 of 4

Lemma 13.6: (Orthonormal Eigenvectors for Duplicate Eigenvalue) If \mathbf{A} has a duplicate eigenvalue λ_i with multiplicity ^a $k \geq 2$, then there exist k orthonormal eigenvectors corresponding to λ_i .

^a We will define multiplicity rigorously in Definition 13.2.

Proof [of Lemma 13.6] We note that there is at least one eigenvector \mathbf{x}_{i1} corresponding to λ_i . And for such eigenvector \mathbf{x}_{i1} , we can always find additional $n - 1$ orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ so that $\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n\}$ forms an orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^n . Place the $\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ into matrix \mathbf{Y}_1 and $\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n\}$ into matrix \mathbf{P}_1

$$\mathbf{Y}_1 = [\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_1 = [\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{Y}_1].$$

We then have

$$\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a result, \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1$ are similar matrices such that they have the same eigenvalues since \mathbf{P}_1 is nonsingular (even orthogonal here, see Lemma 8.3, p. 112). We obtain

$$\det(\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n) = {}^3 (\lambda_i - \lambda) \det(\mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{n-1}).$$

If λ_i has a multiplicity of $k \geq 2$, then the term $(\lambda_i - \lambda)$ occurs k times in the polynomial from the determinant $\det(\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n)$, i.e., the term occurs $k - 1$ times in the polynomial from $\det(\mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{n-1})$. In other words, $\det(\mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-1}) = 0$ and λ_i is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1$.

Let $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Y}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1$. Since $\det(\mathbf{B} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-1}) = 0$, the null space of $\mathbf{B} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-1}$ is not empty. Suppose $(\mathbf{B} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-1})\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{n} = \lambda_i \mathbf{n}$ and \mathbf{n} is an eigenvector of \mathbf{B} .

From $\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix}$, we have $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{P}_1 \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix}$, where z is any scalar.

From the left side of this equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} &= [\lambda_i \mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1] \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \lambda_i z \mathbf{x}_{i1} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{13.7}$$

3. By the fact that if matrix \mathbf{M} has a block formulation: $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{A}) \det(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B})$.

And from the right side of the equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_1 \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{i1} & \mathbf{Y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_{i1} & \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{B} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \lambda_i z \mathbf{x}_{i1} + \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{n} \\
 &= \lambda_i z \mathbf{x}_{i1} + \lambda_i \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n}. \quad (\text{Since } \mathbf{B} \mathbf{n} = \lambda_i \mathbf{n})
 \end{aligned} \tag{13.8}$$

Combining Equation (13.8) and Equation (13.7), we obtain

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n} = \lambda_i \mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n},$$

which means $\mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n}$ is an eigenvector of \mathbf{A} corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_i (the same eigenvalue corresponding to \mathbf{x}_{i1}). Since $\mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n}$ is a linear combination of $\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$, which are orthonormal to \mathbf{x}_{i1} , the $\mathbf{Y}_1 \mathbf{n}$ can be chosen to be orthonormal to \mathbf{x}_{i1} .

To conclude, if we have one eigenvector \mathbf{x}_{i1} corresponding to λ_i whose multiplicity is $k \geq 2$, we could construct the second eigenvector by choosing one vector from the null space of $(\mathbf{B} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-1})$ constructed above. Suppose now, we have constructed the second eigenvector \mathbf{x}_{i2} , which is orthonormal to \mathbf{x}_{i1} . For such eigenvectors \mathbf{x}_{i1} and \mathbf{x}_{i2} , we can always find additional $n-2$ orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_4, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ so that $\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_4, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n\}$ forms an orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^n . Arrange the $\mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_4, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ into matrix \mathbf{Y}_2 and $\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_4, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n\}$ into matrix \mathbf{P}_2 :

$$\mathbf{Y}_2 = [\mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_4, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_2 = [\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \mathbf{Y}_1].$$

We then have

$$\mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 0 & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{Y}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 0 & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Y}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_2$ such that $\det(\mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_2 - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n) = (\lambda_i - \lambda)^2 \det(\mathbf{C} - \lambda \mathbf{I}_{n-2})$. If the multiplicity of λ_i is $k \geq 3$, $\det(\mathbf{C} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-2}) = 0$ and the null space of $\mathbf{C} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-2}$ is not none so that we can still find a vector from the null space of $\mathbf{C} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_{n-2}$ and $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{n} = \lambda_i \mathbf{n}$.

Now we can construct a vector $\begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where z_1 and z_2 are any scalar values, such that

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_2 \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{P}_2 \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 0 & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \lambda_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \mathbf{n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, from the left side of the above equation, we will get $\lambda_i z_1 \mathbf{x}_{i1} + \lambda_i z_2 \mathbf{x}_{i2} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_2 \mathbf{n}$. From the right side of the above equation, we will get $\lambda_i z_1 \mathbf{x}_{i1} + \lambda_i z_2 \mathbf{x}_{i2} + \lambda_i \mathbf{Y}_2 \mathbf{n}$. As a result,

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Y}_2 \mathbf{n} = \lambda_i \mathbf{Y}_2 \mathbf{n},$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_2\mathbf{n}$ is an eigenvector of \mathbf{A} and orthogonal to $\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}$. And it is easy to construct the eigenvector to be orthonormal to the first two.

The process can go on, and finally, we will find k orthonormal eigenvectors corresponding to λ_i .

Actually, the dimension of the null space of $\mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1 - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}_n$ is equal to the multiplicity k . It also follows that if the multiplicity of λ_i is k , there cannot be more than k orthogonal eigenvectors corresponding to λ_i . Otherwise, it will come to the conclusion that we could find more than n orthogonal eigenvectors, which leads to a contradiction. ■

The proof of the existence of the spectral decomposition is trivial from the lemmas above. Alternatively, we can use Schur decomposition to prove its existence.

Proof [of Theorem 13.1: Existence of Spectral Decomposition] From the Schur decomposition in Theorem 12.1 (p. 143), symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\top$ leads to $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}^\top\mathbf{Q}^\top$. Then \mathbf{U} is a diagonal matrix. And this diagonal matrix contains eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . All the columns of \mathbf{Q} are eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} . We conclude that all symmetric matrices are diagonalizable even with repeated eigenvalues. ■

For a more compact proof, Lu (2021c) provides an alternative via Gram-Schmidt process and induction.

For any matrix multiplication, the rank of the result is no greater than the rank of the input matrices. However, the symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is exceptional; the rank of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is equal to that of \mathbf{A} , which will be used in the proof of singular value decomposition in the forthcoming section.

Lemma 13.7: (Rank of \mathbf{AB}) Given any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, then the matrix multiplication $\mathbf{AB} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ has $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \min(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}), \text{rank}(\mathbf{B}))$.

Proof [of Lemma 13.7] For matrix multiplication \mathbf{AB} , we have

- All rows of \mathbf{AB} are linear combinations of rows of \mathbf{B} , the row space of \mathbf{AB} is a subset of the row space of \mathbf{B} . Thus, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{B})$.
- All columns of \mathbf{AB} are linear combinations of columns of \mathbf{A} , the column space of \mathbf{AB} is a subset of the column space of \mathbf{A} . Thus, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$.

Therefore, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \min(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}), \text{rank}(\mathbf{B}))$. ■

Symmetric Matrix Property 4 of 4

Lemma 13.8: (Rank of Symmetric Matrices) If \mathbf{A} is an $n \times n$ real symmetric matrix, then $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) =$ the total number of nonzero eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . In particular, \mathbf{A} has full rank if and only if \mathbf{A} is nonsingular. Furthermore, $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$ is the linear space spanned by the eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} that correspond to nonzero eigenvalues.

Proof [of Lemma 13.8] For any symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} , we have \mathbf{A} , in spectral form, as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$ and also $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}$. Since we have shown in Lemma 13.7 that the rank of the multiplication with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \min(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}), \text{rank}(\mathbf{B}))$.

- From $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, we have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$;
- From $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{Q}$, we have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$,

The inequalities above give us a contradiction. And thus $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$, which is the total number of nonzero eigenvalues.

Since \mathbf{A} is nonsingular if and only if all of its eigenvalues are nonzero, \mathbf{A} has full rank if and only if \mathbf{A} is nonsingular. \blacksquare

Similar to the eigenvalue decomposition, we can compute the m -th power of matrix \mathbf{A} more efficiently via the spectral decomposition.

Remark 13.9: m -th Power

The m -th power of \mathbf{A} is $\mathbf{A}^m = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}^m\mathbf{Q}^\top$ if the matrix \mathbf{A} can be factored as the spectral decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$.

13.3. Uniqueness of Spectral Decomposition

Clearly, the spectral decomposition is not unique, primarily due to the eigenvalue multiplicity. When eigenvalues λ_i and λ_j coincide for certain $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, interchanging the corresponding eigenvectors in \mathbf{Q} yields equivalent results, yet the decompositions are different. However, the *eigenspaces* (i.e., the null space $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$ for eigenvalue λ_i) corresponding to each eigenvalue are fixed. So there is a unique decomposition in terms of eigenspaces, and then any orthonormal basis of these eigenspaces can be chosen.

13.4. Other Forms, Connecting Eigenvalue Decomposition*

In this section, we discuss alternative forms of the spectral decomposition under different conditions. To see this, we provide a rigorous definition of the characteristic polynomial.

Definition 13.1 (Characteristic Polynomial) For any square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the *characteristic polynomial* $\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) &= \lambda^n + \gamma_{n-1} \lambda^{n-1} + \dots + \gamma_1 \lambda + \gamma_0 \\ &= (\lambda - \lambda_1)^{k_1} (\lambda - \lambda_2)^{k_2} \dots (\lambda - \lambda_m)^{k_m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m$ are the distinct roots of $\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) = 0$ and also the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_m = n$, i.e., $\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})$ is a polynomial of degree n for any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (see proof of Lemma 13.6).

The equation $\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) = 0$ is called the *characteristic equation* of \mathbf{A} .

The characteristic polynomial of a matrix is then employed to define an important multiplicity as follows:

Definition 13.2 (Algebraic Multiplicity and Geometric Multiplicity) *Given the characteristic polynomial of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$:*

$$\det(\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) = (\lambda - \lambda_1)^{k_1} (\lambda - \lambda_2)^{k_2} \dots (\lambda - \lambda_m)^{k_m}.$$

*The integer k_i is called the **algebraic multiplicity** of the eigenvalue λ_i , i.e., the algebraic multiplicity of eigenvalue λ_i is equal to the multiplicity of the corresponding root of the characteristic polynomial.*

*The **eigenspace associated to eigenvalue λ_i** is defined by the null space of $(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$.*

*And the dimension of the eigenspace associated with λ_i , $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$, is called the **geometric multiplicity** of λ_i .*

In short, we denote the algebraic multiplicity of λ_i by $\text{alg}(\lambda_i)$, and its geometric multiplicity by $\text{geo}(\lambda_i)$.

Remark 13.10: Geometric Multiplicity

Note that for a matrix \mathbf{A} and its eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$ associated with eigenvalue λ_i , the dimension of the eigenspace is also the number of linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} associated with λ_i , namely a basis for the eigenspace. This implies that, while there are an infinite number of eigenvectors associated with each eigenvalue λ_i , the fact that they form a subspace (provided the zero vector is added) means that they can be described by a finite number of vectors.

By definition, the sum of the algebraic multiplicities equals n , while the sum of the geometric multiplicities can be strictly smaller.

Corollary 13.11: (Multiplicity in Similar Matrices) Similar matrices have the same algebraic multiplicities and geometric multiplicities.

Proof [of Corollary 13.11] In Lemma 8.3 (p. 112), we proved that the eigenvalues of similar matrices are identical. Consequently, the algebraic multiplicities of similar matrices are the same as well.

Suppose \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{PAP}^{-1}$ are similar matrices, where \mathbf{P} is nonsingular. And the geometric multiplicity of an eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} , say λ , is k . Then there exists a set of orthogonal vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ forming a basis for the eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ such that $\mathbf{Av}_i = \lambda \mathbf{v}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Then, $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{Pv}_i$'s are the eigenvectors of \mathbf{B} associated with eigenvalue λ . Furthermore, these \mathbf{w}_i 's are linearly independent since \mathbf{P} is nonsingular. Thus, the dimension of the eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$ is at least k , that is, $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I}))$.

Similarly, there exists a set of orthogonal vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_k$ forming a basis for the eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I})$, then $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{w}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are the eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} associated with λ . This will result in $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}))$.

Therefore, by “sandwiching”, we get $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I})) = \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I}))$, which is the equality of the geometric multiplicities, and the claim follows. ■

Lemma 13.12: (Bounded Geometric Multiplicity) For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, its geometric multiplicity is bounded by algebraic multiplicity for any eigenvalue λ_i :

$$geo(\lambda_i) \leq alg(\lambda_i).$$

Proof [of Lemma 13.12] If we can identify a similar matrix B of A with a specific form of the characteristic polynomial, the proof will be complete.

Suppose $P_1 = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k]$ contains the linearly independent eigenvectors of A associated with λ_i . That is, the k vectors form a basis for the eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(A - \lambda_i I)$ and the geometric multiplicity associated with λ_i is k . Expanding it to n linearly independent vectors yields

$$P = [P_1, P_2] = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_n],$$

where P is nonsingular. Then we have $AP = [\lambda_i P_1, AP_2]$.

Construct a matrix $B = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i I_k & C \\ \mathbf{0} & D \end{bmatrix}$, where $AP_2 = P_1 C + P_2 D$, then $P^{-1}AP = B$ such that A and B are similar matrices. We can always find such C and D that meet the above condition, since v_i 's are linearly independent with spanning the entire space \mathbb{R}^n , and any column of AP_2 belongs to the column space of $P = [P_1, P_2]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A - \lambda I) &= \det(P^{-1}) \det(A - \lambda I) \det(P) && (\det(P^{-1}) = 1/\det(P)) \\ &= \det(P^{-1}(A - \lambda I)P) && (\det(A) \det(B) = \det(AB)) \\ &= \det(B - \lambda I) \\ &= \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} (\lambda_i - \lambda) I_k & C \\ \mathbf{0} & D - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= (\lambda_i - \lambda)^k \det(D - \lambda I), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is from the fact that if matrix M has a block formulation: $M = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$, then $\det(M) = \det(A) \det(D - CA^{-1}B)$. This implies

$$geo(\lambda_i) \leq alg(\lambda_i).$$

And we complete the proof. ■

Building on the proof of Lemma 13.6, it is evident that symmetric matrices exhibit equality between algebraic and geometric multiplicities. Such matrices are referred to as simple matrices.

Definition 13.3 (Simple Matrix) When the algebraic multiplicity and geometric multiplicity are the same for a matrix, we call it a simple matrix.

Definition 13.4 (Diagonalizable) A matrix A is considered diagonalizable if there exists a nonsingular matrix P and a diagonal matrix D such that $A = PDP^{-1}$.

Diagonal matrices possess a very simple structure, facilitating efficient computation of determinants and inverses. The eigenvalue decomposition in Theorem 11.1 (p. 135) and

the spectral decomposition in Theorem 13.1 exemplify matrices that are diagonalizable.

Lemma 13.13: (Simple Matrices are Diagonalizable) A matrix is a simple matrix if and only if it is diagonalizable.

Proof [of Lemma 13.13] We will show by forward implication and backward implication separately as follows.

Forward implication. Suppose that $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a simple matrix, meaning that the algebraic and geometric multiplicities for each eigenvalue are equal. Consider a specific eigenvalue λ_i , let $\{\mathbf{v}_1^i, \mathbf{v}_2^i, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_i}^i\}$ be a basis for the eigenspace $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I})$, that is, $\{\mathbf{v}_1^i, \mathbf{v}_2^i, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_i}^i\}$ is a set of linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} associated with λ_i , where k_i is the algebraic or geometric multiplicity of λ_i : $\text{alg}(\lambda_i) = \text{geo}(\lambda_i) = k_i$. Suppose there are m distinct eigenvalues, since $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_m = n$, the set of eigenvectors consists of the union of n vectors. Suppose there is a set of x_j 's such that

$$\mathbf{z} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_1} x_j^1 \mathbf{v}_j^1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} x_j^2 \mathbf{v}_j^2 + \dots + \sum_{j=1}^{k_m} x_j^m \mathbf{v}_j^m = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13.9)$$

Let $\mathbf{w}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} x_j^i \mathbf{v}_j^i$. Then \mathbf{w}^i is either an eigenvector associated with λ_i , or it is a zero vector. That is, $\mathbf{z} = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{w}^i$ is a sum of either zero vector or an eigenvector associated with different eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} . Since eigenvectors associated with different eigenvalues are linearly independent. We must have $\mathbf{w}^i = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. That is,

$$\mathbf{w}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} x_j^i \mathbf{v}_j^i = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

Since we assume the eigenvectors \mathbf{v}_j^i 's associated with λ_i are linearly independent, we must have $x_j^i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k_i\}$. Thus, the n vectors are linearly independent:

$$\{\mathbf{v}_1^1, \mathbf{v}_2^1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_1}^1\}, \{\mathbf{v}_1^2, \mathbf{v}_2^2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_2}^2\}, \dots, \{\mathbf{v}_1^m, \mathbf{v}_2^m, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_m}^m\}.$$

By eigenvalue decomposition in Theorem 11.1 (p. 135), matrix \mathbf{A} can be diagonalizable.

Backward implication. Suppose \mathbf{A} is diagonalizable. That is, there exists a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} and a diagonal matrix \mathbf{D} satisfying $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$. \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{D} are similar matrices such that they have the same eigenvalues (Lemma 8.3, p. 112), same algebraic multiplicities, and geometric multiplicities (Corollary 13.11). It can be easily verified that a diagonal matrix has equal algebraic multiplicity and geometric multiplicity such that \mathbf{A} is a simple matrix. ■

Remark 13.14: Equivalence on Diagonalization

From Theorem 13.4 that any eigenvectors corresponding to different eigenvalues are linearly independent, and Remark 13.10 that the geometric multiplicity is the dimension of the eigenspace. We realize, if the geometric multiplicity is equal to the algebraic multiplicity (for all eigenvalues), the eigenspaces can span the entire space \mathbb{R}^n if matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. So the above Lemma is equivalent to claiming that if the eigenspaces can span the entire space \mathbb{R}^n , then \mathbf{A} can be diagonalizable.

Corollary 13.15 A square matrix \mathbf{A} with linearly independent eigenvectors is a simple matrix. Or if \mathbf{A} is symmetric, it is also a simple matrix.

The proof for the aforementioned corollary is straightforward, as derived from the eigenvalue decomposition in Theorem 11.1 (p.135) and the spectral decomposition in Theorem 13.1.

Now we are ready to show the second form of the spectral decomposition.

Theorem 13.16: (Spectral Decomposition: The Second Form) A simple matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be decomposed as a sum of a set of idempotent matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i,$$

where λ_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ are eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} (duplicate possible), and also known as the *spectral values* of \mathbf{A} . Specifically, we have the following properties:

1. Idempotent: $\mathbf{A}_i^2 = \mathbf{A}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$;
2. Orthogonal: $\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \neq j$;
3. Additivity: $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}_n$;
4. Rank-Additivity: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \dots + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_n) = n$.

Proof [of Theorem 13.16] Since \mathbf{A} is a simple matrix, from Lemma 13.13, there exists a nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} and a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{P}^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$, and λ_i 's are eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} and columns of \mathbf{P} are eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} . Suppose

$$\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \quad \mathbf{v}_2 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{v}_n] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1^\top \\ \mathbf{w}_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{w}_n^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

are the column and row partitions of \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{P}^{-1} , respectively. Then we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{P}^{-1} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \quad \mathbf{v}_2 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{v}_n] \mathbf{\Lambda} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1^\top \\ \mathbf{w}_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{w}_n^\top \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top.$$

Let $\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top$, we have $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i$. We realize that $\mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j = 1, & \text{if } i = j; \\ \mathbf{w}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j = 0, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{w}_j^\top = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{w}_i^\top = \mathbf{A}_i, & \text{if } i = j; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

This implies the idempotency and orthogonality of \mathbf{A}_i 's. We also notice that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{I}$, implying the additivity of \mathbf{A}_i 's. The rank-additivity of the \mathbf{A}_i 's is trivial since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_i) = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. \blacksquare

The decomposition is closely related to the *Cochran's theorem*, and its application in the distribution theory of linear models (Lu, 2021c, 2022a).

Going further, suppose we have k distinct eigenvalues, we have the following result.

Theorem 13.17: (Spectral Decomposition: The Third Form) A simple matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with k distinct eigenvalues can be decomposed as a sum of a set of idempotent matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i,$$

where λ_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are the distinct eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and also known as the *spectral values* of \mathbf{A} . Specifically, we have the following properties:

1. Idempotent: $\mathbf{A}_i^2 = \mathbf{A}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$;
2. Orthogonal: $\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \neq j$;
3. Additivity: $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}_n$;
4. Rank-Additivity: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \dots + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_k) = n$.

Proof [of Theorem 13.17] From Theorem 13.16, we can decompose \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{B}_j$. Without loss of generality, the eigenvalues β_j 's are ordered such that $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \beta_n$, where duplicate is possible. Let $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k\}$ be the k distinct eigenvalues, and \mathbf{A}_i be the sum of the \mathbf{B}_j 's associated with λ_i . Suppose the multiplicity of λ_i is m_i , and the \mathbf{B}_j 's associated with λ_i can be denoted by $\{\mathbf{B}_1^i, \mathbf{B}_2^i, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{m_i}^i\}$. Then \mathbf{A}_i can be denoted by $\mathbf{A}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbf{B}_j^i$. Apparently, we have $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i$.

Idempotency. $\mathbf{A}_i^2 = (\mathbf{B}_1^i + \mathbf{B}_2^i + \dots + \mathbf{B}_{m_i}^i)(\mathbf{B}_1^i + \mathbf{B}_2^i + \dots + \mathbf{B}_{m_i}^i) = \mathbf{B}_1^i + \mathbf{B}_2^i + \dots + \mathbf{B}_{m_i}^i = \mathbf{A}_i$ from the idempotency and orthogonality of \mathbf{B}_j^i 's.

Orthogonality. $\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = (\mathbf{B}_1^i + \mathbf{B}_2^i + \dots + \mathbf{B}_{m_i}^i)(\mathbf{B}_1^j + \mathbf{B}_2^j + \dots + \mathbf{B}_{m_j}^j) = \mathbf{0}$ from the orthogonality of the \mathbf{B}_j^i 's.

Additivity. It is trivial that $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}_n$.

Rank-Additivity. $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_i) = \text{rank}(\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbf{B}_j^i) = m_i$ such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \dots + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_k) = m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_k = n$. ■

Theorem 13.18: (Spectral Decomposition: Backward Implication) If a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with k distinct eigenvalues can be decomposed as a sum of a set of idempotent matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i,$$

where λ_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are the distinct eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and

1. Idempotent: $\mathbf{A}_i^2 = \mathbf{A}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$;
2. Orthogonal: $\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \neq j$;
3. Additivity: $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}_n$;
4. Rank-Additivity: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \dots + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_k) = n$.

Then the matrix \mathbf{A} is a simple matrix.

Proof [of Theorem 13.18] Suppose $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_i) = r_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. By ULV decomposition in Theorem 4.1 (p. 81), \mathbf{A}_i can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{U}_i \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_i & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}_i,$$

where $\mathbf{L}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r_i \times r_i}$ is lower triangular, and $\mathbf{U}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are orthogonal. Let

$$\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{U}_i \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_i \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_i \\ \mathbf{Z}_i \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{X}_i is of size $\mathbb{R}^{n \times r_i}$, and $\mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r_i \times n}$ is the first r_i rows of \mathbf{V}_i . Then we have

$$\mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{Y}_i.$$

This can be seen as a **reduced** ULV decomposition of \mathbf{A}_i . Appending the \mathbf{X}_i 's and \mathbf{Y}_i 's into \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} ,

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k], \quad \mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_1 \\ \mathbf{Y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Y}_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (from rank-additivity). By block matrix multiplication and the additivity of \mathbf{A}_i 's, we have

$$\mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{Y}_i = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}.$$

Therefore, \mathbf{Y} is the inverse of \mathbf{X} , and

$$\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_1 \\ \mathbf{Y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Y}_k \end{bmatrix} [\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_1\mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{Y}_1\mathbf{X}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{Y}_1\mathbf{X}_k \\ \mathbf{Y}_2\mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{Y}_2\mathbf{X}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{Y}_2\mathbf{X}_k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{Y}_k\mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{Y}_k\mathbf{X}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{Y}_k\mathbf{X}_k \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{I},$$

such that

$$\mathbf{Y}_i\mathbf{X}_j = \begin{cases} \mathbf{I}_{r_i}, & \text{if } i = j; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

This implies

$$\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{X}_j = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}_i, & \text{if } i = j; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}_i = \lambda_i\mathbf{X}_i.$$

Finally, we have

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}[\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k] = [\lambda_1\mathbf{X}_1, \lambda_2\mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \lambda_k\mathbf{X}_k] = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda},$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1\mathbf{I}_{r_1} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \lambda_2\mathbf{I}_{r_2} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \lambda_k\mathbf{I}_{r_k} \end{bmatrix}$$

is a diagonal matrix. This implies \mathbf{A} can be diagonalized, and from Lemma 13.13, \mathbf{A} is a simple matrix. ■

Corollary 13.19: (Forward and Backward Spectral) Combining Theorem 13.17 and Theorem 13.18, we can claim that matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a simple matrix with k distinct eigenvalues if and only if it can be decomposed as a sum of a set of idempotent matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{A}_i,$$

where λ_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are the distinct eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and

1. Idempotent: $\mathbf{A}_i^2 = \mathbf{A}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$;
2. Orthogonal: $\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $i \neq j$;
3. Additivity: $\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{I}_n$;
4. Rank-Additivity: $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_1) + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_2) + \dots + \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}_k) = n$.

