



UNIVERSITÄT KARLSRUHE

New criteria for the feasibility of the Cholesky
method with interval data

G. Alefeld
G. Mayer

Preprint Nr. 07/07

Institut für Wissenschaftliches Rechnen
und Mathematische Modellbildung



76128 Karlsruhe

Anschriften der Verfasser:

Prof. Dr. Götz Alefeld
Institut für Angewandte und Numerische Mathematik
Universität Karlsruhe (TH)
D-76128 Karlsruhe

Prof. Dr.rer.nat. habil. Günter Mayer
Institut für Mathematik
Universität Rostock
D-18051 Rostock

New criteria for the feasibility of the Cholesky method with interval data

G. Alefeld* G. Mayer†

Dedicated to Professor Dr. Ulrich Kulisch, Karlsruhe, on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

Abstract

We present some new criteria for the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method. In particular, we relate this feasibility to that of the interval Gaussian algorithm.

Key words: Linear interval equations, Cholesky method, interval Cholesky algorithm, Gaussian algorithm, interval Gaussian algorithm, linear system of equations, criteria of feasibility.

AMS Subject Classification: 65G20, 65G30

1 Introduction

In [2] we introduced the interval Cholesky method in order to enclose the symmetric solution set

$$S_{\text{sym}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = b, A = A^T \in [A] = [A]^T, b \in [b]\},$$

where $[A] = [\underline{A}, \overline{A}]$ is a given $n \times n$ interval matrix and $[b]$ is a corresponding interval vector. The algorithm uses the formulae of the classical Cholesky method replacing the real entries and arithmetic by interval ones. It terminates with an interval vector $[x]^C = \text{ICh}([A], [b])$ which encloses S_{sym} but not necessarily the general solution set

$$S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = b, A \in [A], b \in [b]\},$$

which also contains the solutions of linear systems with unsymmetric matrices from $[A]$. A necessary criterion for $[x]^C$ to exist is the positive definiteness of all symmetric matrices in $[A]$ – independently of any righthand side $[b]$. Unfortunately, this

*Institut für Angewandte und Numerische Mathematik, Universität Karlsruhe, Kaiserstr. 12, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany, Email: goetz.alefeld@mathematik.uni-karlsruhe.de

†Institut für Mathematik, Universität Rostock, Universitätsplatz 1, D-18051 Rostock, Germany, Email: guenter.mayer@uni-rostock.de

property is not sufficient as Reichmann's example in [13] shows which originally was constructed for a different situation. This example caused the necessity of criteria which guarantee the existence of $[x]^C$ or, equivalently, the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method for arbitrary righthand interval sides. In [2] we proved that $[x]^C$ exists for a variety of structured matrices among them H -matrices, M -matrices, diagonal dominant matrices and tridiagonal ones, all with appropriate additional properties. In [3] we extended these criteria of feasibility by perturbation results analogously to those in [11]. In [15] further results of feasibility were presented for block variants of the algorithm which were introduced there. It is the purpose of the present paper to add other ones. In particular, we will show that the feasibility of the interval Gaussian algorithm [1] implies the existence of $[x]^C$ provided that $[A]$ contains at least one positive definite element matrix. Based on this crucial result a lot of criteria for the interval Gaussian algorithm carry over to the interval Cholesky method. Unfortunately, the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method does not necessarily imply that of the interval Gaussian algorithm. We will illustrate this phenomenon by an example. It was unexpected since we can show that the existence of x^C for each *symmetric* matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ implies the feasibility of the Gaussian algorithm for *any* matrix $A \in [A]$ and not only for the symmetric ones.

We have organized our paper as follows: In Section 2 we recall the formulae for the algorithm and a recursive representation. In addition we introduce our notation and some basic facts as far as they are used later on. In Section 3 we state and prove our new results illustrating them by examples.

2 Preliminaries

By $\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \mathbb{IR}, \mathbb{IR}^n, \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ we denote the set of real vectors with n components, the set of real $n \times n$ matrices, the set of intervals, the set of interval vectors with n components and the set of $n \times n$ interval matrices, respectively. By 'interval' we always mean a real compact interval. We write interval quantities in brackets with the exception of point quantities (i.e., degenerate interval quantities) which we identify with the element which they contain. Examples are the zero matrix O , the identity matrix I and the vector $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$. We use the notation $[A] = [\underline{A}, \bar{A}] = ([a]_{ij}) = ([\underline{a}_{ij}, \bar{a}_{ij}]) \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ simultaneously without further reference, and we proceed similarly for the elements of $\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \mathbb{IR}$ and \mathbb{IR}^n . We also mention the standard notation from interval analysis ([1], [11])

$$\check{a} = \text{mid}([a]) = (\underline{a} + \bar{a})/2 \quad (\text{midpoint})$$

$$|[a]| = \max\{|\tilde{a}| \mid \tilde{a} \in [a]\} = \max\{|\underline{a}|, |\bar{a}|\} \quad (\text{absolute value})$$

$$\langle [a] \rangle = \min\{|\tilde{a}| \mid \tilde{a} \in [a]\} = \begin{cases} \min\{|\underline{a}|, |\bar{a}|\} & \text{if } 0 \notin [a] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (\text{minimal absolute value})$$

for intervals $[a]$. For $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ we obtain $|[A]| \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by applying the operator $|\cdot|$ entrywise and we define the comparison matrix $\langle [A] \rangle = (c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by setting

$$c_{ij} = \begin{cases} -|[a]_{ij}| & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle & \text{if } i = j \end{cases} .$$

Since real numbers can be viewed as degenerate intervals, $|\cdot|$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ can also be used for them.

By $A \geq O$ we denote a non-negative $n \times n$ matrix, i.e., $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Analogously, we define $x \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We call $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ positive writing $x > 0$ if $x_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n$. We use $Z^{n \times n}$ for the set of real $n \times n$ matrices with non-positive off-diagonal entries. Trivially, $Z^{n \times n}$ contains the $n \times n$ matrix $\langle A \rangle$. As usual we call $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ an M -matrix if A is non-singular with $A^{-1} \geq O$ and $A \in Z^{n \times n}$. It is an H -matrix if $\langle A \rangle$ is an M -matrix.

