

# Numerical Analysis - Part II

Anders C. Hansen

Lecture 23

---

# *Eigenvalues and eigenvectors*

# Spectrum preserved under similarity transforms

## Theorem 1

Let  $A$  and  $S$  be  $n \times n$  matrices,  $S$  being nonsingular. Then  $\mathbf{w}$  is an eigenvector of  $A$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda$  if and only if  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = S\mathbf{w}$  is an eigenvector of  $\hat{A} = SAS^{-1}$  with the same eigenvalue.

**Proof.**

$$A\mathbf{w} = \lambda\mathbf{w} \Leftrightarrow AS^{-1}(S\mathbf{w}) = \lambda\mathbf{w} \Leftrightarrow (SAS^{-1})(S\mathbf{w}) = \lambda(S\mathbf{w}).$$

□

# Deflation

Suppose that we have found one solution of the eigenvector equation  $A\mathbf{w} = \lambda\mathbf{w}$ , where  $A$  is again  $n \times n$ . Then *deflation* is the task of constructing an  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  matrix,  $B$  say, whose eigenvalues are the other eigenvalues of  $A$ . Specifically, we apply a similarity transformation  $S$  to  $A$  such that the first column of  $\hat{A} = SAS^{-1}$  is  $\lambda$  times the first coordinate vector  $\mathbf{e}_1$ , because it follows from the characteristic equation for eigenvalues and from Theorem 1 that we can let  $B$  be the bottom right  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  submatrix of  $\hat{A} = SAS^{-1}$ . In particular,

$$SAS^{-1} = \hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & \beta \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}.$$

We write the condition on  $S$  as  $(SAS^{-1})\mathbf{e}_1 = \lambda\mathbf{e}_1$ . Then the last equation in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that it is sufficient if  $S$  has the property  $S\mathbf{w} = c\mathbf{e}_1$ , where  $c$  is any nonzero scalar.

## Algorithm for deflation for symmetric $A$

---

Suppose that  $A$  is symmetric and  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  are given so that  $A\mathbf{w} = \lambda\mathbf{w}$ . We seek a nonsingular matrix  $S$  such that  $S\mathbf{w} = c\mathbf{e}_1$  and such that  $SAS^{-1}$  is also symmetric. The last condition holds if  $S$  is orthogonal, since then  $S^{-1} = S^T$ . It is suitable to pick a *Householder reflection*, which means that  $S$  has the form

$$H_{\mathbf{u}} = I - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T / \|\mathbf{u}\|^2, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

## Algorithm for deflation for symmetric $A$

Specifically, we recall from the Numerical Analysis IB course that Householder reflections are orthogonal and that, because  $H_u \mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{u}$  and  $H_u \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$  if  $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} = 0$ , they reflect any vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane orthogonal to  $\mathbf{u}$ . So, for any two vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  of equal lengths,

$$H_u \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}.$$

Hence,

$$\left( I - 2 \frac{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T}{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2} \right) \mathbf{w} = \pm \|\mathbf{w}\| \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w} \mp \|\mathbf{w}\| \mathbf{e}_1.$$

Since the bottom  $n-1$  components of  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{w}$  coincide, the calculation of  $\mathbf{u}$  requires only  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  computer operations. Further, the calculation of  $SAS^{-1}$  can be done in only  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  operations, taking advantage of the form  $S = I - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T/\|\mathbf{u}\|^2$ , even if all the elements of  $A$  are nonzero.

## Algorithm for deflation for symmetric $A$

---

After deflation, we may find an eigenvector,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  say, of  $SAS^{-1}$ . Then the new eigenvector of  $A$ , according to Theorem 1, is  $S^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{w}} = S\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ , because Householder matrices, like all symmetric orthogonal matrices, are *involutions*:  $S^2 = I$ .