13.5. Skew-Symmetric Matrix and its Properties*

We have presented the spectral decomposition for symmetric matrices. Another noteworthy class of matrices connected to symmetry is known as *skew-symmetric matrices*.

Definition 13.5 (Skew-Symmetric Matrix) If a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfies the condition

$$\mathbf{A}^\top = -\mathbf{A},$$

it is termed a **skew-symmetric matrix**. Notably, under this definition, the diagonal values a_{ii} for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ satisfy the condition $a_{ii} = -a_{ii}$, implying that all the diagonal components are equal to 0.

We have established, as per Lemma 13.2, that the eigenvalues of symmetric matrices are real. Similarly, we can demonstrate that all eigenvalues of skew-symmetric matrices are imaginary.

Lemma 13.20: (Imaginary Eigenvalues) The eigenvalues of any skew-symmetric matrix are either purely imaginary or zero.

Proof [of Lemma 13.20] Suppose the eigenvalue λ of the skew-symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} is a complex number $\lambda = a + ib$, where a and b are real. Its complex conjugate is $\bar{\lambda} = a - ib$. Similarly, for a complex eigenvector $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c} + i\mathbf{d}$, its complex conjugate $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{c} - i\mathbf{d}$, where \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} are real vectors. We then have the following property

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{transpose to}} \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top = \bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top.$$

Taking the dot product of the first equation with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and the last equation with \mathbf{x} :

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \lambda \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{x} = \bar{\lambda} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}.$$

Then we have the equality $-\lambda \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x} = \bar{\lambda} \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x}$ (since $\mathbf{A}^\top = -\mathbf{A}$). Since $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{c} - i\mathbf{d})^\top (\mathbf{c} + i\mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{d}$ is a real number, the real part of λ is zero, indicating λ is either imaginary or zero. \blacksquare

Lemma 13.21: (Odd Skew-Symmetric Determinant) Given a skew-symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, if n is odd, then $\det(\mathbf{A}) = 0$.

Proof [of Lemma 13.21] When n is odd, we have

$$\det(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \det(-\mathbf{A}) = (-1)^n \det(\mathbf{A}) = -\det(\mathbf{A}).$$

This implies $\det(\mathbf{A}) = 0$. \blacksquare

Theorem 13.22: (Block-Diagonalization of Skew-Symmetric Matrices) A real skew-symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{Z}^\top,$$

where \mathbf{Z} is an $n \times n$ nonsingular matrix, and \mathbf{D} is a block-diagonal matrix with the following form

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, 0, \dots, 0 \right).$$

Proof [of Theorem 13.22] We will prove this by recursive calculation. As usual, we will denote the entry (i, j) of a matrix \mathbf{A} by a_{ij} .

Case 1). Suppose the first row of \mathbf{A} is nonzero, we notice that \mathbf{EAE}^\top is skew-symmetric for any matrix \mathbf{E} if \mathbf{A} is skew-symmetric. This will make both the diagonals of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{EAE}^\top zeros, and the upper-left 2×2 submatrix of \mathbf{EAE}^\top takes the following form

$$(\mathbf{EAE}^\top)_{1:2,1:2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \\ -x & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since we suppose the first row of \mathbf{A} is nonzero, there exists a permutation matrix \mathbf{P} (Definition 0.14, p. 7), such that we will exchange the nonzero value, say a , in the first row to the second column of \mathbf{PAP}^\top . As previously discussed, the upper-left 2×2 submatrix of \mathbf{PAP}^\top has the following form

$$(\mathbf{PAP}^\top)_{1:2,1:2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a \\ -a & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Construct a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/a & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$ such that the upper left 2×2 submatrix of $\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top$ has the following form

$$(\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top)_{1:2,1:2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now we finish block-diagonalizing the upper-left 2×2 block. Suppose now $(\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top)$ has a nonzero value, say b , in the first row with entry $(1, j)$ for some $j > 2$, we can construct a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I} - b \cdot \mathbf{E}_{j2}$, where \mathbf{E}_{j2} is an all-zero matrix except the entry $(j, 2)$ is 1, such that $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top) \mathbf{L}^\top$ will set the entry with value b to 0.

A Trivial Example

For example, suppose $\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top$ is a 3×3 matrix with the following value

$$\mathbf{MPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & b \\ -1 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I} - b \cdot \mathbf{E}_{j2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -b & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $j = 3$ for this specific example. This results in

$$\mathbf{LMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -b & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & b \\ -1 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -b \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, if the second row of $\mathbf{LMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top$ contains a nonzero value, say c , we could construct a nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{I} + c \cdot \mathbf{E}_{j1}$ such that $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{LMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top) \mathbf{K}^\top$ will introduce 0 for the entry with value c .

A Trivial Example

For example, suppose $\mathbf{LMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top$ is a 3×3 matrix with the following value

$$\mathbf{LMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & c \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{I} + c \cdot \mathbf{E}_{j1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ c & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $j = 3$ for this specific example. This results in

$$\mathbf{KLMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ c & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & c \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since we have shown that $\mathbf{KLMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top$ is also skew-symmetric, then, it is actually

$$\mathbf{KLMPAP}^\top \mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

so that we do not need to tackle the first 2 columns of the above equation.

Apply this process to the bottom-right $(n-2) \times (n-2)$ submatrix, we will complete the proof.

Case 2). If the first row of matrix \mathbf{A} is zero, we can utilize a permutation matrix to reposition the first row to become the last row. Subsequently, we can apply the procedure outlined in Case 1 to complete the proof. ■

The block-diagonalization of skew-symmetric matrices, as discussed earlier, reveals that the rank of a skew-symmetric matrix is always even. And we could prove the determinant of skew-symmetric matrices with even order is nonnegative as follows.

Lemma 13.23: (Even Skew-Symmetric Determinant) Given a skew-symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, if n is even, then $\det(\mathbf{A}) \geq 0$.

Proof [of Lemma 13.23] Applying Theorem 13.22, we could block-diagonalize $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{ZDZ}^\top$, resulting in

$$\det(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{ZDZ}^\top) = \det(\mathbf{Z})^2 \det(\mathbf{D}) \geq 0.$$

This completes the proof. ■

13.6. Applications

13.6.1 Application: Eigenvalue of Projection Matrix

In Section 14.5 (p. 180), we will show that the QR decomposition can be applied to solve the least squares problem, where we consider the overdetermined system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ being the data matrix, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ being the observation matrix ($m \geq n$). Normally, \mathbf{A} will have full column rank since the data from real work has a large chance to be unrelated. And the least squares solution is given by $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$ for minimizing $\|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|^2$, where $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is invertible since \mathbf{A} has full column rank and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$. The recovered observation vector is then $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{Ax}_{LS} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$. The observed \mathbf{b} may not lie in the column space of \mathbf{A} , but the recovered $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ is within this column space. We then define such a matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top$ to be a projection matrix, i.e., projecting \mathbf{b} onto the column space of \mathbf{A} . It is also known as a *hat matrix*, since we put a hat on \mathbf{b} . It can be easily verified the projection matrix is *symmetric and idempotent* (i.e., $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}^\top$ and $\mathbf{H}^2 = \mathbf{H}$).

Remark 13.24: Column Space of Projection Matrix

We notice that the hat matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top$ projects any vector in \mathbb{R}^m into the column space of \mathbf{A} . That is, $\mathbf{Hy} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$. Notice again \mathbf{Hy} is a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{H} , establishing $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$.

In general, for any projection matrix \mathbf{H} projecting vectors onto the subspace \mathcal{V} , the relation $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{V}$ holds. In a mathematical language, this property can be formally proved by singular value decomposition (Section 14.1, p. 173).

We now show that any projection matrix has specific eigenvalues.

Proposition 13.25: (Eigenvalue of Projection Matrix) The eigenvalues of a projection matrix are limited to 0 and 1.

Proof [of Proposition 13.25] Since \mathbf{H} is symmetric, we have spectral decomposition $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$. From the idempotent property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top)^2 &= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top \\ \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\mathbf{Q}^\top &= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}^2 &= \mathbf{\Lambda} \\ \lambda_i^2 &= \lambda_i, \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the eigenvalues of \mathbf{H} are confined to 0 and 1. ■

This property of the projection matrix is important in the analysis of distribution theory for linear models. See Lu (2022a) for more details. Following the eigenvalue of the projection matrix, it leads to the construction of the perpendicular projection $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$.

Proposition 13.26: (Project onto \mathcal{V}^\perp) Let \mathcal{V} be a subspace, and \mathbf{H} be a projection onto \mathcal{V} . Then, $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$ serves as the projection matrix onto \mathcal{V}^\perp .

Proof [of Proposition 13.26] First, $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})$ is symmetric, $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^\top = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$ since \mathbf{H} is symmetric. Furthermore, it follows that

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^2 = \mathbf{I}^2 - \mathbf{I}\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^2 = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H},$$

i.e., $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$ is idempotent. Thus, $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$ is a projection matrix. By spectral theorem again, let $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$. Then $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{\Lambda})\mathbf{Q}^\top$. Consequently, the column space of $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}$ is spanned by the eigenvectors of \mathbf{H} corresponding to the zero eigenvalues of \mathbf{H} (by Proposition 13.25), aligning precisely with \mathcal{V}^\perp . ■

Again, for a detailed analysis of the origin of the projection matrix and results behind the projection matrix, we recommend consulting Lu (2021c), although it is not the main interest of matrix decomposition results.

13.6.2 Application: An Alternative Definition of PD and PSD of Matrices

In Definition 2.1 (p. 29), positive definite matrices and positive semidefinite matrices are defined based on the quadratic form of the matrices. We here establish that a symmetric matrix is positive definite if and only if all eigenvalues are positive.

Lemma 13.27: (Eigenvalues of PD and PSD Matrices i.e., the Eigenvalue Characterization Theorem) A matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive definite (PD) if and only if \mathbf{A} has only positive eigenvalues. And a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive semidefinite (PSD) if and only if \mathbf{A} has only nonnegative eigenvalues.

Proof [of Lemma 13.27] We will prove by forward implication and reverse implication separately as follows.

Forward implication. Suppose \mathbf{A} is PD, then for any eigenvalue λ and its corresponding eigenvector \mathbf{v} of \mathbf{A} , we have $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$. Thus

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} = \lambda \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 > 0.$$

This implies $\lambda > 0$.

Reverse implication. Conversely, suppose the eigenvalues are positive. By spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, if \mathbf{x} is a nonzero vector, let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{x}$, we have

$$\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top) \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i y_i^2 > 0.$$

That is, \mathbf{A} is PD.

Analogously, we can prove the second part of the claim. ■

Theorem 13.28: (Nonsingular Factor of PSD and PD Matrices) A real symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} is PSD if and only if \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$, and it is PD if and only if \mathbf{P} is nonsingular.

Proof [of Theorem 13.28] For the first part, we will prove by forward implication and reverse implication separately as follows.

Forward implication. Suppose \mathbf{A} is PSD, its spectral decomposition is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$. Since eigenvalues of PSD matrices are nonnegative, we can decompose $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}$. Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, we can decompose \mathbf{A} as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$.

Reverse implication. If \mathbf{A} can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$, then all eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} are nonnegative since for any eigenvalues λ and its corresponding eigenvector \mathbf{v} of \mathbf{A} , we have

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}} = \frac{\|\mathbf{P} \mathbf{v}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{v}\|^2} \geq 0.$$

This implies \mathbf{A} is PSD by Lemma 13.27.

Similarly, we can prove the second part for PD matrices, where the positive definiteness will result in the nonsingular \mathbf{P} , and the nonsingular \mathbf{P} implies the positivity of the eigenvalues. ■

13.6.3 Proof for Semidefinite Rank-Revealing Decomposition

In this section, we provide a proof for Theorem 2.9 (p. 40), establishing the existence of the rank-revealing decomposition for positive semidefinite matrices.

Proof [of Theorem 2.9, p. 40] The proof relies on the nonsingular factor of PSD matrices (Theorem 13.28) and the existence of column-pivoted QR decomposition (Theorem 3.2, p. 59).

By Theorem 13.28, the nonsingular factor of PSD matrix \mathbf{A} is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}^\top$, and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{Q}^\top$ is the spectral decomposition of \mathbf{A} .

By Lemma 13.8, the rank of matrix \mathbf{A} is the number of nonzero eigenvalues (here, the number of positive eigenvalues since \mathbf{A} is PSD). Thus, only r components in the diagonal of $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2}$ are nonzero, and $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}^\top$ contains only r independent columns, i.e., \mathbf{Z} is of rank r . Using column-pivoted QR decomposition, we have

$$\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{P} is a permutation matrix, $\mathbf{R}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonals, and $\mathbf{R}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times (n-r)}$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11}^\top & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}_{12}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{11} & \mathbf{R}_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

we find the rank-revealing decomposition for semidefinite matrix: $P^\top AP = R^\top R$. ■

This decomposition is produced by using complete pivoting. At each stage, the algorithm permutes the largest diagonal element in the active submatrix into the pivot position. The process is similar to the partial pivoting technique discussed in Section 1.10.1 (p. 23).

13.6.4 Application: Cholesky Decomposition via the QR Decomposition and the Spectral Decomposition

In this section, we provide an alternative proof for the existence of the Cholesky decomposition.

Proof [of Theorem 2.1, p. 29] From Theorem 13.28, the PD matrix A can be factored as $A = P^\top P$, where P is a nonsingular matrix. Then, the QR decomposition of P is given by $P = QR$. This implies

$$A = P^\top P = R^\top Q^\top QR = R^\top R,$$

which closely resembles the Cholesky decomposition, albeit without the stipulation that R has solely positive diagonal values. Considering the CGS algorithm for computing the QR decomposition (Section 3.6, p. 53), we realize that the diagonals of R are nonnegative. If P is nonsingular, these diagonals of R are also positive. ■

The above proof is a consequence of the existence of both the QR decomposition and the spectral decomposition. Therefore, the existence of the Cholesky decomposition can be demonstrated through the QR decomposition and the spectral decomposition in this context.

13.6.5 Application: Unique Power Decomposition of Positive Definite Matrices

Theorem 13.29: (Unique Power Decomposition of PD Matrices) Any $n \times n$ positive definite matrix A can be **uniquely** decomposed as a product of a positive definite matrix B such that $A = B^2$.

Proof [of Theorem 13.29] We first prove that there exists such positive definite matrix B such that $A = B^2$.

Existence. Since A symmetric and positive definite, its spectral decomposition is given by $A = Q\Lambda Q^\top$. Since the eigenvalues of PD matrices are positive by Lemma 13.27, the square root of Λ exists. We can define $B = Q\Lambda^{1/2}Q^\top$ such that $A = B^2$, where B is apparently PD.

Uniqueness. Suppose such factorization is not unique, then there exist two of this decomposition such that

$$A = B_1^2 = B_2^2,$$

where B_1 and B_2 are both PD. Their spectral decompositions are given by

$$B_1 = Q_1\Lambda_1Q_1^\top \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 = Q_2\Lambda_2Q_2^\top.$$

We notice that Λ_1^2 and Λ_2^2 contain the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} , and both eigenvalues of \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 contained in Λ_1 and Λ_2 are positive (since \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 are both PD). Without loss of generality, we suppose $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = \Lambda^{1/2}$, and $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ such that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$. By $\mathbf{B}_1^2 = \mathbf{B}_2^2$, we have

$$\mathbf{Q}_1 \Lambda \mathbf{Q}_1^\top = \mathbf{Q}_2 \Lambda \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \quad \text{leads to} \quad \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}_1 \Lambda = \Lambda \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}_1.$$

Let $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}_1$, this implies Λ and \mathbf{Z} commute, and \mathbf{Z} must be a block diagonal matrix whose partitioning conforms to the block structure of Λ . This results in $\Lambda^{1/2} = \mathbf{Z} \Lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}^\top$ and

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = \mathbf{Q}_2 \Lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_2^\top = \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{Q}_1 \Lambda^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2^\top = \mathbf{B}_1.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Similarly, we could prove the unique decomposition of PSD matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}^2$, where \mathbf{B} is PSD. A more detailed discussion on this topic can be referred to [Koeber and Schäfer \(2006\)](#).

Decompositions for PD matrices. In summary, for a PD matrix \mathbf{A} , we can factor it into $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$, where \mathbf{R} is an upper triangular matrix with positive diagonals as shown in Theorem 2.1 (p. 29) by Cholesky decomposition; $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$, where \mathbf{P} is nonsingular in Theorem 13.28; and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}^2$, where \mathbf{B} is PD in Theorem 13.29.

Chapter 13 Problems

1. Show that the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and its transpose \mathbf{A}^\top have the same eigenvalues.
Hint: prove this using the characteristic polynomial of \mathbf{A} .
2. Given symmetric positive definite matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , the product \mathbf{AB} may not retain symmetry, but its eigenvalues remain positive. *Hint: take the product of \mathbf{Bx} and $\mathbf{ABx} = \lambda \mathbf{x}$.*
3. Given a symmetric positive definite matrix \mathbf{A} , show that $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{AB}$ is positive definite if \mathbf{B} contains linearly independent columns.
4. Given a symmetric positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with eigenvalues arranged in descending order as $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$.
 - What are the eigenvalues of $\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}$?
 - Prove the positive semidefiniteness of $\lambda \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}$.
 - Show that $\lambda_1 \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{Ax}$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
 - Find the maximum value of $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{Ax} / \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}$.
5. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfying $\mathbf{A}^2 - \mathbf{A} = 2\mathbf{I}$, show that \mathbf{A} is diagonalizable.

14

Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)

Contents

14.1	Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)	173
14.2	Existence of the SVD	173
14.3	Properties of the SVD	176
14.3.1	Four Subspaces in SVD	176
14.3.2	Relationship between Singular Values and Determinant	178
14.3.3	Orthogonal Equivalence	178
14.3.4	SVD for QR	178
14.4	Polar Decomposition	179
14.5	Application: Least Squares via the Full QR Decomposition, UTV, SVD	180
14.6	Application: Principal Component Analysis (PCA) via the Spectral Decomposition and the SVD	183
14.7	Application: Low-Rank Approximation	186
	Chapter 14 Problems	188

14.1. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)



In eigenvalue decomposition, the matrix is typically factored into a diagonal matrix. However, this is not universally applicable. If \mathbf{A} lacks linearly independent eigenvectors, such diagonalization is impossible. The singular value decomposition (SVD) addresses this limitation. Instead of being decomposed into an eigenvector matrix, the matrix is split into two orthogonal matrices through SVD. We provide the result of SVD in the following theorem and we will discuss the existence of SVD in the following sections.

Theorem 14.1: (Reduced SVD for Rectangular Matrices) Given any real $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r , the matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

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

where $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_r)$ with $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r > 0$ and

- The σ_i 's are the nonzero *singular values* of \mathbf{A} , in the meantime, they are the (positive) square roots of the nonzero *eigenvalues* of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$.
- Columns of $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ contain the r eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ corresponding to the r nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$.
- Columns of $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ contain the r eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ corresponding to the r nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$.
- Moreover, the columns of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are called the *left and right singular vectors* of \mathbf{A} , respectively.
- Further, the columns of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are orthonormal (by Spectral Theorem 13.1, p. 149).

In particular, we can express the matrix decomposition as the sum of outer products of vectors $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, which is a sum of r rank-one matrices.

If we append additional $m - r$ silent columns that are orthonormal to the r eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$, just like the silent columns in the QR decomposition (Section 3.7, p. 57), we will obtain an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. The same principle applies to the columns of \mathbf{V} , and this yields the full SVD. The comparison between the reduced and the full SVD is shown in Figure 14.1, where white entries are zero, and blue entries are not necessarily zero.

14.2. Existence of the SVD

To prove the existence of the SVD, we need to use the following lemmas. We mentioned above that the singular values are the square roots of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$. While negative values do not have square roots such that the eigenvalues must be nonnegative.




Figure 14.1: Comparison between the reduced and full SVD.

Lemma 14.2: (Nonnegative Eigenvalues of $A^\top A$) Given any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $A^\top A$ has nonnegative eigenvalues.

Proof [of Lemma 14.2] For eigenvalue λ and its corresponding eigenvector \mathbf{x} of $A^\top A$, we have

$$A^\top A \mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{x} \quad \text{leads to} \quad \mathbf{x}^\top A^\top A \mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}.$$

Since $\mathbf{x}^\top A^\top A \mathbf{x} = \|A \mathbf{x}\|^2 \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} > 0$, we have $\lambda \geq 0$. ■

Since $A^\top A$ has nonnegative eigenvalues, we can define the *singular value* $\sigma \geq 0$ of A such that σ^2 is the eigenvalue of $A^\top A$, i.e., $A^\top A \mathbf{v} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}$. This is essential to the existence of the SVD.

We have shown in Lemma 13.7 (p. 154) that $\text{rank}(AB) \leq \min\{\text{rank}(A), \text{rank}(B)\}$. However, the symmetric matrix $A^\top A$ is rather special in that the rank of $A^\top A$ is equal to $\text{rank}(A)$. And we now prove it.

Lemma 14.3: (Rank of $A^\top A$) $A^\top A$ and A have same rank.

Proof [of Lemma 14.3] Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, we have

$$A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{leads to} \quad A^\top A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0},$$

i.e., $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ leads to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A^\top A)$, therefore, $\mathcal{N}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A^\top A)$.

Further, let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A^\top A)$, we have

$$A^\top A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \text{ leads to } \mathbf{x}^\top A^\top A \mathbf{x} = 0 \text{ leads to } \|A \mathbf{x}\|^2 = 0 \text{ leads to } A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0},$$

i.e., $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A^\top A)$ leads to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, therefore, $\mathcal{N}(A^\top A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$.

As a result, by “sandwiching”, it follows that

$$\mathcal{N}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A^\top A) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(\mathcal{N}(A)) = \dim(\mathcal{N}(A^\top A)).$$

Applying the fundamental theorem of linear algebra (Theorem 0.3, p. 6), $A^\top A$ and A have the same rank. ■

Applying the observation to \mathbf{A}^\top , we can also prove that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ and \mathbf{A} have the same rank:

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top).$$

In the form of the SVD, we claimed the matrix \mathbf{A} is a sum of r rank-one matrices, where r denotes the number of nonzero singular values. This count of nonzero singular values is, in fact, equivalent to the rank of the matrix.

Lemma 14.4: (The Number of Nonzero Singular Values vs the Rank) The number of nonzero singular values of a matrix \mathbf{A} is identical to its rank.

Proof [of Lemma 14.4] The rank of any symmetric matrix (here $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$) equals the number of nonzero eigenvalues (with repetitions) by Lemma 13.8 (p. 154). So the number of nonzero singular values equals the rank of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$. By Lemma 14.3, the number of nonzero singular values equals the rank of \mathbf{A} . ■

We are now ready to prove the existence of the SVD.

Proof [of Theorem 14.1: Existence of the Reduced SVD] Since $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is a symmetric matrix, by Spectral Theorem 13.1 (p. 149) and Lemma 14.2, there exists an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{V} such that

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

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the singular values of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\mathbf{\Sigma}^2$ contains the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$. Specifically, $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_r)$ and $\{\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_r^2\}$ are the nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ with r being the rank of \mathbf{A} . In other words, $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r\}$ are the singular values of \mathbf{A} . In this case, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$. We now delve into the core of the proof.

Starting from $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, i.e., the eigenvector \mathbf{v}_i of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is corresponding to eigenvalue σ_i^2 :

1. Multiplying both sides by \mathbf{v}_i^\top :

$$\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_i \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i\|^2 = \sigma_i^2 \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i\| = \sigma_i.$$

2. Multiplying both sides by \mathbf{A} :

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \frac{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i}{\sigma_i} = \sigma_i^2 \frac{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i}{\sigma_i} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{u}_i = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i,$$

where we notice that this form can find the eigenvector of $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top$ corresponding to σ_i^2 , which is $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i$. Since the length of $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i$ is σ_i , we then define $\mathbf{u}_i = \frac{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i}{\sigma_i}$ with a norm of 1.

