

Interpolative Decomposition

1. INTERPOLATIVE DECOMPOSITION CONTINUED

Theorem 1. Let \mathbf{A} be an $m \times n$ matrix of exact rank k . The \mathbf{A} admits a factorization

$$(1) \quad \begin{matrix} \mathbf{A} & = & \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) & \mathbf{Z} \\ m \times n & & m \times k & k \times n \end{matrix}$$

Where \mathbf{J}_s is an index vector of length k contained in $[1, 2, \dots, n]$, and where $\mathbf{Z}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) = \mathbf{I}_k$ and $\max_{i,j} \|\mathbf{Z}(i, j)\| \leq 1$

1.1. **Proof.** Case 1: Suppose $m = k$ so \mathbf{A} is $k \times n$. Pick \mathbf{J}_s so that $\|\det(\mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s))\|$ is maximized. Let \mathbf{J}_r denote the remaining indices, so

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{J}_s \cup \mathbf{J}_r = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$$

Where \cup is the disjoint union. In other words,

$$(3) \quad [\mathbf{J}_s \ \mathbf{J}_r] = [\mathbf{j}_1 \ \mathbf{j}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{j}_k \ \mathbf{j}_{k+1} \ \dots \ \mathbf{j}_n]$$

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}) = [\mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \ \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_r)]$$

For some permutation matrix \mathbf{P}

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s)^{-1} \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_r) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^*$$

With the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}) \\ \mathbf{Z} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s)^{-1} \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_r) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^* \\ \mathbf{T} &:= \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s)^{-1} \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_r) \end{aligned}$$

It remains to be shown that $\|\mathbf{T}(i, j)\| \leq 1$ Recall Cramer's Rule which states that given a $k \times k$ matrix \mathbf{B} and the equation $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, that \mathbf{x} can be found by the following method.

$$\mathbf{x}(i) = \frac{\det[\mathbf{b}_1 \ \mathbf{b}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{b}_{i-1} \ \mathbf{y} \ \mathbf{b}_{i+1} \ \dots \ \mathbf{b}_k]}{\det[\mathbf{b}_1 \ \mathbf{b}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{b}_k]}$$

where \mathbf{b}_j is the j^{th} column of \mathbf{B} .

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{A} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} | & | & & | \\ \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{C}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_n \\ | & | & & | \end{array} \right]$$

Then $\mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_r)$. \mathbf{T} is defined as the solution to this equation.

$$(7) \quad \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} | & | & & | \\ \mathbf{C}_{j_1} & \mathbf{C}_{j_2} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{j_k} \\ | & | & & | \end{array} \right] \mathbf{T} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} | & | & & | \\ \mathbf{C}_{j_{k+1}} & \mathbf{C}_{j_{k+2}} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{j_n} \\ | & | & & | \end{array} \right]$$

Cramer's Rule provides formulas for each $\mathbf{T}(i, j)$. For instance,

$$(8) \quad \mathbf{T}(1, 1) = \frac{\det[\mathbf{C}_{j_{k+1}} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_2} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_3} \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_{j_n}]}{\det[\mathbf{C}_{j_1} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_2} \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_{j_k}]}$$

By definition of \mathbf{J}_s , the determinant in the denominator is at least as large as the determinant in the numerator in magnitude. The same argument applies for all i, j

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{T}(2, 1) = \frac{\det[\mathbf{C}_{j_1} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_{k+1}} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_2} \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_{j_n}]}{\det[\mathbf{C}_{j_1} \ \mathbf{C}_{j_2} \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_{j_k}]}$$

Case 2: Let $m \geq k$. The \mathbf{A} admits some factorization

$$(10) \quad \begin{matrix} \mathbf{A} & = & \mathbf{E} & \mathbf{F} \\ m \times n & & m \times k & k \times n \\ & & 1 & \end{matrix}$$

We show that \mathbf{F} admits a factorization

$$(11) \quad \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \mathbf{Z}.$$

For \mathbf{Z} that satisfies the criteria in Theorem 1. Combining Equations 10 and 11

$$(12) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E} \mathbf{F}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \mathbf{Z}$$

Restricting Equation 12 to \mathbf{J}_s ,

$$(13) \quad \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) = \mathbf{E} \mathbf{F}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \mathbf{Z}(:, \mathbf{J}_s)$$

Note that $\mathbf{Z}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) = \mathbf{I}_k$ by construction. Combining Equations 12 and 13,

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}(:, \mathbf{J}_s) \mathbf{Z}$$

2. DETERMINISTIC METHODS FOR COMPUTING THE ID

2.1. **Option 1.** Do as in the proof. This is extremely expensive, but it leads to an optimal result

2.2. **Option 2.** Use the CPQR from the last lecture.

$$\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{Q}_1 [\mathbf{R}_{1,1} \quad \mathbf{R}_{1,2}] \mathbf{P}^* = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{1,1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{R}_{1,1}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{1,2} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^*$$

With $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{1,1}$ and $\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{R}_{1,1}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{1,2} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^*$. This method is very computationally efficient. You can use the standard software to accomplish this method. In practice, elements of \mathbf{Z} are more or less bounded in magnitude by 1. Artificial counterexamples exist.

2.3. **Option 3. Rank Revealing QR** (recommend)

Let $\nu > 0$ be a positive number. There exist pivoting strategies that find, in polynomial time, an index set \mathbf{J}_s such that $\|\mathbf{T}(i, j)\| \leq 1 + \nu$. They also attain a "goodish" rank- k approximation $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}_1 [\mathbf{R}_{11} \mathbf{R}_{12}] \mathbf{P}^*\| = \|\mathbf{R}_{22}\| \approx \sigma_{k+1} \leq p(k, n) \sigma_{k+1}$.

3. RANDOMIZED ID

First Recall the RSVD

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G} &= \text{rand}(n, k + p) \\ \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G} \\ \mathbf{Q} &= \text{orth}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{Q}^* \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{B} &= \hat{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{V}^* \\ \mathbf{U} &= \mathbf{Q} \hat{\mathbf{U}} \\ \mathbf{A} &\approx \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{V}^* \end{aligned}$$

Assume that \mathbf{A} has exact rank k .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G} &= \text{rand}(n, k) \\ \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G} \\ [\mathbf{I}_s, \mathbf{X}] &= \text{IDrow}(\mathbf{Y}, k) \end{aligned}$$

$$(15) \quad \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{I}_s, :)$$

Automatically $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I}_s, :)$. With probability 1, we know that for some \mathbf{F}

$$(16) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{F}$$

Combining Equation 16 and 15,

$$(17) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{I}_s, :) \mathbf{F}$$

Restricting Equation 17,

$$(18) \quad \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I}_s, :) = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_s, :) \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{I}_s, :) \mathbf{F}$$

Combining Equation 18 and 17,

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I}_s, :)$$