
Subject: Re: 3d matrices and LUSOL

Posted by [the_cacc](#) on Thu, 24 Jan 2002 23:22:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"M" <mrmanish@bigfoot.com> wrote in message news:<a2pj2t\$fv8\$1@yarrow.open.ac.uk>...

> Hi all,

>

> I am in desperate need of help!!

>

> I have a set of linear equations represented as matrix arrays which need to
> be solved using the LU decomposition technique. The two arrays consist of a
> 14 x 14 array, and a 14 x 1 array, but each element in the matrices itself
> is an array of 221 elements (ie the matrices are 3dimensional...?)

>

> So i need to solve the system using LUDC and LUSOL, but i have to do it 221
> times (ie a solution for each 'layer' of the matrices)

>

> The first question is, is there a way to declare the two input arrays as
> 3-d? I tried defining the matrix using matrix=[[a,b,...],[...,...,...] etc]
> where a,b,... = arrays, but this isn't recognised as a 14 x14 square matrix
> which is 221 elements 'deep'. Instead, it expands each array across the
> row, making it a 3094 x 14 matrix. (it needs to be square to run LUDC)

>

> Is there a way i can force IDL to see it as a 'layered' 3-d matrix?

>

> What i need to achieve is a 3 dimensional 14 x 1 solution array, again 221
> elements 'deep'. To get this, could i simply run LUDC and LUSOL as normal
> provided the inputs are 3d matrices, or do i need to somehow loop the
> procedures so it produces solutions one 'layer' at a time and builds them
> into the 3 d solution matrix ?

>

> I don't know if anyone has any idea of what i'm talking about, but i only
> just understand it myself!!

> Apologies if it makes no sense whatsoever, suffice to say i'm a little
> confused right now!

>

>

> Any insight into the above would be great,

>

> thanks,

>

> Manish.

Hi,

From what you say, it sounds like you want to be solving the 14x14
problem 221 times, ie.

For the first 14x14 matrix (A1) and 14x1 vector (b1), solve for x1:
x1 = INVERT(A1) ## b1

Then for the second case: x2 = INVERT(A2) ## b2

and so on 221 times. You'll then have 221 14x1 vectors x1,x2,... which together give a 2D matrix (221x14).

Is this what you were expecting as your answer ? If so, then yay! If not, I haven't understood the problem :(

Of course, you can define the individual matrices in larger matrices, ie. A = FLTARR(14,14,221), b = FLTARR(14,221) and x = FLTARR(14,221) then loop as follows:

```
FOR i = 0, 220 DO x[* ,i] = INVERT(A[* ,*,i]) ## b[* ,i]
```

NOTE: using LUDC and LUSOL directly is slightly faster than using INVERT, but you may prefer INVERT initially since it makes the code simpler.

Ciao.

Subject: Re: 3d matrices and LUSOL

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Thu, 24 Jan 2002 23:22:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"M" <mrmanish@bigfoot.com> writes:

> Hi all,
>
> I am in desperate need of help!!
>
> I have a set of linear equations represented as matrix arrays which need to
> be solved using the LU decomposition technique. The two arrays consist of a
> 14 x 14 array, and a 14 x 1 array, but each element in the matrices itself
> is an array of 221 elements (ie the matrices are 3dimensional...?)
>
> So i need to solve the system using LUDC and LUSOL, but i have to do it 221
> times (ie a solution for each 'layer' of the matrices)
>
> The first question is, is there a way to declare the two input arrays as
> 3-d? I tried defining the matrix using matrix=[[a,b,...],[...,...,...] etc]
> where a,b,... = arrays, but this isn't recognised as a 14 x14 square matrix
> which is 221 elements 'deep'. Instead, it expands each array across the
> row, making it a 3094 x 14 matrix. (it needs to be square to run LUDC)
>

> Is there a way i can force IDL to see it as a 'layered' 3-d matrix?

First of all, IDL can do up to eight dimensions. Since you mention the notation `[[a,b,...]]`, you are probably not getting the syntax exactly right. It doesn't really matter though. If you really have a 3094 x 14 matrix, it is straightforward to use REFORM to make that 221x14x14 matrix (ie, `matrix = reform(matrix,221,14,14)`)

I am pretty sure that LUDC/LUSOL will not handle a "3-d" matrix. Can your solution be applied component by component? I.e., can you solve each of the 221 14x14 matrix equations separately using a FOR loop?

Good luck,
Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: 3d matrices and LUSOL
Posted by [Manish](#) on Fri, 25 Jan 2002 16:13:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cheers guys, that should sort it - it was exactly what I needed!

I'll give it a go with INVERT first with the looped arrays, maybe try and refine it to LUSOL later on if I get it working!

Both of you, thanks for your help again

Manish.

"trouble" <the_cacc@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:5f9f0a23.0201241522.7f538c34@posting.google.com...