## Givens rotations

- 1) We can choose  $\Omega^{[i,j]}$  so that any prescribed element  $\tilde{a}_{jk}$  in the  $j$ -th row of  $\tilde{A} = \Omega^{[i,j]}A$  is zero.
- 2) The rows of  $\tilde{A} = \Omega^{[i,j]}A$  are the same as the rows of  $A$ , except that the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th rows of the product are linear combinations of the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th rows of  $A$ .
- 3) The columns of  $\hat{A} = \tilde{A}\Omega^{[i,j]T}$  are the same as the columns of  $\tilde{A}$ , except that the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th columns of  $\hat{A}$  are linear combinations of the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th columns of  $\tilde{A}$ .
- 4)  $\Omega^{[i,j]}$  is an orthogonal matrix, thus  $\hat{A} = \Omega^{[i,j]}A\Omega^{[i,j]T}$  inherits the eigenvalues of  $A$ .
- 5) If  $A$  is symmetric, then so is  $\hat{A}$ .

# Transformation to upper Hessenberg – Givens

**Transformation to an upper Hessenberg form:** We replace  $A$  by  $\hat{A} = SAS^{-1}$ , where  $S$  is a product of Givens rotations  $\Omega^{[i,j]}$  chosen to annihilate subsubdiagonal elements  $a_{j,i-1}$  in the  $(i-1)$ -st column:

$$\begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\Omega^{[2,3]} \times} \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[2,3]T}} \begin{bmatrix} * & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\Omega^{[2,4]} \times} \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[2,4]T}} \begin{bmatrix} * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & * & \bullet \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\Omega^{[3,4]} \times} \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \bullet & \bullet \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[3,4]T}} \begin{bmatrix} * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & * & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \bullet & \bullet \end{bmatrix}$$

The  $\bullet$ -elements have changed through a single transformation while the  $*$ -elements remained the same.

It is seen that every element that we have set to zero remains zero, and the final outcome is indeed an upper Hessenberg matrix. If  $A$  is symmetric then so will be the outcome of the calculation, hence it will be tridiagonal. In general, the cost of this procedure is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .

# Transformation to upper Hessenberg – Householder

Alternatively, we can transform  $A$  to upper Hessenberg using *Householder reflections*, rather than Givens rotations. In that case we deal with a column at a time, taking  $\mathbf{u}$  such that, with  $H_u = I - 2\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^T / \|\mathbf{u}\|^2$ , the  $i$ -th column of  $\tilde{B} = H_u B$  is consistent with the upper Hessenberg form. Such a  $\mathbf{u}$  has its first  $i$  coordinates vanishing, therefore  $\hat{B} = \tilde{B}H_u^T$  has the first  $i$  columns unchanged, and all new and old zeros (which are in the first  $i$  columns) stay untouched.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{H_1 \times} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\times H_1^T} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{H_2 \times} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\times H_2^T} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{H_3 \times} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\times H_3^T} \left[ \begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & * & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & * & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & * & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \right]
 \end{array}$$

# The QR algorithm

The “plain vanilla” version of the QR algorithm is as follows. Set  $A_0 = A$ . For  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  calculate the QR factorization  $A_k = Q_k R_k$  (here  $Q_k$  is  $n \times n$  orthogonal and  $R_k$  is  $n \times n$  upper triangular) and set  $A_{k+1} = R_k Q_k$ . The eigenvalues of  $A_{k+1}$  are the same as the eigenvalues of  $A_k$ , since we have

$$A_{k+1} = R_k Q_k = Q_k^{-1} (Q_k R_k) Q_k = Q_k^{-1} A_k Q_k, \quad (1)$$

a similarity transformation. Moreover,  $Q_k^{-1} = Q_k^T$ , therefore if  $A_k$  is symmetric, then so is  $A_{k+1}$ .

If for some  $k \geq 0$  the matrix  $A_{k+1}$  can be regarded as “deflated”, i.e. it has the block form

$$A_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} B & C \\ D & E \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $B, E$  are square and  $D \approx 0$ , then we calculate the eigenvalues of  $B$  and  $E$  separately (again, with QR, except that there is nothing to calculate for  $1 \times 1$  and  $2 \times 2$  blocks). As it turns out, such a “deflation” occurs surprisingly often.