An interval matrix $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ is defined to be an M -matrix if each element $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is an M -matrix. In the same way the term ‘ H -matrix’ can be extended to $\mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$. It is easy to verify that $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ is an M -matrix if and only if \underline{A} is an M -matrix and $\bar{a}_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$, and that $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ is an H -matrix if and only if $\langle [A] \rangle$ is an M -matrix.

We call $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$, irreducible if $\langle [A] \rangle$ is irreducible. In the same way we define $[A]$ to be diagonally dominant, strictly diagonally dominant, and irreducibly diagonally dominant, respectively. If there is a positive vector x such that

$$\langle [A] \rangle x \geq 0 \quad (2.1)$$

holds then we call $[A]$ generalized diagonally dominant. Moreover, we define $[A]$ to be generalized strictly diagonally dominant if strict inequality holds in (2.1). Analogously, a generalized irreducibly diagonally dominant matrix $[A]$ is irreducible and generalized diagonally dominant with $(\langle [A] \rangle x)_i > 0$ in (2.1) for at least one component i . It is well-known that generalized strictly diagonally dominant matrices are H -matrices and vice versa.

We equip $\mathbb{IR}, \mathbb{IR}^n, \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ with the usual real interval arithmetic as described in [1], [11]. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic properties of this arithmetic. For $[a] \in \mathbb{IR}$ we define

$$\sqrt{[a]} = \{\sqrt{a} \mid a \in [a]\} \text{ for } 0 \leq \underline{a} \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$[a]^2 = \{a^2 \mid a \in [a]\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Instead of $\sqrt{[a]}$ we also write $[a]^{1/2}$.

Then the interval Cholesky method reads as follows.

Given $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$, $[b] \in \mathbb{IR}^n$ define the lower triangular matrix $[L]$ and the vectors $[y]$, $[x]^C = ([x]_i^C) = \text{ICh}([A], [b]) \in \mathbb{IR}^n$ by

$$\begin{aligned} [l]_{jj} &= \left([a]_{jj} - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} [l]_{jk}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \\ [l]_{ij} &= \left([a]_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} [l]_{ik} [l]_{jk} \right) / [l]_{jj}, \quad i = j+1, \dots, n, \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad j = 1, \dots, n; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[y]_i &= \left([b]_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} [l]_{ij} [y]_j \right) / [l]_{ii}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \\
[x]_i^C &= \left([y]_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^n [l]_{ji} [x]_j^C \right) / [l]_{ii}, \quad i = n, n-1, \dots, 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Sums with an upper bound smaller than the lower one are defined to be zero; the squares in the first formula are evaluated by applying the interval square function (2.3).

Apparently $[x]^C$ exists if and only if $0 < \underline{l}_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In this case we call the algorithm feasible. Note that this feasibility does not depend on the choice of $[b]$. For the interval Cholesky method we assume without loss of generality $[A]$ to be symmetric, i.e., $[A] = [A]^T$. (In the case $[A] \neq [A]^T$ we replace $[A]$ by the largest interval matrix $[B] \subseteq [A]$ which satisfies $[B] = [B]^T$ and rename $[B]$ to $[A]$.) By the overestimation of the interval arithmetic only

$$[A] \subseteq [L][L]^T \tag{2.4}$$

can be guaranteed; cf. [2] for details. Nevertheless the pair $([L], [L]^T)$ is called Cholesky decomposition of $[A]$. This decomposition can also be defined in a recursive way. To this end write $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ as $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} [a]_{11} & [c]^T \\ [c] & [A]' \end{pmatrix}$ and use its Schur complement $\Sigma_{[A]}^C = [A]' - [c][c]^T/[a]_{11}$ if $n > 1$, $0 \notin [a]_{11}$ where $[c]_i[c]_i$ is evaluated as $[c]_i^2$.

Definition 2.1 (Equivalent definition of the Cholesky decomposition $([L], [L]^T)$)

The pair $([L], [L]^T)$ is called Cholesky decomposition of $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ if $0 < \underline{a}_{11}$ and if either $n = 1$, $[L] = (\sqrt{[a]_{11}})$ or if $n > 1$ and

$$[L] = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{[a]_{11}} & 0 \\ [c]/\sqrt{[a]_{11}} & [L]' \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $([L]', ([L]')^T)$ is the Cholesky decomposition of $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$. If $0 \in [a]_{11}$ the Cholesky decomposition does not exist.

In [2] we showed that the matrix $[L]$ in Definition 2.1 is the same as that defined by the interval Cholesky method. In particular, the existence of the Cholesky decomposition is equivalent to the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method. We will exploit this fact later on. It is a basic fact of matrix analysis that the existence of the Cholesky decomposition of a symmetric point matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is equivalent to A being positive definite, to A having only positive eigenvalues, and to A having only positive leading principal minors; cf. for instance [7].

Directly from the formulae of the interval Cholesky method we obtain the following result which corresponds to Lemma 3.1 b) in [8].

Lemma 2.1

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $[b] \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $[x]^C = \text{ICh}([A], [b])$ exist. If $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has positive entries d_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, in the diagonal, then $[\tilde{x}]^C = \text{ICh}([D[A]D, D[b)])$ exists and satisfies $[\tilde{x}]^C = D^{-1}[x]^C$.

Proof.

Denote by a tilde all items which belong to $[\tilde{x}]^C$. Then, by induction, the formulae of the interval Cholesky method yield $[\tilde{L}] = D[L]$, hence $[\tilde{y}] = [y]$ and $[\tilde{x}]^C = D^{-1}[x]^C$.

□

We continue by recalling some results from [2].

