## Power method.

1. Power iteration:

Given an initial vector $u_{0}$,
$i=0$
repeat
$t_{i+1}=A u_{i}$
$u_{i+1}=t_{i+1} /\left\|t_{i+1}\right\|_{2} \quad$ (approximate eigenvector)
$\theta_{i+1}=u_{i+1}^{H} A u_{i+1} \quad$ (approximate eigenvalue)
$i=i+1$
until convergence
2. Stopping criterion: $\left|\theta_{i+1}-\theta_{i}\right| \leq t o l \cdot\left|\theta_{i}\right|$.
3. Example: Let

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
-261 & 209 & -49 \\
-530 & 422 & -98 \\
-800 & 631 & -144
\end{array}\right] .
$$

and $\lambda(A)=\{10,4,3\}$. Let $u_{0}=(1,0,0)^{T}$, then

| $i$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\cdots$ | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\theta_{i}$ | 994.49 | 13.0606 | 10.07191 | $\cdots$ | 10.0002 |

4. Convergence analysis: Assume that $A$ is diagonalizable, i.e.,

$$
A=X \Lambda X^{-1}
$$

with $\Lambda=\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right)$ and $\left|\lambda_{1}\right|>\left|\lambda_{2}\right| \geq \ldots \geq\left|\lambda_{n}\right|$. Then, we can show that

- $u_{i}=\frac{A^{i} u_{0}}{\left\|A^{2} u_{0}\right\|} \rightarrow x_{1} /\left\|x_{1}\right\|$, where $x_{1}=X e_{1}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.
- $\theta_{i} \rightarrow \lambda_{1}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.
- The convergence rate depends on $\frac{\left|\lambda_{2}\right|}{\left|\lambda_{1}\right|}$.

5. Therefore, if $\frac{\left|\lambda_{2}\right|}{\left|\lambda_{1}\right|}$ is close to 1 , then the power method could be very slow convergent or doesn't converge at all.

## Inverse iteration.

1. Purposes:

- Overcome the drawbacks of the power method (slow convergence)
- find an eigenvalue closest to a particular given number (called shift): $\sigma$

2. Observation: if $\lambda$ is an eigenvalue of $A$, then

- $\lambda-\sigma$ is an eigenvalue of $A-\sigma I$,
- $\frac{1}{\lambda-\sigma}$ is an eigenvalue of $(A-\sigma I)^{-1}$.


3. Inverse iteration

Given an initial vector $u_{0}$ and a shift $\sigma$
$i=0$
repeat
solve $(A-\sigma I) t_{i+1}=u_{i}$ for $t_{i+1}$
$u_{i+1}=t_{i+1} /\left\|t_{i+1}\right\|_{2} \quad$ (approximate eigenvector)
$\theta_{i+1}=u_{i+1}^{H} A u_{i+1} \quad$ (approximate eigenvalue)
$i=i+1$
until convergence
4. Convergence analysis: Assume $A=X \Lambda X^{-1}$ with $\Lambda=\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \ldots, \lambda_{n}\right)$ and $\lambda_{k}$ is the eigenvalue cloest to the shift $\sigma$. It can be shown that

- $u_{i} \rightarrow x_{k} /\left\|x_{k}\right\|$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, where $x_{k}=X e_{k}$
- $\theta_{i}$ converges to $\lambda_{k} i \rightarrow \infty$.
- Convergence rate depends on $\max _{j \neq k} \frac{\left|\lambda_{k}-\sigma\right|}{\left|\lambda_{j}-\sigma\right|}$.

5. Advantages: (a) the ability to converge to any desired eigenvalue (the one nearest to the shift $\sigma$ ). (b) By choosing $\sigma$ very close to a desired eigenvalue, the method converges very quickly and thus not be as limited by the proximity of nearby eigenvalues as is the original power method. (c) The method is particularly effective when we have a good approximation to an eigenvalue and want only its corresponding eigenvector.
6. Drawbacks: (a) expensive in general: solving $(A-\sigma I) t_{i+1}=u_{i}$ for $u_{i+1}$. One LU factorization of $A-\sigma I$ is required, which could be very expensive for large matrices, (b) Only compute one eigenpair.