> "M" <mrmanish@bigfoot.com> wrote in message
[news:<a2pj2t\\$jv8\\$1@yarrow.open.ac.uk>](mailto:news:<a2pj2t$jv8$1@yarrow.open.ac.uk>)...

>> Hi all,

>>

>> I am in desperate need of help!!

>>

>> I have a set of linear equations represented as matrix arrays which need

to

>> be solved using the LU decomposition technique. The two arrays consist of a

>> 14 x 14 array, and a 14 x 1 array, but each element in the matrices itself

>> is an array of 221 elements (ie the matrices are 3dimensional...?)

>>

>> So i need to solve the system using LUDC and LUSOL, but i have to do it 221

>> times (ie a solution for each 'layer' of the matrices)

>>

>> The first question is, is there a way to declare the two input arrays as

>> 3-d? I tried defining the matrix using matrix=[[a,b,...],[...,...,...]

etc]

>> where a,b,... = arrays, but this isn't recognised as a 14 x14 square matrix

>> which is 221 elements 'deep'. Instead, it expands each array across the

>> row, making it a 3094 x 14 matrix. (it needs to be square to run LUDC)

>>

>> Is there a way i can force IDL to see it as a 'layered' 3-d matrix?

>>

>> What i need to achieve is a 3 dimensional 14 x 1 solution array, again 221

>> elements 'deep'. To get this, could i simply run LUDC and LUSOL as normal

>> provided the inputs are 3d matrices, or do i need to somehow loop the

>> procedures so it produces solutions one 'layer' at a time and builds them

>> into the 3 d solution matrix ?

>>

>> I don't know if anyone has any idea of what i'm talking about, but i only

>> just understand it myself!!

>> Apologies if it makes no sense whatsoever, suffice to say i'm a little

>> confused right now!

>>

>>

>> Any insight into the above would be great,

>>

>> thanks,

>>

>> Manish.

>

> Hi,

>

> From what you say, it sounds like you want to be solving the 14x14

> problem 221 times, ie.

>

> For the first 14x14 matrix (A1) and 14x1 vector (b1), solve for x1:
> x1 = INVERT(A1) ## b1
>
> Then for the second case: x2 = INVERT(A2) ## b2
>
> and so on 221 times. You'll then have 221 14x1 vectors x1,x2,... which
> together give a 2D matrix (221x14).
>
> Is this what you were expecting as your answer ? If so, then yay! If
> not, I haven't understood the problem :(
>
> Of course, you can define the individual matrices in larger matrices,
> ie. A = FLTARR(14,14,221), b = FLTARR(14,221) and x = FLTARR(14,221)
> then loop as follows:
>
> FOR i = 0, 220 DO x[* ,i] = INVERT(A[* ,*,i]) ## b[* ,i]
>
>
> NOTE: using LUDC and LUSOL directly is slightly faster than using
> INVERT, but you may prefer INVERT initially since it makes the code
> simpler.
>
> Ciao.

Subject: Re: 3d matrices and LUSOL
Posted by [James Kuyper](#) on Fri, 25 Jan 2002 17:18:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M wrote:

> Hi all,
>
> I am in desperate need of help!!
>
> I have a set of linear equations represented as matrix arrays which need to
> be solved using the LU decomposition technique. The two arrays consist of a
> 14 x 14 array, and a 14 x 1 array, but each element in the matrices itself
> is an array of 221 elements (ie the matrices are 3dimensional...?)
>
> So i need to solve the system using LUDC and LUSOL, but i have to do it 221
> times (ie a solution for each 'layer' of the matrices)
>
> The first question is, is there a way to declare the two input arrays as
> 3-d? I tried defining the matrix using matrix=[[a,b,...],[...,...,...] etc]
> where a,b,... = arrays, but this isn't recognised as a 14 x14 square matrix
> which is 221 elements 'deep'. Instead, it expands each array across the
> row, making it a 3094 x 14 matrix. (it needs to be square to run LUDC)

>

> Is there a way i can force IDL to see it as a 'layered' 3-d matrix?

Yes. If 'a', 'b', 'c' etc are 221-element arrays, then

```
[ [[a],[b]], [[c],[d]] ]
```

defines a (221,2,2) array. If you need a different ordering of indices (I suspect that you want (2,2,221)), then you need to use `transpose()` and `reform()`. In APL, which is part of IDL's ancestry, the equivalent of `transpose()` could handle arrays of any dimension. However, in IDL `transpose()` won't work on arrays of rank higher than 2. Therefore, do the following:

```
big = reform(transpose([[a],[b],[c],[d]]),2,2,221)
```

You'll need to call LUDC and LUSOL separately for each of the 221 layers. Therefore, if there's any advantage to forming them all into one big array, that advantage will have to lie in some other part of the code.