# The QR iteration for upper Hessenberg matrices

If  $A_k$  is upper Hessenberg, then its QR factorization by means of the Givens rotations produces the matrix

$$R_k = Q_k^T A_k = \Omega^{[n-1,n]} \dots \Omega^{[2,3]} \Omega^{[1,2]} A_k,$$

which is upper triangular. The QR iteration sets

$A_{k+1} = R_k Q_k = R_k \Omega^{[1,2]T} \Omega^{[2,3]T} \dots \Omega^{[n-1,n]T}$ , and it follows that  $A_{k+1}$  is also upper Hessenberg, because

$$\begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ 0 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[1,2]T}} \begin{bmatrix} \bullet & \bullet & * & * \\ \bullet & \bullet & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[2,3]T}} \begin{bmatrix} * & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ * & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ 0 & \bullet & \bullet & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\times \Omega^{[3,4]T}} \begin{bmatrix} * & * & \bullet & \bullet \\ * & * & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & * & \bullet & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \bullet & \bullet \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus a strong advantage of bringing  $A$  to the upper Hessenberg form initially is that then, in every iteration in QR algorithm,  $Q_k$  is a product of just  $n-1$  Givens rotations. Hence each iteration of the QR algorithm requires just  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  operations.

# The QR iteration for symmetric matrices

---

We bring  $A$  to the upper Hessenberg form, so that the QR algorithm commences from a symmetric tridiagonal matrix  $A_0$ , and then the technique on the previous slide is applied for every  $k$  as before. Since both the upper Hessenberg structure and symmetry is retained, each  $A_{k+1}$  is also *symmetric tridiagonal* too.

It follows that, whenever a Givens rotation  $\Omega^{[i,j]}$  combines either two adjacent rows or two adjacent columns of a matrix, the total number of nonzero elements in the new combination of rows or columns is at most five. Thus there is a bound on the work of each rotation that is independent of  $n$ . Hence each QR iteration requires just  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  operations.

To analyse the matrices  $A_k$  that occur in the QR algorithm 5.13, we introduce

$$\bar{Q}_k = Q_0 Q_1 \cdots Q_k, \quad \bar{R}_k = R_k R_{k-1} \cdots R_0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2)$$

Note that  $\bar{Q}_k$  is orthogonal and  $\bar{R}_k$  upper triangular.



# Fundamental properties of $\bar{Q}_k$ and $\bar{R}_k$

## Lemma 2 (Fundamental properties of $\bar{Q}_k$ and $\bar{R}_k$ )

$A_{k+1}$  is related to the original matrix  $A$  by the similarity transformation  $A_{k+1} = \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k$ . Further,  $\bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k$  is the QR factorization of  $A^{k+1}$ .

**Proof.** We prove the first assertion by induction. By (1), we have  $A_1 = Q_0^T A_0 Q_0 = \bar{Q}_0^T A \bar{Q}_0$ . Assuming  $A_k = \bar{Q}_{k-1}^T A \bar{Q}_{k-1}$ , equations (1)-(2) provide the first identity

$$A_{k+1} = Q_k^T A_k Q_k = Q_k^T (\bar{Q}_{k-1}^T A \bar{Q}_{k-1}) Q_k = \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k.$$

The second assertion is true for  $k = 0$ , since  $\bar{Q}_0 \bar{R}_0 = Q_0 R_0 = A_0 = A$ . Again, we use induction, assuming  $\bar{Q}_{k-1} \bar{R}_{k-1} = A^k$ . Thus, using the definition (2) and the first statement of the lemma, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k &= (\bar{Q}_{k-1} Q_k)(R_k \bar{R}_{k-1}) = \bar{Q}_{k-1} A_k \bar{R}_{k-1} = \bar{Q}_{k-1} (\bar{Q}_{k-1}^T A \bar{Q}_{k-1}) \bar{R}_{k-1} \\ &= A \bar{Q}_{k-1} \bar{R}_{k-1} = A \cdot A^k = A^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is true. □

## Relation between QR and the power method

---

Assume that the eigenvalues of  $A$  have different magnitudes,

$$|\lambda_1| < |\lambda_2| < \cdots < |\lambda_n|, \quad \text{and let } \mathbf{e}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbf{w}_i = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \mathbf{w}_i \quad (3)$$

be the expansion of the first coordinate vector in terms of the normalized eigenvectors of  $A$ , where  $m$  is the greatest integer such that  $c_m \neq 0$ .

