

The 2-norm of random matrices *

Per Christian HANSEN

Copenhagen University Observatory, Øster Voldgade 3, DK-1350 København K, Denmark

Received 16 November 1987

Revised 8 February 1988

Abstract: Numerical experiments show that it is possible to derive simple estimates for the expected 2-norm of random matrices A with elements from a normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation σ , and from a Poisson distribution with mean value λ . These estimates are $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)} < E\{\|A\|_2\} < 2\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$ and $E\{\|A\|_2\} \approx \lambda\sqrt{mn}$, respectively, where m and n are the dimensions of A .

Keywords: Random matrices, numerical rank decision.

1. Introduction

In a number of technical applications of linear algebra, one is given a matrix whose elements are due to unbiased and uncorrelated absolute or relative errors, usually arising from measurements. It is convenient to consider the perturbed matrix as a sum of a perfect, undisturbed matrix and an error matrix solely consisting of the errors. The 2-norm of the error matrix is of great importance in numerical rank decisions such as in Cholesky factorizations, in Rank Revealing Q-R Factorizations, and via the Singular Value Decomposition, where this norm is used as a threshold for distinction between numerically zero and nonzero quantities, cf. [1,2,3]. The purpose of the present investigation is to derive simple approximations to this norm in order to yield a simple conversion from the measurement errors to the corresponding matrix threshold.

2. Elements from a normal distribution

Consider first the case with unbiased absolute errors and assume that the standard deviations of all matrix elements are identical. This corresponds to an error matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with elements from a normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation σ : $a_{ij} \in N(0, \sigma^2)$. It is easy to derive naive upper and lower bounds for the expected value of the 2-norm of this A :

$$E\{\|A\|_2\} \leq E\{\|A\|_F\} = \left[\sum E\{a_{ij}^2\}\right]^{1/2} = \left[\sum \sigma^2\right]^{1/2} = \sigma\sqrt{mn}, \quad (1a)$$

$$E\{\|A\|_2\} \geq E\{\max(|a_{ij}|)\} = \sigma \quad (1b)$$

* This project was supported by the Danish Space Board.

where $E\{\cdot\}$ denotes the expected value, and Σ denotes summation over all i and j . Experience shows that especially the upper bound is much too pessimistic. This is because all the singular values of such a matrix decay only rather slowly, such that $\|A\|_2$ (the largest singular value of A) is far from $\|A\|_F$ (which is the RMS of all the singular values).

To derive more realistic bounds on $E\{\|A\|_2\}$, let r_i^T and a_j denote the rows and columns of A , respectively, and introduce the maximum row/column norm

$$\mu \equiv \max[\|r_i\|_2, \|a_j\|_2] \tag{2}$$

which is related to m and n by

$$E\{\mu\} \geq \max[E\{\|r_i\|_2\}, E\{\|a_j\|_2\}] = \sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}. \tag{3}$$

Due to the definition of $\|A\|_2$ it follows that $\mu \leq \|A\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\max(m, n)} \mu$ such that

$$E\{\mu\} \leq E\{\|A\|_2\} \leq \sqrt{\max(m, n)} E\{\mu\}. \tag{4}$$

These bounds are better than those in (1); but they suffer from two inconveniencies; the upper bound is still much too crude, and it is not easy to estimate $E\{\mu\}$ from σ , m , and n .

To derive a simpler lower bound in (4), simply apply (3) to get $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)} \leq E\{\|A\|_2\}$. Concerning the upper bound, experience shows that the factor $\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$ should be replaced

Table 1

The results with $a_{ij} \in N(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 1$. Each entry contains: First line: mean value $E\{\|A\|_2\}$ and, in (), its standard deviation. Second line: the quantity $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$. Third line: the quantity $E\{\|A\|_2\}/(\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)})$

m	n					
	4	8	16	32	64	128
4	3.1 (0.5)	4.1(0.6)	5.2 (0.5)	7.0 (0.5)	9.3 (0.5)	12.6 (0.6)
	2.0	2.8	4.0	5.7	8.0	11.3
	1.57	1.44	1.30	1.24	1.17	1.12
8	4.1 (0.5)	4.9 (0.6)	6.1 (0.5)	7.9 (0.6)	10.3 (0.5)	13.5 (0.5)
	2.8	2.8	4.0	5.7	8.0	11.3
	1.45	1.75	1.53	1.40	1.28	1.20
16	5.2 (0.5)	6.1 (0.5)	7.3 (0.5)	9.1 (0.5)	11.5 (0.4)	14.7 (0.4)
	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.7	8.0	11.3
	1.30	1.53	1.83	1.62	1.43	1.30
32	6.9 (0.5)	7.8 (0.5)	9.1 (0.5)	10.9 (0.5)	13.2 (0.4)	16.5 (0.4)
	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	8.0	11.3
	1.22	1.38	1.60	1.92	1.65	1.46
64	9.3 (0.5)	10.3 (0.5)	11.4 (0.5)	13.2 (0.4)	15.5 (0.4)	18.8 (0.4)
	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	11.3
	1.16	1.28	1.43	1.65	1.94	1.66
128	12.7 (0.5)	13.5 (0.5)	14.8 (0.4)	16.5 (0.4)	19.0 (0.4)	22.2 (0.4)
	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.3
	1.12	1.20	1.31	1.46	1.68	1.96

by a much ‘milder’ function of $\max(m, n)$ and that $E\{\mu\}$ can easily be replaced by its lower bound $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$. Equation (4) then becomes:

$$\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)} \leq E\{\|A\|_2\} \leq f(\max(m, n)) \cdot \sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)} \tag{5}$$

where f is an appropriate simple function which has to be determined.

