# Giving up optimality

What problem should we actually solve then?

### Recap: The Power Method

How did the power method work again?

A diagonalizable will eigenvalue 
$$\lambda_1$$
.  $\lambda_n$  and eig vec  $x_1$ .  $X_n$ 

$$|\lambda_1| > |\lambda_2| > \dots |\lambda_n| > 0$$

$$y = \alpha_1 \times_1 + \dots + \lambda_n$$

$$\lambda_1 = \alpha_1 \times_1 + \dots + \lambda_n$$

### How do we construct the LRA basis?

#### Put randomness to work:

# Tweaking the Range Finder (I)

Can we accelerate convergence?

# Tweaking the Range Finder (II)

What is one possible issue with the power method?

## Even Faster Matvecs for Range Finding

Assumptions on  $\Omega$  are pretty weak—can use more or less anything we want.  $\to$  Make it so that we can apply the matvec  $A\Omega$  in  $O(n\log\ell)$  time. How? Pick  $\Omega$  as a carefully-chosen subsampling of the Fourier transform.



### Errors in Random Approximations

If we use the randomized range finder, how close do we get to the optimal answer?

#### Theorem

For an  $m \times n$  matrix A, a target rank  $k \ge 2$  and an oversampling parameter  $p \ge 2$  with  $k + p \le \min(m, n)$ , with probability  $1 - 6 \cdot p^{-p}$ ,

$$|A - QQ^TA|_2 \leqslant (1 + 11\sqrt{k + p}\sqrt{\min(m, n)}) \sigma_{k+1}.$$

(given a few more very mild assumptions on p)

[Halko/Tropp/Martinsson '10, 10.3]

Message: We can probably (!) get away with oversampling parameters as small as p=5.

### A-posteriori and Adaptivity

The result on the previous slide was a-priori. Once we're done, can we find out 'how well it turned out'?

estimate 
$$\|A-QQTA\|_2$$
 $E = (I-QQT)A$ 

We're interested in  $O_1(E)$ 

read.veco with  $\|\omega\|_2 = 1$ 

Use  $\|E\|_2 \propto \frac{\|A\omega\|_1}{\|\omega\|_2}$ 

Adaptive Range Finding: Algorithm

- Compade a small ith	(R/A
- Check shell or it's OK	(by the esthution proc.)
- Too by? Continue	with more and vec.

### Rank-revealing/pivoted QR

Sometimes the SVD is too good (aka expensive)—we may need less accuracy/weaker promises, for a significant decrease in cost.

A 
$$= QR = Q(R_1, R_2)$$
where
$$R_1 \in R^{k \times k}$$

$$||R_1||_{L^{1}} \text{ is } ^k \text{ small}^k$$

$$Q^{\dagger}Q = ||R_1||_{L^{1}}$$

Using RRQR for LRA

G/VL ch.5

```
- Onto & Il Rzz IIz (it would bent the SVD)
- To precision Illalla, A has non routh k.
```

## Interpolative Decomposition (ID): Definition

Would be helpful to know *columns of A* that contribute 'the most' to the rank.

(orthogonal transformation like in QR 'muddies the waters')

### **ID**: Computation

How do we construct this (from RRQR): (short/fat case)

$$A\Pi = Q(Q_{\parallel} Q_{\square}) \qquad B = QQ_{\parallel} = A_{\{:,\}\}}$$

 $\mathbb{Q}$ : What is P, in terms of the RRQR?

### ID Q vs ID A

What does row selection mean for the LRA?

$$A \approx Q Q^{T} A$$

$$Q = P Q_{[\gamma_{i}]}$$

$$A_{(\gamma_{i})} = P_{(\gamma_{i})} Q_{[\gamma_{i}]} Q^{T} A$$

$$P A_{(\gamma_{i})} = P Q_{[\gamma_{i}]} Q^{T} A$$

[Martinsson, Rokhlin, Tygert '06]

ssen, remin, Tygert sej

Demo: Interpolative Decomposition

	mized tools have two stages:	
1. Find ON	IB of approximate range	
2. Do actu	al work only on approximate range	
Complexity?		
A / 1	mpact of the ID?	

## **ID-based Complexity Reduction**

How can we reduce factorization complexity with the ID?		