## Orthogonal iteration (subspace iteration, simultaneous iteration).

1. Purpose: compute $p>1$ eigenvalues (and eigenvectors), rather than one eigenvector at a time.
2. Orthogonal iteration

Given an initial $n \times p$ orthogonal matrix $Z_{0}$

```
\(i=0\)
repeat
    \(Y_{i+1}=A Z_{i}\)
    \(Y_{i+1}=Z_{i+1} R_{i+1} \quad\) (QR decomposition)
    \(i=i+1\)
```

until convergence

The use of QR decomposition keeps the vectors spanning $\operatorname{span}\left\{A^{i} Z_{0}\right\}$ of full rank.
3. Example: Let $Z_{0}=\left[e_{1}, e_{2}, e_{3}\right]$ and

```
A =
    -0.4326 1.1892 -0.5883 -0.0956 -0.6918 -0.3999
    -1.6656 -0.0376 2.1832 -0.8323 0.8580 0.6900
        0.1253 0.3273 -0.1364 0.2944 1.2540
        0.2877 0.1746 0.1139 -1.3362 
    -1.1465 -0.1867 1.0668 0.7143 -1.4410 1.2902
        1.1909 0.7258 0.0593 1.6236 0.5711 0.6686
Eigenvalues of A = -2.1659 +- 0.5560i, 2.1493, 0.2111 +- 1.9014i, -0.9548
i = 10: Eigenvalues of Z'_10*A*Z_10: -1.4383 +- 0.3479i, 2.1500
i = 30: Eigenvalues of Z'_30*A*Z_30: -2.1592 +- 0.5494i, 2.1118
i = 70: Eigenvalues of Z'_70*A*Z_70: -2.1659 +- 0.5560i, 2.1493
```

4. Convergence: under mild conditions, $Z_{i}$ converges to the invariant subspace spanned by the first $p$ eigenvectors corresponding to the $p$ dominant eigenvalues, where

$$
\left|\lambda_{1}\right| \geq\left|\lambda_{2}\right| \geq \cdots \geq\left|\lambda_{p}\right|>\left|\lambda_{p+1}\right| \geq \cdots \geq\left|\lambda_{n}\right|
$$

If we let $B_{i}=Z_{i}^{T} A Z_{i}$, then

$$
\left\|A Z_{i}-Z_{i} B_{i}\right\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad i \rightarrow \infty
$$

and eigenvalues of $B_{i}$ approximate the dominant eigenvalues of $A$.
Convergence rate depends on $\left|\lambda_{p+1}\right| /\left|\lambda_{p}\right|$.

## QR iteration.

1. Our goal is to reorganize orthogonal iteration to incorporate shifting and inverting as in the inverse iteration. This will make it more efficient and eliminate the assumption that eigenvalues differ in magnitude.
2. QR iteration
```
\(A_{0}=A\)
\(i=0\)
repeat
    \(A_{i}=Q_{i} R_{i} \quad(\mathrm{QR}\) decomposition)
    \(A_{i+1}=R_{i} Q_{i}\)
    \(i=i+1\)
until convergence
```

3. (i) Observe that $A_{i+1}=R_{i} Q_{i}=Q_{i}^{T} Q_{i} R_{i} Q_{i}=Q_{i}^{T} A_{i} Q_{i}$. Therefore it performs an orthogonal similarity transformation at each iteration.
(ii) $A_{i+1}$ is orthogonally similar to $A_{0}=A$. Therefore $A_{i+1}$ and $A$ have same eigenvalues:

$$
A_{i+1}=\left(Q_{0} Q_{1} \cdots Q_{i-1} Q_{i}\right)^{T} A\left(Q_{0} Q_{1} \cdots Q_{i-1} Q_{i}\right)
$$

Note that $Q_{0} \cdots Q_{i-1} Q_{i}$ is an orthogonal matrix since all $Q_{j}$ are.
4. Example. The same test matrix, numerical results of QR iteration

| A_10 $=$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -1.6994 | 0.2201 | -0.8787 | -1.4292 | -0.3847 | 0.0112 |
| -0.0007 | 1.1325 | 1.2186 | 1.2245 | -0.0867 | 0.0648 |
| 0.2637 | 1.9636 | -0.1598 | -2.3959 | 0.8136 | -0.4311 |
| 0.0364 | -0.2346 | -0.5527 | -0.4393 | -1.9263 | 1.2496 |
| 0.4290 | 1.3482 | -1.1484 | 0.6121 | -0.5937 | 0.2416 |
| 0.0003 | 0.0013 | -0.0003 | -0.0011 | 0.0014 | -0.9554 |


| A_30 $=$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -2.4055 | -1.0586 | 1.3420 | -0.0991 | 1.1210 | 0.1720 |
| 0.0517 | 0.9645 | 1.6519 | -0.8512 | -0.7215 | 0.7654 |
| -0.2248 | 1.9947 | -0.7656 | -1.1876 | -0.2736 | -0.1552 |
| -0.0029 | -0.0263 | -0.0682 | 0.1381 | -2.3094 | 0.6765 |
| -0.0147 | 0.0808 | -0.0569 | 1.5462 | 0.3082 | -0.8476 |
| 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | -0.9548 |

From the last rwo of $A_{30}$, we can conclude -0.9548 is an eigenvalue of $A$. The subsequent QR iterations are performed on the leading $4 \times 4$ submatrices to find the rest of eigenvalues.

