

Relaxation method

easy to write, but does it work?
for what choice of λ ?

$$g(x) = x - \lambda f(x)$$

scalar multiplier...
(relaxation coefficient)

Newton's method

$$g(x) = x - (Df(x))^{-1} f(x)$$

$(J_f(x))^{-1}$ in the book

A natural compromise between relaxation and Newton's method with n equations/unknowns is

$$g(x) = x - M f(x)$$

Theorem 4.3 Suppose that $f(\xi) = \mathbf{0}$, and that all the first partial derivatives of $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)^T$ are defined and continuous in some (open) neighbourhood of ξ , and satisfy a condition of strict diagonal dominance at ξ ; i.e.,

$$\left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) \right| > \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.17)$$

Then, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a positive constant λ such that the relaxation iteration (4.16) converges to ξ for any x_0 in the closed ball $\bar{B}_\varepsilon(\xi)$ of radius ε , centre ξ .

$$Df(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1}(\xi) & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_2}(\xi) & \dots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n}(\xi) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_1}(\xi) & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_2}(\xi) & \dots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_n}(\xi) \end{bmatrix}$$

sometimes called diagonal dominance

Want to show g is a contraction

$$g(x) = x - \lambda f(x)$$

↖ scalar

By showing $\|Dg(\xi)\|_\infty < 1$.

Know: $\|I\|_\infty = 1$

$$Dg(\xi) = \left. D_x \right|_{x=\xi} - \lambda Df(\xi) = I - \lambda Df(\xi)$$

this needs to reduce the norm of I

$$D_x = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial x_n}{\partial x_n} \end{bmatrix} = I$$

Case the diagonal

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) = [Dg(\xi)]_{ii} = 1 - \lambda [Df(\xi)]_{ii} = 1 - \frac{1}{m} [Df(\xi)]_{ii} \geq 0$$

want to choose $\lambda = \frac{1}{[Df(\xi)]_{ii}}$

this is ≤ 1

but λ can't depend on i .

instead set $\lambda = \frac{1}{m}$ where $m = \max\{[Df(\xi)]_{ii} : i=1, \dots, n\}$

$$\|Dg(\xi)\|_\infty = \max_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left| [Dg(\xi)]_{ij} \right| = \max_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right| = \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) \right| + \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

Know this ≥ 0

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) + \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

note have to remove absolute value before substituting the inequality

$$< 1 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right| + \sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) > \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

$$-\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i}(\xi) < -\sum_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right|$$

Therefore.

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right| < 1$$

and so

$$\|Dg(\xi)\|_\infty = \max_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j}(\xi) \right| < 1$$

Therefore by Theorem 4.2 there is $\epsilon > 0$ so the iteration $x^{(k+1)} = g(x^{(k)})$ converges for $x^{(0)} \in \overline{B}_\epsilon(\xi)$,

Newton's method...

$$g(x) = x - (Df(x))^{-1} f(x)$$

$(J_f(x))^{-1}$ in the book

Would like to show that $\|Dg(\xi)\| < 1$.

$$Dg(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial g_m}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial g_m}{\partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial g_m}{\partial x_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

What is $D\left([Df(x)]^{-1} f(x)\right)$? Compute element at a time.

$$\text{Let } K(x) = [Df(x)]^{-1}$$

definition of matrix multiplication.

$$\left[[Df(x)]^{-1} f(x) \right]_i = [K(x)f(x)]_i = \sum_{r=1}^m K_{ir}(x) f_r(x)$$

$$\frac{\partial \left[[Df(x)]^{-1} f(x) \right]_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \sum_{r=1}^m K_{ir}(x) f_r(x)$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{\partial K_{ir}(x)}{\partial x_j} f_r(x) + \sum_{r=1}^m K_{ir}(x) \frac{\partial f_r(x)}{\partial x_j}$$

$$\frac{\partial \left[[Df(x)]^{-1} f(x) \right]_i}{\partial x_j} \Big|_{x=\xi} = \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{\partial K_{ir}(\xi)}{\partial x_j} f_r(\xi) + \sum_{r=1}^m K_{ir}(\xi) \frac{\partial f_r(\xi)}{\partial x_j}$$

related to second order derivatives...

since $f(\xi) = 0$

matrix - matrix mult.

$$= \sum_{r=1}^m K_{ir}(\xi) \frac{\partial f_r(\xi)}{\partial x_j} = [K(\xi) Df(\xi)]_{ij}$$

$$= [[Df(\xi)]^{-1} Df(\xi)]_{ij} = [I]_{ij}$$

recall
 $K(x) = [Df(x)]^{-1}$

$$g(x) = x - (Df(x))^{-1} f(x)$$

$(J_f(x))^{-1}$ in the book

$$Dg(x) = I - D \left((Df(x))^{-1} f(x) \right)$$

$$Dg(\xi) = I - I = 0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

$$\|Dg(\xi)\| = 0 \quad \text{for any matrix norm.}$$

In particular...

by Theorem 4.2 there is $\epsilon > 0$ so the iteration

$$x^{(k+1)} = g(x^{(k)}) \quad \text{converges for } x^{(0)} \in \overline{B}_\epsilon(\xi),$$

What is the rate of convergence...

Theorem 4.4 Suppose that $\mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathbf{0}$, that in some (open) neighbourhood $N(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, where \mathbf{f} is defined and continuous, all the second-order partial derivatives of \mathbf{f} are defined and continuous, and that the Jacobian matrix $D\mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ of \mathbf{f} at the point $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is nonsingular. Then, the sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ defined by Newton's method (4.18) converges to the solution $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ provided that $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ is sufficiently close to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$; the convergence of the sequence $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is at least quadratic.

Computer lab on Friday... Check Thursday for more details on the lab.