

# Another solution for midterm 2's problem 4

Kyle Miller

29 March 2016

Probably because of Spring break, I completely forgot to show you a much better solution to the fourth problem on the midterm today. This is definitely what Prof. Yuan had in mind when he created the exam, since Gram-Schmidt takes too much work.

To remind you, this is problem 4 in full:

4. (5 points) Let  $W$  be the subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^4$  given by  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = 0$ . Compute the orthogonal projection  $\text{proj}_W(\vec{v})$  of the vector  $\vec{v} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$  to the space  $W$ .

First observation:  $\text{proj}_W \vec{v} + \text{proj}_{W^\perp} \vec{v} = \vec{v}$ . If we can calculate  $\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \vec{v}$  easily, then it is a quick calculation to get  $\text{proj}_W \vec{v}$ . It should be easy:  $\dim W^\perp = 1$  since  $\dim W = 3$  (which is because  $W$  is the nullspace of  $(1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1)$ ), so  $W^\perp$  is the span of a single vector.

Now,

$$W^\perp = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Here are a couple of justifications:

- Recall that  $(\text{Nul } A)^\perp = \text{Row } A$ .  $W^\perp = (\text{Nul } (1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1))^\perp = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ .

- Saying that  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = 0$  is the same as saying  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \vec{x} = 0$ , so  $W$  is already

$$\left( \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right)^\perp. \text{ Then } W^\perp = \left( \left( \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right)^\perp \right)^\perp = \text{Span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Let  $\vec{u} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Then  $\text{proj}_{W^\perp} \vec{v} = \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \vec{u}}{\vec{u} \cdot \vec{u}} \vec{u} = \frac{10}{4} \vec{u} = \frac{5}{2} \vec{u}$ .

Thus,  $\text{proj}_W \vec{v} = \vec{v} - \text{proj}_{W^\perp} \vec{v} = \vec{v} - \frac{5}{2} \vec{u} = \begin{pmatrix} -3/2 \\ -1/2 \\ 1/2 \\ 3/2 \end{pmatrix}$ .

## 1 Another solution to problem 6

For the 3:30–5:00pm section, I gave a solution to problem 6 involving Gauss-Jordan elimination. This was not a good solution, and what I said then should be disregarded. The G-J elimination solution works much better like this:

- Comparing  $\text{rank}(AB)$  and  $\text{rank}(A)$  is the same as comparing  $\text{rank}(B^T A^T)$  and  $\text{rank}(A^T)$ , since transposition does not change rank.
- Since  $B$  is invertible, so is  $B^T$ , so the reduced row-echelon form of  $B^T$  is  $I_n$ .
- The sequence of row operations correspond to elementary matrices, hence  $B^T = E_1 \cdots E_n$ , a product of elementary matrices.
- Then  $B^T A^T = E_1 \cdots E_n A^T$ .
- But this is row-equivalent to  $A^T$  since the difference is a bunch of elementary row operations (represented by  $E_1, \dots, E_n$ ).
- That is,  $B^T A^T \sim A^T$ .
- Thus  $\text{rank}(B^T A^T) = \text{rank}(A^T)$ .
- Therefore  $\text{rank}(AB) = \text{rank}(A)$ .