## QR iteration with shifts $\Rightarrow$ QR Algorithm.

1. Purpose: accelerate the convergence of QR iteration by using shifts
2. QR iteration with shifts
```
\(A_{0}=A ; i=0\)
repeat
    Choose a shift \(\sigma_{i}\)
    \(A_{i}-\sigma_{i} I=Q_{i} R_{i} \quad\) (QR decomposition)
    \(A_{i+1}=R_{i} Q_{i}+\sigma_{i} I\)
    \(i=i+1\)
until convergence
```

3. Property: $A_{i}$ and $A_{i+1}$ are orthogonally similar: $A_{i+1}=Q_{i}^{T} A_{i} Q_{i}$. Therefore, $A_{i+1}$ and $A$ are orthogonally similar, and $A_{i+1}$ and $A$ have the same eigenvalues.
4. How to choose the shifts $\sigma_{i}$ ?

- If $\sigma_{i}$ is an exact eigenvalue of $A$, then it can be shown that

$$
A_{i+1}=R_{i} Q_{i}+\sigma_{i} I=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
A^{\prime} & a \\
0 & \sigma_{i}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

This means that the algorithm converges in one iteration. If more eigenvalues are wanted, we can apply the algorithm again to the $n-1$ by $n-1$ matrix $A^{\prime}$.

- In practice, a common choice of the $\sigma_{i}$ is

$$
\sigma_{i}=A_{i}(n, n) .
$$

A motivation of this choice is by observing that the convergence of the QR iteration (without a shift), the ( $n, n$ ) entry of $A_{i}$ usually converges to an eigenvalue of $A$ first.
5. Example. The same test matrix as before. The following is the numerical result of QR iteration with a shift.

- With the shift $\sigma_{0}$ as an exact eigenvalue $\sigma_{0}=2.1493$, then

| A_1 $=$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -1.4127 | 1.4420 | 1.0845 | -0.6866 | -0.1013 | -0.2042 |
| -1.2949 | -0.2334 | 1.4047 | -1.3695 | 1.5274 | -0.7062 |
| 0.5473 | 0.1343 | -0.7991 | -0.6716 | 1.1585 | 0.0736 |
| -0.2630 | 0.0284 | 0.5440 | -1.4616 | -1.5892 | 0.9205 |
| -1.6063 | -0.3898 | 0.3410 | 0.1623 | -0.9576 | -0.5795 |
| 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 2.1493 |

We observe that in one iteration, we have found an eigenvalue 2.1493 of $A$ (from the last row). The subsequent QR iterations with shift are performed on the leading $4 \times 4$ submatrices to find the rest of eigenvalues.

- With the shifts $\sigma_{i}=A_{i}(n, n)$.

$$
\begin{array}{lrrrrr}
\text { A_7 = } \\
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { A }
\end{array} \\
-2.4302 & 2.0264 & -0.2799 & -0.2384 & 0.3210 & -0.0526 \\
-0.1865 & -1.4295 & -1.3515 & 0.0812 & 0.8577 & -0.0388 \\
-0.1087 & -0.8991 & 0.4491 & 0.4890 & -1.8463 & -1.2034 \\
-0.0008 & 0.0511 & -0.5997 & -0.7839 & -0.8088 & -0.5188 \\
-0.0916 & -0.8273 & 1.6940 & 0.0645 & -0.6698 & -0.0854 \\
0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 & 2.1493
\end{array}
$$

We observe that with 7th iterations, from the last row, we have found an eigenvalue 2.1493 of $A$ (from the last row). The subsequent QR iterations with shift are performed on the leading $4 \times 4$ submatrices to find the rest of eigenvalues.
6. Note that the QR decomposition in the algorithm takes $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{3}\right)$ flops. Even if the algorithm took $n$ iterations to converge, the overall cost of the algorithm will be $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{4}\right)$. This is too expensive (today, the complexity of algorithms for all standard matrix computation problems is at $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{3}\right)$.) However, if the matrix is initially reduced to upper Hessenberg form, then the QR decomposition of a Hessenberg form $\operatorname{costs} \mathcal{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$ flops. As a result, the overall cost of the algorithm is reduced to $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{3}\right)$. This is referred to as the Hessenberg $Q R$ algorithm, the method of choice for dense eigenvalue problem today, say Matlab's eigensolver eig use LAPACK's implementation of the QR algorithm.
7. QR algorithm is ranked as one of the top 10 algorithms invented in the 20th century.

