# CS 598 EVS: Tensor Computations Matrix Computations Background

Edgar Solomonik

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

# Matrices and Tensors

§ What is a matrix?

§ What is a tensor?

### Matrix Norms

§ **Properties of matrix norms**:

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\|A\| &\geqslant 0\\ \n\|A\| &= 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad A = 0\\ \n\|\alpha A\| &= |\alpha| \cdot \|A\|\\ \n\|A + B\| &\leqslant \|A\| + \|B\| \quad \text{(triangle inequality)}\n\end{aligned}
$$

- § **Frobenius norm**:
- § **Operator/induced/subordinate matrix norms**:

### Existence of SVD

**• Consider any maximizer**  $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $||x_1||_2 = 1$  to  $||Ax_1||_2$ 

# Singular Value Decomposition

§ The singular value decomposition (SVD)

§ Condition number in terms of singular values

#### Visualization of Matrix Conditioning



# Matrix Condition Number

Extem the matrix condition number  $\kappa(A)$  is the ratio between the max and min distance from the surface to the center of the unit ball (norm-1 vectors) transformed by A:

§ The matrix condition number bounds the worst-case amplification of error in a matrix-vector product:

#### Linear Systems

- ► Given a square matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with rank  $n$ , consider solving  $Ax = b$  given  $b$
- $\blacktriangleright$  The SVD allows explicit inversion of  $A$

▶ However, Gaussian elimination is more computationally efficient

 $\blacktriangleright$  Given a factorization of  $\bm A,$  solving a system with  $\bm A + \bm u \bm v^T$  has cost  $O(n^2)$  via the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula

#### Linear Least Squares

$$
\text{ Find } x^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|Ax - b\|_2 \text{ where } A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}:
$$

 $\blacktriangleright$  Given the SVD  $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{U} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{V}^T$  we have  $\boldsymbol{x}^\star = \boldsymbol{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\dagger \boldsymbol{U}^T$  $A^{\dagger}$ b, where  $\Sigma^{\dagger}$  contains the reciprocal of all nonzeros in  $\Sigma$ , and more generally  $\dagger$  denotes pseudoinverse:

### Normal Equations

*Demo: [Normal equations vs Pseudoinverse](https://relate.cs.illinois.edu/course/cs450-f18/f/demos/upload/03-least-squares/Normal equations vs Pseudoinverse.html) Demo: [Issues with the normal equations](https://relate.cs.illinois.edu/course/cs450-f18/f/demos/upload/03-least-squares/Issues with the normal equations.html)*

▶ Normal equations are given by solving 
$$
A^T A x = A^T b
$$
:

 $\blacktriangleright$  However, solving the normal equations is a more ill-conditioned problem then the original least squares algorithm

# Solving the Normal Equations

▶ If A is full-rank, then  $A^T A$  is symmetric positive definite (SPD):

Since  $A^T A$  is SPD we can use Cholesky factorization, to factorize it and solve linear systems:

# QR Factorization

 $\triangleright$  If A is full-rank there exists an orthogonal matrix Q and a unique upper-triangular matrix R with a positive diagonal such that  $A = QR$ 

 $\triangleright$  A reduced QR factorization (unique part of general QR) is defined so that  $\boldsymbol{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  has orthonormal columns and  $\boldsymbol{R}$  is square and upper-triangular

 $\triangleright$  We can solve the normal equations (and consequently the linear least squares problem) via reduced QR as follows

# Computing the QR Factorization

§ The Cholesky-QR algorithm uses the normal equations to obtain the QR factorization

§ Orthogonalization-based methods are most efficient and stable for QR factorization of dense matrices

### Householder orthogonalization



#### Eigenvalue Decomposition

§ If a matrix A is diagonalizable, it has an *eigenvalue decomposition*

 $\blacktriangleright$  A and B are *similar*, if there exist Z such that  $A = ZBZ^{-1}$ 

# Similarity of Matrices

#### Invertible similarity transformations  $Y = XAX^{-1}$



Unitary similarity transformations  $Y = UAU^H$ 



Orthogonal similarity transformations  $\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{Q}^T$ 



#### Field of Values

 $\triangleright$  For any square matrix A and vector x the *Rayleigh quotient* is

§ Its magnitude is bounded by the singular values as

 $\blacktriangleright$  If  $x$  is an eigenvector of  $A$ , so  $Ax = \lambda x$  or  $x^H A = \lambda x^H$ , then

 $\blacktriangleright$  The set  $\mathcal{F}_{\bm A} = \{\rho_{\bm A}(\bm x): \bm x\in \mathbb{C}^n, \bm x\neq 0\}$  is the *field of values* of  $\bm A$ 

# Field of Values and Eigenvalues

- Elearly any eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $\boldsymbol{A}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{A}}$
- For the matrix  $\bm{A} =$  $\Bigg\}$ 3  $-3$ 3 1 1  $\Big|$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_A$  is<sup>1</sup>
- $\triangleright$  The field of values of a normal matrix is easy to characterize

 $\blacktriangleright$  In general, eigenvectors are obtained from critical points of the Rayleigh quotient on the unit circle