These \mathbf{u}_i 's are orthogonal because $(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i)^\top (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j) = \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_j = \sigma_j^2 \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$. That is,

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{U}^\top.$$

Since $\boxed{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i}$, we have

$$[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_r] = [\sigma_1 \mathbf{u}_1, \sigma_2 \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \sigma_r \mathbf{u}_r] \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma},$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

By appending silent columns into \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , we can easily find the full SVD. A additional outcome of the above proof is that the spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{V}^\top$ will result in the spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{U}^\top$ with the same eigenvalues.

Corollary 14.5: (Eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$) The nonzero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ are the same.

We have shown in Lemma 14.2 that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ are nonnegative. Consequently, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ are nonnegative as well.

Corollary 14.6: (Nonnegative Eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$) The eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ are nonnegative.

The existence of the SVD is important for defining the effective rank of a matrix.

Definition 14.1 (Effective Rank vs Exact Rank) *Effective rank, or also known as the **numerical rank**. Following Lemma 14.4, the number of nonzero singular values is equal to the rank of a matrix. Assume the i -th largest singular value of \mathbf{A} is denoted as $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$. Then if $\sigma_r(\mathbf{A}) \gg \sigma_{r+1}(\mathbf{A}) \approx 0$, r is known as the numerical rank of \mathbf{A} . Whereas, when $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}) > \sigma_{r+1}(\mathbf{A}) = 0$, it is known as having **exact rank** r as we have used in most of our discussions.*

14.3. Properties of the SVD

14.3.1 Four Subspaces in SVD

For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we have the following property:

- $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ is the orthogonal complement of the row space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ in \mathbb{R}^n : $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = n$;
- $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$ is the orthogonal complement of the column space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$ in \mathbb{R}^m : $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = m$.

This is referred to as the fundamental theorem of linear algebra, also known as the rank-nullity theorem (Theorem 0.3, p. 6). Using the SVD, we can identify an orthonormal basis for each subspace.

Lemma 14.7: (Four Orthonormal Bases) Given the full SVD of a matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m]$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , respectively. Then, we have the following property:

- $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$;
- $\{\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \mathbf{v}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$;




Figure 14.2: Orthonormal bases that diagonalize \mathbf{A} from SVD.

- $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$;
- $\{\mathbf{u}_{r+1}, \mathbf{u}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$.

The relationship of the four subspaces is demonstrated in Figure 14.2, where \mathbf{A} transfers the row basis \mathbf{v}_i into column basis \mathbf{u}_i by $\sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$.

Proof [of Lemma 14.7] From Lemma 13.8 (p. 154), for symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$, $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$ is spanned by the eigenvectors, thus $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$.

Considering the following:

1. $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is symmetric, then the row space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ equals the column space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$.
2. All rows of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ are the linear combinations of the rows of \mathbf{A} , so the row space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \subseteq$ the row space of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$.
3. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ by Lemma 14.3, we then have:
The row space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} =$ the column space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} =$ the row space of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$. Thus, $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$.

Furthermore, the space spanned by $\{\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \mathbf{v}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$ is an orthogonal complement to the space spanned by $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$, so $\{\mathbf{v}_{r+1}, \mathbf{v}_{r+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$.

If we apply this process to $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top$, we will prove the rest claims in the lemma. Also, we can see that $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r\}$ is a basis for the column space of \mathbf{A} by Lemma 0.2 (p. 6) ¹, since $\mathbf{u}_i = \frac{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{v}_i}{\sigma_i}$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. ■

1. For any matrix \mathbf{A} , let $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_r\}$ be a set of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , which forms a basis for the row space, then $\{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r}_r\}$ is a basis for the column space of \mathbf{A} .

14.3.2 Relationship between Singular Values and Determinant

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a square matrix, and the singular value decomposition of \mathbf{A} is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, it follows that

$$|\det(\mathbf{A})| = |\det(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top)| = |\det(\mathbf{\Sigma})| = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n.$$

If all the singular values σ_i are nonzero, then $\det(\mathbf{A}) \neq 0$. That is, \mathbf{A} is **nonsingular**. If there is at least one singular value such that $\sigma_i = 0$, then $\det(\mathbf{A}) = 0$, and \mathbf{A} does not have full rank, and is not invertible. Then the matrix is called **singular**. This is why σ_i 's are known as the singular values.

14.3.3 Orthogonal Equivalence

We have defined in Definition 8.2 (p. 111) that \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{PAP}^{-1} are similar matrices for any nonsingular matrix \mathbf{P} . The *orthogonal equivalence* is defined in a similar way.

Definition 14.2 (Orthogonal Equivalent Matrices) *Given any orthogonal matrices \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , the matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{UAV} are called **orthogonal equivalent matrices**. Or **unitary equivalent** in the complex domain when \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are unitary.*

Then, we have the following property for orthogonal equivalent matrices.

Lemma 14.8: (Orthogonal Equivalent Matrices) Given any orthogonal equivalent matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , then singular values are the same.

Proof [of Lemma 14.8] Since \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are orthogonal equivalent, there exist orthogonal matrices that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{UAV}$. We then have

$$\mathbf{BB}^\top = (\mathbf{UAV})(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{U}^\top) = \mathbf{UAA}^\top \mathbf{U}^\top.$$

This implies \mathbf{BB}^\top and \mathbf{AA}^\top are similar matrices. By Lemma 8.3 (p. 112), the eigenvalues of similar matrices are the same, which proves the singular values of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are the same. ■

14.3.4 SVD for QR

Lemma 14.9: (SVD for QR) Suppose the full QR decomposition for a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$ is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$, where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is orthogonal and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is upper triangular. Then \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{R} have the same singular values and right singular vectors.

Proof [of Lemma 14.9] We notice that $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ such that $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$ have the same eigenvalues and eigenvectors, i.e., \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{R} have the same singular values and right singular vectors (i.e., the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ or $\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}$). ■

The above lemma implies that the SVD of a matrix can be constructed by its QR decomposition. Suppose the QR decomposition of \mathbf{A} is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$, and the SVD of \mathbf{R} is given by $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U}_0\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$. Therefore, the SVD of \mathbf{A} can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{A} = \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}_0}_{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top.$$

14.4. Polar Decomposition

A decomposition closely related to the SVD is the *polar form* of a matrix. In the context of continuum mechanics, it is imperative to distinguish between stretching and rotation. The polar decomposition factors any matrix into an orthogonal matrix (corresponds to rotation) and a symmetric matrix (corresponds to stretching or compression, see Chapter 15, p. 192).

Theorem 14.10: (Polar Decomposition) Given a real $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} with rank r , then the matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}_l \mathbf{S},$$

where \mathbf{Q}_l is an orthogonal matrix, and \mathbf{S} is a positive semidefinite matrix. And this form is called the *left polar decomposition*. Also the matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{Q}_r,$$

where \mathbf{Q}_r is an orthogonal matrix, and \mathbf{S} is a positive semidefinite matrix. And this form is called the *right polar decomposition*.

Specially, the left and right polar decomposition of a square full-rank matrix \mathbf{A} is **unique**.

Since every $n \times n$ square matrix \mathbf{A} has full SVD $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where both \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix. We then have $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\top)(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top) = \mathbf{Q}_l \mathbf{S}$, where it can be easily verified that $\mathbf{Q}_l = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\top$ is an orthogonal matrix, and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$ is a symmetric matrix. We notice that the singular values in $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are nonnegative, showing that $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\mathbf{V}^\top$, and \mathbf{S} is PSD.

Similarly, we have $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^\top\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\top = (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^\top)(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}^\top) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_r$. Here, $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{U}^\top = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\mathbf{U}^\top$ such that \mathbf{S} is PSD as well.

For the uniqueness of the right polar decomposition, we suppose the decomposition is not unique, and two of the decompositions are given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2,$$

such that

$$\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_1^\top.$$

Since \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are symmetric, we have

$$\mathbf{S}_1^2 = \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{S}_1^\top = \mathbf{S}_2 \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{Q}_2^\top \mathbf{S}_2 = \mathbf{S}_2^2.$$

This implies $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathbf{S}_2$, and the decomposition is unique (Theorem 13.29, p. 169). Similarly, the uniqueness of the left polar decomposition can be implied from the context.

Corollary 14.11: (Full-Rank Polar Decomposition) When $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has full rank, then the \mathbf{S} in both the left and right polar decomposition is a symmetric positive definite matrix.

14.5. Application: Least Squares via the Full QR Decomposition, UTV, SVD

Least Squares via the Full QR Decomposition

Let's consider the overdetermined system $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the data matrix, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $m \geq n$ is the observation matrix. Normally, \mathbf{A} will have full column rank since the data from real work has a large chance to be unrelated. And the least squares (LS) solution is given by $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$ for minimizing $\|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|^2$, where $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is invertible since \mathbf{A} has full column rank and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$.

However, the inverse of a matrix is not easy to compute, we can then use the QR decomposition to find the least squares solution as illustrated in the following theorem.

Theorem 14.12: (LS via QR for Full Column Rank Matrix) Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$ represents its full QR decomposition with $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ being an orthogonal matrix, $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ being an upper triangular matrix appended by additional $m - n$ zero rows. Assume \mathbf{A} has full column rank with $m \geq n$. Suppose further $\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\mathbf{R}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the square upper triangular in \mathbf{R} , and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then the LS solution to $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} \mathbf{c},$$

where \mathbf{c} is the first n components of $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b}$.

Proof [of Theorem 14.12] Since $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$ is the full QR decomposition of \mathbf{A} and $m \geq n$, the last $m - n$ rows of \mathbf{R} are zero as shown in Figure 3.4 (p. 58). Then $\mathbf{R}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the square upper triangular in \mathbf{R} and $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 &= (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b})^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}) \\ &= (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b})^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}) && \text{(Since } \mathbf{Q} \text{ is an orthogonal matrix)} \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \right\|^2 && \text{(Invariant under orthogonal)} \\ &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \right\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{c} is the first n components of $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b}$, and \mathbf{d} is the last $m - n$ components of $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b}$. And the LS solution can be calculated by performing back substitution of the upper triangular system $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}$, which can be expressed as $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} \mathbf{c}$. ■

To verify Theorem 14.12, we consider the full QR decomposition of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Together with the LS solution $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{x}_{LS} &= (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= (\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= (\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= (\mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} \mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} \mathbf{R}_1^{-\top} \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{b} \\
 &= \mathbf{R}_1^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_1^\top \mathbf{b},
 \end{aligned} \tag{14.1}$$

where $\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{R}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an upper triangular matrix, and $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_{1:m, 1:n} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the first n columns of \mathbf{Q} (i.e., $\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{R}_1$ is the reduced QR decomposition of \mathbf{A}). Then the result of Equation (14.1) agrees with Theorem 14.12.

To conclude, using the QR decomposition, we first derive directly the least squares result, which results in the argument in Theorem 14.12. Moreover, we verify the result of LS from calculus indirectly by the QR decomposition as well. The two results coincide with each other. For readers who are interested in LS in linear algebra, a pictorial view of least squares for full column rank \mathbf{A} in the fundamental theorem of linear algebra is provided in Lu (2021d).

Least Squares via ULV/URV for Rank-Deficient Matrices

In the above section, we introduced the LS via the full QR decomposition for full-rank matrices. However, it often happens that the matrix may be rank-deficient. If \mathbf{A} does not have full column rank, $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is not invertible. We can then use the ULV/URV decomposition to find the least squares solution as illustrated in the following theorem.

Theorem 14.13: (LS via ULV/URV for Rank-Deficient Matrix) Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r and $m \geq n$. Suppose $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}$ is its full ULV/URV decomposition, where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are orthogonal matrices, and

$$\mathbf{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_{11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a lower triangular matrix or an upper triangular matrix. Suppose $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then the LS solution with the minimal ℓ_2 -norm to $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \mathbf{V}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{c} represents the first r components of $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}$.

Proof [of Theorem 14.13] Since $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{QR}$ is the full QR decomposition of \mathbf{A} and $m \geq n$, the last $m - n$ rows of \mathbf{R} are zero as shown in Figure 3.4 (p. 58). Then, $\mathbf{R}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the square upper triangular in \mathbf{R} and $\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 &= (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b})^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}) \\
&= (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b})^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\top (\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}) && \text{(Since } \mathbf{U} \text{ is an orthogonal matrix)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}\|^2 && \text{(Invariant under orthogonal)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{UTVx} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}\|^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{TVx} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}\|^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{T}_{11}\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{c}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{d}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{c} is the first r components of $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}$, \mathbf{d} is the last $m - r$ components of $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}$, \mathbf{e} is the first r components of \mathbf{Vx} , and \mathbf{f} is the last $n - r$ components of \mathbf{Vx} :

$$\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{d} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Vx} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix}.$$

And the LS solution can be calculated by performing back/forward substitution of the upper/lower triangular system $\mathbf{T}_{11}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{c}$, i.e., $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{T}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{c}$. For \mathbf{x} to have a minimal ℓ_2 -norm, \mathbf{f} must be zero. That is,

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \mathbf{V}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{c} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

A word on the minimal ℓ_2 -norm LS solution. For the least squares problem, the set of all minimizers

$$\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\| = \min\}$$

is convex (Golub and Van Loan, 2013). If $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, then

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\lambda\mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_2) - \mathbf{b}\| \leq \lambda \|\mathbf{Ax}_1 - \mathbf{b}\| + (1 - \lambda) \|\mathbf{Ax}_2 - \mathbf{b}\| = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|.$$

Thus, $\lambda\mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}$. In the above proof, if we do not set $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}$, we will find more least squares solutions. However, the minimal ℓ_2 -norm least squares solution is unique. For the full-rank case as discussed in the previous section, the least squares solution is unique and it must have a minimal ℓ_2 -norm. See also Foster (2003); Golub and Van Loan (2013) for a more detailed discussion on this topic.

Least Squares via SVD for Rank-Deficient Matrices

Apart from the UTV decomposition for rank-deficient least squares solution, SVD serves as an alternative.

Theorem 14.14: (LS via SVD for Rank-Deficient Matrix) Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$ represents its full SVD decomposition, where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are orthogonal matrices, and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = r$. Suppose $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m]$, $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then the LS solution with minimal ℓ_2 -norm to $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{b}}{\sigma_i} \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^+ \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b}, \quad (14.2)$$

where the upper-left side of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is a diagonal matrix, and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1^+ & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1^+ = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sigma_1}, \frac{1}{\sigma_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sigma_r})$.

Proof [of Theorem 14.14] Write out the loss to be minimized

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 &= (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b})^\top (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) \\ &= (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b})^\top \mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\top (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) && \text{(Since } \mathbf{U} \text{ is an orthogonal matrix)} \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b} \right\|^2 && \text{(Invariant under orthogonal)} \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b} \right\|^2 && \text{(Since } \mathbf{V} \text{ is an orthogonal matrix)} \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b} \right\|^2 && \text{(Let } \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r (\sigma_i \alpha_i - \mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{b})^2 + \sum_{i=r+1}^m (\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{b})^2. && \text{(Since } \sigma_{r+1} = \sigma_{r+2} = \dots = \sigma_m = 0) \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{x} only appears in $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we just need to set $\alpha_i = \frac{\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{b}}{\sigma_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ to minimize the above equation. Any value assigned to $\alpha_{r+1}, \alpha_{r+2}, \dots, \alpha_n$ will not affect the result. From the regularization point of view (or here, we want the minimal ℓ_2 -norm), we can set them to be 0. This gives us the LS solution via SVD:

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{b}}{\sigma_i} \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^+ \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}^+ \mathbf{b},$$

where $\mathbf{A}^+ = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}^+ \mathbf{U}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is known as the *pseudo-inverse* of \mathbf{A} . ■

14.6. Application: Principal Component Analysis (PCA) via the Spectral Decomposition and the SVD

An important application of SVD is to apply principal component analysis (PCA). The PCA is frequently employed to identify patterns in data and find the variance-covariance structure of the data so as to accomplish

1. *Data reduction.* We reduce the data dimension using a smaller number of *principal components*.

2. *Interpretation.* The PCA can help reveal relationships that were not suspected previously.

Given a data set of n observations $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Our goal is to project the data onto a low-dimensional space, say $m < p$. Define the sample mean vector and sample covariance matrix

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})^\top,$$

where the $n-1$ term in the covariance matrix is to make it to be an unbiased consistent estimator of the covariance (Lu, 2022a). Or the covariance matrix can also be defined as $\mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})^\top$, which is also a consistent estimator of the covariance matrix ².

Each data point \mathbf{x}_i is then projected onto a scalar value using a vector \mathbf{u}_1 (see discussion below) such that $\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_i$. The mean of the projected data is obtained by $E[\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{u}_1^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}}$, and the variance of the projected data is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_i] &= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{u}_1^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}})^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{u}_1^\top (\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}})^\top \mathbf{u}_1 \\ &= \mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Our objective is to maximize the projected variance $\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}_1$ concerning \mathbf{u}_1 to retain more information from the projected data. To achieve this, we need to impose a constraint on $\|\mathbf{u}_1\|$ to prevent it from approaching infinity, which is achieved by setting $\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{u}_1 = 1$. Employing Lagrange multiplier (see Bishop (2006); Boyd et al. (2004)), we can maximize the following objective:

$$\mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}_1 + \lambda_1 (1 - \mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{u}_1).$$

A trivial calculation will lead to

$$\mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}_1 = \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \quad \text{leads to} \quad \mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}_1 = \lambda_1.$$

That is, \mathbf{u}_1 is an eigenvector of \mathbf{S} corresponding to eigenvalue λ_1 . And the maximum variance projection \mathbf{u}_1 is corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of \mathbf{S} . The eigenvector is known as the *first principal axis*.

Define the other principal axes by decremental eigenvalues until we have m such principal components. The procedure brings about the dimension reduction. This is known as the *maximum-variance formulation* of PCA (Hotelling, 1933; Bishop, 2006; Shlens, 2014). An alternative approach, known as the *minimum-error formulation* of PCA, is discussed in Pearson (1901); Bishop (2006).

2. Consistency: An estimator θ_n of θ constructed on the basis of a sample of size n is said to be consistent if $\theta_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

PCA via the spectral decomposition. Now let's assume the data are centered such that the sample mean vector $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is zero, or we can set $\mathbf{x}_i := \mathbf{x}_i - \bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to centralize the data, i.e., achieving data centering by subtracting the mean from each data point. Let the data matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ contain the data observations as rows. The covariance matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1},$$

which is a symmetric matrix, and its spectral decomposition is given by

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{U}^\top, \quad (14.3)$$

where \mathbf{U} is an orthogonal matrix of eigenvectors (the columns of \mathbf{U} are eigenvectors of \mathbf{S}), and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$ is a diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues (ordered such that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$). The eigenvectors are called *principal axes* of the data, and they *decorrelate* the covariance matrix. Projections of the data on the principal axes are called the *principal components*. The i -th principal component is given by the i -th column of \mathbf{XU} . If our objective is to reduce the dimension from p to m , we simply select the first m columns of \mathbf{XU} .

PCA via the SVD. If the SVD of \mathbf{X} is given by $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{Q}^\top$, then the covariance matrix can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1} = \mathbf{Q} \frac{\mathbf{\Sigma}^2}{n-1} \mathbf{Q}^\top, \quad (14.4)$$

where $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is an orthogonal matrix containing the right singular vectors of \mathbf{X} , and the upper-left part of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the singular values $\text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$ with $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots$. The number of singular values is equal to $\min\{n, p\}$, which will not be larger than p and some of them may be zeros.

The comparison between Equation (14.4) and Equation (14.3) suggests that Equation (14.4) also represents a spectral decomposition of \mathbf{S} . This is due to the fact that both the eigenvalues in $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ and singular values in $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are ordered in a descending order, and the spectral decomposition in terms of the eigenspaces is unique (Section 13.3, p. 155).

In other words, the right singular vectors \mathbf{Q} can also serve as the principal axes, which decorrelate the covariance matrix, and the singular values are related to the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix through the relationship: $\lambda_i = \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n-1}$. To reduce the dimensionality of the data from p to m , we should select the largest m singular values and the corresponding right singular vectors. This is also related to the truncated SVD (TSVD) $\mathbf{X}_m = \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i \mathbf{p}_i \mathbf{q}_i^\top$, where \mathbf{p}_i 's and \mathbf{q}_i 's are the columns of \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} .

A byproduct of PCA via the SVD for high-dimensional data. For a principle axis \mathbf{u}_i of $\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1}$, we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1} \mathbf{u}_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{u}_i.$$

Left multiply by \mathbf{X} , we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1} (\mathbf{X} \mathbf{u}_i) = \lambda_i (\mathbf{X} \mathbf{u}_i),$$

which implies λ_i is also an eigenvalue of $\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and the corresponding eigenvector is $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{u}_i$. This relationship is also stated in the proof of Theorem 14.1, which establishes the existence of the SVD. If $p \gg n$, instead of finding the eigenvector of $\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1}$, i.e., the principle axes of $\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1}$, we can find the eigenvector of $\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1}$. This reduces the complexity from $O(p^3)$ to $O(n^3)$ if $p \gg n$.

Return to the principle axes of $\mathbf{S} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1}$. Suppose now, the eigenvector of $\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1}$ is \mathbf{v}_i , corresponding to a nonzero eigenvalue λ_i ,

$$\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1} \mathbf{v}_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i.$$

Left multiply by \mathbf{X}^\top , we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}}{n-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{v}_i) = \mathbf{S} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{v}_i) = \lambda_i (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{v}_i),$$

i.e., the eigenvector \mathbf{u}_i of \mathbf{S} , is proportional to $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{v}_i$, where \mathbf{v}_i is the eigenvector of $\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top}{n-1}$ corresponding to the same eigenvalue λ_i . Note here, a further normalization step is needed to make $\|\mathbf{u}_i\| = 1$.

14.7. Application: Low-Rank Approximation

Considering a low-rank approximation problem, there are basically two types related due to the interplay of rank and error: *fixed-precision approximation problem* and *fixed-rank approximation problem*. In the fixed-precision approximation problem, for a given matrix \mathbf{A} and a given tolerance ϵ , one wants to find a matrix \mathbf{B} with rank $r = r(\epsilon)$ such that $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\| \leq \epsilon$ in an appropriate matrix norm. On the contrary, in the fixed-rank approximation problem, one looks for a matrix \mathbf{B} with fixed rank k and an error $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|$ as small as possible. In this section, we will consider the latter. Some excellent examples can also be found in Kishore Kumar and Schneider (2017); Martinsson (2019).

Suppose we want to approximate matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r by a rank- k matrix \mathbf{B} ($k < r$). The approximation is measured by spectral norm:

$$\mathbf{B} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{B}} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_2,$$

where the spectral norm is defined as follows:

Definition 14.3 (Spectral Norm) *The spectral norm of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is defined as*

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} = \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n: \|\mathbf{u}\|_2=1} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}\|_2,$$

which is also the maximal singular value of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \sigma_1(\mathbf{A})$.

Then, we can recover the optimal rank- k approximation by the following theorem.

Theorem 14.15: (Eckart-Young-Misky Theorem w.r.t. Spectral Norm) Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $1 \leq k \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = r$, and let \mathbf{A}_k be the truncated SVD (TSVD) of \mathbf{A} with the largest k terms, i.e., $\mathbf{A}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ from the SVD of $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ by zeroing out the $r - k$ trailing singular values of \mathbf{A} . Then, \mathbf{A}_k is the optimal rank- k approximation to \mathbf{A} in terms of the spectral norm.

Note that \mathbf{A}_k can be stored using $(m + n)k + k$ entries, as opposed to mn entries.

Proof [of Theorem 14.15] We need to show for any matrix \mathbf{B} , if $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}) = k$, then $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_2$.

Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}) = k$, then $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})) = n - k$. As a result, any set of $k + 1$ basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^n intersects $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$. As shown in Lemma 14.7, $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}^\top) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, so that we can choose the first $k + 1$ \mathbf{v}_i 's as a $k + 1$ basis for \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\mathbf{V}_{k+1} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}]$, then there is a vector \mathbf{x} such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{V}_{k+1}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1.$$

That is, \mathbf{x} can be expressed as $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i \mathbf{v}_i$, and $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^2 = 1$. And we also have $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_2^2 &\geq \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2, && \text{(From definition of spectral norm)} \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2, && (\mathbf{x} \text{ in null space of } \mathbf{B}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \sigma_i^2 (\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{x})^2, && (\mathbf{x} \text{ orthogonal to } \mathbf{v}_{k+2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r) \\ &\geq \sigma_{k+1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{x})^2, && (\sigma_{k+1} \leq \sigma_k \leq \dots \leq \sigma_1) \\ &\geq \sigma_{k+1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^2, && (\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{x} = a_i) \\ &= \sigma_{k+1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it is evident that $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_2^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=k+1}^r \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \right\|_2^2 = \sigma_{k+1}^2$. Thus, $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_2$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Moreover, readers can prove that \mathbf{A}_k is also the optimal rank- k approximation to \mathbf{A} in terms of the Frobenius norm. The minimal error is given by the Euclidean norm of the singular values that have been zeroed out in the process: $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_k\|_F = \sqrt{\sigma_{k+1}^2 + \sigma_{k+2}^2 + \dots + \sigma_r^2}$ (Lu, 2021c).