## Relation between QR and the power method

Consider the first columns of both sides of the matrix equation

$$A^{k+1} = \bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k.$$

By the power method arguments, the vector  $A^{k+1} \mathbf{e}_1$  is a multiple of  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i (\lambda_i / \lambda_m)^{k+1} \mathbf{w}_i$ , so the first column of  $A^{k+1}$  tends to be a multiple of  $\mathbf{w}_m$  for  $k \gg 1$ . On the other hand, if  $\mathbf{q}_k$  is the first column of  $\bar{Q}_k$ , then, since  $\bar{R}_k$  is upper triangular, the first column of  $\bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k$  is a multiple of  $\mathbf{q}_k$ .

Therefore  $\mathbf{q}_k$  tends to be a multiple of  $\mathbf{w}_m$ . Further, because both  $\mathbf{q}_k$  and  $\mathbf{w}_m$  have unit length, we deduce that  $\mathbf{q}_k = \pm \mathbf{w}_m + \mathbf{h}_k$ , where  $\mathbf{h}_k$  tends to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,

$$A \mathbf{q}_k = \lambda_m \mathbf{q}_k + o(1), \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4)$$

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big\\_O\\_notation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_O_notation)

[http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/research/afha/anders/JFA\\_Final.pdf](http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/research/afha/anders/JFA_Final.pdf)

# The first column of $A_k$

## Theorem 3 (The first column of $A_k$ )

Let conditions (3) be satisfied. Then, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the first column of  $A_k$  tends to  $\lambda_m \mathbf{e}_1$ , making  $A_k$  suitable for deflation.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2, the first column of  $A_{k+1}$  is  $\bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k \mathbf{e}_1$ , and, using (4), we deduce that

$$A_{k+1} \mathbf{e}_1 = \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k \mathbf{e}_1 = \bar{Q}_k^T A \mathbf{q}_k \stackrel{(4)}{=} \bar{Q}_k^T [\lambda_m \mathbf{q}_k + o(1)] \stackrel{(*)}{=} \lambda_m \mathbf{e}_1 + o(1),$$

where in (\*) we used that  $\bar{Q}_k^T \mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{e}_1$  by orthogonality of  $\bar{Q}$ , and that  $\|\bar{Q}_k \mathbf{x}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$  because an orthogonal mapping is an isometry.

□

<https://blogs.mathworks.com/cleve/2019/08/05/the-qr-algorithm-computes-eigenvalues-and-singular-values/>

## Relation between QR and inverse iteration

In practice, the statement of Theorem 3 is hardly ever important, because usually, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the off-diagonal elements in the bottom row of  $A_{k+1}$  tend to zero *much faster* than the off-diagonal elements in the first column. The reason is that, besides the connection with the power method, the QR algorithm also enjoys a close relation with *inverse iteration*.

Let again

$$|\lambda_1| < |\lambda_2| < \cdots < |\lambda_n|, \quad \text{and let } \mathbf{e}_n^T = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbf{v}_i^T = \sum_{i=s}^n c_i \mathbf{v}_i^T \quad (5)$$

be the expansion of the last coordinate row vector  $\mathbf{e}_n^T$  in the basis of normalized *left eigenvectors* of  $A$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{v}_i^T A = \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i^T$ , where  $s$  is the least integer such that  $c_s \neq 0$ .