Theorem 2.1

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an H -matrix with $0 < \underline{a}_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the following statements hold.

- a) The vector $[x]^C$ exists, and $[L]$ is again an H -matrix.
- b) Each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is positive definite.

From Theorem 2.1 we easily get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be an H -matrix. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) The vector $[x]^C$ exists.
- (ii) The sign condition $\underline{a}_{ii} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, holds.
- (iii) The matrix $[A]$ contains at least one symmetric and positive definite element $\tilde{A} \in [A]$.

Proof.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii)

Since $\langle [A] \rangle$ is an M -matrix we have $\langle [a]_{ii} \rangle > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, whence $0 \notin [a]_{ii}$. The existence of $[x]^C$ then implies $\underline{a}_{ii} > 0$.

The implications (ii) \Rightarrow (i) and (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) follow directly from Theorem 2.1.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii)

As in the first implication above one gets $0 \notin [a]_{ii}$, and the sign condition for \underline{a}_{ii} follows from the positive definiteness of \tilde{A} .

□

Theorem 2.2

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a tridiagonal matrix and let $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ be any symmetric matrix which satisfies $\langle \tilde{A} \rangle = \langle [A] \rangle$ and which is positive definite. Then $[A]$ is an H -matrix; in particular, all symmetric matrices $A \in [A]$ are positive definite, and $[x]^C$ exists.

Theorem 2.3

Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & c^T \\ c & A' \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric and positive definite. Then the Schur complement $\Sigma_A^C = A' - cc^T/a_{11}$ of A is symmetric and positive definite.

Proof.

Use $0 < x^T Ax = (x')^T \Sigma_A^C x'$ for $x = (-c^T x'/a_{11}, (x')^T)^T$ and any non-zero vector $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

□

Since we will also use results of the interval Gaussian algorithm we will repeat its formulae, too.

Given $[A] \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $[b] \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^n$ define $[A]^{(k)} = ([a]_{ij}^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $[b]^{(k)} = ([b]_i^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^n$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, and $[x]^G = ([x]_i^G) = \text{IGA}([A], [b]) \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$[A]^{(1)} = [A], \quad [b]^{(1)} = [b],$$

$$[a]_{ij}^{(k+1)} = \begin{cases} [a]_{ij}^{(k)}, & i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \\ [a]_{ij}^{(k)} - \frac{[a]_{ik}^{(k)} \cdot [a]_{kj}^{(k)}}{[a]_{kk}^{(k)}}, & i = k+1, \dots, n, \quad j = k+1, \dots, n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$[b]_i^{(k+1)} = \begin{cases} [b]_i^{(k)}, & i = 1, \dots, k, \\ [b]_i^{(k)} - \frac{[a]_{ik}^{(k)}}{[a]_{kk}^{(k)}} \cdot [b]_k^{(k)}, & i = k+1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

$$[x]_i^G = \left([b]_i^{(n)} - \sum_{j=i+1}^n [a]_{ij}^{(n)} [x]_j^G \right) / [a]_{ii}^{(n)}, \quad i = n, n-1, \dots, 1,$$

where $\sum_{j=n+1}^n \dots = 0$. Note that $[x]^G$ is defined without permuting rows or columns. The algorithm is feasible if and only if $0 \notin [a]_{kk}^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, where again the feasibility does not depend on the choice of $[b]$. Define the lower triangular matrix $[\hat{L}]$ by $[\hat{l}]_{ii} = 1$, $[\hat{l}]_{ij} = [a]_{ij}^{(j)} / [a]_{jj}^{(j)}$ for $i > j$, and the upper triangular matrix $[\hat{U}]$ by $[\hat{u}]_{ij} = [a]_{ij}^{(n)}$ for $i \leq j$. According to [11] the pair $([\hat{L}], [\hat{U}])$ is called the triangular decomposition of $[A]$.

Similar to Definition 2.1 there is an equivalent recursive definition of that decomposition. It uses the partition $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} [a]_{11} & [c]^T \\ [d] & [A]' \end{pmatrix}$ and its Schur complement $\Sigma_{[A]}^G = [A]' - [d][c]^T / [a]_{11}$ if $n > 1$, $0 \notin [a]_{11}$. Note that for $[A] = [A]^T$ we have $[c] = [d]$. In this case we assume that $[c]_i [c]_i$ in the product $[d][c]^T = [c][c]^T$ is evaluated as a product of intervals and not as in (2.3). This implies

$$\Sigma_{[A]}^C \subseteq \Sigma_{[A]}^G \quad (2.6)$$

where both matrices may differ from each other. For symmetric *point matrices* $A \equiv [A]$, however, equality always holds in (2.6), provided that $a_{11} > 0$.

Definition 2.2 (Equivalent definition of the triangular decomposition $([\hat{L}], [\hat{U}])$)

The pair $([\hat{L}], [\hat{U}])$ is called *triangular decomposition* of $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ if $0 \notin [a]_{11}$ and if either $n = 1$, $[\hat{L}] = 1$, $[\hat{U}] = ([a]_{11})$ or if $n > 1$ and

$$[\hat{L}] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ [d]/[a]_{11} & [\hat{L}]' \end{pmatrix}, \quad [\hat{U}] = \begin{pmatrix} [a]_{11} & [c]^T \\ 0 & [\hat{U}]' \end{pmatrix},$$

where $([\hat{L}]', [\hat{U}]')$ is the triangular decomposition of $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$. If $0 \in [a]_{11}$ the triangular decomposition does not exist.

In the sequel we will use the notation of Section 2 without further reference.

3 New results

In this section we will present some new criteria for the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method. Since neither the existence of $[x]^C$ nor that of $[x]^G$ depend on the righthand side $[b]$ we do not mention $[b]$ in our results.