Definition 14.4 (Frobenius Norm) The Frobenius norm of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is defined as

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1, j=1}^{m, n} (a_{ij})^2} = \sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)} = \sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})} = \sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \dots + \sigma_r^2},$$

where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_r$ are nonzero singular values of \mathbf{A} .

Exercise 14.1 Given the definition of the Frobenius norm, show that $\mathbf{A}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ is also the optimal rank- k approximation to \mathbf{A} in terms of the Frobenius norm.

Chapter 14 Problems

1. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, show that the trace of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is equal to the sum of all a_{ij}^2 , i.e., $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m,n} a_{ij}^2$.
2. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r , suppose further the columns of $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ span the column space of \mathbf{A} , and the columns of $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ span the row space of \mathbf{A} . Show that the matrix \mathbf{A} admits the factorization $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{C}^\top$, where \mathbf{E} is an r by r nonsingular matrix.
3. Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with rank r , and consider the $(2n) \times (2n)$ symmetric matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Suppose \mathbf{A} admits the full SVD $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$.

- Show that σ_k is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} corresponding with the eigenvector $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_k \\ \mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix}$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and that $-\sigma_k$ is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} corresponding with the eigenvector $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_k \\ -\mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix}$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.
 - Show that the $2n$ eigenvectors are pairwise orthogonal.
4. Given a rectangular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r , and consider the $(m+n) \times (m+n)$ symmetric matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A}^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Suppose \mathbf{A} admits the full SVD $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$.

- Show that σ_k is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} corresponding with the eigenvector $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_k \\ \mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix}$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, and that $-\sigma_k$ is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} corresponding with the eigenvector $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_k \\ -\mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix}$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$.
- Show that the remaining $m+n-2r$ eigenvectors of \mathbf{B} are corresponding to the eigenvalue 0.

- Show that the $m + n$ eigenvectors are pairwise orthogonal.
5. Given two nonzero vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top$. Show that the nonzero singular value of \mathbf{A} is $\|\mathbf{u}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|$.
 6. Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with singular values $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n$. Show that $\sigma_1^3, \sigma_2^3, \dots, \sigma_n^3$ are the singular values of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A}$.
 7. Given a rectangular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and let $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{m} \times \hat{n}}$ be the submatrix of \mathbf{A} , where $\hat{m} \leq m$ and $\hat{n} \leq n$. Show that the largest singular value of \mathbf{B} is not greater than the largest singular value of \mathbf{A} .
 8. Given a positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that the singular values and the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} are the same.
 9. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a positive definite matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, prove that the singular values of $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$ and \mathbf{A} are the same. And also discuss the relationship between the left and right singular vectors of $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$ and \mathbf{A} .
 10. We have shown in Lemma 14.8 that orthogonal equivalent matrices have the same singular values. Prove the reverse implication that if two matrices have the same singular values, then they are orthogonal equivalent.
 11. We only discuss the SVD of real matrices in this chapter: $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$. Show that if \mathbf{A} is real, then \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are real.
 12. Given a Householder transformation matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I} - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$, determine the eigenvalues, determinant, and singular values of the Householder transformation matrix.
 13. Given the nonzero singular values $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_r$ of \mathbf{A} , discuss the singular values of \mathbf{A}^\top , $\gamma\mathbf{A}$ with $\gamma > 0$, and \mathbf{A}^{-1} with \mathbf{A} being nonsingular.
 14. Given a square and real matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if \mathbf{A} has only zero eigenvalues.
 15. Given a square matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that $\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$ are similar (Definition 8.2, p. 111). *Hint: proceeding with the SVD of \mathbf{A} .*
 16. Show that all eigenvalues of a square matrix are less than or equal to the maximal singular value σ_1 .
 17. Suppose \mathbf{x} is an eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A}$ corresponding to a nonzero eigenvalue, discuss the eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top$. *Hint: pre-multiply by \mathbf{A} .*
 18. Given the SVD of a nonsingular square matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, find the singular values of $\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A}$.
 19. Find the optimal rank-1 approximation in terms of the spectral norm for the following matrix:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

20. **Skew-symmetric.** Given a skew-symmetric and tridiagonal matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, show that it admits the decomposition

$$\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B}^\top \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $n = 2m$, and \mathbf{P} is a permutation. Given further the SVD of $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, find the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of \mathbf{S} .

Part VI

Special Topics

15

Transformation in Matrix Decomposition

Contents

15.1	An Overview of Matrix Multiplication	193
15.2	Eigenvalue Decomposition	193
15.3	Spectral Decomposition	194
15.4	SVD	195
15.5	Polar Decomposition	196
Chapter 15	Problems	197



We consider a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with elements $\mathbf{v} = [3, 7, 2]^\top$. However, it is essential to clarify the significance of these values: In the Cartesian coordinate system, they represent a component of 3 along the x -axis, a component of 7 along the y -axis, and a component of 2 along the z -axis. Matrix multiplication, on the other hand, gains significance when applied in high-dimensional spaces.

15.1. An Overview of Matrix Multiplication

Coordinate defined by a nonsingular matrix. Suppose we have a 3×3 nonsingular matrix \mathbf{B} , which is invertible and possesses linearly independent columns. Consequently, the three columns of \mathbf{B} collectively establish a basis for the \mathbb{R}^3 space. Taking a step further, these three columns of \mathbf{B} can be viewed as the basis for a **new coordinate system**, referred to as the **B coordinate system**.

Returning to the Cartesian coordinate system, we also have a set of three vectors forming a basis, denoted by $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$. If we arrange these three vectors as columns in a matrix, this matrix will be an identity matrix. Therefore, when we multiply a vector \mathbf{v} by the identity matrix, denoted by $\mathbf{I}\mathbf{v}$, we are essentially performing a coordinate transformation that leaves \mathbf{v} in the same coordinate system. In other words, $\mathbf{I}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ means **transferring \mathbf{v} from the Cartesian coordinate system into the Cartesian coordinate system**, the same coordinate.

Similarly, when we multiply a vector \mathbf{v} by the matrix \mathbf{B} , denoted by $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}$, we are **transforming \mathbf{v} from the Cartesian coordinate system into the B coordinate system**. To illustrate this with a specific example, consider $\mathbf{v} = [3, 7, 2]^\top$ and $\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3]$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{v} = 3\mathbf{b}_1 + 7\mathbf{b}_2 + 2\mathbf{b}_3$, i.e., vector \mathbf{u} contains 3 of the first basis \mathbf{b}_1 of \mathbf{B} , 7 of the second basis \mathbf{b}_2 of \mathbf{B} , and 2 of the third basis \mathbf{b}_3 of \mathbf{B} . Now, if we wish to transform the vector \mathbf{u} from the B coordinate system back to the Cartesian coordinate system, we can achieve this by multiplying \mathbf{u} by the inverse of \mathbf{B} , denoted by \mathbf{B}^{-1} . This operation results in $\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$.

Coordinate defined by an orthogonal matrix. A 3×3 orthogonal matrix \mathbf{Q} defines a “better” coordinate system since its three columns, forming the basis, are orthonormal to each other (same as those in the Cartesian coordinate system). The operation $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}$ facilitates the transition of \mathbf{v} from the Cartesian coordinate system to the one defined by the orthogonal matrix. Since the basis vectors from the orthogonal matrix exhibit orthonormality, just like the three vectors $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$ in the Cartesian coordinate system, the transformation induced by the orthogonal matrix involves rotating or reflecting the Cartesian system. To revert to the Cartesian coordinate system, one can utilize $\mathbf{Q}^{-1} = \mathbf{Q}^\top$.

15.2. Eigenvalue Decomposition

A square matrix \mathbf{A} with linearly independent eigenvectors can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}$, where \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{X}^{-1} are nonsingular so that they define a system transformation inherently. The operation $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{u}$ firstly transfers \mathbf{u} into the coordinate system defined by \mathbf{X}^{-1} , which we shall refer to as the **eigen coordinate system**. Subsequently, the operation $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\cdot)$ stretches each component of the vector in the eigen system by the length of the eigenvalue. And then \mathbf{X} facilitates the transformation of the resultant vector back to the




Figure 15.1: Eigenvalue Decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{X}^{-1}$: \mathbf{X}^{-1} undergoes a transformation into a different coordinate system, followed by stretching with $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, and then transforming back with \mathbf{X} . \mathbf{X}^{-1} and \mathbf{X} are nonsingular, which will change the basis of the system, and the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 will **not** be preserved. In other words, the angle between \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 is **different** from the angle between \mathbf{v}'_1 and \mathbf{v}'_2 . The lengths of \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are also **not** preserved, that is, $\|\mathbf{v}_1\| \neq \|\mathbf{v}'_1\|$ and $\|\mathbf{v}_2\| \neq \|\mathbf{v}'_2\|$.

Cartesian coordinate system. A visual representation of the coordinate system transformation via eigenvalue decomposition is presented in Figure 15.1, where \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 are two linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} such that they form a basis for \mathbb{R}^2 .




Figure 15.2: Spectral Decomposition $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$: \mathbf{Q}^\top rotates or reflects, $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ stretches the circle to an ellipse, and \mathbf{Q} rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{Q}^\top and \mathbf{Q} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 , and their lengths.

15.3. Spectral Decomposition

A symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, where \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{Q}^\top are orthogonal matrices so that they define a coordinate system transformation inherently as well. The operation $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{Q}^\top\mathbf{u}$ firstly rotates or reflects \mathbf{u} into the coordinate system defined by \mathbf{Q}^\top , which we shall refer to as the **spectral coordinate system**. The operation $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\cdot)$ stretches each component of the vector in the spectral system by the length of the corre-

sponding eigenvalue. Subsequently, \mathbf{Q} facilitates the rotation or reflection of the resultant vector back to the original coordinate system. A demonstration of how the spectral decomposition transforms between coordinate systems in \mathbb{R}^2 space is shown in Figure 15.2, where \mathbf{q}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 represent two linearly independent eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} such that they form a basis for \mathbb{R}^2 . The coordinate transformation in the spectral decomposition is similar to that in the eigenvalue decomposition, with the distinction that in spectral decomposition, orthogonal vectors transformed by \mathbf{Q}^\top remain orthogonal. This is also a property of orthogonal matrices. That is, orthogonal matrices can be viewed as matrices, which change the basis of other matrices. In the meantime, they preserve the angle (inner product) between the vectors:

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{u})^\top (\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}).$$

The aforementioned invariance of the angle between vectors also relies on the invariance of their lengths:

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{u}\|.$$

15.4. SVD




Figure 15.3: SVD $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$: \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{U} rotate or reflect, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ stretches the circle to an ellipse. Orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{U} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 , and their lengths.

Any $m \times n$ matrix with rank r can be factored as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, which represents the SVD. The operation $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{u}$ then firstly rotates or reflects vector \mathbf{u} into the system defined by \mathbf{V}^\top , which we refer to as the **\mathbf{V} coordinate system**. $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ stretches the first r components of the resulting vector in the \mathbf{V} system by the lengths of the singular values. If $n \geq m$, then $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ only keeps additional $m - r$ components, which are scaled to zero while removing the final $n - m$ components. If $m > n$, then $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ scales $n - r$ components to zero, and also adds additional $m - n$ zero components. Finally, \mathbf{U} rotates or reflects the resulting vector into the **\mathbf{U} coordinate system** defined by \mathbf{U} . A visual demonstration of how the SVD transforms by a 2×2 example is shown in Figure 15.3. Further, Figure 15.4 demonstrates the transformation of $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$ in a 2×2 example. Similar to the spectral decomposition, orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{U} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve the angle between vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 .




Figure 15.4: $V\Sigma V^T$ from SVD or Polar decomposition: V^T rotates or reflects, Σ stretches the circle to an ellipse, and V rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices V^T and V only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors v_1 and v_2 , and their lengths.




Figure 15.5: Polar decomposition $A = Q_l S$: V^T rotates or reflects, Σ stretches the circle to an ellipse, and V rotates or reflects back. Orthogonal matrices V^T , V , and Q_l only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve both the angle between the vectors v_1 and v_2 , and their lengths.

15.5. Polar Decomposition

Any square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ can be factored as the left polar decomposition $A = (UV^T)(V\Sigma V^T) = Q_l S$. Similarly, the operation $Au = Q_l(V\Sigma V^T)u$ transforms u into

the system defined by \mathbf{V}^\top , and stretch each component by the lengths of the singular values. Subsequently, the resulting vector is transferred back into the Cartesian coordinate system by \mathbf{V} . Finally, \mathbf{Q}_l will rotate or reflect the resulting vector from the Cartesian coordinate system into the Q system defined by \mathbf{Q}_l . The right polar decomposition carries a similar interpretation. Similar to the spectral decomposition, orthogonal matrices \mathbf{V}^\top and \mathbf{V} only change the basis of the system. However, they preserve the angle between the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 .

Chapter 15 Problems

1. Is there any coordinate transformation in the QR or LQ decomposition?
2. Given the SVD of the matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ -1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top.$$

Illustrate the coordinate transformation of this decomposition in a two-dimensional figure.

16

Alternating Least Squares (ALS)

Contents

16.1	Preliminary: Least Squares Approximations	199
16.2	Netflix Recommender and Matrix Factorization	202
16.3	Regularization: Extension to General Matrices	207
16.4	Missing Entries and Rank-One Update	208
16.5	Vector Inner Product	210
16.6	Gradient Descent	211
16.7	Regularization: A Geometrical Interpretation	214
16.8	Stochastic Gradient Descent	216
16.9	Bias Term	218
16.10	Movie Recommender	220
	Chapter 16 Problems	223

16.1. Preliminary: Least Squares Approximations



The linear model is the primary technique employed in regression problems, with the least squares approximation serving as the fundamental tool for minimizing the sum of squared errors. This choice is natural when seeking the regression function that minimizes the corresponding expected squared error. In recent decades, linear models have found wide-ranging applications, including decision making (Dawes and Corrigan, 1974), time series (Christensen, 1991; Lu, 2017), quantitative finance (Menchero et al., 2011), and various fields of study such as production science, social science, and soil science (Fox, 1997; Lane, 2002; Schaeffer, 2004; Mrode, 2014).

To be more specific, let's consider the overdetermined system $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ represents the input data matrix, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the observation vector (or target vector), and the number of samples m exceeds the dimensionality n . The vector \mathbf{x} denotes weights for the linear model. Typically, \mathbf{A} will have full column rank since real-world data is often uncorrelated or becomes uncorrelated after post-processing. In practice, a bias term is introduced in the first column of \mathbf{A} to enable the least squares method to find the solution for:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{A}] \begin{bmatrix} x_0 \\ \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{b}. \quad (16.1)$$

On the other hand, it often happens that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ has no solution (the system is *inconsistent*). This typically occurs when there are too many equations, indicating the matrix has more rows than columns. Define the column space of \mathbf{A} as $\{\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\gamma} : \forall \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$, denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})$. In essence, when we say $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ has no solution, it implies that \mathbf{b} lies outside the column space of \mathbf{A} . In other words, the error $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ cannot be reduced to zero. When the error \mathbf{e} is minimized in terms of the mean squared error, \mathbf{x}_{LS} becomes a least squares solution, i.e., $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{LS}\|^2$ is minimized. The method of least squares stands as one of the most powerful tools in mathematical sciences. Numerous dedicated books cover this topic, and interested readers are encouraged to consult works by Trefethen and Bau III (1997); Strang (2019, 2021); Lu (2022a).

Least squares by calculus. When $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$ is differentiable, and the parameter space of \mathbf{x} covers the entire space \mathbb{R}^n ¹, the least squares estimator corresponds to the root of $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$. This leads us to the following lemma.

Lemma 16.1: (Least Squares by Calculus) Assume the data matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is fixed and has full rank (i.e., the columns of \mathbf{A} are linearly independent) with $m \geq n$. Considering the overdetermined system $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$, the least squares solution, obtained by employing calculus and setting the derivative in every direction of $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$ to be zero (i.e., the gradient is a zero vector), is $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$ ^a. The value, $\mathbf{x}_{LS} =$

1. In other words, the *domain* of the optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$ is the entire space \mathbb{R}^n .

$(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$, is commonly referred to as the *ordinary least squares (OLS)* estimator or simply the *least squares (LS)* estimator of \mathbf{x} .

a. This is known as the *first-order optimality condition* for local optima points. Note the proof of the first-order optimality condition for multivariate functions strongly relies on the first-order optimality conditions for one-dimensional functions, which is also known as the *Fermat's theorem*. See (Lu, 2021c).

To prove the aforementioned lemma, we must establish the invertibility of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$. Since we assume \mathbf{A} has full rank and $m \geq n$, $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is invertible if it has a rank of n , which is equivalent to the rank of \mathbf{A} (as verified in Lemma 14.3, p. 174). Extending this insight to \mathbf{A}^\top , we can similarly prove that $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top$ and \mathbf{A} share the same rank. This result leads to the ordinary least squares estimator, expressed as follows.

Proof [of Lemma 16.1] Recalling from calculus that a minimum of a function $f(\mathbf{x})$ occurs at a value \mathbf{x}_{LS} , where the gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$. The gradient of $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$ is given by $2\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - 2\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$. $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is invertible since we assume \mathbf{A} is fixed and has full rank with $m \geq n$ (Lemma 14.3, p. 174). So the OLS solution for \mathbf{x} is $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$, which completes the proof. ■

Definition 16.1 (Normal Equation) The condition for the gradient of $\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$ to be zero can be expressed as $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$. The equation is also known as the **normal equation**. Under the assumption that \mathbf{A} has full rank with $m \geq n$, it follows that $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ is invertible, implying $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b}$.




Figure 16.1: Three functions.

However, it is not certain whether the least squares estimator obtained in Lemma 16.1 is the smallest or largest achievable estimator, or neither. An example illustrating this ambiguity is presented in Figure 16.1. What we can assert with confidence is the existence of at least one root for the function $f(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|^2$. The following remark can provide clarification on this matter.

Remark 16.2: Verification of Least Squares Solution

Why does the zero gradient imply the least mean squared error? The typical explanation arises from convex analysis, as we will see shortly. Here, we directly confirm that the

OLS solution indeed minimizes the mean squared error. For any $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}_{LS}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS} + \mathbf{Ax}_{LS} - \mathbf{Ax}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS} + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x})\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x}))^\top (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS}) \\ &= \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x})\|^2 + 2(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{Ax}_{LS}),\end{aligned}$$

where the third term is zero as a result of the normal equation, and $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_{LS} - \mathbf{x})\|^2 \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}\|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ax}_{LS}\|^2.$$

Thus, we demonstrate that the OLS estimator indeed corresponds to the minimum, rather than the maximum or a saddle point, using the calculus approach. As a matter of fact, this condition from the least squares estimator is also known as the *sufficiency of stationarity under convexity*. When \mathbf{x} is defined over the entire space \mathbb{R}^n , this condition is also known as the *necessity of stationarity under convexity*.

Another question that arises is: why does this normal equation magically yield solutions for \mathbf{x} ? A simple example can shed light on the answer. The equation $x^2 = -1$ has no real solution. But $x \cdot x^2 = x \cdot (-1)$ has a real solution $\hat{x} = 0$, in which case \hat{x} minimizes the difference between x^2 and -1 as much as possible.

Example 16.1 (Changing the Solution Set by Left Multiplication) Consider the following data matrix and target vector

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -4 \\ 4 & 6 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be easily verified that $\mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b}$ has no solution for \mathbf{x} . However, if we multiply on the left by

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 & -4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have $\mathbf{x}_{LS} = [1/2, -1/2]^\top$ as the solution to $\mathbf{BAx} = \mathbf{Bb}$. This specific example illustrates why the normal equation can yield the least squares solution. Multiplying on the left of a linear system will change the solution set. \square

Rank-Deficiency

Note here, we assume $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has full rank with $m \geq n$ to make $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ invertible. However, when two or more columns of \mathbf{A} are perfectly correlated, the matrix \mathbf{A} becomes deficient and $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ becomes singular. To address this issue, one can choose \mathbf{x} that minimizes $\mathbf{x}_{LS}^\top \mathbf{x}_{LS}$ in accordance with the normal equation. That is, we select least squares solution with the smallest magnitude. However, this is not the main focus of the text, and we leave it for readers to explore further. In Section 14.5 (p. 180), we

briefly discuss how to use UTV decomposition and SVD to address the rank-deficient least squares problem.

16.2. Netflix Recommender and Matrix Factorization

In the Netflix Prize competition (Bennett et al., 2007), the objective is to predict the ratings of users for various movies based on their existing ratings for other movies. We index M movies with $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ and N users by $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$. We denote the rating of the n -th user for the m -th movie by a_{mn} . Let \mathbf{A} be an $M \times N$ rating matrix with columns $\mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^M$ containing ratings provided by the n -th user. Note that many ratings $\{a_{mn}\}$ are missing, and our objective is to accurately predict these missing ratings.

We formally consider algorithms for solving the following problem: factorizing the matrix \mathbf{A} into an $M \times K$ matrix \mathbf{W} and a $K \times N$ matrix \mathbf{Z} to achieve an approximate representation. Usually, K is chosen to be smaller than both M and N , ensuring that \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} are smaller than the original matrix \mathbf{A} . This reduction in dimensionality results in a compressed version of the original data matrix. An appropriate choice for the value of K is crucial in practice; but the choice of K is very often problem-dependent. The factorization is significant in the sense; suppose $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_N]$ and $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{Z} , respectively. Then $\mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{z}_n$, meaning each column \mathbf{a}_n is approximated by a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{W} , weighted by the components in \mathbf{z}_n . Therefore, the columns of \mathbf{W} can be considered as containing the column basis of \mathbf{A} . This concept is similar to the factorization methods discussed in the data interpretation part (Part III, p. 88). What sets this approach apart is that we do not constrain \mathbf{W} to consist of exact columns from \mathbf{A} .

To achieve the approximation $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$, we need to define a loss function that measures the distance between \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$. In our discussion, the selected loss function is the Frobenius norm (Definition 14.4, p. 188) between two matrices, which vanishes to zero if $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$, and the benefits of this choice will become apparent shortly.

To simplify the problem, let's first assume that there are no missing ratings. Project data vectors $\mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^M$ into a lower dimension $\mathbf{z}_n \in \mathbb{R}^K$ with $K < \min\{M, N\}$ in a way that the *reconstruction error* as measured by the Frobenius norm is minimized (assume K is known):

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2, \quad (16.2)$$

where $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}_1^\top; \mathbf{w}_2^\top; \dots; \mathbf{w}_M^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$ and $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ containing \mathbf{w}_m 's and \mathbf{z}_n 's as **rows** and **columns**, respectively. The loss formulation in Equation (16.2) is termed the *per-example loss*. It can be equivalently expressed as

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2 = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2.$$

Moreover, the loss function $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M (a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n)$ is convex with respect to \mathbf{Z} given \mathbf{W} , and vice versa. This enables a two-step optimization approach: initially

minimizing it with respect to \mathbf{Z} while keeping \mathbf{W} fixed (ALS1), followed by minimizing it with respect to \mathbf{W} with \mathbf{Z} fixed (ALS2):

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}); & (\text{ALS1}) \\ \mathbf{W} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{W}} L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}). & (\text{ALS2}) \end{cases}$$

This strategy defines the *coordinate descent algorithm*, alternately optimizing least squares with respect to \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} , and is known as the *alternating least squares (ALS)* algorithm (Comon et al., 2009; Takács and Tikk, 2012; Giampouras et al., 2018). The convergence is assured if the loss function $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$ decreases at each iteration, a topic we will delve into further in the sequel.

Remark 16.3: Convexity and Global Minimum

While the loss function defined by Frobenius norm $\|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2$ exhibits convexity concerning either \mathbf{W} when \mathbf{Z} is fixed or vice versa, it lacks jointly convexity in both variables simultaneously. Consequently, identifying the global minimum is infeasible. Nonetheless, the convergence is guaranteed to find local minima.