## Relation between QR and inverse iteration

Assuming that  $A$  is nonsingular, we can write the equation  $A^{k+1} = \bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k$  in the form  $A^{-(k+1)} = \bar{R}_k^{-1} \bar{Q}_k^T$ . Consider the bottom rows of both sides of this equation:  $\mathbf{e}_n^T A^{-(k+1)} = (\mathbf{e}_n^T \bar{R}_k^{-1}) \bar{Q}_k^T$ . By the inverse iteration arguments, the vector  $\mathbf{e}_n^T A^{-(k+1)}$  is a multiple of  $\sum_{i=s}^n c_i (\lambda_s / \lambda_i)^{k+1} \mathbf{v}_i^T$ , so the bottom row of  $A^{-(k+1)}$  tends to be multiple of  $\mathbf{v}_s^T$ . On the other hand, let  $\mathbf{p}_k^T$  be the bottom row of  $\bar{Q}_k^T$ . Since  $\bar{R}_k$  is upper triangular, its inverse  $\bar{R}_k^{-1}$  is upper triangular too, hence the bottom row of  $\bar{R}_k^{-1} \bar{Q}_k^T$ , is a multiple of  $\mathbf{p}_k^T$ .

Therefore,  $\mathbf{p}_k^T$  tends to a multiple of  $\mathbf{v}_s^T$ , and, because of their unit lengths, we have  $\mathbf{p}_k^T = \pm \mathbf{v}_s^T + \mathbf{h}_k^T$ , where  $\mathbf{h}_k \rightarrow 0$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{p}_k^T A = \lambda_s \mathbf{p}_k^T + o(1), \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6)$$

# The bottom row of $A_k$

## Theorem 4 (The bottom row of $A_k$ )

Let conditions (5) be satisfied. Then, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the bottom row of  $A_k$  tends to  $\lambda_s \mathbf{e}_n^T$ , making  $A_k$  suitable for deflation.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2, the bottom row of  $A_{k+1}$  is  $\mathbf{e}_n^T \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k$ , and similarly to the previous proof we obtain

$$\mathbf{e}_n^T A_{k+1} = \mathbf{e}_n^T \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k = \mathbf{p}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k \stackrel{(6)}{=} [\lambda_s \mathbf{p}_k^T + o(1)] \bar{Q}_k = \lambda_s \mathbf{e}_n^T + o(1). \quad (7)$$

the last equality by orthogonality of  $\bar{Q}_k$ .  $\square$

## Single shifts

---

As we saw in previous lectures, there is a huge difference between power iteration and inverse iteration: the latter can be accelerated arbitrarily through the use of shifts. The better we can estimate  $s_k \approx \lambda_s$ , the more we can accomplish by a step of inverse iteration with the shifted matrix  $A_k - s_k I$ . Theorem 4 shows that the bottom right element  $(A_k)_{nn}$  becomes a good estimate of  $\lambda_s$ . So, in the *single shift technique*, the matrix  $A_k$  is replaced by  $A_k - s_k I$ , where  $s_k = (A_k)_{nn}$ , before the QR factorization:

$$\begin{aligned}A_k - s_k I &= Q_k R_k, \\A_{k+1} &= R_k Q_k + s_k I.\end{aligned}$$



## Single shifts

A good approximation  $s_k = (A_k)_{nn}$  to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_s$  generates even better approximation of  $s_{k+1} = (A_{k+1})_{nn}$  to  $\lambda_s$ , and convergence is accelerating at a higher and higher rate (it will be the so-called cubic convergence  $|\lambda_s - s_{k+1}| \leq \gamma |\lambda_s - s_k|^3$ ). Note that, similarly to the original QR iteration, we have

$$A_{k+1} = Q_k^T (Q_k R_k + s_k I) Q_k = Q_k^T A_k Q_k,$$

hence  $A_{k+1} = \bar{Q}_k^T A \bar{Q}_k$ , but note also that  $\bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k \neq A^{k+1}$ , but we have instead

$$\bar{Q}_k \bar{R}_k = \prod_{m=0}^k (A - s_m I)$$

[https://uk.mathworks.com/content/dam/mathworks/tag-team/Objects/t/72899\\_92026v00Cleve\\_QR\\_Algorithm\\_Sum\\_1995.pdf](https://uk.mathworks.com/content/dam/mathworks/tag-team/Objects/t/72899_92026v00Cleve_QR_Algorithm_Sum_1995.pdf)