Assume now that $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric and positive definite. Then from the Cholesky decomposition (L, L^T) of A we define the diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(l_{11}, \dots, l_{nn})$. It is well-known that D has positive diagonal entries. Hence $A = LL^T = (LD^{-1})(DL^T)$ yields the unique (\hat{L}, \hat{U}) -decomposition of A with $\hat{L} = LD^{-1}$ and $\hat{U} = DL^T$. Conversely, from the (\hat{L}, \hat{U}) -decomposition of a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with positive diagonal entries \hat{u}_{ii} , $i = 1, \dots, n$, one easily verifies positive definiteness of A and hence the existence of the Cholesky decomposition. Therefore, the question arises at once whether a similar result also holds in the interval case. In one direction the answer is positive.

Theorem 3.1

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ contain a symmetric and positive definite matrix \tilde{A} . If $[x]^G$ exists then $[x]^C$ exists, too.

Proof.

Since $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is symmetric and positive definite we have $\tilde{a}_{11} > 0$. Moreover, since by assumption $[x]^G$ exists we obtain $\underline{a}_{11} > 0$. We now proceed by induction of the dimension of $[A]$.

If $n = 1$ the assertion is obvious. If $n > 1$ let it hold for dimensions less than n and let $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} [a]_{11} & [c]^T \\ [c] & [A'] \end{pmatrix}$. From $\underline{a}_{11} > 0$ the Schur complements

$$\Sigma_{[A]}^C = [A]' - [c][c]^T/[a]_{11} \quad \text{with } [c]_i[c]_i \text{ being evaluated as } [c]_i^2$$

for the Cholesky method and

$$\Sigma_{[A]}^G = [A]' - [c][c]^T/[a]_{11} \supseteq \Sigma_{[A]}^C$$

(with $[c]_i[c]_i$ being evaluated as a product of two intervals) for the Gaussian algorithm exist. Since, by assumption, the interval Gaussian algorithm is feasible for $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$ and since this interval matrix contains the symmetric and positive definite matrix $\Sigma_{\tilde{A}}^G = \Sigma_{\tilde{A}}^C$ (cf. Theorem 2.3) the induction hypothesis applies for $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$. Therefore, the Cholesky decomposition exists for this interval matrix and thus it exists for the (eventually proper) subset $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$, too. \square

We will prove now a result on point matrices which originally increased our hope for a converse of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.2

Let all symmetric matrices $\tilde{A} \in [A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ be positive definite. Then the Gaussian algorithm is feasible without pivoting for all matrices $A \in [A]$ (and not only for the symmetric ones).

Proof.

Let $A \in [A]$. Then the symmetric part¹ $A_{\text{sym}} = (A + A^T)/2$ of A is contained in $[A]$, hence it is positive definite by assumption. For $x \neq 0$ we have

$$0 < x^T A_{\text{sym}} x = (x^T A x + x^T A^T x)/2 = x^T A x, \tag{3.1}$$

where we used $x^T A^T x = (x^T A^T x)^T = x^T A x$. From (3.1) we immediately get $\det A \neq 0$. Since this implication applies also to all leading submatrices of A the assertion follows from Theorem 9.1.2 in [12]. \square

Despite this positive result the converse of Theorem 3.1 does not hold. This is illustrated by the following example.

¹We thank Prof. M. Plum, Karlsruhe, for his hint to apply the symmetric part of A which made our original proof more elementary.

Example 3.1

Consider the matrix

$$[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & [-1, 1] & 0 & 0 \\ [-1, 1] & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 5 + \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

with a positive parameter ε which will be chosen below. Then for the interval Cholesky method we get

$$[L] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ [-1, 1] & [1, \sqrt{2}] & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & [1/\sqrt{2}, 1] & [1, \sqrt{3/2}] & 0 \\ 0 & [2/\sqrt{2}, 2] & [0, 1] & [\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \sqrt{3 + \varepsilon}] \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., $[x]^C$ exists for any positive value of ε . On the other hand we obtain

$$[\hat{U}] = [A]^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & [-1, 1] & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & [1, 3] & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & [1, 5/3] & [0, 4/3] \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & [\varepsilon - 7/9, \varepsilon + 11/3] \end{pmatrix}$$

for the upper triangular matrix of the interval Gaussian algorithm. Choosing $\varepsilon = 1/3$ results in the interval $[a]_{44}^{(4)} = [-4/9, 4]$ which contains zero. Hence $[x]^G$ does not exist although $[x]^C$ does. In particular, the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 are fulfilled. Therefore, the Gaussian algorithm is feasible for any matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$, and our example is also a counterexample for the interval Gaussian algorithm. □

The dimension $n = 4$ in Example 3.1 is minimal for a counterexample. This can be seen from our next result.

Theorem 3.3

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ contain a symmetric and positive definite matrix \tilde{A} and let $n \leq 3$. Then $[x]^C$ exists if and only if $[x]^G$ exists.

Proof.

By virtue of Theorem 3.1 we only must show that the existence of $[x]^C$ implies that of $[x]^G$. Therefore, from now on we assume that $[x]^C$ exists. In particular, $0 < \underline{a}_{11}$ holds which immediately guarantees the existence of $[x]^G$ in the case $n = 1$.

$n = 2$: By Theorem 3.2 no matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{2 \times 2}$ is singular, hence $[x]^G$ exists by Proposition 4.5.4 in [11].