Given \mathbf{W} , optimizing \mathbf{Z} . Now, let's examine the problem of $\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$. When there exists a unique minimum of the loss function $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$ with respect to \mathbf{Z} , we refer to it as the *least squares* minimizer of $\arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$. Given \mathbf{W} fixed, $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$ can be represented as $L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$ (or more compactly, as $L(\mathbf{Z})$) to emphasize the variable of \mathbf{Z} :

$$L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{W}[z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N] - [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_N]\|^2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}z_1 - \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{W}z_2 - \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{W}z_N - \mathbf{a}_N \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2. \quad 2$$

Now, if we define

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{W} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times KN}, \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{z}} = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \vdots \\ z_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{KN}, \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{a}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN},$$

then the (ALS1) problem can be reduced to the ordinary least squares problem for minimizing $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{a}}\|^2$ with respect to $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}$. And the solution is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} = (\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}})^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{a}}.$$

2. The matrix norm employed in this context is the Frobenius norm (Definition 14.4, p. 188). It is defined as $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij})^2}$ for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. And the vector norm used here is the ℓ_2 -norm, given by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$ if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

However, it is not advisable to obtain the result using this approach, as computing the inverse of $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ requires $2(KN)^3$ flops (Lu, 2021c). Alternatively, a more direct approach to solving the problem of (ALS1) is to find the gradient of $L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$ with respect to \mathbf{Z} (suppose all the partial derivatives of this function exist):

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) &= \frac{\partial \operatorname{tr}((\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})^\top)}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \\ &= \frac{\partial \operatorname{tr}((\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})^\top)}{\partial(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})} \frac{\partial(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} 2\mathbf{W}^\top(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N},\end{aligned}\tag{16.3}$$

where the first equality arises from the definition of the Frobenius norm (Definition 14.4, p. 188) such that $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij})^2} = \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)}$, and equality $(*)$ is a consequence of the fact that $\frac{\partial \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\top)}{\partial \mathbf{A}} = 2\mathbf{A}$. When the loss function is a differentiable function of \mathbf{Z} , we can determine the least squares solution using differential calculus. And a minimum of the function $L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$ must be a root of the equation:

$$\nabla L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{0}.$$

By finding the root of the equation above, we obtain the “candidate” update for \mathbf{Z} that finds the minimizer of $L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$:

$$\boxed{\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}).}\tag{16.4}$$

This takes $2K^3$ flops to compute the inverse of $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W}$ as compared to $2(KN)^3$ flops to get the inverse of $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ (Lu, 2021c). Before we declare a root of the equation above is actually a minimizer rather than a maximizer (that’s why we call the update a “candidate” update), we need to verify the function is convex. In the case where the function is twice differentiable, this verification can be equivalently achieved by confirming:

$$\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) > 0. \quad \textcolor{blue}{3}$$

That is, the Hessian matrix is positive definite (recall the definition of positive definiteness, Definition 2.1, p. 29; see Beck (2014)). To see this, we explicitly express the Hessian matrix as

$$\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) = 2\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{KN \times KN},\tag{16.5}$$

which has full rank if $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$ has full rank and $K < M$ (Lemma 14.3, p. 174).

3. In short, a twice continuously differentiable function f over an open convex set \mathbb{S} is called *convex* if and only if $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}$ (sufficient and necessary for convex); and called *strictly convex* if $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) > \mathbf{0}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}$ (only sufficient for strictly convex, e.g., $f(x) = x^6$ is strictly convex, but $f''(x) = 30x^4$ is equal to zero at $x = 0$). And when the convex function f is a continuously differentiable function over a convex set \mathbb{S} , the stationary point $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}$ of $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{S}$ is a *global minimizer* of f over \mathbb{S} . In our context, when given \mathbf{W} and updating \mathbf{Z} , the function is defined over the entire space $\mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$.

Remark 16.4: Positive Definite Hessian if W Has Full Rank

We claim that if $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$ has full rank K with $K < M$, then $\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$ is positive definite. This can be demonstrated by confirming that when \mathbf{W} has full rank, the equation $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ only holds true when $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, since the null space of \mathbf{W} is of dimension 0. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{x}^\top (2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{x} > 0, \quad \text{for any nonzero vector } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^K.$$

Now, the problem becomes that we need to verify **whether W has full rank so that the Hessian of $L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$ is positive definite**; otherwise, we cannot claim the update of \mathbf{Z} in Equation (16.4) reduces the loss (due to convexity) so that the matrix decomposition progressively improves the approximation of the original matrix \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$ in each iteration. We will shortly come back to the positive definiteness of the Hessian matrix in the sequel, relying on the following lemma.

Lemma 16.5: (Rank of \mathbf{Z} after Updating) Suppose $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ has full rank with $M \leq N$ and $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$ has full rank with $K < M$ (i.e., $K < M \leq N$), then the update of $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ in Equation (16.4) has full rank.

Proof [of Lemma 16.5] Since $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ has full rank if \mathbf{W} has full rank (Lemma 14.3, p. 174), it follows that $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1}$ has full rank.

Suppose $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, this implies that $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, the following two null spaces satisfy:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{W}^\top) \subseteq \mathcal{N}\left((\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top\right).$$

Moreover, suppose \mathbf{x} is in the null space of $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top$ such that $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. And since $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1}$ is invertible, this implies $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$\mathcal{N}\left((\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top\right) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{W}^\top).$$

As a result, by “sandwiching”, it follows that

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{W}^\top) = \mathcal{N}\left((\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top\right). \quad (16.6)$$

Therefore, $(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top$ has full rank K . Let $\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times M}$, and suppose $\mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. This implies $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{T}^\top) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top).$$

Similarly, suppose $\mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$. Since \mathbf{A} has full rank with the dimension of the null space being 0: $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = 0$, $(\mathbf{T}^\top \mathbf{x})$ must be zero. The claim follows since \mathbf{A} has full rank M with the row space of \mathbf{A}^\top being equal to the column space of \mathbf{A} , where $\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = M$ and the $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top)) = M - \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) = 0$. Therefore, \mathbf{x} is in the null space of \mathbf{T}^\top if \mathbf{x} is in the null space of $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top$:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{T}^\top).$$

By “sandwiching” again,

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{T}^\top) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top). \quad (16.7)$$

Since \mathbf{T}^\top has full rank $K < M \leq N$, it follows that $\dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{T}^\top)) = \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top)) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathbf{Z}^\top = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{T}^\top$ has full rank K . We complete the proof. ■

Given \mathbf{Z} , optimizing \mathbf{W} . Given \mathbf{Z} fixed, $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$ can be expressed as $L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z})$ (or more compactly, as $L(\mathbf{W})$) to emphasize the variable of \mathbf{W} :

$$L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2.$$

A direct approach to solve the optimization of (ALS2) is to find the gradient of $L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z})$ with respect to \mathbf{W} :

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) &= \frac{\partial \operatorname{tr}((\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})^\top)}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \\ &= \frac{\partial \operatorname{tr}((\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})^\top)}{\partial(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})} \frac{\partial(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \\ &= 2(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{Z}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the “candidate” update for \mathbf{W} can be obtained by locating the root of the gradient $\nabla L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z})$:

$$\boxed{\mathbf{W}^\top = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{W}} L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}).} \quad (16.8)$$

Once more, we emphasize that the update is merely a “candidate” update. Further verification is required to determine whether the Hessian is positive definite or not. The Hessian matrix is expressed as follows:

$$\nabla^2 L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) = 2\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{KM \times KM}. \quad (16.9)$$

Therefore, by analogous analysis, if \mathbf{Z} has full rank with $K < N$, the Hessian matrix is positive definite.

Lemma 16.6: (Rank of \mathbf{W} after Updating) Suppose $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ has full rank with $M \geq N$ and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ has full rank with $K < N$ (i.e., $K < N \leq M$), then the update of $\mathbf{W}^\top = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}^\top$ in Equation (16.8) has full rank.

The proof of Lemma 16.6 is similar to that of Lemma 16.5, and we shall not repeat the details.

Key observation. Combine the observations in Lemma 16.5 and Lemma 16.6, as long as we initialize \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{W} to have full rank, the updates in Equation (16.4) and Equation (16.8) are reasonable since the Hessians in Equation (16.5) and (16.9) are positive definite. Note that we need an additional condition to satisfy both Lemma 16.5 and Lemma 16.6: $M = N$, i.e., there must be an equal number of movies and users.

We will relax this condition in the next section through regularization. We summarize the process in Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 5 Alternating Least Squares

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ with $M = N$;
 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ with full rank and $K < M = N$;
 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
 3: Choose the maximal number of iterations C ;
 4: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
 5: **while** $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}\| > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
 6: $iter = iter + 1$;
 7: $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$;
 8: $\mathbf{W}^\top = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{W}} L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z})$;
 9: **end while**
 10: Output \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z} ;

16.3. Regularization: Extension to General Matrices

Regularization is a machine learning technique utilized to mitigate overfitting and enhance model generalization. Overfitting occurs when a model is overly complex, fitting the training data too closely but performing poorly on unseen data. Regularization introduces a constraint or penalty term into the loss function used for model optimization, discouraging the development of overly complex models. This introduces a trade-off between having a simple, generalizable model and fitting the training data well. Common regularization types include ℓ_1 regularization, ℓ_2 regularization, and elastic net regularization (a combination of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 regularization). Regularization is widely employed in machine learning algorithms such as linear regression, logistic regression, and neural networks.

In the alternating least squares problem, incorporating an ℓ_2 regularization term aims to minimize the following loss:

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2, \quad \lambda_w > 0, \lambda_z > 0, \quad (16.10)$$

where the gradient with respect to \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{W} are given respectively by

$$\begin{cases} \nabla L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) = 2\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}) + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}; \\ \nabla L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) = 2(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{Z}^\top + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}. \end{cases} \quad (16.11)$$

The Hessian matrices are given respectively by

$$\begin{cases} \nabla^2 L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W}) = 2\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{KN \times KN}; \\ \nabla^2 L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) = 2\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{KM \times KM}, \end{cases}$$

which are positive definite due to the regularization-induced perturbation. This can be justified by observing that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}^\top (2\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x} = \underbrace{2\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{x}}_{\geq 0} + 2\lambda_z \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 > 0, & \text{for nonzero } \mathbf{x}; \\ \mathbf{x}^\top (2\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}} \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x} = \underbrace{2\mathbf{x}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}} \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathbf{x}}_{\geq 0} + 2\lambda_w \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 > 0, & \text{for nonzero } \mathbf{x}. \end{cases}$$

The regularization ensures that the Hessian matrices become positive definite, even if \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} are rank-deficient. Consequently, matrix decomposition can be extended to any matrix, irrespective of whether $M > N$ or $M < N$. In certain instances, K can be selected as $K > \max\{M, N\}$ to obtain a *high-rank approximation* of \mathbf{A} . However, in most scenarios, the objective is to find the *low-rank approximation* of \mathbf{A} with $K < \min\{M, N\}$. For example, the ALS can be employed to find the low-rank neural networks, reducing the memory usage of the neural networks while improving performance (Lu, 2021c). Therefore, the minimizers can be determined by identifying the roots of the gradient:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A}; \\ \mathbf{W}^\top = (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}^\top. \end{cases} \quad (16.12)$$

The regularization parameters $\lambda_z, \lambda_w \in \mathbb{R}$ are used to balance the trade-off between the accuracy of the approximation and the smoothness of the computed solution. The selection of these parameters is typically problem-dependent and can be obtained through *cross-validation*. Again, we summarize the process in Algorithm 6.

Algorithm 6 Alternating Least Squares with Regularization

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$;

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ randomly without condition on the rank and the relationship between M, N, K ;
 - 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
 - 3: Choose regularization parameters λ_w, λ_z ;
 - 4: Choose the maximal number of iterations C ;
 - 5: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
 - 6: **while** $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}\| > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
 - 7: $iter = iter + 1$;
 - 8: $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{Z}} L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})$;
 - 9: $\mathbf{W}^\top = (\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{W}} L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z})$;
 - 10: **end while**
 - 11: Output \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z} ;
-

16.4. Missing Entries and Rank-One Update

Given the widespread application of matrix decomposition via ALS in the context of Netflix recommender data, it is pertinent to consider scenarios where a significant number of entries are missing. This occurs when users have not watched specific movies or have chosen not

to rate them for various reasons. To address this, we can incorporate an additional mask matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, where $m_{mn} \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes whether the user n has rated the movie m or not. Consequently, the loss function can be defined as

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{M} \circledast \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{M} \circledast (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z})\|^2,$$

where \circledast represents the *Hadamard product* between matrices. For example, the Hadamard product of a 3×3 matrix \mathbf{A} and a 3×3 matrix \mathbf{B} is

$$\mathbf{A} \circledast \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} \circledast \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}b_{11} & a_{12}b_{12} & a_{13}b_{13} \\ a_{21}b_{21} & a_{22}b_{22} & a_{23}b_{23} \\ a_{31}b_{31} & a_{32}b_{32} & a_{33}b_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

To find the solution of the problem, we decompose the updates in Equation (16.12) into:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_n = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{a}_n, & \text{for } n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}; \\ \mathbf{w}_m = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{b}_m, & \text{for } m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}, \end{cases} \quad (16.13)$$

where $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N]$ and $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_N]$ represent the column partitions of \mathbf{Z} and \mathbf{A} , respectively. Similarly, $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$ and $\mathbf{A}^\top = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_M]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{W}^\top and \mathbf{A}^\top , respectively. This decomposition of the updates indicates the updates can be executed in a column-by-column manner (the rank-one update).

Given \mathbf{W} . Let $\mathbf{o}_n \in \mathbb{R}^M$ represent the movies rated by user n , where $o_{nm} = 1$ if user n has rated movie m , and $o_{nm} = 0$ otherwise. Then the n -th column of \mathbf{A} without missing entries can be denoted using the Matlab-style notation as $\mathbf{a}_n[\mathbf{o}_n]$. And we want to approximate the existing entries of the n -th column by $\mathbf{a}_n[\mathbf{o}_n] \approx \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :] \mathbf{z}_n$, which constitutes a rank-one least squares problem:

$$\mathbf{z}_n = \left(\mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :]^\top \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :] + \lambda_z \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :]^\top \mathbf{a}_n[\mathbf{o}_n], \quad \text{for } n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}. \quad (16.14)$$

Moreover, the loss function with respect to \mathbf{z}_n can be described by

$$L(\mathbf{z}_n | \mathbf{W}) = \sum_{m \in \mathbf{o}_n} \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2$$

and if we are concerned about the loss for all users:

$$L(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{W}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m \in \mathbf{o}_n} \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2.$$

Given \mathbf{Z} . Similarly, if $\mathbf{p}_m \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denotes the users who have rated movie m , with $p_{mn} = 1$ if the movie m has been rated by user n , and $p_{mn} = 0$ otherwise. Then the m -th row of \mathbf{A} without missing entries can be denoted by the Matlab-style notation as $\mathbf{b}_m[\mathbf{p}_m]$. And we want to approximate the existing entries of the m -th row by $\mathbf{b}_m[\mathbf{p}_m] \approx \mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m]^\top \mathbf{w}_m$,⁴ which is a rank-one least squares problem again:

$$\mathbf{w}_m = (\mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m] \mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m]^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m] \mathbf{b}_m[\mathbf{p}_m], \quad \text{for } m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}. \quad (16.15)$$

4. Note that $\mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m]^\top$ is the transpose of $\mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m]$, which is equal to $\mathbf{Z}^\top[\mathbf{p}_m, :]$, i.e., transposing first and then selecting.

Moreover, the loss function with respect to \mathbf{w}_n can be described by

$$L(\mathbf{w}_n|\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{p}_m} \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2$$

and if we are concerned about the loss for all users:

$$L(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{n \in \mathbf{p}_m} \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2.$$

The procedure is once again presented in Algorithm 7.

Algorithm 7 Alternating Least Squares with Missing Entries and Regularization

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$;

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ randomly without condition on the rank and the relationship between M, N, K ;
 - 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
 - 3: Choose regularization parameters λ_w, λ_z ;
 - 4: Compute the mask matrix \mathbf{M} from \mathbf{A} ;
 - 5: Choose the maximal number of iterations C ;
 - 6: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
 - 7: **while** $\|\mathbf{M} \circledast \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{M} \circledast (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z})\|^2 > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
 - 8: $iter = iter + 1$;
 - 9: **for** $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 10: $\mathbf{z}_n = (\mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :]^\top \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :] + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{W}[\mathbf{o}_n, :]^\top \mathbf{a}_n[\mathbf{o}_n]$; ▷ n -th column of \mathbf{Z}
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ **do**
 - 13: $\mathbf{w}_m = (\mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m] \mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m]^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[:, \mathbf{p}_m] \mathbf{b}_m[\mathbf{p}_m]$; ▷ m -th column of \mathbf{W}^\top
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end while**
 - 16: Output $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$, $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N]$;
-

16.5. Vector Inner Product

We have observed that the ALS algorithm seeks to find matrices \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} such that their product $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$ can approximate $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$ in terms of squared loss:

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2,$$

that is, each entry a_{mn} in \mathbf{A} can be approximated as the inner product of two vectors $\mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n$. The geometric definition of the vector inner product is given by

$$\mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n = \|\mathbf{w}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{z}\| \cos \theta,$$

where θ represents the angle between vectors \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{z} . So if the vector norms of \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{z} are determined, the smaller the angle, the larger the inner product.

Returning to the Netflix data, the movie ratings range from 0 to 5 with higher ratings indicating a stronger user preference for the movie. If \mathbf{w}_m and \mathbf{z}_n fall sufficiently “close”, the value $\mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n$ increases. This concept underlies ALS, where \mathbf{w}_m represents the features/attributes of movie m , while \mathbf{z}_n encapsulates the features/preferences of user n . In other words, the ALS associates each user with a *latent vector of preference*, and each movie with a *latent vector of attributes*. Moreover, each element in \mathbf{w}_m and \mathbf{z}_n signifies a specific feature. For example, it could be that the second feature w_{m2} ⁵ represents whether the movie is an action movie or not, and z_{n2} denotes if the user n has a preference for action movies. When this holds true, then $\mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n$ becomes large and provides a good approximation of a_{mn} .

In the decomposition $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$, it is established that the rows of \mathbf{W} contain the hidden features of the movies, and the columns of \mathbf{Z} contain the hidden features of the users. Nevertheless, the explicit meanings of the rows in \mathbf{W} or the columns in \mathbf{Z} remain undisclosed. Although they might correspond to categories or genres of the movies, fostering underlying connections between users and movies, their precise nature remains uncertain. This ambiguity gives rise to the terms “latent” or “hidden”.

16.6. Gradient Descent

In Algorithm 5, 6, and 7, we reduce the loss via the inverse of matrices. The reality, however, is frequently far from straightforward, particularly in the big data era of today. As data volumes explode, the size of the inversion matrix will grow at a pace proportional to the cube of the number of samples, which poses a great challenge to the storage and computational resources. On the other hand, this leads to the creation of an ongoing development of the gradient-based optimization technique. The *gradient descent (GD)* method and its derivation, the *stochastic gradient descent (SGD)* method, are among them the simplest, fastest, and most efficient methods (Lu, 2022d). Convex loss function optimization problems are frequently solved using this type of approach. We now delve into the principles behind these techniques.

In Equation (16.13), we derive the column-by-column update directly from the full matrix approach in Equation (16.12) (with regularization considered). Now delve into the underlying concept. As expressed in Equation (16.10), the loss function, taking regularization into account, can be expressed as:

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2, \quad \lambda_w > 0, \lambda_z > 0, \quad (16.16)$$

Since we are now considering the minimization of the above loss with respect to \mathbf{z}_n , we can decompose the loss into

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{z}_n) &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{a}_n\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{z}_n\|^2 + \underbrace{\sum_{i \neq n} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{a}_i\|^2 + \lambda_z \sum_{i \neq n} \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2}_{C_{z_n}} + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16.17)$$

⁵. w_{m2} represents the second element of vector \mathbf{w}_m .

where C_{z_n} represents a constant with respect to z_n , and $\mathbf{Z} = [z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N]$, $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_N]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{Z} , \mathbf{A} respectively. Taking the gradient

$$\nabla L(z_n) = 2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} z_n - 2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{a}_n + 2\lambda_z z_n,$$

under which the root is exactly the first update of the column fashion in Equation (16.13):

$$z_n = (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{a}_n, \quad \text{for } n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}.$$

Similarly, we can decompose the loss with respect to \mathbf{w}_m ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{w}_m) &= \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{A}^\top\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}^\top\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2 \\ &= \underbrace{\|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{w}_m - \mathbf{b}_n\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq m} \|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{b}_i\|^2}_{C_{w_m}} + \lambda_w \sum_{i \neq m} \|\mathbf{w}_i\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{16.18}$$

where C_{w_m} represents a constant with respect to \mathbf{w}_m , and $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$, $\mathbf{A}^\top = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_M]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{W}^\top , \mathbf{A}^\top respectively. Analogously, taking the gradient with respect to \mathbf{w}_m , it follows that

$$\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m) = 2\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{w}_m - 2\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{b}_n + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{w}_m,$$

under which the root is exactly the second update of the column fashion in Equation (16.13):

$$\mathbf{w}_m = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{b}_n, \quad \text{for } m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}.$$

Now suppose we express the iteration number ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) as the superscript, and we want to find the updates $\{z_n^{(k+1)}, \mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)}\}$ in the $(k+1)$ -th iteration base on $\{\mathbf{Z}^{(k)}, \mathbf{W}^{(k)}\}$ in the k -th iteration:

$$\begin{cases} z_n^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{z_n^{(k)}} L(z_n^{(k)}); \\ \mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)}} L(\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)}). \end{cases}$$

For brevity, we will only derive for $z_n^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{z_n^{(k)}} L(z_n^{(k)})$, and the derivation for the update on $\mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)}$ will be the same.

Approximation by linear update. Suppose we want to approximate $z_n^{(k+1)}$ by a *linear update* on $z_n^{(k)}$:

$$\text{Linear Update: } \boxed{z_n^{(k+1)} = z_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v}.}$$

The problem now turns to the solution of \mathbf{v} such that

$$\mathbf{v} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}} L(z_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v}).$$

By Taylor's formula, $L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v})$ can be approximated by

$$L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v}) \approx L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)}) + \eta \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)}),$$

where η is a small value and $\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})$ represents the gradient of $L(\mathbf{z})$ at $\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)}$. Then a search under the condition $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$ given positive η is shown as follows:

$$\mathbf{v} = \arg \min_{\|\mathbf{v}\|=1} L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v}) \approx \arg \min_{\|\mathbf{v}\|=1} \left\{ L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)}) + \eta \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)}) \right\}.$$

This approach is known as the *greedy search*. The optimal \mathbf{v} can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{v} = - \frac{\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})}{\|\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})\|},$$

i.e., \mathbf{v} points in the opposite direction of $\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})$. Therefore, it is reasonable to update $\mathbf{z}_n^{(k+1)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{z}_n^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} - \eta \frac{\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})}{\|\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})\|},$$

which is usually called the *gradient descent* (GD). Similarly, the gradient descent for $\mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{w}_m^{(k)} + \eta \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{w}_m^{(k)} - \eta \frac{\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)})}{\|\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)})\|}.$$

The revised procedure for Algorithm 6 employing a gradient descent approach is presented in Algorithm 8.

Geometrical interpretation of gradient descent.

Lemma 16.7: (Direction of Gradients) An important fact is that gradients of variables given a loss function are perpendicular to level curves (a.k.a., level surface).

Proof [of Lemma 16.7] This is equivalent to proving that the gradient is orthogonal to the tangent of the level curve. For simplicity, let's first look at the 2-dimensional case. Suppose the level curve takes the form $f(x, y) = c$. This implicitly establishes a relationship between x and y such that $y = y(x)$, where y can be regarded as a function of x . Therefore, the level curve can be expressed as

$$f(x, y(x)) = c.$$

The chain rule indicates

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \underbrace{\frac{dx}{dx}}_{=1} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \frac{dy}{dx} = 0.$$

Therefore, the gradient is perpendicular to the tangent:

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right\rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{dx}{dx}, \frac{dy}{dx} \right\rangle = 0.$$

Algorithm 8 Alternating Least Squares with Full Entries and Gradient Descent

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$;

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ randomly without condition on the rank and the relationship between M, N, K ;
- 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
- 3: Choose regularization parameters λ_w, λ_z , and step size η_w, η_z ;
- 4: Choose the maximal number of iterations C ;
- 5: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
- 6: **while** $\|\mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z})\|^2 > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
- 7: $iter = iter + 1$;
- 8: **for** $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ **do**
- 9: $\mathbf{z}_n^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{z}_n^{(k)} - \eta_z \frac{\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})}{\|\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n^{(k)})\|}$; ▷ n -th column of \mathbf{Z}
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ **do**
- 12: $\mathbf{w}_m^{(k+1)} = \mathbf{w}_m^{(k)} - \eta_w \frac{\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)})}{\|\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m^{(k)})\|}$; ▷ m -th column of \mathbf{W}^\top
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end while**
- 15: Output $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$, $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N]$;

In full generality, consider the level curve of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$: $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = c$. Each variable x_i can be regarded as a function of a variable t on the level curve $f(\mathbf{x}) = c$: $f(x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t)) = c$. Differentiate the equation with respect to t using chain rule:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \frac{dx_1}{dt} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \frac{dx_2}{dt} + \dots + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \frac{dx_n}{dt} = 0.$$

Therefore, the gradient is perpendicular to the tangent in the n -dimensional case:

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right\rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{dx_1}{dt}, \frac{dx_2}{dt}, \dots, \frac{dx_n}{dt} \right\rangle = 0.$$

This completes the proof. ■

The lemma elucidates the geometrical interpretation of gradient descent. When seeking a solution to minimize a convex function $L(\mathbf{z})$, gradient descent proceeds in the direction opposite to the gradient, inducing a decrease in the loss. Figure 16.2 depicts a two-dimensional case, where $-\nabla L(\mathbf{z})$ drives a reduction in the loss for the convex function $L(\mathbf{z})$.