The bounds in (5) are investigated numerically as follows: random matrices as described above with $\sigma = 1$ were generated in batches of 100, their 2-norm $\|A\|_2$ were computed, and the mean value and standard deviation of $\|A\|_2$ were calculated for each batch and compared with $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$. The results are shown in Table 1: the upper line of each entry shows for each batch $E\{\|A\|_2\}$ and its standard deviation, the middle line shows $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$, and the bottom line shows the quantity $E\{\|A\|_2\}/(\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)})$ which gives the upper and lower bounds for the function f in (5). The table confirms that $\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}$ is indeed a not too pessimistic lower bound on $E\{\|A\|_2\}$. The table also shows that the function f has the asymptotic value 2 for $m = n \rightarrow \infty$ and that f always lies between 1 and 2. Similar experiments with $\sigma \neq 1$ gave exactly the same results. Hence, one can use the value 2 for f in (5) to get the following simple bounds for $E\{\|A\|_2\}$:

$$\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)} < E\{\|A\|_2\} < 2\sigma\sqrt{\max(m, n)}. \tag{6}$$

This gives the required simple relationship between the standard deviation σ of the matrix elements a_{ij} and the 2-norm of A .

In case the absolute errors have different standard deviations, and in the case of relative errors, it is recommended to apply an initial row and column scaling to A , before further numerical processing, such that as far as possible the standard deviations of the elements of the scaled matrix are all of the same magnitude [3]. The above analysis therefore also applies to these situations.

3. Elements from a Poisson distribution

Consider now the case where all the elements of A belong to a Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda: a_{ij} \in P(\lambda)$. In this case, the matrix A has non-negative elements of mean value λ and standard deviation $\sqrt{\lambda}$. Whenever $\lambda > 1$ this means that the first singular value of A , which is identical to $\|A\|_2$, is much larger than the remaining singular values of A . Hence, if $V\{\cdot\}$ denotes the variance, one gets the following simple estimate for $\|A\|_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} E\{\|A\|_2\} &\approx E\{\|A\|_F\} = \left[\sum E\{a_{ij}^2\} \right]^{1/2} = \left[\sum [V\{a_{ij}\} + E\{a_{ij}\}^2] \right]^{1/2} \\ &= [(\lambda + \lambda^2)mn]^{1/2} \approx \lambda\sqrt{mn}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Results from two numerical experiments with $\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda = 5$ are shown in Table 2. The upper two lines show the mean value $E\{\|A\|_2\}$ for batches of 100 matrices generated with $\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda = 5$, respectively, and the bottom two lines show the corresponding values of the ratio $E\{\|A\|_2\}/(\lambda\sqrt{mn})$. It is seen that even for the case $\lambda = 1$, this ratio is never greater than 1.2,

Table 2

The results with $a_{ij} \in P(\lambda)$. Each entry contains: First line: $E\{\|A\|_2\}$ for $\lambda = 1$. Second line: $E\{\|A\|_2\}$ for $\lambda = 5$. Third line: the quantity $E\{\|A\|_2\}/(\lambda\sqrt{mn})$ for $\lambda = 1$. Fourth line: the quantity $E\{\|A\|_2\}/(\lambda\sqrt{mn})$ for $\lambda = 5$.

m	n					
	4	8	16	32	64	128
4	4.7	6.4	9.1	12.9	18.0	25.2
	100.7	142.4	200.6	283.5	407.7	568.9
	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12
	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01
8	6.5	8.8	12.5	17.2	24.3	34.1
	141.7	200.9	284.0	400.9	566.6	801.5
	1.15	1.10	1.10	1.07	1.07	1.06
	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
16	9.3	12.2	17.1	23.6	33.3	46.8
	201.4	284.5	401.6	566.8	800.1	1132.9
	1.16	1.08	1.07	1.05	1.04	1.03
	1.01	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
32	12.8	17.3	23.6	33.0	46.3	65.2
	284.1	401.0	566.1	800.5	1132.3	1601.2
	1.13	1.08	1.04	1.03	1.02	1.02
	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
64	18.1	23.9	33.5	46.2	65.0	91.5
	401.1	567.1	801.1	1132.2	1601.4	2263.5
	1.13	1.06	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.01
	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
128	25.5	34.1	46.7	65.4	91.5	129.1
	568.6	802.4	1133.2	1601.6	2263.5	3200.4
	1.13	1.07	1.03	1.02	1.01	1.01
	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

and for large values of λ it is even closer to 1, without ever getting smaller than 1. Hence, it can be concluded that the quantity $\lambda\sqrt{mn}$ gives a good estimate of $\|A\|_2$, even for λ as small as 1.

4. Conclusion

Our experiments have shown that the singular value spectra of random matrices A with elements from normal and Poisson distributions behave quite differently, such that the estimates for $\|A\|_2$ become rather different. In both cases, however, simple estimates are obtained, giving a very simple relationship between the statistical quantity σ or λ and the matrix norm $\|A\|_2$.

References

- [1] T.F. Chan, Rank revealing QR-factorizations, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **88/89** (1987) 67–82.
- [2] P.C. Hansen, Detection of near-singularity in Cholesky and LDL^T factorizations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **19** (1987) 293–299.
- [3] G.W. Stewart, Rank degeneracy, *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.* **5** (1984) 403–413.