 $\overline{z}$ 

# Singular Vectors as Critical Points

▶ Like eigenvectors, we can also derive singular vectors from an optimization (critical point) perspective

#### Matrix Functions

 $\blacktriangleright$  Consider a polynomial  $p,$  for a diagonalizable matrix  $\bm A = \bm X \bm D \bm X^{-1},$ 

$$
p(\boldsymbol{A}) = \boldsymbol{X} p(\boldsymbol{D}) \boldsymbol{X}^{-1}
$$

 $\triangleright$  The above definition readily extends to other analytic functions f, but non-diagonalizable matrices require a more sophisticated definition

# Crouzeix's conjecture

- ► So far, we have seen close connections between the matrix 2-norm and singular values, and between the Rayleigh quotient and the eigenvalues
- $\triangleright$  An important open problem in numerical analysis that relates the norm with the Rayleigh quotient is Crouzeix's conjecture

# Computing Eigenvalue and Singular Value Decompositions

 $\triangleright$  Direct methods for eigenvalue problems start by reducing the matrix to upper-Hessenberg form

 $\blacktriangleright$  Iterative methods are generally based on products with the matrix

### Introduction to Krylov Subspace Methods

 $\triangleright$  *Krylov subspace methods* work with information contained in the  $n \times k$  matrix

$$
K_k = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & Ax_0 & \cdots & A^{k-1}x_0 \end{bmatrix}
$$

 $\blacktriangleright$  Assuming  $\pmb{K}_n$  is invertible, the matrix  $\pmb{K}_n^{-1}\pmb{A}\pmb{K}_n$  is a *companion matrix*  $\pmb{C}$ :

#### Krylov Subspaces

► Given  $Q_kR_k = K_k$ , we obtain an orthonormal basis for the Krylov subspace,

$$
\mathcal{K}_k(\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{x}_0)=\text{span}(\boldsymbol{Q}_k)=\{p(\boldsymbol{A})\boldsymbol{x}_0:\text{deg}(p)< k\},
$$

where  $p$  is any polynomial of degree less than  $k$ .

Extemble Krylov subspace includes the  $k - 1$  approximate dominant eigenvectors generated by  $k - 1$  steps of power iteration:

### Rayleigh-Ritz Procedure

 $\blacktriangleright$  The eigenvalues/eigenvectors of  $H_k$  are the *Ritz values/vectors*:

§ The Ritz vectors and values are the *ideal approximations* of the actual eigenvalues and eigenvectors based on only  $H_k$  and  $Q_k$ :

# Arnoldi Iteration

▶ Arnoldi iteration computes the *i*th column of  $H_n$ ,  $h_i$  and the *i*th column of Arnoidi iteration computes the  $i$ th column of  $\bm{H}_n$ ,  $\bm{h}_i$  ;<br> $\bm{Q}_n$  directly using the recurrence  $\bm{A}\bm{q}_i = \bm{Q}_n\bm{h}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i+1}$  $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{i+1}h_{ji}\boldsymbol{q}_j$ 

# Multidimensional Optimization

 $\blacktriangleright$  Minimize  $f(x)$ 

▶ Quadratic optimization  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x$ 

# Basic Multidimensional Optimization Methods

▶ Steepest descent: minimize  $f$  in the direction of the negative gradient:

▶ Given quadratic optimization problem  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^TAx + b^Tx$  where A is symmetric positive definite, the error  $\boldsymbol{e}_k = \boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^*$  satisfies

 $||e_{k+1}||_A =$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  When sufficiently close to a local minima, general nonlinear optimization problems are described by such an SPD quadratic problem.
- $\triangleright$  Convergence rate depends on the conditioning of A, since

### Gradient Methods with Extrapolation

▶ We can improve the constant in the linear rate of convergence of steepest descent by leveraging *extrapolation methods*, which consider two previous iterates (maintain *momentum* in the direction  $x_k - x_{k-1}$ ):

 $▶$  The *heavy ball method*, which uses constant  $α_k = α$  and  $β_k = β$ , achieves better convergence than steepest descent:

# Conjugate Gradient Method

§ The *conjugate gradient method* is capable of making the optimal (for a quadratic objective) choice of  $\alpha_k$  and  $\beta_k$  at each iteration of an extrapolation method:

§ *Parallel tangents* implementation of the method proceeds as follows

# Krylov Optimization

▶ Conjugate gradient (CG) finds the minimizer of  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x$  (which satisfies optimality condition  $Ax = b$ ) within the Krylov subspace of A:

### Conjugate Gradient Method: Optimized Form

After initialization  $x_0 = 0, r_0 = b, p_0 = r_0$ , the kth iteration of CG computes

$$
\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{q}_k &= \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{p}_k \\ \alpha_k &= \frac{\boldsymbol{r}_k^T \boldsymbol{r}_k}{\boldsymbol{q}_k^T \boldsymbol{p}_k} \\ \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{x}_k + \alpha_k \boldsymbol{p}_k \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{r}_k - \alpha_k \boldsymbol{q}_k \end{aligned}
$$

At this point if the residual norm ( $||r_{k+1}||$ ) is small, terminate, otherwise prepare for next iteration,

$$
\boldsymbol{p}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} + \frac{\boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}^T \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1}}{\boldsymbol{r}_k^T \boldsymbol{r}_k} \boldsymbol{p}_k
$$

See Jonathan Shewchuk 1994 notes on CG or James Demmel's book for the derivation of this form of the algorithm.

