## 12 How to Compute the SVD

We saw earlier that the nonzero singular values of $A$ are given by the square roots of the nonzero eigenvalues of either $A^{*} A$ or $A A^{*}$. However, computing the singular values in this way is usually not stable (cf. solution of the normal equations).

Recall the strategy for finding the eigenvalues of a real symmetric matrix $A$ :

1. Transform $A$ to tridiagonal form with a unitary matrix $Q_{1}$, i.e., $A=Q_{1} T Q_{1}^{T}$. This is what we called Hessenberg reduction.
2. Transform $T$ to diagonal form using a sequence of unitary matrices and deflation (i.e., QR iteration). Thus $T^{(k)}=\left[\underline{Q}^{(k)}\right]^{T} T \underline{Q}^{(k)}$. Note that this is equivalent to $T=\underline{Q}^{(k)} T^{(k)}\left[\underline{Q}^{(k)}\right]^{T}$.

We can now combine steps 1 and 2 to get
3.

$$
A=\underbrace{Q_{1} \underline{Q}^{(k)}}_{=Q} \underbrace{T^{(k)}}_{=\Lambda} \underbrace{\left[\underline{Q}^{(k)}\right]^{T} Q_{1}^{T}}_{=Q^{T}},
$$

where $Q$ and $\Lambda$ contain accurate approximations to the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $A$, respectively.

Now we will employ a similar idea to find the SVD of an arbitrary (albeit square) matrix $A$ (note that it will later be possible to reduce rectangular SVD problems to square ones):

1. Transform $A$ to bidiagonal form $B$ using two unitary matrices $U_{1}$ and $V_{1}$ :

$$
A=U_{1} B V_{1}^{*}
$$

2. Transform $B$ to diagonal form $\Sigma$ using two sequences of unitary matrices:

$$
B=\underline{U}^{(k)} \Sigma\left[\underline{V}^{(k)}\right]^{*} .
$$

3. Combine 1. and 2. to get

$$
A=\underbrace{U_{1} \underline{U}^{(k)}}_{=U} \Sigma \underbrace{\left[\underline{V}^{(k)}\right]^{*} V_{1}^{*}}_{=V^{*}},
$$

where $U, \Sigma$ and $V$ contain good approximations to the left singular vectors, singular values, and right singular vectors, respectively.

Step 2. (the computation of the approximate SVD of $B$ ) can be viewed as an eigenvalue problem of a larger matrix $H$ in the following way. We define

$$
H=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
O & B^{*} \\
B & O
\end{array}\right]
$$

and use the SVD of $B$ in the form $B=U \Sigma V^{*}$ to arrive at

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
O & B^{*}  \tag{37}\\
B & O
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
V & V \\
U & -U
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
V & V \\
U & -U
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\Sigma & O \\
O & -\Sigma
\end{array}\right]
$$

or individually

$$
\begin{aligned}
B^{*} U & =V \Sigma \\
B V & =U \Sigma \\
-B^{*} U & =-V \Sigma \\
B V & =U \Sigma
\end{aligned}
$$

(which shows how (37) follows from the SVD of $B$ ). Clearly, (37) describes the eigenvalue problem for the matrix $H$, and the singular values of $B$ are given by the eigenvalues of $H$.

Remark If the columns of $H$ are permuted appropriately then $P^{T} H P$ is symmetric and tridiagonal.

Example Take

$$
B=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a & b & 0 \\
0 & c & d \\
0 & 0 & e
\end{array}\right]
$$

so that

$$
H=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
O & B^{*} \\
B & O
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{llllll} 
& & & a & & \\
& & & b & c & \\
& & & & d & e \\
a & b & & & & \\
& c & d & & & \\
& & e & & &
\end{array}\right]
$$

To get a tridiagonal matrix we pick the permutation matrix $P=\left[\boldsymbol{e}_{1}, \boldsymbol{e}_{4}, \boldsymbol{e}_{2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{5}, \boldsymbol{e}_{3}, \boldsymbol{e}_{6}\right]$. Then

$$
H P=\left[\begin{array}{lllll} 
& a & & & \\
& b & & c & \\
& & & d & \\
a & & b & & \\
& & c & & d \\
& & & & e
\end{array}\right]
$$

and

$$
P^{T} H P=\left[\begin{array}{cccccc} 
& a & & & & \\
a & & b & & & \\
& b & & c & & \\
& & c & & d & \\
& & & & d & \\
& & & & e
\end{array}\right]
$$

which is both symmetric and tridiagonal as desired.