$n = 3$: From $\underline{a}_{11} > 0$ we know that $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$ exists. Since any interval $[c]$ satisfies

$$[c]^2 \subseteq [c] \cdot [c] = [c]^2 + [-d, 0]$$

with an appropriate nonnegative number d , we obtain

$$\Sigma_{[A]}^G = \Sigma_{[A]}^C + [D] \quad \text{with } [D] = \text{diag}([0, d_1], [0, d_2], [0, d_3]),$$

where d_1, d_2, d_3 are appropriate nonnegative real numbers. Note that $\min(\Sigma_{[A]}^G)_{11} = \min(\Sigma_{[A]}^C)_{11} > 0$. Choose $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}^G = (\tilde{\Sigma}^G)^T \in \Sigma_{[A]}^G$. Then $\tilde{\Sigma}^G$ can be written as $\tilde{\Sigma}^G = \tilde{\Sigma}^C + \tilde{D}$ with $\tilde{\Sigma}^C = (\tilde{\Sigma}^C)^T \in \Sigma_{[A]}^C$ and $O \leq \tilde{D} \in [D]$, whence

$$x^T \tilde{\Sigma}^G x = x^T \tilde{\Sigma}^C x + x^T \tilde{D} x \geq x^T \tilde{\Sigma}^C x > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus any symmetric matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}^G \in \Sigma_{[A]}^G$ is positive definite, and Theorem 3.2 applies to $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$. Therefore, no matrix $\Sigma \in \Sigma_{[A]}^G$ is singular, and $[x]^G \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^3$ exists again by virtue of Proposition 4.5.4 in [11] applied to $\Sigma_{[A]}^G \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$. □

Another interesting negative result can be seen from Example 3.1: For symmetric and positive definite matrices $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ one proves similarly as for $\tilde{\Sigma}^G$ in (3.2) that $\tilde{A} + \tilde{D}$ with $\tilde{D} \geq O$ is positive definite, hence the Cholesky method is feasible for $\tilde{A} + \tilde{D}$, too. For interval matrices $[A] + [O, D]$, $D \geq O$, an analogous result does not hold if one merely knows that $[x]^C$ exists for $[A]$. Otherwise apply this result to $\Sigma_{[A]}^G = \Sigma_{[A]}^C + [O, D]$; it would guarantee that $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$ has a Cholesky decomposition if $[A]$ has one, and an inductive argument would show that Theorem 3.1 has a converse. This contradicts Example 3.1.

There are more classes of matrices for which one can prove the converse of Theorem 3.1. In order to characterize some of them we use the concept of an undirected graph of a real matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with the nodes $1, \dots, n$ and the edges $\{i, j\}$, whenever $|a_{ij}| + |a_{ji}| \neq 0$; cf. for instance [6]. We call j a neighbor of the node i ($\neq j$) if i and j are connected by an edge. The number of neighbors of i is the degree of i in the underlying graph. Let G_k denote the k -th elimination graph of $[A]$, i.e., the undirected graph of $|[A]^{(k)}|$ in which the nodes $1, \dots, k-1$ and the corresponding edges have been removed and for which we assume that $[a]_{ij}^{(k-1)} \neq 0$ implies $[a]_{ij}^{(k)} \neq 0$, $i, j \geq k$ (no accidental zeros!); cf. [6]. If in G_k the node k has the smallest degree and if this holds for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ then we say that $[A]$ is ordered by minimum degree. If the graph of such a matrix has tree structure (i.e., there are no cycles of length ≥ 3) the following result holds.

Theorem 3.4

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ contain a symmetric and positive definite matrix \tilde{A} . If the undirected graph of $\langle [A] \rangle$ is a tree and if it is ordered by minimum degree then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) *The vector $[x]^G$ exists.*
- (ii) *The vector $[x]^C$ exists.*

(iii) Each symmetric matrix in $[A]$ is positive definite.

Proof.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii) follows from Theorem 3.1.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) is trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) follows from Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4 in [4]. \square

For a variant of the interval Cholesky method Theorem 3.4 was proved in [4]. Note that symmetric tridiagonal interval matrices and symmetric arrowhead interval matrices [14] belong to the class of matrices characterized in Theorem 3.4 (provided that they contain a symmetric and positive definite matrix \tilde{A}).

Example 3.2

Consider the arrowhead matrix

$$[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & [-1, 1] & [-1, 1] \\ [-1, 1] & 2 & 0 \\ [-1, 1] & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then Gerschgorin's Theorem shows that the eigenvalues of each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ are nonnegative. They are even positive as can be seen in most cases by the same theorem. For the remaining cases \tilde{A} is irreducibly diagonally dominant and thus an H -matrix. Since such a matrix is regular it cannot have zero as eigenvalue. Therefore, each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is positive definite, and $[x]^C$ exists for $[A]$ by Theorem 3.4. \square

In order to formulate our next result we need the extended sign matrix S' which we define recursively as in [8].

Definition 3.1 (Sign matrix S and extended sign matrix S' for $[A]$)

Let $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$.

- a) The matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $s_{ij} = \text{sign } \tilde{a}_{ij}$ is called sign matrix of $[A]$.
- b) With S from a) the extended sign matrix S' is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} S' &= S \\ \text{for } k &= 1 : (n-1) \\ \quad \text{for } i &= (k+1) : n \\ \quad \quad \text{for } j &= (k+1) : n \\ \quad \quad \quad \text{if } s'_{ij} &= 0 \text{ then } s'_{ij} = -s'_{ik} s'_{kk} s'_{kj}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the values of s'_{ij} only depend on S . Any other matrix $[\hat{A}]$ with the same sign matrix S as $[A]$ yields the same extended sign matrix S' .

Theorem 3.5

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be irreducible and generalized diagonally dominant with $0 < \underline{a}_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, let S' be the extended sign matrix of $[A]$ defined in Definition 3.1. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) The vector $[x]^C$ exists.
- (ii) The vector $[x]^G$ exists.
- (iii) The matrix $[A]$ is generalized irreducibly diagonally dominant or the sign condition

$$s'_{ij} s'_{ik} s'_{kj} s'_{kk} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \neq j \\ -1, & \text{if } i = j \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

holds for some triple (i, j, k) with $k < i, j$.

- (iv) The matrix $[A]$ is generalized irreducibly diagonally dominant or the sign condition

$$s'_{ij} s'_{ik} s'_{kj} = 1 \quad (3.4)$$

holds for some triple (i, j, k) with $k < j < i$.

Proof.

The case $n = 1$ is trivial since $\underline{a}_{11} > 0$. Therefore, from now on we assume $n > 1$.