# Conjugate Gradient Convergence Analysis

In previous discussion, we assumed  $K_n$  is invertible, which may not be the case if A has  $k < n$  distinct eigenvalues, however, then CG converges in  $k - 1$  iterations (in exact arithmetic)

# Round-off Error in Conjugate Gradient

- $\triangleright$  CG provides strong convergence quarantees for SPD matrices in exact arithmetic
	- ▶ Classically, CG was viewed as a direct method, since its quaranteed to convergence in  $n$  iterations
	- § In practice, round-off error prevents CG from achieving this for realistic matrices, so CG was actually abandoned for a while due to being viewed as unstable
	- ► Later, it was realized that CG is highly competitive as an iterative method
- ▶ Due to round-off CG may stagnate / have plateaus in convergence
	- $\blacktriangleright$  A formal analysis of round-off error<sup>2</sup> reveals that CG with round-off is equivalent to exact CG on a matrix of larger dimension, whose eigenvalues are clustered around those of A
	- $\blacktriangleright$  Using this view, CG convergence plateaus may be explained by the polynomial  $q_k$  developing more and more zeros near the same eigenvalue of  $\boldsymbol{A}$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A. Greenbaum and Z. Strakos, SIMAX 1992

# Preconditioning

► Convergence of iterative methods for  $Ax = b$  depends on  $\kappa(A)$ , the goal of a preconditioner  $M$  is to obtain  $x$  by solving

$$
\boldsymbol{M}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{M}^{-1}\boldsymbol{b}
$$

with  $\kappa(M^{-1}A)<\kappa(A)$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  need not form  $M^{-1}A$  but only compute matrix-vector products  $M^{-1}(Ax)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  want  $M^{-1}x$  to be easy to compute (easier than  $A^{-1}x$ )
- ► so generally one extracts some  $M \approx A$  that is easy to solve linear systems with
- ▶ however,  $M \approx A$  may be insufficient/unnecessary, primary goal is to improve conditioning to accelerate iterative methods, i.e., want  $\kappa(M^{-1}A)\ll \kappa(A)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Common preconditioners select parts of A or perform inexact factorization
	- $\blacktriangleright$  (block-)Jacobi preconditioner takes  $M$  to be (block-)diagonal of  $A$
	- incomplete LU (ILU) preconditioners compute  $M = LU \approx A$  (+pivoting)
	- E ILU variants constraint sparsity of L and U factors during factorization to be the same or not much more than that of A
	- § good problem-specific preconditioners are often available in practice and theory, applying also to problems beyond linear systems (eigenvalue problems, optimization, approximate graph algorithms)

# Newton's Method

 $\blacktriangleright$  Newton's method in n dimensions is given by finding minima of  $n$ -dimensional quadratic approximation using the gradient and Hessian of  $f$ :

### Nonlinear Least Squares

§ An important special case of multidimensional optimization is *nonlinear least squares*, the problem of fitting a nonlinear function  $f_{\bm{x}}(t)$  so that  $f_{\bm{x}}(t_i) \approx y_i$ :

► We can cast nonlinear least squares as an optimization problem to minimize residual error and solve it by Newton's method:

#### Gauss-Newton Method

▶ The Hessian for nonlinear least squares problems has the form:

§ The *Gauss-Newton* method is Newton iteration with an approximate Hessian:

#### Low Rank Matrix Approximation

▶ Given a matrix  $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  seek rank  $r < m, n$  approximation

▶ Eckart-Young (optimal low-rank approximation by SVD) theorem

# Rank Revealing Matrix Factorizations

▶ Computing the SVD

▶ QR with column pivoting

# Simultaneous and Orthogonal Iteration

▶ Orthogonal iteration computing many eigenvectors at once in an iterative way

# Orthogonal Iteration Convergence

▶ If A has distinct eigenvalues and  $R_i$  has positive decreasing diagonal, the *i*th column of  $Q_i$  converges to the *i*th Schur vector of A linearly with rate  $\max(|\lambda_{i+1}/\lambda_i|, |\lambda_i/\lambda_{i-1}|).$ 

### Randomized SVD

▶ Orthogonal iteration for SVD can also be viewed as a randomized algorithm

# Generalized Nyström Algorithm

► The generalized Nyström algorithm provides an efficient way of computing a low-rank factorization given an approximation of its span<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Nakatsukasa, Yuji, Fast and stable randomized low-rank matrix approximation, 2020.

Analysis of Generalized Nyström Algorithm

 $\blacktriangleright$  Consider  $\boldsymbol{F_1} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{S}_1^T$  and  $\boldsymbol{F_2} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{S}_2^T$ , derive the minimizer  $\boldsymbol{Z}$  to

 $\| \bm A - \bm F_1 \bm Z \bm F_2^T \|_F$ 

 $\triangleright$  The generalized Nyström algorithm may be interpreted as applying a two-sided oblique projection of A