The preceding remark shows us that we can use a modification of the QR algorithm for the second phase of the procedure. However, the matrix $H$ is never explicitly formed. This part of the algorithm can also be replaced one of the newer eigenvalue algorithms mentioned earlier such as divide-and-conquer or RRR.

The operations count (for the general setting of rectangular matrices) is $\mathcal{O}\left(m n^{2}\right)$ for phase 1 , and $\mathcal{O}\left(n^{2}\right)$ for the second phase. As before, the cost for the first phase is the dominant one.

We will now close with the discussion of an algorithm for the first phase.

### 12.1 Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization

The procedure is similar to the Householder reduction for the eigenvalue case. However, now we use two different sets of Householder reflectors to get a bidiagonal (instead of an upper Hessenberg) matrix. Note that we are allowed to do that since we no longer need to perform a similarity transformation.

Example Consider

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
x & x & x & x \\
x & x & x & x \\
x & x & x & x \\
x & x & x & x \\
x & x & x & x
\end{array}\right]
$$

Householder reflectors applied alternatingly from the left and the right will be used to zero parts of the matrix as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
U_{1}^{*} A=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x}
\end{array}\right] & \longrightarrow U_{1}^{*} A V_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
x & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x}
\end{array}\right] \\
\longrightarrow U_{2}^{*} U_{1}^{*} A V_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
x & x & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x}
\end{array}\right] & \longrightarrow U_{2}^{*} U_{1}^{*} A V_{1} V_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
x & x & 0 & 0 \\
0 & x & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{0} \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x}
\end{array}\right] \\
\longrightarrow U_{3}^{*} U_{2}^{*} U_{1}^{*} A V_{1} V_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
x & x & 0 & 0 \\
0 & x & x & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & 0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x}
\end{array}\right] & \longrightarrow U_{4}^{*} U_{3}^{*} U_{2}^{*} U_{1}^{*} A V_{1} V_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
x & x & 0 & 0 \\
0 & x & x & 0 \\
0 & 0 & x & x \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{x} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{0}
\end{array}\right]=B .
\end{array}
$$

Note that no more right-multiplications were needed after the second step, so the corresponding identity matrices are omitted. The final matrix $B$ is bidiagonal.

The procedure just illustrated is just like applying two separate QR factorizations, alternatingly applied to $A$ and $A^{*}$. The resulting algorithm for $m \times n$ matrices with $m \geq n$ dates back to 1965 and is given by

## Algorithm (Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization)

for $k=1: n$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{x}=A(k: m, k) \\
& \boldsymbol{u}_{k}=\boldsymbol{x}+\operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{x}(1))\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2} \boldsymbol{e}_{1} \\
& \boldsymbol{u}_{k}=\boldsymbol{u}_{k} /\left\|\boldsymbol{u}_{k}\right\|_{2} \\
& A(k: m, k: n)=A(k: m, k: n)-2 \boldsymbol{u}_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{*} A(k: m, k: n)\right) \\
& \text { if } k \leq n-2 \\
& \quad \boldsymbol{x}=A(k, k+1: n) \\
& \quad \boldsymbol{v}_{k}=\boldsymbol{x}+\operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{x}(1))\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2} \boldsymbol{e}_{1} \\
& \quad \boldsymbol{v}_{k}=\boldsymbol{v}_{k} /\left\|\boldsymbol{v}_{k}\right\|_{2} \\
& \quad A(k: m, k+1: n)=A(k: m, k+1: n)-2\left(A(k: m, k+1: n) \boldsymbol{v}_{k}\right) \boldsymbol{v}_{k}^{*} \\
& \text { end }
\end{aligned}
$$

end
The operations count is that for two QR factorizations, i.e., approximately $4 m n^{2}-$ $\frac{4}{3} n^{3}$ floating point operations.

An improvement over the Golub-Kahan algorithm is given by the Lawson-HansonChan algorithm. Its operations count is approximately $2 m n^{2}+2 n^{3}$ which is more efficient if $m>\frac{5}{3} n$.

The main idea for the Lawson-Hanson-Chan algorithm is to first compute a QR factorization of $A$, i.e., $A=Q R$. Then one applies the Golub-Kahan algorithm to $R$, i.e., $R=U B V^{*}$. Together this results in

$$
A=Q U B V^{*} .
$$

The advantage of this approach is that the bidiagonalization algorithm has to be applied only to a small $n \times n$ matrix, namely the nonzero part of $R$.

Remark 1. In the book [Trefethen/Bau] a hybrid method is discussed which is more efficient for any $m \geq n$.
2. In practice other implementations also exist. Some emphasize speed (such as divide-and-conquer methods), while others focus on the accuracy of small singular values (such as some QR implementations).