16.7. Regularization: A Geometrical Interpretation

In Section 16.3, we discussed how regularization can extend the ALS algorithm to general matrices. Gradient descent can reveal the geometrical meaning of the regularization. To avoid confusion, we denote the loss function without regularization as $l(\mathbf{z})$ and the loss with regularization as $L(\mathbf{z}) = l(\mathbf{z}) + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{z}\|^2$, where $l(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. When minimizing $l(\mathbf{z})$, a descent method searches for a solution in \mathbb{R}^n . However, in machine learning, searching




Figure 16.2: Figure 16.2(a) shows surface and contour plots for a specific function (blue=low, yellow=high), where the upper graph is the surface plot, and the lower one is the projection of it (i.e., contour). Figure 16.2(b): $-\nabla L(\mathbf{z})$ pushes the loss to decrease for the convex function $L(\mathbf{z})$.




Figure 16.3: Constrained gradient descent with $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. The green vector \mathbf{w} represents the projection of \mathbf{v}_1 into $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$, where \mathbf{v}_1 is the component of $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z})$ that is perpendicular to \mathbf{z}_1 . The image on the right illustrates the next step after the update in the left picture. \mathbf{z}^* denotes the optimal solution of $\{\min l(\mathbf{z})\}$.

across the entire space \mathbb{R}^n can lead to overfitting. A partial solution is to search within a subset of the vector space, e.g., searching in $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} < C$ for some constant C . That is,

$$\arg \min_{\mathbf{z}} l(\mathbf{z}), \quad \text{s.t.,} \quad \mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C.$$

As demonstrated above, a basic gradient descent method advances in the direction of $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z})$, updating \mathbf{z} as $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{z} - \eta \nabla l(\mathbf{z})$ for a small step size η . When the level curve is $l(\mathbf{z}) = c_1$ and the current position of parameter \mathbf{z} is $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_1$, where \mathbf{z}_1 is the intersection of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} = C$ and $l(\mathbf{z}) = c_1$, the descent direction $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1)$ will be perpendicular to the level curve of $l(\mathbf{z}_1) = c_1$ as shown in the left picture of Figure 16.3 (by Lemma 16.7). However,

if we further restrict that the optimal value must lie within $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$, the trivial descent direction $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1)$ will lead the update $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta \nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1)$ beyond the boundary of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. One solution is to decompose the step $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1)$ into

$$-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1) = a\mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1,$$

where $a\mathbf{z}_1$ represents the component perpendicular to the curve of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} = C$, and \mathbf{v}_1 is the component parallel to the curve of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} = C$. Keep only the step \mathbf{v}_1 , then the update is

$$\mathbf{z}_2 = \text{project}(\mathbf{z}_1 + \eta \mathbf{v}_1) = \text{project} \left(\mathbf{z}_1 + \eta \underbrace{(-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1) - a\mathbf{z}_1)}_{\mathbf{v}_1} \right),^6$$

which will lead to a smaller loss from $l(\mathbf{z}_1)$ to $l(\mathbf{z}_2)$, while matching the prerequisite of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. This approach is known as the *projection gradient descent*. It is not hard to see that the update $\mathbf{z}_2 = \text{project}(\mathbf{z}_1 + \eta \mathbf{v}_1)$ can be understood as finding a vector \mathbf{w} (represented by the green vector in the left picture of Figure 16.3) such that $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{w}$ lies inside the curve of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. Mathematically, the \mathbf{w} can be determined as $-\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_1) - 2\lambda \mathbf{z}_1$ for some λ , as shown in the middle picture of Figure 16.3. This is exactly the negative gradient of $L(\mathbf{z}) = l(\mathbf{z}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{z}\|^2$ such that

$$-\nabla L(\mathbf{z}) = -\nabla l(\mathbf{z}) - 2\lambda \mathbf{z},$$

and

$$\mathbf{w} = -\nabla L(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{leads to} \quad \mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{z}_1 - \nabla L(\mathbf{z}).$$

And in practice, a small step size η prevents moving outside the curve of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$:

$$\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_1 - \eta \nabla L(\mathbf{z}),$$

which is exactly what we have discussed in Section 16.3, the regularization term.

Sparsity. In rare cases, we seek to identify a sparse solution \mathbf{z} such that $l(\mathbf{z})$ is minimized. Regularization to be constrained in $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq C$ exists to this purpose, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the ℓ_1 -norm of a vector or a matrix. Similar to the previous case, the ℓ_1 constrained optimization pushes the gradient descent towards the border of the level of $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 = C$. The situation in the two-dimensional case is shown in Figure 16.4. In a high-dimensional case, many elements in \mathbf{z} will be pushed towards the breakpoint of $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 = C$, as shown in the right picture of Figure 16.4.

16.8. Stochastic Gradient Descent

The gradient descent method is a valuable optimization algorithm; it exhibits certain limitations in practical applications. To comprehend the issues associated with the gradient descent method, we consider the mean squared error (MSE) derived from Equation (16.2):

$$\frac{1}{MN} \min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2. \quad (16.19)$$

6. where the operation $\text{project}(\mathbf{x})$ will project the vector \mathbf{x} to the closest point inside $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$. Notice here the unprojected update $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_1 + \eta \mathbf{v}_1$ can still make \mathbf{z}_2 fall outside the curve of $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} \leq C$.




Figure 16.4: Constrained gradient descent with $\|z\|_1 \leq C$, where the red dot denotes the breakpoint in ℓ_1 -norm. The right picture illustrates the next step after the update in the left picture. z^* denotes the optimal solution of $\{\min l(z)\}$.

The MSE needs to calculate the residual $e_{mn} = (a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n)^2$ for each observed entry a_{mn} , representing the squared difference between predicted and actual values. The total sum of residual squares is denoted by $e = \sum_{m,n=1}^{MN} e_{mn}$. In cases with a substantial number of training entries (i.e., large MN), the entire computation process becomes notably slow. Additionally, the gradients from different input samples may cancel out, resulting in small changes in the final update. To address these challenges, researchers have enhanced the gradient descent method with the *stochastic gradient descent (SGD)* method. The core idea of the stochastic gradient descent method is to randomly select a single sample from all training samples during each iteration.

We consider again the per-example loss:

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^M \left(a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n \right)^2 + \lambda_w \sum_{m=1}^M \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 + \lambda_z \sum_{n=1}^N \|\mathbf{z}_n\|^2.$$

As we iteratively reduce the per-example loss term $l(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{z}_n) = (a_{mn} - \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n)^2$ for all $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}, n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, the overall loss $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$ decreases accordingly. This process is also known as the *stochastic coordinate descent*. The gradients with respect to \mathbf{w}_m and \mathbf{z}_n , and their roots are given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla l(\mathbf{z}_n) = \frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{z}_n)}{\partial \mathbf{z}_n} = 2\mathbf{w}_m \mathbf{w}_m^\top \mathbf{z}_n + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{w}_m - 2a_{mn} \mathbf{w}_m \\ \quad \quad \quad \text{leads to } \mathbf{z}_n = a_{mn} (\mathbf{w}_m \mathbf{w}_m^\top + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{w}_m; \\ \nabla l(\mathbf{w}_m) = \frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{z}_n)}{\partial \mathbf{w}_m} = 2\mathbf{z}_n \mathbf{z}_n^\top \mathbf{w}_m + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{z}_n - 2a_{mn} \mathbf{z}_n \\ \quad \quad \quad \text{leads to } \mathbf{w}_m = a_{mn} (\mathbf{z}_n \mathbf{z}_n^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_n. \end{array} \right.$$

or analogously, the update can be performed using gradient descent. Since we update based on per-example loss, this approach is also known as the *stochastic gradient descent (SGD)*:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{z}_n - \eta_z \frac{\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_n)}{\|\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_n)\|}; \\ \mathbf{w}_m = \mathbf{w}_m - \eta_w \frac{\nabla l(\mathbf{w}_m)}{\|\nabla l(\mathbf{w}_m)\|}. \end{cases}$$

The stochastic gradient descent update for ALS is formulated in Algorithm 9. And in practice, the values of m and n in the algorithm can be randomly generated, hence the term “*stochastic*”.

Algorithm 9 Alternating Least Squares with Full Entries and Stochastic Gradient Descent

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$;

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ randomly without condition on the rank and the relationship between M, N, K ;
 - 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
 - 3: Choose regularization parameters λ_w, λ_z , and step size η_w, η_z ;
 - 4: Choose the maximal number of iterations C ;
 - 5: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
 - 6: **while** $\|\mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z})\|^2 > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
 - 7: $iter = iter + 1$;
 - 8: **for** $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 9: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots, M$ **do** ▷ in practice, m, n can be randomly produced
 - 10: $\mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{z}_n - \eta_z \frac{\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_n)}{\|\nabla l(\mathbf{z}_n)\|}$; ▷ n -th column of \mathbf{Z}
 - 11: $\mathbf{w}_m = \mathbf{w}_m - \eta_w \frac{\nabla l(\mathbf{w}_m)}{\|\nabla l(\mathbf{w}_m)\|}$; ▷ m -th column of \mathbf{W}^\top
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **end while**
 - 15: Output $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$, $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N]$;
-

16.9. Bias Term

In ordinary least squares, a bias term is usually incorporated into the raw matrix, as illustrated in Equation (16.1). A similar idea can be applied to the ALS problem. We can append a fixed column filled with all 1’s to the **last column** of \mathbf{W} , thus an extra row should be added to the last row of \mathbf{Z} to fit the features introduced by the bias term in \mathbf{W} . Analogously, a fixed row with all 1’s can be added to the **first row** of \mathbf{Z} , and an extra column in the first column of \mathbf{W} can be added to fit the features. The situation is shown in Figure 16.5.




Figure 16.5: Bias terms in alternating least squares, where the **yellow** entries denote ones (which are fixed) and **cyan** entries denote the added features to fit the bias terms. The dotted boxes provide an example of how the bias terms work.

Following the loss with respect to the columns of \mathbf{Z} in Equation (16.17), suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{z}_n \end{bmatrix}$ is the n -th column of $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 L(\mathbf{z}_n) &= \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} - \mathbf{A} \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{z}_n \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{a}_n \right\|^2 + \underbrace{\lambda_z \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n \right\|^2}_{=\lambda_z \left\| \mathbf{z}_n \right\|^2 + \lambda_z} + \sum_{i \neq n} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i - \mathbf{a}_i \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \sum_{i \neq n} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \right\|^2 \\
 &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{w}}_0 & \bar{\mathbf{W}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{z}_n \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{a}_n \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \left\| \mathbf{z}_n \right\|^2 + C_{z_n} = \left\| \bar{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{z}_n - \underbrace{(\mathbf{a}_n - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_0)}_{\bar{\mathbf{a}}_n} \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \left\| \mathbf{z}_n \right\|^2 + C_{z_n},
 \end{aligned} \tag{16.20}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_0$ represents the first column of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{W}}$ denotes the last K columns of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$, and C_{z_n} is a constant with respect to \mathbf{z}_n . Let $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_n = \mathbf{a}_n - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_0$, the update for \mathbf{z}_n is just similar to the one in Equation (16.17), with the gradient given by:

$$\nabla L(\mathbf{z}_n) = 2\bar{\mathbf{W}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{z}_n - 2\bar{\mathbf{W}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{z}_n.$$

Therefore, the update for \mathbf{z}_n is given by determining the root of the gradient above:

$$\text{update for } \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n \text{ is } \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_n = (\bar{\mathbf{W}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{W}} + \lambda_z \mathbf{I})^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{W}}^\top \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n, & \text{for } n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}; \\ \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{z}_n \end{bmatrix}. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, following the loss with respect to each row of \mathbf{W} in Equation (16.18), suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_m \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ is the m -th row of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ (or m -th column of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\mathbf{w}_m) &= \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{A}^\top \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^\top \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m - \mathbf{b}_m \right\|^2 + \underbrace{\lambda_w \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m \right\|^2}_{=\lambda_w \left\| \mathbf{w}_m \right\|^2 + \lambda_w} + \sum_{i \neq m} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i - \mathbf{b}_i \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \sum_{i \neq m} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_i \right\|^2 + \lambda_z \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right\|^2 \\
&= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top & \bar{\mathbf{z}}_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_m \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{b}_m \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \left\| \mathbf{w}_m \right\|^2 + C_{w_m} \\
&= \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathbf{w}_m - (\mathbf{b}_m - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_0) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \left\| \mathbf{w}_m \right\|^2 + C_{w_m},
\end{aligned} \tag{16.21}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_0$ represents the last column of $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top$ contains the remaining columns of it, C_{w_m} is a constant with respect to \mathbf{w}_m , and $\mathbf{W}^\top = [\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_M]$, $\mathbf{A}^\top = [\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_M]$ are the column partitions of \mathbf{W}^\top , \mathbf{A}^\top respectively. Let $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_m = \mathbf{b}_m - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_0$, the update for \mathbf{w}_m is again just similar to the one in Equation (16.18), with the gradient given by:

$$\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_m) = 2\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathbf{w}_m - 2\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{b}}_m + 2\lambda_w \mathbf{w}_m.$$

Therefore, the update for \mathbf{w}_m is given by the root of the gradient above:

$$\text{update for } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m \text{ is } \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_m = (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top + \lambda_w \mathbf{I})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{b}}_m, & \text{for } m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}; \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_m = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_m \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{cases}$$

Similar updates through gradient descent with the consideration of the bias terms or treatment on missing entries can be deduced, and we shall not repeat the details (see Section 16.6 and 16.4 for a reference).

16.10. Movie Recommender

The ALS algorithm finds significant application in the domain of movie recommendation systems, particularly demonstrated using the “MovieLens 100K” data set (Harper and Konstan, 2015)⁷. This data set comprises 100,000 ratings from 943 users for 1,682 movies, with ratings ranging from 0 to 5. The data was gathered through the MovieLens website over a seven-month period from September 19th, 1997 through April 22nd, 1998. This data has been cleaned up - users who had less than 20 ratings or did not have complete demographic information were removed from this data set such that simple demographic info for the users (age, gender, occupation, zip) can be obtained. However, our focus will solely be on the raw rating matrix.

The data set is divided into training and validation data, around 95,015 and 4,985 ratings, respectively, to fit by the ALS algorithm. The error is assessed using the *root mean*

⁷. <http://grouplens.org>

squared error (RMSE). The RMSE is frequently used as a measure of the difference between values. For a set of values $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and its predictions $\{\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \dots, \hat{x}_n\}$, the RMSE is defined as

$$\text{RMSE}(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{x}_i)^2}.$$

The minimal RMSE for validation set is obtained when $K = 185$ and $\lambda_w = \lambda_z = 0.15$, resulting in a RMSE of 0.806 (smaller than 1), as shown in Figure 16.6. Therefore, when the rating ranges from 0 to 5, the ALS at least can predict whether the user is inclined to watch a movie (e.g., ratings of 4 to 5) or not (e.g., ratings of 0 to 2).




Figure 16.6: Comparison of training and validation error for the “MovieLens 100K” data set with different reduction dimensions and regularization parameters.

Recommender 1. A recommender system can work simply by suggesting the movie m when $a_{mn} \geq 4$ if user n has not rated the movie m .

Recommender 2. Or in rare cases, it happens that the user n has rated all the movies he likes (say rates ≥ 4). In such situations, a partial solution is to find out similar movies to the high-rated movies to recommend. Suppose user n likes movie m very much and he has rated the movie m with 5: $a_{mn} = 5$. Under the ALS approximation $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{WZ}$, where each row of \mathbf{W} represents the hidden features of each movie (see Section 16.5 on the vector inner product). The solution is given by identifying the most similar movies, which user n has not rated (or watched), to movie m . In mathematical language,

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{w}_i} \quad \text{similarity}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_m), \quad \text{for all } i \notin \mathbf{o}_n,$$

where \mathbf{w}_i ’s are the rows of \mathbf{W} , each representing the hidden features of movie i , and \mathbf{o}_n represents a mask vector, indicating the movies that user n has rated.

The method described above relies on a similarity function applied to two vectors. The *cosine similarity* is the most commonly used measure. It is defined as the cosine of the

angle between the two vectors:

$$\cos(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{y}\|},$$

where the value ranges from -1 to 1 , with -1 representing perfectly dissimilar and 1 being perfectly similar. Based on this definition, it follows that the cosine similarity depends only on the angle between the two nonzero vectors, but not on their magnitudes since it can be regarded as the inner product between the normalized versions of these vectors. Another measure for calculating similarity is known as the *Pearson similarity*:

$$\text{Pearson}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\sigma_x \cdot \sigma_y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}},$$

whose range varies between -1 and 1 , where -1 is perfectly dissimilar, 1 is perfectly similar, and 0 indicates no linear relationship. The Pearson similarity is usually used to measure the linear correlation between two sets of data. It is calculated as the ratio between the covariance of two variables and the product of their standard deviations.

Both Pearson correlation and cosine similarity are used in various fields, including machine learning and data analysis. Pearson correlation is commonly used in regression analysis, while cosine similarity is commonly used in recommendation systems and information retrieval, as we will see the cosine similarity performs better in the *precision-recall curve* analysis.




Figure 16.7: Distribution of the insample and outsample using cosine and Pearson similarity, and the Precision-Recall curves for them.

Building upon the previous example using the MovieLens 100K data set, we choose $\lambda_w = \lambda_z = 0.15$ for regularization and a rank of 62 to minimize RMSE. We want to look at the similarity between different movie hidden vectors and the goal is to see whether the matrix factorization can help differentiate high-rated from low-rated movies, so that the system can recommend the movies correlated to the existing high-rated movies for each user. Define further the term “insample” as the similarity between the movies having rates 5 for each user, and “outsample” as the similarity between the movies having rates 5 and 1 for each user. Figure 16.7(a) and 16.7(b) depict the bin plots of the distributions of insample and outsample under cosine and Pearson similarities, respectively. In both scenarios, a clear distinction is observed between the distributions of the “insample” and “outsample” data,

showing that the ALS decomposition can actually find the hidden features of different movies for each user. Figure 16.7(c) shows the *precision-recall (PR) curve* for these scenarios, where we find the cosine similarity works better such that it can find out more than 73% of the potential high-rated movies with a precision of 90%. However, Pearson similarity can identify only about 64% of the high-rated movies with the same precision. In practice, other measures can also be explored, such as the *negative Euclidean distance* in which case the Euclidean distance can measure the “dissimilarity” between two vectors, and a negative one thus represents the similarity between them.

Chapter 16 Problems

1. Prove Lemma 16.6.
2. Find the update of column-by-column fashion for Algorithm 6.
3. **Constrained (Regularized) least squares (CLS).** Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, we consider the regularized least squares problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{Ax} - \mathbf{b}\|^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{Bx}\|^2.$$

Show that the constrained least squares (CLS) problem has a unique solution if and only if $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

4. **Weighted least squares (WLS).** Going further from the assumptions in Lemma 16.1, we consider further that each data point $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ (i.e., each row of \mathbf{A}) has a weight w_i . This means some data points may carry greater significance than others and there are ways to produce approximate minimizers that reflect this. Show that the value $\mathbf{x}_{WLS} = (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W}^2 \mathbf{b}$ serves as the *weighted least squares (WLS)* estimator of \mathbf{x} , where $\mathbf{W} = \text{diag}([w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m]) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. *Hint: find the normal equation for this problem.*
5. **Restricted least squares (RLS).** Going further from the assumptions in Lemma 16.1, we consider further the restriction $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbf{c}$, where $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ is a known matrix such that \mathbf{AC} has full rank, \mathbf{c} is a known vector, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is an unknown vector. Show that the value $\mathbf{x}_{RLS} = \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{AC})^{-1}(\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top)(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{Ac}) + \mathbf{c}$ serves as the *restricted least squares (RLS)* estimator of \mathbf{x} .
6. Find the restricted weighted least squares estimator.

17

Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)

Contents

17.1 Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)	225
17.2 NMF via Multiplicative Update (MU)	225
17.3 Regularization	226
17.4 Initialization	228
17.5 Movie Recommender Context	228
Chapter 17 Problems	229

17.1. Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (NMF)

Following the matrix factorization via the ALS, we now consider algorithms for solving the nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) problem:

- Given a nonnegative matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times N}$ with rank r , find nonnegative matrix factors $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times K}$ and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K \times N}$ such that:

$$\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}.$$

To measure the quality of the approximation, we evaluate the loss by computing the Frobenius norm of the difference between the original matrix and the approximation:

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2.$$

NMF is a machine learning technique employed to factorize a nonnegative matrix into two (or more) nonnegative matrices. Similar to ALS approximation, NMF can also reveal hidden patterns and structures in the data represented by the nonnegative matrix. It finds a wide range of applications in areas such as text mining, image processing, and recommender systems.

Early consideration of the NMF problem is due to [Paatero and Tapper \(1994\)](#); [Cohen and Rothblum \(1993\)](#), where they called it *positive matrix factorization*. While [Lee and Seung \(2001\)](#) later made the problem famous by the *multiplicative update*. See also the applications of the NMF in the survey paper [Berry et al. \(2007\)](#). When we want to find two nonnegative matrices $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times r}$ and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times N}$ such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$, the problem is known as the *Exact NMF* of \mathbf{A} of size r . Exact NMF is NP-hard ([Gillis, 2020](#)). Thus, we only consider the approximation of NMF here.

17.2. NMF via Multiplicative Update (MU)

We consider the NMF via an alternating update. The hidden features in \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} are modeled as nonnegative vectors in low-dimensional space. These latent vectors are randomly initialized and iteratively updated via an alternating multiplicative update rule to minimize the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the observed and modeled matrices. Following Section 16.2 (p. 202), we consider the low-rank with K problem; given $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times K}$, we want to update $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K \times N}$, the gradient with respect to \mathbf{Z} is given by Equation (16.3) (p. 204):

$$\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} = 2\mathbf{W}^\top(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}.$$

Applying the gradient descent idea discussed in Section 16.6 (p. 211), the trivial update for \mathbf{Z} can be obtained by

$$(\text{GD on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad \mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \mathbf{Z} - \eta \left(\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right) = \mathbf{Z} - \eta (2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - 2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A}),$$

where η represents a small positive step size. Now if we impose a different step size for each entry of \mathbf{Z} and incorporate the constant 2 into the step size, the update can be obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{GD}' \text{ on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad z_{kn} &\leftarrow z_{kn} - \frac{\eta_{kn}}{2} \left(\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right)_{kn} \\ &= z_{kn} - \eta_{kn} (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A})_{kn}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \end{aligned}$$

where z_{kn} denotes the (k, n) -th entry of \mathbf{Z} . To proceed, we further rescale the step size:

$$\eta_{kn} = \frac{z_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn}}.$$

Then we obtain the update rule:

$$(\text{MU on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad z_{kn} \leftarrow z_{kn} \frac{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A})_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn}}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, n \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

which is known as the *multiplicative update (MU)*, and is first developed in [Lee and Seung \(2001\)](#) and further discussed in [Pauca et al. \(2006\)](#). Analogously, the multiplicative update for \mathbf{W} can be obtained by

$$(\text{MU on } \mathbf{W}) \quad w_{mk} \leftarrow w_{mk} \frac{(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}{(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}, \quad m \in \{1, \dots, M\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (17.1)$$

Theorem 17.1: (Convergence of Multiplicative Update) The loss $L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2$ remains non-increasing under the following multiplicative update rules:

$$\begin{cases} z_{kn} \leftarrow z_{kn} \frac{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A})_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn}}, & k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, n \in \{1, \dots, N\}; \\ w_{mk} \leftarrow w_{mk} \frac{(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}{(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}, & m \in \{1, \dots, M\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \end{cases}$$

We refer the proof of the theorem above to [Lee and Seung \(2001\)](#). Clearly, the approximations \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} remain nonnegative during the updates. It is generally better to update \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} “simultaneously” rather than “sequentially”, i.e., updating each matrix completely before the other. In this case, after updating a row of \mathbf{Z} , we update the corresponding column of \mathbf{W} . In the implementation, it is advisable to introduce a small positive quantity, say the square root of the machine precision, to the denominators in the approximations of \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} at each iteration. And a trivial value like $\epsilon = 10^{-9}$ suffices. The full procedure is shown in Algorithm 10.

