

Prof. Dr. Rudolf Mathar, Dr. Arash Behboodi, Emilio Balda

Exercise 5

- Proposed Solution -

Friday, November 24, 2017

Solution of Problem 1

a)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{x}^{(j)} &= \left(\mathbf{I}_k - \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{1}_k \mathbf{1}_k^T \right) \mathbf{x}^{(j)} = \mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{1}_k \mathbf{1}_k^T \mathbf{x}^{(j)} = \mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^{(j)} \mathbf{1}_k \\ &= \mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \bar{x}^{(j)} \mathbf{1}_k\end{aligned}$$

b)

$$\left(\mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{X}^T \right)_{ij} = \left[\mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{x}^{(n)} \right]_{ij} = \left(\mathbf{x}^{(j)} - \bar{x}^{(j)} \mathbf{1}_k \right)_i = x_i^{(j)} - \bar{x}^{(j)}$$

c)

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\mathbf{E}_k \mathbf{X}^T \right)_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^k \left(x_i^{(j)} - \bar{x}^{(j)} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{x}^{(j)} = k \bar{x}^{(j)} - k \bar{x}^{(j)} = 0$$

Solution of Problem 2

a) Note that:

$$\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2 = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j - 2 \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j.$$

It is easy to check that:

$$(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T)_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_j^T.$$

Consider $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T \mathbf{x}_n]^T$. We have:

$$\mathbf{1}_n \hat{\mathbf{x}}^T = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_1 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_n^T \mathbf{x}_n \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_1 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_n^T \mathbf{x}_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_1 & \dots & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_n^T \mathbf{x}_n \end{bmatrix}$$

This means that $(\mathbf{1}_n \hat{\mathbf{x}}^T)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j$ and moreover $(\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{1}_n^T)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_i$

Therefore:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}^{(2)}(\mathbf{X}) \right)_{ij} = (\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X})_{ij} - (\mathbf{1}_n \hat{\mathbf{x}}^T)_{ij} - (\hat{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{1}_n^T)_{ij}.$$

The element-wise identity implies the desired identity.

b) Since $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n$ is non-negative definite and has the rank $\text{rk}(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n) \leq k$, it can be written as:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^T,$$

where $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k$ are top k eigenvalues of the matrix $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n$ with corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$. This can be obtained from spectral decomposition of $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n$. Using this representation, the matrix \mathbf{X} can be constructed as $\mathbf{X} = [\sqrt{\lambda_1}\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_k}\mathbf{v}_k]$. It can be seen that:

$$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^T = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n.$$

Moreover the image of $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}_n\mathbf{\Delta}^{(2)}\mathbf{E}_n$ is a subset of the image of \mathbf{E}_n . Therefore for all non-zero λ_i , the corresponding eigenvector \mathbf{v}_i belongs to the image of \mathbf{E}_n and since it is an orthogonal projection:

$$\mathbf{E}_n \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_i.$$

If $\lambda_i = 0$, then trivially $\mathbf{E}_n \sqrt{\lambda_i} \mathbf{v}_i = \sqrt{\lambda_i} \mathbf{v}_i = 0$. This means that:

$$\mathbf{E}_n \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X} \implies \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{E}_n = \mathbf{X}^T.$$

c) The direction where $\mathbf{A} = 0$ is trivial. Let us assume $\mathbf{E}_n \mathbf{A} \mathbf{E}_n = 0$. This means that the matrix \mathbf{A} takes each vector in the image of \mathbf{E}_n to the kernel of \mathbf{E}_n . Note that the kernel of \mathbf{E}_n is spanned by $\mathbf{1}_n$, so for each \mathbf{v} such that $\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{1}_n = 0$, we have:

$$\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R}; \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} = \alpha \mathbf{1}_n.$$

Pick $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$. The equation above implies that $(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})_i = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})_j$. But $(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})_k = a_{ki} - a_{kj}$. Therefore:

$$a_{ii} - a_{ij} = a_{ji} - a_{jj}.$$

But $a_{kk} = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ and \mathbf{A} is symmetric. Therefore $a_{ij} = 0$ for all i, j which means that $\mathbf{A} = 0$.

Solution of Problem 3

We start by expanding the following difference

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \beta)(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta}) - (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 &= 1 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta} + \beta + \gamma - (1 + 2\sqrt{\gamma} + \gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} + \beta - 2\sqrt{\gamma} \\ &= \frac{\gamma - 2\beta\sqrt{\gamma} + \beta^2}{\beta} = \frac{(\sqrt{\gamma} - \beta)^2}{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta > 0$ we have that

$$(1 + \beta)(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta}) - (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 = \frac{(\sqrt{\gamma} - \beta)^2}{\beta} > 0,$$

yielding

$$(1 + \beta)(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\beta}) > (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2$$

which proves the statement.