"(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii)" holds by virtue of Theorem 4.7 in [8].

"(iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv)"

From the general assumptions of the theorem we get $s_{ii} = 1 = s'_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $S = S^T$, whence $S' = (S')^T$. Therefore,

$$s'_{ii} s'_{ik} s'_{ki} s'_{kk} = (s'_{ik})^2 \neq -1$$

holds, i.e., the second sign condition in (3.3) can never be fulfilled. Moreover, a factor $s'_{kk} = 1$ can always be added in (3.4) which results in the first sign condition in (3.3). Hence the existence of some triple (i, j, k) as required in (iii) is equivalent to the existence of some triple as required in (iv).

"(ii) \Rightarrow (i)"

Since $[x]^G$ exists by assumption, each matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is regular. Consider the matrix $[A] + \varepsilon I$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\underline{a}_{ii} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we get $\langle [A] + \varepsilon I \rangle = \langle [A] \rangle + \varepsilon I$ which shows that $[A] + \varepsilon I$ is generalized strictly diagonally dominant. Therefore, it is an H -matrix by Theorem 4.4 a) in [8] and Theorem 2.1 guarantees that $\tilde{A} + \varepsilon I$ is positive definite for each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$. Hence $\tilde{A} + \varepsilon I$ has only positive

real eigenvalues which remain positive in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ since \tilde{A} is regular and since the eigenvalues behave continuously when changing the entries of a matrix continuously. Therefore, \tilde{A} is positive definite for each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$. In particular, $[A]$ contains at least one such matrix, and Theorem 3.1 finishes the proof.

”(i) \Rightarrow (ii)”

Let $[x]^C$ exist and assume that $[x]^G$ does not exist. Then $[A]$ cannot be an H -matrix, in particular, by Theorem 4.4 b) in [8] it cannot be generalized irreducibly diagonally dominant. However, since it is generalized diagonally dominant by assumption, there must exist a positive vector x such that $\langle [A] \rangle x = 0$. Without loss of generality we can assume $x = e$, i.e.,

$$\langle [A] \rangle e = 0 . \quad (3.5)$$

Otherwise consider the matrix $D[A]D$ with $D = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. This matrix has the same extended sign matrix S' as $[A]$, is irreducible and diagonally dominant, but not irreducibly diagonally dominant. Moreover, it fulfills (3.5), and by Lemma 2.1 the interval Cholesky method is feasible for it since it is for $[A]$ by assumption.

Since we assumed that $[x]^G$ does not exist the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) shows that the sign condition (3.3) does not hold. Choose $k = 1$ for the moment and let S be the sign matrix of $[A]$. If $s_{ij} \neq s'_{ij}$ then s_{ij} must be zero by the construction of S' in Definition 3.1. (Note that at the beginning of this definition we have $S' = S$. Later on s'_{ij} is changed only if it was equal to zero.) Therefore, $s_{ij} = s'_{ij}$ or $s_{ij} = 0$. Hence (3.3) does not hold if s'_{ij} is replaced there by s_{ij} . By Lemma 2.1 in [9] this implies

$$\left| [a]_{ij} - \frac{[a]_{i1} \cdot [a]_{1j}}{[a]_{11}} \right| = |[a]_{ij}| + \frac{|[a]_{i1}| \cdot |[a]_{1j}|}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} \quad \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } i, j > 1 . \quad (3.6)$$

Next we remark that the equality $|[a]^2| = |[a]|^2 = |[a] \cdot [a]|$ holds for any interval $[a]$. Since \underline{a}_{ii} is positive and since $[x]^C$ exists we have $0 < \underline{l}_{ii}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < (\underline{l}_{ii})^2 &= \underline{a}_{ii} - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} |[l]_{ik}^2| \leq \underline{a}_{ii} - |[l]_{i1}^2| = \underline{a}_{ii} - \left| \left(\frac{[a]_{i1}}{[l]_{11}} \right)^2 \right| = \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \left| \frac{[a]_{i1}^2}{[a]_{11}} \right| \\ &= \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \frac{|[a]_{i1}^2|}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} = \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \frac{|[a]_{i1}|^2}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle}, \quad i > 1 . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\langle [a]_{ii} \rangle > \frac{|[a]_{i1}|^2}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle}$ holds, and Lemma 2.1 (b) in [9] implies

$$\left\langle [a]_{ii} - \frac{[a]_{i1}^2}{[a]_{11}} \right\rangle = \left\langle [a]_{ii} - \frac{[a]_{i1} \cdot [a]_{i1}}{[a]_{11}} \right\rangle = \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \frac{|[a]_{i1}|^2}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle}, \quad i > 1 . \quad (3.7)$$

From (3.6) and (3.7) we directly get

$$\langle \Sigma_{[A]}^C \rangle = \Sigma_{\langle [A] \rangle}^C = \Sigma_{\langle [A] \rangle}^G = \langle \Sigma_{[A]}^G \rangle \quad (3.8)$$

although $\Sigma_{[A]}^C \subsetneq \Sigma_{[A]}^G$ may hold. In fact, by construction both matrices can differ at most in the diagonal because $[c]_i^2 \subsetneq [c]_i \cdot [c]_i$ can occur. Since $[x]^C$ exists the diagonal entries of $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$ are positive hence the sign matrices of $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$ and $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$ coincide and the same holds for the extended sign matrices.

