

# IE 495 Lecture 23

November 21, 2000

# Reading for This Lecture

- Primary
  - Miller and Boxer, Pages 128-134
  - Forsythe and Mohler, Sections 9-13

# Parallel Gaussian Elimination

- PRAM with  $n^2$  processors
- Mesh with  $n^2$  processors

# Scaling

- In the "bad" example from the last lecture, what caused the trouble?
- Essentially, coefficients were too far apart in "scale".
- Ex:  $10^5 + 10^{-5} = 10^5$  if  $d = 5$ .
- What can we do about this?

# Diagonal Equivalence

- Two matrices  $A$  and  $A'$  are diagonally equivalent if
  - $A' = D_1^{-1}AD_2$
  - $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are non-singular diagonal matrices
- $A'$  is just  $A$  with the columns and rows "scaled".
- For our purposes, the elements of  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  will be powers of 10 (we assume this base).
- Hence, this operation merely changes the exponent.
- This operation does not change the "significands".

# Computing with Scaled Matrices

- Notice that "diagonal equivalence" is an equivalence relation.
- Suppose we set  $b' = D_1 b$  (similarly scaled)
  - If the same sequence of pivots is used,
  - The solutions to the these systems will have the same significands:
    - $A'x' = b'$
    - $Ax = b$
- They will differ only in their exponents.

# What is the point?

- We can now see that scaling only alters the choice of pivot element.
- However, we can use scaling to change the condition number of the matrix.
- The problem of finding a scaling that minimizes the condition number of the system is difficult.
- It has been solved for certain norms, but not  $L_2$ .

# Another approach

- A matrix is said to be *row equilibrated* if the maximum entry in each row is between  $10^{-1}$  and 1.
- *Column equilibrated* is defined similarly.
- A matrix is *equilibrated* if it is both *row and column equilibrated*.
- It is unknown how to "optimally" equilibrate a matrix.
- There are heuristics for doing so approximately.
- This seems to be a good approach.



# Iterative Improvement

- Iterative Procedure
  - Solve  $Ax_1 = b$ .
  - Compute the *residual*  $r_1 = Ax_1 - b$ .
  - Solve the system  $Az_1 = r_1$ .
  - Set  $x_2 = A(x_1 + z_1)$ .
- Note that  $r_i$  must be computed with more precision than the rest of the computation.

# Convergence of Iterative Improvement

- The error in  $x_1$  is related to  $r_1$  by

$$e_1 = x_1 - A^{-1}b = A^{-1}(Ax_1 - b) = -A^{-1}r_1.$$

- Hence,  $norm(e_1) \leq norm(A^{-1}) \cdot norm(r_1)$ .
- Also,  $norm(r_1) \approx 10^{-t} norm(A) \cdot norm(x_1)$ .
- So finally,  $norm(e_1) \approx 10^{-t} cond(A) \cdot norm(x_1)$
- If  $cond(A) \approx 10^p$ ,  $norm(e_1)/norm(x_1) \approx 10^{t-p}$ .

# Consequences

- With some care, we can assure that  $\text{norm}(z_1)/\text{norm}(x_1) \approx \text{norm}(e_1)/\text{norm}(x_1) \approx 10^{t-p}$ .
- Hence,  $\text{cond}(A) \approx 10^t \text{norm}(z_1)/\text{norm}(x_1)$ .
- Furthermore, the number of iterations needed to compute to  $t$  digits of precision is  $t/(\log_{10}(\text{norm}(z_1)/\text{norm}(x_1)))$ .
- If  $p \geq t$ , we're out of luck.

# Sparsity

- Sparse matrices allow faster calculation.
- If  $A$  is sparse, we attempt to maintain that sparsity in the LU factorization.
- Markowitz's Rule
  - Let  $p_i$  be the number of nonzeros in row  $i$  and  $q_j$  the number of nonzeros in column  $j$ .
  - Pivot on the element  $a_{ij}$  such that  $(p_i - 1)(q_j - 1)$  is minimized.
- Note that this is at odds with pivoting rules to limit round-off error.

# Another Procedure

- Note that if  $A$  has no nonzeros above the diagonal in column  $j$ , then this pattern is carried into  $L$  and  $U$ .
- Hence, we try to make  $A$  look as much like a lower diagonal matrix as possible through permutation.
- This has good results in practice, but also must be traded off against round-off error.

# A Word About Zero Tolerances

- The number **zero** plays a central role in these issues.
- Numbers that are very close to zero tend to cause numerical difficulties.
- Values that appear nonzero because of round-off, but whose *true value* is zero are especially dangerous.
- For this reason, practitioners usually use zero tolerances.
- This is a limit below which a value is taken to be exactly zero.
- Usually, there are several different tolerances.
- Choosing them is problematic.

# Summary

- Limiting round-off error is an inexact science.
- There is some theory to guide us, but techniques based on the theory don't always work.
- You have to know your problem!
- Always remember the difference between conditioning and stability!
- Formulation can make a big difference to conditioning!!
- Changing the algorithm can improve stability.