17.3. Regularization

Similar to the ALS with regularization discussed in Section 16.3 (p. 207), recall that the regularization can help extend the applicability of ALS to general matrices. Additionally, a regularization term can be incorporated into the NMF framework to enhance its performance:

$$L(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}) = \|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}\|^2 + \lambda_w \|\mathbf{W}\|^2 + \lambda_z \|\mathbf{Z}\|^2, \quad \lambda_w > 0, \lambda_z > 0,$$

where the employed matrix norm is still the Frobenius norm. The gradient with respect to \mathbf{Z} given \mathbf{W} is the same as that in Equation (16.11) (p. 207):

$$\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} = 2\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{A}) + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}.$$

Algorithm 10 NMF via Multiplicative Updates

Require: Matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$;

- 1: Initialize $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times K}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ randomly with nonnegative entries;
- 2: Choose a stop criterion on the approximation error δ ;
- 3: Choose maximal number of iterations C ;
- 4: $iter = 0$; ▷ Count for the number of iterations
- 5: **while** $\|\mathbf{A} - (\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z})\|^2 > \delta$ and $iter < C$ **do**
- 6: $iter = iter + 1$;
- 7: **for** $k = 1$ to K **do**
- 8: **for** $n = 1$ to N **do** ▷ update k -th row of \mathbf{Z}
- 9: $z_{kn} \leftarrow z_{kn} \frac{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A})_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn} + \epsilon}$;
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **for** $m = 1$ to M **do** ▷ update k -th column of \mathbf{W}
- 12: $w_{mk} \leftarrow w_{mk} \frac{(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}{(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk} + \epsilon}$;
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **end while**
- 16: Output \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z} ;

The gradient descent update can be obtained by

$$(\text{GD on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad \mathbf{Z} \leftarrow \mathbf{Z} - \eta \left(\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right) = \mathbf{Z} - \eta \left(2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - 2\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} + 2\lambda_z \mathbf{Z} \right),$$

Analogously, if we assume a different step size for each entry of \mathbf{Z} and incorporate the constant 2 into the step size, the update can be obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{GD}' \text{ on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad z_{kn} &\leftarrow z_{kn} - \frac{\eta_{kn}}{2} \left(\frac{\partial L(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{W})}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right)_{kn} \\ &= z_{kn} - \eta_{kn} (\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A} + \lambda_z \mathbf{Z})_{kn}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, n \in \{1, \dots, N\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now if we rescale the step size:

$$\eta_{kn} = \frac{z_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn}},$$

then we obtain the multiplicative update rule:

$$(\text{MU on } \mathbf{Z}) \quad z_{kn} \leftarrow z_{kn} \frac{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{A})_{kn} - \lambda_z z_{kn}}{(\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z})_{kn}}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, n \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Similarly, the multiplicative update on \mathbf{W} can be obtained by

$$(\text{MU on } \mathbf{W}) \quad w_{mk} \leftarrow w_{mk} \frac{(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk} - \lambda_w w_{mk}}{(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^\top)_{mk}}, \quad m \in \{1, \dots, M\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}.$$

A nonnegative matrix factorization $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{W}\mathbf{Z}$ can be applied for clustering algorithm. Specifically, the data vector \mathbf{a}_j is assigned to cluster i if z_{ij} is the largest element in column j of \mathbf{Z} (Brunet et al., 2004; Gao and Church, 2005).

In the context of collaborative filtering, it is recognized that the NMF via multiplicative update can result in overfitting despite favorable convergence results. The overfitting can be partially mitigated through regularization, but its out-of-sample performance remains low. Bayesian optimization through the use of generative models, on the other hand, can effectively prevent overfitting for nonnegative matrix factorization (Brouwer et al., 2017; Lu and Ye, 2022; Lu, 2023).

For other issues in the NMF, readers are advised to consult the survey of Berry et al. (2007).

17.4. Initialization

A significant challenge in NMF is the absence of guaranteed convergence to a global minimum. It often happens that convergence is slow and a suboptimal approximation is reached. In the preceding discussion, we initialized \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{Z} randomly. To mitigate this issue, there are also alternative strategies designed to obtain better initial estimates in the hope of converging more rapidly to a good solution (Boutsidis and Gallopoulos, 2008; Gillis, 2014). We sketch the methods as follows for reference:

- *Clustering techniques.* Apply some clustering methods to the columns of \mathbf{A} , set the cluster means of the top K clusters as the columns of \mathbf{W} , and initialize \mathbf{Z} as a proper scaling of the cluster indicator matrix (that is, $z_{kn} \neq 0$ indicates \mathbf{a}_n belongs to the k -th cluster);
- *Subset selection.* Pick K columns of \mathbf{A} and set those as the initial columns for \mathbf{W} , and analogously, K rows of \mathbf{A} are selected to form the rows of \mathbf{Z} ;
- *SVD-based approach.* Suppose the optimal rank- K approximation of \mathbf{A} is $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, where each factor $\sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ is a rank-one matrix with possible negative values in \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i , and nonnegative σ_i . Denote $[x]_+ = \max(x, 0)$, we notice

$$\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top = [\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top + [-\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [-\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top - [-\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top - [\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [-\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top.$$

where the first two rank-one factors in this decomposition are nonnegative. Then, either $[\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$ or $[-\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [-\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$ can be selected to replace the factor $\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$. Boutsidis and Gallopoulos (2008) suggests to replace each rank-one factor in $\sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ with either $[\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$ or $[-\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [-\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$, selecting the one with larger norm and scaling it properly.¹ In other words, if we select $[\mathbf{u}_i]_+ [\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$, then $\sigma_i \cdot [\mathbf{u}_i]_+$ can be initialized as the i -th column of \mathbf{W} , and $[\mathbf{v}_i]_+^\top$ can be chosen as the i -th row of \mathbf{Z} .

However, these techniques are not guaranteed to yield better performance theoretically. We recommend referring to the aforementioned papers for more information.

17.5. Movie Recommender Context

Both the NMF and the ALS methods approximate the matrix and reconstruct the entries in the matrix with a set of basis vectors. The basis in the NMF is composed of vectors with nonnegative elements while the basis vectors in the ALS can have positive or negative values. The key distinction lies in how the approximation is carried out. In NMF, each

¹. Note here we consider general matrix \mathbf{A} . If \mathbf{A} is nonnegative, then \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{v}_i are nonnegative as well.

vector is reconstructed as a positive summation of the basis vectors with a “relative” small component in the direction of each basis vector. Whereas, in the ALS approximation, the data is modeled as a linear combination of the basis such that we can add or subtract vectors as needed and the components in the direction of each basis vector can be large positive values or negative values. Therefore, depending on the application, one or the other factorization can be utilized to describe the data with different meanings.

In the context of a movie recommender system, the rows of \mathbf{W} represent the hidden features of movies, while the columns of \mathbf{Z} represent the hidden features of users. In the NMF method, we can say that a movie is 0.5 comedy, 0.002 action, and 0.09 romantic. However, in the ALS approach, we can get combinations such as 4 comedy, -0.05 comedy, and -3 drama, i.e., a positive or negative component on that feature.

The ALS and NMF are similar in the sense that the importance of each basis vector is not ranked in a hierarchical manner. Whereas, the key difference between the ALS (or NMF) and the SVD is that, in the SVD, the importance of each vector in the basis is relative to the value of the singular value associated with that vector. In the SVD representation of $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, this usually means that the reconstruction $\sigma_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top$ via the first set of basis vectors dominates and is the most used set to reconstruct data, followed by the second set, and so on. So the basis in the SVD has an implicit hierarchy and that doesn't happen in the ALS or the NMF approaches.

Chapter 17 Problems

1. * Suppose $\mathbf{C} = P(\mathbf{A})$ is defined as the matrix obtained by setting each entry of \mathbf{C} as the absolute value of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Suppose further that $\mathbf{B} - P(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, then it follows that

$$\rho(\mathbf{A}) \leq \rho(P(\mathbf{A})) \leq \rho(\mathbf{B}),$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{X})$ is the spectral radius of matrix \mathbf{X} (Definition 0.2, p. 3).

2. * Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, show that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \leq \rho(\mathbf{A}) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij};$$

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij} \leq \rho(\mathbf{A}) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}.$$

18

Biconjugate Decomposition

Contents

18.1	Existence of the Biconjugate Decomposition	231
18.2	Properties of the Biconjugate Decomposition	235
18.3	Connection to Well-Known Decomposition Methods	236
18.3.1	LDU Decomposition	236
18.3.2	Cholesky Decomposition	237
18.3.3	QR Decomposition	238
18.3.4	SVD	239
18.4	Proof General Term Formula of Wedderburn Sequence	240
Chapter 18	Problems	241

18.1. Existence of the Biconjugate Decomposition



The biconjugate decomposition was proposed in [Chu et al. \(1995\)](#) and discussed in [Yang \(2000\)](#). A variety of matrix decomposition methods can be unified via this biconjugate decomposition. And the existence of the biconjugate decomposition relies on the rank-one reduction theorem shown below.

Theorem 18.1: (Rank-One Reduction) Given an $m \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r , consider a pair of vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $w = \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \neq 0$, then the matrix $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A} - w^{-1} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A}$ has rank $r - 1$, which has exactly one less than the rank of \mathbf{A} .

Proof [of Theorem 18.1] If we can show that the dimension of the null space $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$ is one greater than that of \mathbf{A} , it implicitly indicates that \mathbf{B} has a rank exactly one less than the rank of \mathbf{A} .

For any vector $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$, i.e., $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, we then have $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{n} - w^{-1} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$, implying that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$.

Now, consider any vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$. We have $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{m} - w^{-1} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$.

Let $k = w^{-1} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{m}$, which is a scalar. Therefore, $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{m} - k \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., for any vector $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$, we could find a vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$ such that $\mathbf{n} = (\mathbf{m} - k \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$. Note that $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ based on the definition of w . Thus, the null space of \mathbf{B} is therefore obtained from the null space of \mathbf{A} by adding \mathbf{x} to its basis, which will increase the order of the space by 1. Therefore, the dimension of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})$ is smaller than the dimension of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{B})$ by 1, which completes the proof. ■

Suppose matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has rank r , we can define a rank-reducing process to generate a sequence of *Wedderburn matrices* $\{\mathbf{A}_k\}$:

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_k - w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k,$$

where $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are any vectors satisfying $w_k = \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \neq 0$. The sequence will terminate after r steps because the rank of \mathbf{A}_k decreases by exactly one at each step. Write out the sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_1 &= \mathbf{A}, \\ \mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2 &= w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_1^\top \mathbf{A}_1, \\ \mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_3 &= w_2^{-1} \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_2^\top \mathbf{A}_2, \\ \mathbf{A}_3 - \mathbf{A}_4 &= w_3^{-1} \mathbf{A}_3 \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{y}_3^\top \mathbf{A}_3, \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{r-1} - \mathbf{A}_r &= w_{r-1}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{r-1} \mathbf{x}_{r-1} \mathbf{y}_{r-1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{r-1}, \\ \mathbf{A}_r - \mathbf{0} &= w_r^{-1} \mathbf{A}_r \mathbf{x}_r \mathbf{y}_r^\top \mathbf{A}_r. \end{aligned}$$

By adding the sequence, we obtain

$$(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) + (\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_3) + \dots + (\mathbf{A}_{r-1} - \mathbf{A}_r) + (\mathbf{A}_r - \mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^r w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{A}_i.$$

Theorem 18.2: (Biconjugate Decomposition: Form 1) This equality, resulting from rank-reducing process, implies the following matrix decomposition

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{\Psi}^\top,$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega} = \text{diag}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_r)$, $\mathbf{\Phi} = [\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$, and $\mathbf{\Psi} = [\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_r]$ with

$$\phi_k = \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_k = \mathbf{A}_k^\top \mathbf{y}_k.$$

Obviously, different choices of \mathbf{x}_k 's and \mathbf{y}_k 's will result in different factorizations. Therefore, this factorization is rather general and quite versatile. We will demonstrate its connection with some well-known decomposition methods.

Remark 18.3

Regarding the vectors \mathbf{x}_k and \mathbf{y}_k in the Wedderburn sequence, the following property holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_k &\in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top), \\ \mathbf{y}_k &\in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top) \perp \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 18.4: (General Term Formula of Wedderburn Sequence: V1) For each matrix with $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_k - w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k$, then \mathbf{A}_{k+1} can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^k w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A},$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k}{w_i} \mathbf{u}_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i}{w_i} \mathbf{v}_i.$$

The proof of this lemma is delayed in Section 18.4. We notice that $w_i = \mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k$ in the general term formula is related to \mathbf{A}_k , which means it is not the true general term formula. We will later reformulate w_i to be related to \mathbf{A} rather than \mathbf{A}_k . From the general term formula of the Wedderburn sequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^k w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}, \\ \mathbf{A}_k &= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} - \mathbf{A}_k = -w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A}$. Since we define the sequence as $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_k - w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k$, we can derive that $w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} = w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k$. It is trivial to see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_k &= \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k, \\ \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k. \end{aligned} \tag{18.1}$$

Let $z_{k,i} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k}{w_i}$, which is a scalar. Referring to the definitions of \mathbf{u}_k and \mathbf{v}_k in the lemma above, we can express them explicitly as follows:

- $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$;
- $\mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{x}_2 - z_{2,1} \mathbf{u}_1$;
- $\mathbf{u}_3 = \mathbf{x}_3 - z_{3,1} \mathbf{u}_1 - z_{3,2} \mathbf{u}_2$;
- ...

This process bears resemblance to the Gram-Schmidt process (Section 3.4, p. 50). However, in this process, we do not perform an orthogonal projection of \mathbf{x}_2 onto \mathbf{x}_1 to find the vector component of \mathbf{x}_2 along \mathbf{x}_1 , as we would do in an orthogonal projection. Instead, the vector of \mathbf{x}_2 along \mathbf{x}_1 is now defined by $z_{2,1}$ (i.e., an oblique projection, see (Lu, 2021c)). This process is illustrated in Figure 18.1. In Figure 18.1(a), \mathbf{u}_2 is not perpendicular to \mathbf{u}_1 (\mathbf{u}_2 will be perpendicular to \mathbf{u}_1 in the Gram-Schmidt process via orthogonal projections). However, \mathbf{u}_2 does not lie on the same line as \mathbf{u}_1 so that $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2\}$ can still span a \mathbb{R}^2 subspace. Similarly, in Figure 18.1(b), $\mathbf{u}_3 = \mathbf{x}_3 - z_{3,1} \mathbf{u}_1 - z_{3,2} \mathbf{u}_2$ does not lie in the subspace spanned by $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2\}$ so that $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3\}$ still can span a \mathbb{R}^3 subspace.

A moment of reflexion would reveal that the span of $\{\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1\}$ is the same as the span of $\{\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_1\}$. This equivalence extends to the \mathbf{v}_i vectors and \mathbf{y}_i vectors as well. We can express this property as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{span}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_j\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_j\}, & \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}; \\ \text{span}\{\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_j\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j\}, & \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}. \end{cases} \quad (18.2)$$




Figure 18.1: “Project” a vector onto a line and onto a space. Compare to the Gram-Schmidt process in Figure 3.2 (p. 52).

Furthermore, based on the rank-reducing property in the Wedderburn sequence, we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}_1) \supset \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}_2) \supset \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}_3) \supset \dots; \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_1^\top) \subset \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_2^\top) \subset \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_3^\top) \subset \dots \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathbf{y}_k \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top)$, it then follows that $\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top)$ for all $j < k + 1$, i.e., $\mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{y}_j = \mathbf{0}$ for all $j < k + 1$. This also holds true for $\mathbf{x}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{y}_j = 0$ for all $j < k + 1$. From

Equation (18.1), we also have $\mathbf{u}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{y}_j = 0$ for all $j < k + 1$. Following Equation (18.2), we obtain

$$\mathbf{v}_j^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_{k+1} = 0 \text{ for all } j < k + 1.$$

Similarly, we can prove

$$\mathbf{v}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_j = 0 \text{ for all } j < k + 1.$$

Moreover, we have defined $w_k = \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k$. According to Equation (18.1), we can express the w_k as:

$$\begin{aligned} w_k &= \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{u}_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k}{w_i} \mathbf{u}_i) \quad (\text{by the definition of } \mathbf{u}_k \text{ in Lemma 18.4}) \\ &= \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_k, \quad (\text{by } \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_j = 0 \text{ for all } j < k) \end{aligned}$$

which can be utilized to substitute the w_k in Lemma 18.4 and we then have the full version of the general term formula of the Wedderburn sequence. In this form, the formula does not depend on \mathbf{A}_k 's (in the form of w_k 's):

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k}{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i} \mathbf{u}_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i}{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i} \mathbf{v}_i. \quad (18.3)$$

Gram-Schmidt process from Wedderburn sequence. Suppose $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ effect a rank-reducing process for \mathbf{A} . Let \mathbf{A} be the identity matrix and (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) be identical and contain the vectors for which an orthogonal basis is desired, then $(\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V})$ gives the resultant orthogonal basis.

The expressions of \mathbf{u}_k and \mathbf{v}_k in Equation (18.3) closely resemble the projection onto the perpendicular space in the Gram-Schmidt process, as shown in Equation (3.1) (p. 51). We then define $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle := \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}$ to explicitly mimic the form of projection in Equation (3.1) (p. 51).

We consolidate the results obtained so far into the following lemma, which provides a concise overview of what we have been working on. These results will be extensively utilized in the sequel.

Lemma 18.5: (Properties of Wedderburn Sequence) For each matrix with $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_k - w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k$, then \mathbf{A}_{k+1} can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^k w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A},$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle} \mathbf{u}_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle} \mathbf{v}_i. \quad (18.4)$$

Furthermore, we can observe the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}_k &= \mathbf{A}_k\mathbf{x}_k, \\ \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (18.5)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } j < k. \quad (18.6)$$

$$w_k = \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k = \langle \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{v}_k \rangle \quad (18.7)$$

By substituting Equation (18.5) into Form 1 of the biconjugate decomposition, and using Equation (18.7), which implies $w_k = \mathbf{v}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_k$, we obtain the Form 2 and Form 3 of this decomposition:

Theorem 18.6: (Biconjugate Decomposition: Form 2 and Form 3) The equality arising from rank-reducing process implies the following matrix decomposition

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{\Omega}_r^{-1} \mathbf{V}_r^\top \mathbf{A},$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_r = \text{diag}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_r)$, $\mathbf{U}_r = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ and $\mathbf{V}_r = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ with

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle} \mathbf{u}_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{y}_k \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle} \mathbf{v}_i. \quad (18.8)$$

And also the following decomposition

$$\mathbf{V}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_\gamma = \mathbf{\Omega}_\gamma, \quad (18.9)$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_\gamma = \text{diag}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\gamma)$, $\mathbf{U}_\gamma = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_\gamma] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma}$ and $\mathbf{V}_\gamma = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_\gamma] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma}$. Note the difference between the subscripts r and γ we employed here with $\gamma \leq r$.

We notice that, in the above two forms of the biconjugate decomposition, they are independent of the Wedderburn matrices $\{\mathbf{A}_k\}$.

A word on the notation. We will employ subscripts to indicate the dimension of the matrix to prevent confusion in the following discussion, e.g., the r, γ notation used in the preceding theorem.

18.2. Properties of the Biconjugate Decomposition

Corollary 18.7: (Connection of \mathbf{U}_γ and \mathbf{X}_γ) If $(\mathbf{X}_\gamma, \mathbf{Y}_\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma}$ effects a rank-reducing process for \mathbf{A} , then there are unique unit upper triangular matrices $\mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(x)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \gamma}$ and $\mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(y)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma \times \gamma}$ such that

$$\mathbf{X}_\gamma = \mathbf{U}_\gamma \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(x)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Y}_\gamma = \mathbf{V}_\gamma \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(y)},$$

where U_γ and V_γ are matrices with columns derived from the Wedderburn sequence, as described in Equation (18.9).

Proof [of Corollary 18.7] The proof is straightforward based on the definitions of u_k and v_k in Equation (18.4) or Equation (18.8), by setting the j -th column of $R_\gamma^{(x)}$ and $R_\gamma^{(y)}$ as follows:

$$\left[\frac{\langle x_j, v_1 \rangle}{\langle u_1, v_1 \rangle}, \frac{\langle x_j, v_2 \rangle}{\langle u_2, v_2 \rangle}, \dots, \frac{\langle x_j, v_{j-1} \rangle}{\langle u_{j-1}, v_{j-1} \rangle}, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0 \right]^\top,$$

and

$$\left[\frac{\langle u_1, y_j \rangle}{\langle u_1, v_1 \rangle}, \frac{\langle u_2, y_j \rangle}{\langle u_2, v_2 \rangle}, \dots, \frac{\langle u_{j-1}, y_j \rangle}{\langle u_{j-1}, v_{j-1} \rangle}, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0 \right]^\top.$$

This completes the proof. \blacksquare

The pair $(U_\gamma, V_\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma}$ in Theorem 18.6 is called a **biconjugate pair** with respect to A if Ω_γ is nonsingular and diagonal. Furthermore, suppose the pair $(X_\gamma, Y_\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma}$ effects a rank-reducing process for A . Then the pair (X_γ, Y_γ) is said to be **biconjugatable** and **biconjugated into a biconjugate pair** of matrices (U_γ, V_γ) , if there exist unit upper triangular matrices $R_\gamma^{(x)}$ and $R_\gamma^{(y)}$ such that $X_\gamma = U_\gamma R_\gamma^{(x)}$ and $Y_\gamma = V_\gamma R_\gamma^{(y)}$.

18.3. Connection to Well-Known Decomposition Methods

18.3.1 LDU Decomposition

Theorem 18.8: (LDU, Chu et al. (1995) Theorem 2.4) Given $(X_\gamma, Y_\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with γ in $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. Then (X_γ, Y_γ) can be biconjugated if and only if $Y_\gamma^\top A X_\gamma$ has an LDU decomposition.

Proof [of Theorem 18.8] Suppose X_γ and Y_γ are biconjugatable, then there exist unit upper triangular matrices $R_\gamma^{(x)}$ and $R_\gamma^{(y)}$ such that $X_\gamma = U_\gamma R_\gamma^{(x)}$, $Y_\gamma = V_\gamma R_\gamma^{(y)}$, and $V_\gamma^\top A U_\gamma = \Omega_\gamma$ is a nonsingular diagonal matrix. Then it follows that

$$Y_\gamma^\top A X_\gamma = R_\gamma^{(y)\top} V_\gamma^\top A U_\gamma R_\gamma^{(x)} = R_\gamma^{(y)\top} \Omega_\gamma R_\gamma^{(x)}$$

is the unique LDU decomposition of $Y_\gamma^\top A X_\gamma$. This expression can be regarded as the **fourth form of biconjugate decomposition**.

Conversely, suppose $Y_\gamma^\top A X_\gamma = R_2^\top D R_1$ is an LDU decomposition with both R_1 and R_2 being unit upper triangular matrices. Then since R_1^{-1} and R_2^{-1} are also unit upper triangular matrices, (X_γ, Y_γ) biconjugates into $(X_\gamma R_1^{-1}, Y_\gamma R_2^{-1})$. \blacksquare

Corollary 18.9: (Determinant) Suppose $(\mathbf{X}_\gamma, \mathbf{Y}_\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times \gamma}$ are biconjugatable. Then it follows that

$$\det(\mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_\gamma) = \prod_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i.$$

Proof [of Corollary 18.9] By Theorem 18.8, since $(\mathbf{X}_\gamma, \mathbf{Y}_\gamma)$ are biconjugatable, then there exist unit upper triangular matrices $\mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(x)}$ and $\mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(y)}$ such that $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_\gamma = \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(y)\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_\gamma \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(x)}$. The determinant is simply the product of the trace. ■

Lemma 18.10: (Biconjugatable in Principal Minors) Let $r = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) \geq \gamma$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. In the Wedderburn sequence, we choose \mathbf{x}_i as the i -th basis in \mathbb{R}^n for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \gamma\}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$), and \mathbf{y}_i as the i -th basis in \mathbb{R}^m for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \gamma\}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$). That is, $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_\gamma$ corresponds to the leading principal submatrix of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_\gamma = \mathbf{A}_{1:\gamma, 1:\gamma}$. Then, $(\mathbf{X}_\gamma, \mathbf{Y}_\gamma)$ is biconjugatable if and only if the γ -th leading principal minor of \mathbf{A} is nonzero. In this case, the γ -th leading principal minor of \mathbf{A} is given by $\prod_{i=1}^{\gamma} w_i$.

Proof [of Lemma 18.10] The proof is straightforward that the γ -th leading principal minor of \mathbf{A} being nonzero will imply that $w_i \neq 0$ for all $i \leq \gamma$. Thus the Wedderburn sequence can be successfully obtained. The converse holds since Corollary 18.9 implies the $\det(\mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_\gamma)$ is nonzero. ■

We have now arrived at the LDU decomposition for square matrices.

Theorem 18.11: (LDU: Biconjugate Decomposition for Square Matrices) For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the pair $(\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{I}_n)$ is biconjugatable if and only if all the leading principal minors of \mathbf{A} are nonzero. In this case, \mathbf{A} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{V}_n^{-\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{U},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n = \mathbf{D}$ is a diagonal matrix with nonzero values along its diagonal, $\mathbf{V}_n^{-\top} = \mathbf{L}$ is a unit lower triangular matrix, and $\mathbf{U}_n^{-1} = \mathbf{U}$ is a unit upper triangular matrix.

Proof [of Theorem 18.11] According to Lemma 18.10, it is evident that the pair $(\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{I}_n)$ is biconjugatable. Based on Corollary 18.7, we have $\mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)}$, thus $\mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{U}_n^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{R}_n^{(y)} = \mathbf{V}_n^{-1}$ are well defined and we complete the proof. ■

18.3.2 Cholesky Decomposition

For symmetric and positive definite matrices, the leading principal minors are always positive. The proof is provided in Section 2.3 (p. 32). Then we have the following biconjugate decomposition for positive definite matrices.

