1. Not all matrices have the LU factorization. The LU factorization can fail on nonsingular matrices. For example,

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 1 \\
2 & 3 & 1
\end{array}\right] \neq L U .
$$

2. A permutation matrix $P$ is an identity matrix with permuted rows.

Let $P, P_{1}, P_{2}$ be $n \times n$ permutation matrices, and $X$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then

- $P^{T} P=I$, i.e., $P^{-1}=P^{T}$.
- $\operatorname{det}(P)= \pm 1$.
- $P_{1} P_{2}$ is also a permutation matrix.
- $P X$ is the same as $X$ with its rows permuted.
- $X P$ is the same as $X$ with its columns permuted.
- $P_{1} X P_{2}$ reorders both rows and columns of $X$.

3. The need of pivoting, mathematically

The LU factorization can fail on nonsingular matrices, see the above example. But by exchanging the first and third rows, we get

$$
P A=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
2 & 3 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2} & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
2 & 3 & 1 \\
0 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right]:=L U .
$$

This avoids "the breakdown" in the elimination process.
4. The above simple observation is the basis for the LU factorization with pivoting.

Theorem. If $A$ is nonsingular, then there exist permutations $P$, a unit lower triangular matrix $L$, and a nonsingular upper triangular matrix $U$ such that

$$
P A=L U .
$$

5. The need for pivoting, numerically

Let us apply LU factorization without pivoting to

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
.0001 & 1 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
10^{-4} & 1 \\
1 & 1
\end{array}\right]=L U=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & \\
l_{21} & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
u_{11} & u_{12} \\
& u_{22}
\end{array}\right]
$$

in three decimal-digit floating point arithmetic. We obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
\mathrm{fl}\left(1 / 10^{-4}\right) & 1
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
10^{4} & 1
\end{array}\right], \\
U & =\left[\begin{array}{cc}
10^{-4} & 1 \\
& \mathrm{fl}\left(1-10^{4} \cdot 1\right)
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
10^{-4} & 1 \\
& -10^{4}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

SO

$$
L U=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
10^{4} & 1
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
10^{-4} & 1 \\
& -10^{4}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
10^{-4} & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right] \not \approx A,
$$

where the original $a_{22}$ has been entirely "lost" from the computation by subtracting $10^{4}$ from it. In fact, we would have gotten the same LU factors whether $a_{22}$ had been $1,0,-2$, or any number such that $\mathrm{fl}\left(a_{22}-10^{4}\right)=-10^{4}$. Since the algorithm proceeds to work only with $L$ and $U$, it will get the same answer for all these different $a_{22}$, which correspond to completely different $A$ and so completely different $x=A^{-1} b$; there is no way to guarantee an accurate answer. This is called numerical instability. $L$ and $U$ are not the exact factors of a matrix close to $A$.
Let us see what happens when we go on to solve $A x=[1,2]^{T}$ for $x$ using this LU factorization. The correct answer is $x \approx[1,1]^{T}$. Instead we get the following. Solving

$$
L y=\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
2
\end{array}\right] \Rightarrow y_{1}=\mathrm{fl}(1 / 1)=1 \text { and } y_{2}=\mathrm{f}\left(2-10^{4} \cdot 1\right)=-10^{4} .
$$

Note that the value 2 has been "lost" by subtracting $10^{4}$ from it. Solving

$$
U x=y=\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
-10^{4}
\end{array}\right] \Rightarrow \hat{x}_{2}=\mathrm{f}\left(\left(-10^{4}\right) /\left(-10^{4}\right)\right)=1 \text { and } \hat{x}_{1}=\mathrm{f}\left((1-1) / 10^{-4}\right)=0,
$$

a completely erroneous solution.
On the other hand, the LU factorization with partial pivoting would have reversed the order of the two equations before proceeding. You can confirm that we get

$$
P A=L U,
$$

where

$$
P=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right], \quad L=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
\mathrm{f}(.0001 / 1) & 1
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
.0001 & 1
\end{array}\right],
$$

and

$$
U=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 1 \\
& \mathrm{fl}(1-.0001 \cdot 1)
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1 \\
& 1
\end{array}\right] .
$$

The computed LU approximates $A$ very accurately. As a result, the computed solution $x$ is perfect (verify that $\left[\begin{array}{l}\hat{x}_{1} \\ \hat{x}_{2}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 1\end{array}\right]$.)
6. Solving $A x=b$ using the LU factorization

1. Factorize $A$ into $P A=L U$
2. Permute the entries of $b: b:=P b$.
3. Solve $L(U x)=b$ for $U x$ by forward substitution:

$$
U x=L^{-1} b .
$$

4. $\quad$ Solve $U x=L^{-1} b$ for $x$ by back substitution:

$$
x=U^{-1}\left(L^{-1} b\right) .
$$

7. Matlab demo functions: lutx.m and bslashtx0.m