With $e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ e' \end{pmatrix}$ and (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle \Sigma_{[A]}^C \rangle e')_i &= (\Sigma_{\langle [A] \rangle}^C e')_i = \left(\langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \frac{|[a]_{i1}|^2}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} \right) - \sum_{\substack{j=2 \\ j \neq i}}^n \left(|[a]_{ij}| + \frac{|[a]_{i1}| \cdot |[a]_{j1}|}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} \right) \\ &= \left\{ \langle [a]_{ii} \rangle - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n |[a]_{ij}| \right\} + \frac{|[a]_{i1}|}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} \left\{ \langle [a]_{11} \rangle - \sum_{j=2}^n |[a]_{j1}| \right\} \\ &= (\langle [A] \rangle e)_i + \frac{|[a]_{i1}|}{\langle [a]_{11} \rangle} (\langle [A] \rangle e)_1 = 0, \quad i = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\langle \Sigma_{[A]}^C \rangle e' = \Sigma_{\langle [A] \rangle}^C e' = \Sigma_{\langle [A] \rangle}^G e' = \langle \Sigma_{[A]}^G \rangle e' = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover, from (3.8) together with Lemma 3.3 in [5] we know that $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$ is irreducible provided that $n \geq 3$.

Since we assumed that $[x]^G$ does not exist the interval Gaussian algorithm cannot be feasible for $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$. Therefore, (3.3) cannot hold when formulated for the extended sign matrix of $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$. (In fact deleting the first row and column of S' for $[A]$ results in the corresponding extended sign matrix for the Schur complement.) Since we already showed that $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$ and $\Sigma_{[A]}^G$ have the same extended sign matrices the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) implies that the interval Gaussian algorithm is not feasible for $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$. Thus the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 for $[A]$ are also fulfilled for $\Sigma_{[A]}^C = (\Sigma_{[A]}^G)^T$. Therefore, the conclusions above can be repeated up to the dimension $n = 2$ for $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$. (Note that the restriction of the dimension n only concerns the irreducibility.) For ease of notation assume that $[A]$ plays the role of $\Sigma_{[A]}^C$ if $n = 2$, i.e., it is an irreducible symmetric 2×2 interval matrix satisfying $\langle [A] \rangle e = 0$. As above we obtain $\langle \Sigma_{[A]}^C \rangle e' = 0$, i.e., $0 \in \Sigma_{[A]}^C \in \mathbb{IR}^{1 \times 1}$ which contradicts the feasibility of the interval Cholesky method and which finally shows that (3.3) must hold for some triple (i, j, k) unless $[A] \in \mathbb{IR}^{n \times n}$ is generalized irreducibly diagonally dominant. (In this case the sign condition (3.3) may be hurt as the example $[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ shows.)

□

Example 3.3

a) Let

$$[A]_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & [\alpha, 2] & [\alpha, 2] \\ [\alpha, 2] & 4 & 2 \\ [\alpha, 2] & 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad -2 \leq \alpha \leq 2.$$

Then $\langle [A]_\alpha \rangle e = 0$. For $-2 < \alpha \leq 2$ we obtain $S = ee^T = S'$. Thus (3.4) is fulfilled with $(i, j, k) = (3, 2, 1)$, and $[x]^C$ exists.

If $\alpha = -2$ things change. Here

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = S'$$

and (3.4) does not hold as one can easily check. Thus $[x]^C$ does not exist. In fact, $[A]_{-2}$ contains the singular matrix

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 2 & -2 \\ 2 & 4 & 2 \\ -2 & 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

b) Let

$$[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 & [0, 2] & [-2, 0] \\ 0 & 4 & [0, 2] & [0, 2] \\ [0, 2] & [0, 2] & [6, 9] & [-2, 2] \\ [-2, 0] & [0, 2] & [-2, 2] & [6, 9] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $[A]$ is irreducible and diagonally dominant. In particular, it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.5. Moreover, we have

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \neq S' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with (3.4) for $(i, j, k) = (4, 3, 2)$. Hence $[x]^C$ exists.

□

It is easy to see by Example 3.3 b) that (3.4) does not hold if the entries of S' are replaced there by the corresponding entries of S . Doing so nevertheless, yields a sufficient criterion analogously to Theorem 5.3 in [5]. We state this result as a corollary which follows directly from Theorem 3.5 (iv) since (3.10) below can be written as (3.4).

Corollary 3.1

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $n \geq 3$, be irreducible and generalized diagonally dominant with $0 < \underline{a}_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, let S be the sign matrix of $[A]$ defined in Definition 3.1. If

$$s_{ij} s_{ik} s_{kj} = 1 \tag{3.10}$$

for some triple (i, j, k) with $k < j < i$ then $[x]^C$ exists.

Now we consider tridiagonal matrices.

Theorem 3.6

Let $[A] = [A]^T \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be tridiagonal. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) The vector $[x]^G$ exists and $[A]$ contains at least one symmetric and positive definite matrix.
- (ii) The vector $[x]^C$ exists.
- (iii) Each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is positive definite.

Proof.

"(i) \Rightarrow (ii)" follows from Theorem 3.1.

"(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)" follows from the feasibility of the Cholesky method for each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$.

"(iii) \Rightarrow (i)" follows from Theorem 2.2 and the feasibility of the interval Gaussian algorithm for H -matrices; cf. [1] or [11].

□

Example 3.4

Let $[A] = \text{tridiag}([-1, 1], 2, [-1, 1]) \in \mathbb{I}\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then Gerschgorin's Theorem shows that the eigenvalues of each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ are nonnegative. Since \tilde{A} is either irreducibly diagonally dominant or consists of blocks of such matrices it is an H -matrix. Therefore, no eigenvalue can be zero, each symmetric matrix $\tilde{A} \in [A]$ is positive definite, and $[x]^C$ exists for $[A]$ by Theorem 3.6.

□

Our final result deals with matrices of the form $[A] = I + [-R, R]$ which at a first glance look very specific. Preconditioning, however, any regular interval matrix by its midpoint inverse \tilde{A}^{-1} finally ends up with a matrix under discussion.

Theorem 3.7

Let $[A] = I + [-R, R]$ with $0 \leq R = R^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $0 < \underline{a}_{ii}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) The vector $[x]^G$ exists.
- (ii) The vector $[x]^C$ exists.
- (iii) The spectral radius of R is less than one.
- (iv) The matrix $[A]$ is an H -matrix.

Proof.

