
Subject: Re: failed matrix inversion returns input-- interesting
Posted by [marc schellens\[1\]](#) on Fri, 14 Jul 2006 07:09:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ed Hyer wrote:

```
> Can someone explain this behavior?
> IDL> testm=[[0,0,0,0],[0,1,0,0],[0,0,1,0],[0,0,0,1]]
> IDL> testmi=invert(testm,status)
> IDL> print,status; 0=success, 1=fail, 2=pivot used
>      1
> IDL> print,testmi
>      0.00000  0.00000  0.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  1.00000  0.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  0.00000  1.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  0.00000  0.00000  1.00000
>
> Is there any reason in creation why IDL simply copies the input into
> the output if it cannot do the inversion? That seems, well, malevolent,
> unless I'm missing something.
```

Well, what do you suggest is better?

Marc

Subject: Re: failed matrix inversion returns input-- interesting
Posted by [Bringfried Stecklum](#) on Fri, 14 Jul 2006 07:14:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ed Hyer wrote:

```
> Can someone explain this behavior?
> IDL> testm=[[0,0,0,0],[0,1,0,0],[0,0,1,0],[0,0,0,1]]
> IDL> testmi=invert(testm,status)
> IDL> print,status; 0=success, 1=fail, 2=pivot used
>      1
> IDL> print,testmi
>      0.00000  0.00000  0.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  1.00000  0.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  0.00000  1.00000  0.00000
>      0.00000  0.00000  0.00000  1.00000
>
> Is there any reason in creation why IDL simply copies the input into
> the output if it cannot do the inversion? That seems, well, malevolent,
> unless I'm missing something.
>
```

I would not call this behavior malevolent. For a singular matrix the inversion is invalid. So the result is meaningless anyway and it does not matter whether IDL returns a fictitious array or the input matrix.

When solving linear equations it is always recommended to check the condition number of the matrix using `cond` and use singular value decomposition in case of an ill-behaved matrix.

regards,

B.St.

File Attachments

1) [stecklum.vcf](#), downloaded 132 times

Subject: Re: failed matrix inversion returns input-- interesting

Posted by [mmeron](#) on Fri, 14 Jul 2006 07:30:57 GMT

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

In article <1152860961.931059.317520@35g2000cwc.googlegroups.com>, "m_schellens@hotmail.com" <m_schellens@hotmail.com> writes:

>

> Ed Hyer wrote:

>> Can someone explain this behavior?

>> IDL> testm=[[0,0,0,0],[0,1,0,0],[0,0,1,0],[0,0,0,1]]

>> IDL> testmi=invert(testm,status)

>> IDL> print,status; 0=success, 1=fail, 2=pivot used

>> 1

>> IDL> print,testmi

>> 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000

>> 0.00000 1.00000 0.00000 0.00000

>> 0.00000 0.00000 1.00000 0.00000

>> 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 1.00000

>>

>> Is there any reason in creation why IDL simply copies the input into

>> the output if it cannot do the inversion? That seems, well, malevolent,

>> unless I'm missing something.

>

> Well, what do you suggest is better?

>

Well, nearly anything would be better.

I've a routine, called `SVD_INVERT`, which returns a regular inverse when one exists, else it returns an inverse in the "SVD sense".

Would the IDL routine have been doing this, that would be fine (though it should've been documented). But, it is not doing this either.

So IMO, it would've been preferable to return an array of NaNs in such case.

Mati Meron | "When you argue with a fool,
meron@cars.uchicago.edu | chances are he is doing just the same"

Subject: Re: failed matrix inversion returns input-- interesting
Posted by news.verizon.net on Fri, 14 Jul 2006 12:23:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Is there any reason in creation why IDL simply copies the input into
> the output if it cannot do the inversion? That seems, well, malevolent,
> unless I'm missing something.

One reason you might want this behaviour is to preserve the original array, in cases where the code overwrites the inverse

```
IDL> testm = invert(testm, status)
IDL> if status EQ 1 then print,'Singular Matrix ', testm
```

If INVERT returned, say, NaN values or an undefined variable (the only reasonable alternatives I think), then you would have lost the original array

Incidentally, the LAPACK (LU Decomposition) invert routine LA_INVERT in IDL has the same behavior. ---Wayne