Theorem 18.12: (Cholesky: Biconjugate Decomposition for PD Matrices) For any symmetric and positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the Cholesky decomposition of \mathbf{A} can be obtained from the Wedderburn sequence when setting $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ as the pair $(\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{I}_n)$. In this case, \mathbf{A} can be factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_n^{-\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} = (\mathbf{U}_n^{-\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2})(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{U}_n^{-1}) = \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R},$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ is a diagonal matrix with positive values along the diagonal, and \mathbf{U}^{-1} is a unit upper triangular matrix.

Proof [of Theorem 18.12] Since the leading principal minors of positive definite matrices are positive, $w_i > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. It can be easily verified via the LDU from biconjugation decomposition and the symmetric property of \mathbf{A} that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}_n^{-\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1}$. And since w_i 's are positive, thus $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$ is positive definite and it can be factored as $\mathbf{\Omega}_n = \mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2}$. This implies $\mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{U}_n^{-1}$ is the Cholesky factor. ■

18.3.3 QR Decomposition

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has full rank so that \mathbf{A} admits the QR decomposition: $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$ with $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} have full rank. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 18.13: (QR: Biconjugate Decomposition for Nonsingular Matrices) For any nonsingular matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the QR decomposition of \mathbf{A} can be obtained from the Wedderburn sequence when setting $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ as $(\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{A})$. Thus, \mathbf{A} can be factored as

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R},$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$ is an orthogonal matrix and $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)}$ is an upper triangular matrix, according to the **Form 4** in Theorem 18.8 and let $\gamma = n$:

$$\mathbf{Y}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)},$$

where we set $\gamma = n$ since γ is any value with $\gamma \leq r$ and the rank $r = n$.

Proof [of Theorem 18.13] Since $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n) = (\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{A})$, applying Theorem 18.8, we have the decomposition

$$\mathbf{Y}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)}.$$

Substituting (I_n, \mathbf{A}) into the decomposition above, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Y}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_n &= \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} \\
\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} \\
\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_1 \quad (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \text{ is symmetric and let } \mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)}) \quad (18.10) \\
\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} &= (\mathbf{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2\top})(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_1) \\
\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R}. \quad (\text{Let } \mathbf{R} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_1)
\end{aligned}$$

To see why $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n$ can be factored as $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2}$, we consider the following steps. Suppose $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$ is the column partition of \mathbf{A} , we obtain $w_i = \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{a}_i > 0$ since \mathbf{A} is nonsingular. Thus, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n = \text{diag}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$ is positive definite and it can be factored as

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2}. \quad (18.11)$$

By $\mathbf{X}_\gamma = \mathbf{U}_\gamma \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(x)}$ in Theorem 18.8 for all $\gamma \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{X}_n &= \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_1 \\
\mathbf{I}_n &= \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_1, \quad (\text{Since } \mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{I}_n) \\
\mathbf{U}_n &= \mathbf{R}_1^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

By $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma = \mathbf{V}_\gamma \mathbf{R}_\gamma^{(y)}$ in Theorem 18.8 for all $\gamma \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Y}_n &= \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_1 \\
\mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_1, \quad (\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Y}_n) \\
\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_1 \\
\mathbf{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_1 &= \mathbf{R}_1^\top \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_1, \quad (\text{Equation (18.10)}) \\
(\mathbf{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2\top})(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_1) &= (\mathbf{R}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2\top} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2\top}) \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{V}_n (\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{R}_1), \quad (\text{Equation (18.11)}) \\
\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} &= \mathbf{R}^\top (\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2\top} \mathbf{V}_n^\top)(\mathbf{V}_n \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}) \mathbf{R} \quad (18.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{V}_n \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}$ is an orthogonal matrix. \blacksquare

18.3.4 SVD

To distinguish the notation, let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\text{svd}} \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}\top}$ be the SVD of \mathbf{A} , where $\mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}} = [\mathbf{u}_1^{\text{svd}}, \mathbf{u}_2^{\text{svd}}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n^{\text{svd}}]$, $\mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}} = [\mathbf{v}_1^{\text{svd}}, \mathbf{v}_2^{\text{svd}}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n^{\text{svd}}]$, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\text{svd}} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = n$. Readers can verify the equivalence for a general matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

If the pair $(\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}}, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}})$ effects a rank-reducing process for \mathbf{A} . From the definition of \mathbf{u}_k and \mathbf{v}_k in Equation (18.4) or Equation (18.8), we have

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{v}_k^{\text{svd}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{u}_k^{\text{svd}} \quad \text{and} \quad w_k = \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k = \sigma_k.$$

This implies $\mathbf{V}_n = \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}}$, $\mathbf{U}_n = \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}}$, and $\mathbf{\Omega}_n = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{\text{svd}}$, where we set $\gamma = n$ since γ is any value that $\gamma \leq r$ and the rank $r = n$.

By $\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)}$ in Theorem 18.8, we have

$$\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}} = \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}} \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)}$$

By $\mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)}$ in Theorem 18.8, we have

$$\mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{V}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}} = \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}} \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{leads to}} \quad \mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)}$$

Again, applying Theorem 18.8 and letting $\gamma = n$, we have

$$\mathbf{Y}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{V}_n^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)} = \mathbf{R}_n^{(y)\top} \mathbf{\Omega}_n \mathbf{R}_n^{(x)}.$$

That is

$$\mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}\top} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{\text{svd}},$$

which corresponds precisely to the form of a SVD and we prove the equivalence between the SVD and the biconjugate decomposition when the Wedderburn sequence is applied to $(\mathbf{V}^{\text{svd}}, \mathbf{U}^{\text{svd}})$ as $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$.

18.4. Proof General Term Formula of Wedderburn Sequence

We define the Wedderburn sequence of \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{A}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_k - w_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A}_k$ and $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A}$. The proof of the general term formula for this sequence is as follows:

Proof [of Lemma 18.4] For \mathbf{A}_2 , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_2 &= \mathbf{A}_1 - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_1^\top \mathbf{A}_1 \\ &= \mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$, and $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1$.

For \mathbf{A}_3 , we can write out the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_3 &= \mathbf{A}_2 - w_2^{-1} \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_2^\top \mathbf{A}_2 \\ &= (\mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A}) \\ &\quad - w_2^{-1} (\mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_2^\top (\mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A}) \quad (\text{substitute } \mathbf{A}_2) \\ &= (\mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A}) \\ &\quad - w_2^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{x}_2 - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_2) (\mathbf{y}_2^\top - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{y}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top) \mathbf{A} \quad (\text{take out } \mathbf{A}) \\ &= \mathbf{A} - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A} - w_2^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{v}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \\ &= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{x}_2 - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_2 - \frac{\mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_2}{w_1} \mathbf{u}_1$, and $\mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{y}_2 - w_1^{-1} \mathbf{y}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2 - \frac{\mathbf{y}_2^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_1}{w_1} \mathbf{v}_1$. Similarly, we can find the expression of \mathbf{A}_4 by \mathbf{A} :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_4 &= \mathbf{A}_3 - w_3^{-1} \mathbf{A}_3 \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{y}_3^\top \mathbf{A}_3 \\
&= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \\
&\quad - w_3^{-1} (\mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{y}_3^\top (\mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}) \quad (\text{substitute } \mathbf{A}_3) \\
&= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \\
&\quad - w_3^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{x}_3 - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A}) (\mathbf{y}_3^\top - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{y}_3^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top) \mathbf{A} \quad (\text{take out } \mathbf{A}) \\
&= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} - w_3^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_3 \mathbf{v}_3^\top \mathbf{A} \\
&= \mathbf{A} - \sum_{i=1}^3 w_i^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_3 = \mathbf{x}_3 - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_3}{w_i} \mathbf{u}_i$, and $\mathbf{v}_3 = \mathbf{y}_3 - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mathbf{y}_3^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i}{w_i} \mathbf{v}_i$.

Continuing this process, we can define

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_k}{w_i} \mathbf{u}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\mathbf{y}_k^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u}_i}{w_i} \mathbf{v}_i,$$

and find the general term of Wedderburn sequence. ■

Chapter 18 Problems

1. Discuss the Gram-Schmidt process within the context of the Wedderburn sequence.
2. Following Section 18.3.4, verify the equivalence between the SVD and the biconjugate decomposition for a general matrix \mathbf{A} of size $m \times n$.

Bibliography

- Sudipto Banerjee and Anindya Roy. *Linear algebra and matrix analysis for statistics*, volume 181. Crc Press Boca Raton, FL, USA:, 2014. [1](#)
- Amir Beck. *Introduction to nonlinear optimization: Theory, algorithms, and applications with MATLAB*. SIAM, 2014. [204](#)
- Amir Beck. *First-Order Methods in Optimization*, volume 25. SIAM, 2017. [1](#)
- James Bennett, Stan Lanning, et al. The netflix prize. In *Proceedings of KDD cup and workshop*, volume 2007, page 35. New York, NY, USA., 2007. [202](#)
- Michael W Berry, Murray Browne, Amy N Langville, V Paul Pauca, and Robert J Plemmons. Algorithms and applications for approximate nonnegative matrix factorization. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 52(1):155–173, 2007. [225](#), [228](#)
- Christopher M Bishop. Pattern recognition. *Machine learning*, 128(9), 2006. [1](#), [184](#)
- Christos Boutsidis and Efstratios Gallopoulos. Svd based initialization: A head start for nonnegative matrix factorization. *Pattern recognition*, 41(4):1350–1362, 2008. [228](#)
- Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Introduction to applied linear algebra: vectors, matrices, and least squares*. Cambridge university press, 2018. [1](#)
- Stephen Boyd, Stephen P Boyd, and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004. [184](#)
- Thomas Brouwer, Jes Frellsen, and Pietro Lió. Comparative study of inference methods for Bayesian nonnegative matrix factorisation. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 513–529. Springer, 2017. [228](#)
- Jean-Philippe Brunet, Pablo Tamayo, Todd R Golub, and Jill P Mesirov. Metagenes and molecular pattern discovery using matrix factorization. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 101(12):4164–4169, 2004. [227](#)

- Tony F Chan. An improved algorithm for computing the singular value decomposition. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 8(1):72–83, 1982. 128
- Tony F Chan. Rank revealing QR factorizations. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 88: 67–82, 1987. 60, 62
- Ronald Christensen. *Linear models for multivariate, time series, and spatial data*, volume 1. Springer, 1991. 199
- Moody T Chu, Robert E Funderlic, and Gene H Golub. A rank-one reduction formula and its applications to matrix factorizations. *SIAM review*, 37(4):512–530, 1995. 231, 236
- Joel E Cohen and Uriel G Rothblum. Nonnegative ranks, decompositions, and factorizations of nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 190:149–168, 1993. 225
- Pierre Comon, Xavier Luciani, and André LF De Almeida. Tensor decompositions, alternating least squares and other tales. *Journal of Chemometrics: A Journal of the Chemometrics Society*, 23(7-8):393–405, 2009. 203
- Robyn M Dawes and Bernard Corrigan. Linear models in decision making. *Psychological bulletin*, 81(2):95, 1974. 199
- Froilán M Dopico, Charles R Johnson, and Juan M Molera. Multiple LU factorizations of a singular matrix. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 419(1):24–36, 2006. 14
- Ricardo D Fierro and Per Christian Hansen. Low-rank revealing UTV decompositions. *Numerical Algorithms*, 15(1):37–55, 1997. 82
- Leslie V Foster. Solving rank-deficient and ill-posed problems using UTV and QR factorizations. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 25(2):582–600, 2003. 182
- John Fox. *Applied regression analysis, linear models, and related methods*. Sage Publications, Inc, 1997. 199
- Jean Gallier and Jocelyn Quaintance. *Fundamentals of Linear Algebra and Optimization*. Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania, 2017. 1
- Yuan Gao and George Church. Improving molecular cancer class discovery through sparse non-negative matrix factorization. *Bioinformatics*, 21(21):3970–3975, 2005. 227
- James E Gentle. *Numerical linear algebra for applications in statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998. 1
- James E Gentle. Matrix algebra. *Springer texts in statistics*, Springer, New York, NY, doi, 10:978–0, 2007. 1
- Paris V Giampouras, Athanasios A Rontogiannis, and Konstantinos D Koutroumbas. Alternating iteratively reweighted least squares minimization for low-rank matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(2):490–503, 2018. 203

- George T Gilbert. Positive definite matrices and Sylvester's criterion. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 98(1):44–46, 1991. [33](#)
- Philip E Gill, Walter Murray, and Margaret H Wright. *Numerical linear algebra and optimization*. SIAM, 2021. [1](#)
- Nicolas Gillis. The why and how of nonnegative matrix factorization. *Connections*, 12:2–2, 2014. [228](#)
- Nicolas Gillis. *Nonnegative matrix factorization*. SIAM, 2020. [225](#)
- Israel Gohberg and Seymour Goldberg. A simple proof of the Jordan decomposition theorem for matrices. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 103(2):157–159, 1996. [138](#)
- Donald Goldfarb. Factorized variable metric methods for unconstrained optimization. *Mathematics of Computation*, 30(136):796–811, 1976. [43](#)
- Gene Golub and William Kahan. Calculating the singular values and pseudo-inverse of a matrix. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series B: Numerical Analysis*, 2(2):205–224, 1965. [126](#)
- Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*, volume 3. JHU press, 2013. [1](#), [50](#), [82](#), [120](#), [123](#), [182](#)
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016. [1](#)
- AW Hales and IBS Passi. Jordan decomposition. In *Algebra*, pages 75–87. Springer, 1999. [138](#)
- F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. The movielens datasets: History and context. *Acm transactions on interactive intelligent systems (tiis)*, 5(4):1–19, 2015. [220](#)
- Nicholas J Higham. *Accuracy and stability of numerical algorithms*. SIAM, 2002. [1](#), [25](#)
- Nicholas J Higham. Cholesky factorization. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 1(2):251–254, 2009. [39](#)
- Harold Hotelling. Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components. *Journal of educational psychology*, 24(6):417, 1933. [184](#)
- Alston S Householder. *Principles of numerical analysis*. Courier Corporation, 2006. [1](#)
- Tsung-Min Hwang, Wen-Wei Lin, and Eugene K Yang. Rank revealing LU factorizations. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 175:115–141, 1992. [25](#)
- Camille Jordan. *Traité des substitutions et des équations algébriques*. Gauthier-Villars, 1870. [136](#)
- N Kishore Kumar and Jan Schneider. Literature survey on low rank approximation of matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 65(11):2212–2244, 2017. [186](#)

- Martin Koeber and Uwe Schäfer. The unique square root of a positive semidefinite matrix. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 37(8):990–992, 2006. [170](#)
- PW Lane. Generalized linear models in soil science. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 53(2):241–251, 2002. [199](#)
- Charles L Lawson and Richard J Hanson. *Solving least squares problems*. SIAM, 1995. [128](#)
- Daniel D Lee and Hyunjune Sebastian Seung. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. In *14th Annual Neural Information Processing Systems Conference, NIPS 2000*. Neural information processing systems foundation, 2001. [225](#), [226](#)
- Jun Lu. Machine learning modeling for time series problem: Predicting flight ticket prices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07205*, 2017. [199](#)
- Jun Lu. A survey on Bayesian inference for Gaussian mixture model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.11753*, 2021a. [42](#)
- Jun Lu. On the column and row ranks of a matrix. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06638*, 2021b. [84](#)
- Jun Lu. Numerical matrix decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.02579*, 2021c. [1](#), [22](#), [54](#), [60](#), [70](#), [93](#), [116](#), [123](#), [128](#), [154](#), [160](#), [167](#), [187](#), [200](#), [204](#), [208](#), [233](#)
- Jun Lu. Revisit the fundamental theorem of linear algebra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04432*, 2021d. [181](#)
- Jun Lu. A rigorous introduction to linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04240*, *Eliva Press*, 2022a. [50](#), [75](#), [77](#), [93](#), [160](#), [166](#), [184](#), [199](#)
- Jun Lu. Bayesian low-rank interpolative decomposition for complex datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14825*, *Studies in Engineering and Technology*, 9(1):1–12, 2022b. [103](#)
- Jun Lu. Comparative study of inference methods for interpolative decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14542*, 2022c. [103](#)
- Jun Lu. Gradient descent, stochastic optimization, and other tales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00832*, *Eliva Press*, 2022d. [211](#)
- Jun Lu. Bayesian matrix decomposition and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11337*, 2023. [228](#)
- Jun Lu and Xuanyu Ye. Flexible and hierarchical prior for Bayesian nonnegative matrix factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11025*, 2022. [228](#)
- Per-Gunnar Martinsson. Randomized methods for matrix computations. *The Mathematics of Data*, 25(4):187–231, 2019. [103](#), [186](#)
- Jose Menchero, D Orr, and Jun Wang. The Barra US equity model (USE4), methodology notes. *English, MSCI (May)*, 2011. [199](#)

- L Miranian and Ming Gu. Strong rank revealing LU factorizations. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 367:1–16, 2003. [14](#)
- Raphael A Mrode. *Linear models for the prediction of animal breeding values*. Cabi, 2014. [199](#)
- Pentti Paatero and Unto Tapper. Positive matrix factorization: A non-negative factor model with optimal utilization of error estimates of data values. *Environmetrics*, 5(2): 111–126, 1994. [225](#)
- C-T Pan. On the existence and computation of rank-revealing LU factorizations. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 316(1-3):199–222, 2000. [14](#)
- V Paul Pauca, Jon Piper, and Robert J Plemmons. Nonnegative matrix factorization for spectral data analysis. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 416(1):29–47, 2006. [226](#)
- Karl Pearson. Liii. on lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin philosophical magazine and journal of science*, 2(11): 559–572, 1901. [184](#)
- Alfio Quarteroni, Riccardo Sacco, and Fausto Saleri. *Numerical mathematics*, volume 37. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010. [1](#)
- Lawrence R Schaeffer. Application of random regression models in animal breeding. *Livestock Production Science*, 86(1-3):35–45, 2004. [199](#)
- Wil HA Schilders. Solution of indefinite linear systems using an LQ decomposition for the linear constraints. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 431(3-4):381–395, 2009. [71](#)
- Matthias Seeger. Low rank updates for the Cholesky decomposition. Technical report, 2004. [40](#), [43](#)
- Jonathon Shlens. A tutorial on principal component analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1100*, 2014. [184](#)
- GW Stewart. The decompositional approach to matrix computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 2(1):50–59, 2000. [1](#)
- Gilbert Strang. *Introduction to linear algebra*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press Wellesley, 4th edition, 2009. [1](#), [34](#), [50](#), [138](#)
- Gilbert Strang. *Linear algebra and learning from data*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press Cambridge, 2019. [1](#), [199](#)
- Gilbert Strang. *Linear algebra for everyone*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press Wellesley, 2021. [1](#), [89](#), [91](#), [199](#)
- Gilbert Strang and Daniel Drucker. Three matrix factorizations from the steps of elimination. 2021. [viii](#)

- Gilbert Strang and Cleve Moler. LU and CR elimination. *SIAM Review*, 64(1):181–190, 2022. [89](#)
- Kuduvally Swamy. On Sylvester’s criterion for positive-semidefinite matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 18(3):306–306, 1973. [33](#)
- Gábor Takács and Domonkos Tikk. Alternating least squares for personalized ranking. In *Proceedings of the sixth ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pages 83–90, 2012. [203](#)
- Lloyd N Trefethen and David Bau III. *Numerical linear algebra*, volume 50. Siam, 1997. [1](#), [50](#), [110](#), [128](#), [199](#)
- Robert van de Geijn and Margaret Myers. Advanced linear algebra: Foundations to frontiers. *Creative Commons NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)*, 2020. [1](#), [138](#)
- Field G Van Zee, Robert A Van De Geijn, Gregorio Quintana-Ortí, and G Joseph Elizondo. Families of algorithms for reducing a matrix to condensed form. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 39(1):1–32, 2012. [110](#)
- Field G Van Zee, Robert A Van de Geijn, and Gregorio Quintana-Ortí. Restructuring the tridiagonal and bidiagonal QR algorithms for performance. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 40(3):1–34, 2014. [110](#)
- Kenneth S Williams. The nth power of a 2x2 matrix. *Mathematics Magazine*, 65(5):336, 1992. [140](#)
- Ming Yang. Matrix decomposition. *Northwestern University, Class Notes*, 2000. [50](#), [231](#)

Alphabetical Index

- Algebraic multiplicity, 156
- ALS, 203
- Backward substitution, 14
- Basis, 4
- Bayesian inference, 228
- Bayesian matrix decomposition, 228
- Bayesian optimization, 228
- Bidiagonal matrix, 123
- Cancellation, 57
- CGS, 53
- Characteristic polynomial, 155
- Classical Gram-Schmidt process, 53
- Column pivoting, 59, 60
- Column space, 4
- Column-pivoted QR (CPQR), 59
- Complete pivoting, 24
- Coordinate transformation, 193
- CPQR, 59
- Cramer's rule, 100
- Data interpretation, 89
- Data storage, 103
- Decomposition: ALS, 202
- Decomposition: Biconjugate, 231
- Decomposition: Bidiagonal, 123
- Decomposition: Cholesky, 29
- Decomposition: CR, 89
- Decomposition: EVD, 135
- Decomposition: Hessenberg, 111
- Decomposition: ID, 99
- Decomposition: LU, 13
- Decomposition: QR, 49
- Decomposition: Schur, 143
- Decomposition: Skeleton, 95
- Decomposition: Spectral, 149
- Decomposition: SVD, 173
- Decomposition: Tridiagonal, 119
- Decomposition: UTV, 81
- Determinant, 143
- Dimension, 4
- Eckart-Young-Miskys theorem, 187
- Eigenvalue, 3
- Eigenvalue decomposition, 135
- Eigenvector, 3
- Elementary transformation, 14
- EVD, 135
- Fibonacci number, 138
- Frobenius norm, 188
- Fundamental spaces, 6, 72
- Fundamental theorem, 54
- Fundamental theorem of linear algebra, 6
- Gaussian elimination, 14, 90
- General formula of a sequence, 138
- Geometric multiplicity, 156
- Givens rotation, 66

- Golub-Kahan process, 128
- Gradient descent (GD), 211
- Gram–Schmidt, 233, 234
- Hessenbert matrix, 110
- Householder reflector, 62
- Householder transformation, 62
- Idempotency, 166
- Idempotent, 166
- Idempotent matrix, 93
- Implicit Q theorem, 115, 120
- Independence check, 58
- Induction, 36
- Inverse of a matrix, 22
- Jordan block, 137
- Kernel, 4
- Krylov matrix, 116
- Leading principal minors, 13, 237
- Least squares, 180–182, 199
- LHC bidiagonalization, 128
- LHC process, 128
- Linearly independent, 4
- Low-rank approximation, 186
- Machine precision, 226
- Matlab-style notation, 3
- Matrix bandwidth, 20
- Matrix multiplication, 193
- Matrix rank, 5
- MGS, 53
- Modified Gram-Schmidt process, 53
- Multiplicity, 156
- Netflix, 202
- NMF, 225
- Nonsingular matrix, 8
- Null space, 4
- Nullspace, 4
- Numerical stability, 53
- Orthogonal, 52
- Orthogonal complement, 5
- Orthogonal equivalence, 178
- Orthogonal equivalent matrices, 178
- Orthogonal matrix, 7, 52
- Orthogonal rojection, 54
- Orthonormal, 52
- Orthonormal basis, 72
- Partial pivoting, 23
- Permutaiton matrix, 7
- Pivot, 16, 34, 91
- Pivoting, 25
- Positive definite, 29, 32, 167
- Positive semidefinite, 29, 39, 167
- Principal component analysis, 184
- Projection matrix, 166
- Pseudo-inverse, 183
- Range, 4
- Rank, 4, 5, 91
- Rank decomposition, 92
- Rank-deficient, 181
- Rank-one reduction, 231
- Rank-one update, 40, 73
- Rank-revealing, 25, 39, 40, 60, 168
- Rank-revealing LU, 25
- Rank-revealing QR, 61
- Rank-two update, 43
- Recursive algorithm, 31
- Reduced row echelon form, 90, 91
- Revealing rank r deficiency, 61
- Revealing rank-one deficiency, 60
- Rook pivoting, 25
- Row echelon form, 90
- Row equivalent, 25
- Row space, 71
- Row-pivoted, 72
- RPLQ, 72
- Schur complement, 30
- Semidefinite rank-revealing, 39, 168
- Similar matrices, 111, 156
- Similarity tansformation, 111
- Singular matrix, 9
- Skeleton, 95
- Skew-symmetric matrix, 163
- Span, 4
- Spectral radius, 3

Spectrum, [3](#)
Subspace, [3](#)
Sylvester's criterion, [33](#)

Trace, [93](#), [112](#)
Tridiagonal matrix, [119](#)

Truncated, [185](#)
Truncated SVD, [185](#)
Uniqueness, [37](#), [70](#)
Upper triangular, [35](#)
Wedderburn sequence, [232](#)