The equivalence of (i), (iii) and (iv) is contained in Theorem 3.1 of [10]; cf. also Theorem 4.2 in [8]. The implication "(iv) \Rightarrow (ii)" follows from Theorem 2.1. For the implication "(ii) \Rightarrow (iv)" let $[x]^C$ exist. Then the Cholesky method is feasible for $\tilde{A} = I - R = \langle [A] \rangle \in [A]$, hence \tilde{A} is symmetric and positive definite. Moreover, it is an M -matrix whence $[A]$ is an H -matrix. □

Acknowledgement

We thank Dr. U. Schäfer, Karlsruhe, for carefully reading and commenting our manuscript.

References

- [1] Alefeld, G. and Herzberger, J.: *Introduction to Interval Computations*, Academic Press, New York, 1983.
- [2] Alefeld, G. and Mayer, G.: The Cholesky Method for Interval Data, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **194** (1993), pp. 161–182.
- [3] Alefeld, G. and Mayer, G.: On the Symmetric and Unsymmetric Solution Set of Interval Systems, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **16** (1995), pp. 1223–1240.
- [4] Frommer, A: A Feasibility Result for Interval Gaussian Elimination Relying on Graph Structure, in: Alefeld, G., Rohn, J., Rump, S., and Yamamoto, T. (eds.), *Symbolic Algebraic Methods and Verification Methods*, SpringerMathematics, Springer, Wien, 2001, pp. 79–86.
- [5] Frommer, A. and Mayer, G.: A New Criterion to Guarantee the Feasibility of the Interval Gaussian Algorithm, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **14** (1993), pp. 408–419.
- [6] George, A. and Liu, G. W.: *Computer Solution of Large Sparse Positive Definite Systems*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1981.
- [7] Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R.: *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [8] Mayer, G.: A Contribution to the Feasibility of the Interval Gaussian Algorithm, *Reliable Computing* **12** (2) (2006), pp. 79–98.
- [9] Mayer, G. and Pieper, L.: A Necessary and Sufficient Criterion to Guarantee the Feasibility of the Interval Gaussian Algorithm for a Class of Matrices, *Appl. Math.* **38** (3) (1993), pp. 205–220.
- [10] Mayer, G. and Rohn, J.: On the Applicability of the Interval Gaussian Algorithm, *Reliable Computing* **4** (3) (1998), pp. 205–222.

- [11] Neumaier, A.: *Interval Methods for Systems of Equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [12] Ortega, J. M.: *Numerical Analysis, A Second Course*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1990.
- [13] Reichmann, K.: Abbruch beim Intervall–Gauss–Algorithmus, *Computing* **22** (1979), pp. 355–361.
- [14] Schäfer, U.: The Feasibility of the Interval Gaussian Algorithm for Arrowhead Matrices, *Reliable Computing* **7** (4) (2001), pp. 59–62.
- [15] Schäfer, U.: Two Ways to Extend the Cholesky Decomposition to Block Matrices with Interval Entries, *Reliable Computing* **8** (1) (2002), pp. 1–20.

IWRMM-Preprints seit 2006

- Nr. 06/01 Willy Dörfler, Vincent Heuveline: Convergence of an adaptive *hp* finite element strategy in one dimension
- Nr. 06/02 Vincent Heuveline, Hoang Nam-Dung: On two Numerical Approaches for the Boundary Control Stabilization of Semi-linear Parabolic Systems: A Comparison
- Nr. 06/03 Andreas Rieder, Armin Lechleiter: Newton Regularizations for Impedance Tomography: A Numerical Study
- Nr. 06/04 Götz Alefeld, Xiaojun Chen: A Regularized Projection Method for Complementarity Problems with Non-Lipschitzian Functions
- Nr. 06/05 Ulrich Kulisch: Letters to the IEEE Computer Arithmetic Standards Revision Group
- Nr. 06/06 Frank Strauss, Vincent Heuveline, Ben Schweizer: Existence and approximation results for shape optimization problems in rotordynamics
- Nr. 06/07 Kai Sandfort, Joachim Ohser: Labeling of n-dimensional images with choosable adjacency of the pixels
- Nr. 06/08 Jan Mayer: Symmetric Permutations for I-matrices to Delay and Avoid Small Pivots During Factorization
- Nr. 06/09 Andreas Rieder, Arne Schneck: Optimality of the fully discrete filtered Backprojection Algorithm for Tomographic Inversion
- Nr. 06/10 Patrizio Neff, Krzysztof Chelminski, Wolfgang Müller, Christian Wieners: A numerical solution method for an infinitesimal elasto-plastic Cosserat model
- Nr. 06/11 Christian Wieners: Nonlinear solution methods for infinitesimal perfect plasticity
- Nr. 07/01 Armin Lechleiter, Andreas Rieder: A Convergence Analysis of the Newton-Type Regularization CG-Reginn with Application to Impedance Tomography
- Nr. 07/02 Jan Lellmann, Jonathan Balzer, Andreas Rieder, Jürgen Beyerer: Shape from Specular Reflection Optical Flow
- Nr. 07/03 Vincent Heuveline, Jan-Philipp Weiß: A Parallel Implementation of a Lattice Boltzmann Method on the Clearspeed Advance Accelerator Board
- Nr. 07/04 Martin Sauter, Christian Wieners: Robust estimates for the approximation of the dynamic consolidation problem
- Nr. 07/05 Jan Mayer: A Numerical Evaluation of Preprocessing and ILU-type Preconditioners for the Solution of Unsymmetric Sparse Linear Systems Using Iterative Methods
- Nr. 07/06 Vincent Heuveline, Frank Strauss: Shape optimization towards stability in constrained hydrodynamic systems
- Nr. 07/07 Götz Alefeld, Günter Mayer: New criteria for the feasibility of the Cholesky method with interval data

Eine aktuelle Liste aller IWRMM-Preprints finden Sie auf:

www.mathematik.uni-karlsruhe.de/iwrmm/seite/preprints