

# RANDOMIZED DUAL SINGULAR VALUE DECOMPOSITION

MENGYU WANG\*, JINGCHUN ZHOU\*, AND HANYU LI\*

**Abstract.** We first propose a concise singular value decomposition of dual matrices. Then, the randomized version of the decomposition is presented. It can significantly reduce the computational cost while maintaining the similar accuracy. We analyze the theoretical properties and illuminate the numerical performance of the randomized algorithm.

**Key words.** Dual matrices, SVD, Randomized algorithm

**MSC codes.** 15A23, 15B33, 65F55, 68W20

**1. Introduction.** Dual numbers were first introduced by [2] as part of his extensive research on Clifford algebras. They take the form  $q = q_s + q_i\epsilon$ , where  $q_s$  and  $q_i$  are real or complex numbers, and  $\epsilon$  is an infinitesimal unit satisfying  $\epsilon^2 = 0$ . Accordingly, we call  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon$  with  $\mathbf{A}_s, \mathbf{A}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  a dual complex matrix. The set of this kind of matrices is denoted as  $\mathbb{DC}^{m \times n}$ . Dual numbers and dual matrices have found applications in various fields such as robotics [14, 5], classical mechanics [1, 12], and computer vision [13]. Moreover, they are also linked with screw theory [3]. For decompositions of dual matrices, some authors discussed singular value decomposition (SVD) [15, 18], QR decomposition [19, 10], UTV decomposition [20] and rank decomposition [17]. In this paper, we focus on SVD of dual matrices.

As mentioned above, several scholars have contributed to the development and application of SVD for dual matrices. Specifically, Pennestri et al. [11] obtained the SVD of dual real full column rank matrices by solving the linear systems involving Kronecker products. Gutin [6] developed two other SVDs applicable to square dual real matrices. Qi et al. [15] demonstrated that the dual complex matrix can be reduced to a diagonal non-negative dual matrix by unitary transformation. Wei et al. [18] introduced a compact dual SVD (CDSVD), which has more advantages compared with the above ones. However, CDSVD configures the singular value matrix as a dual matrix, which results in a complicated algorithm. For clarity, we simplify the matrix as a real matrix and propose a concise CDSVD (CCDSVD).

Considering that SVD faces challenges when dealing with large-scale matrices and randomized methods can significantly reduce the computational cost, we further present the randomized version of CCDSVD. Note that randomized SVD of real or complex matrices has been investigated extensively; see e.g., [7, 4, 9, 21].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose the CCDSVD. Its randomized version is given in Section 3. In Section 4, we present the error analysis. Section 5 is devoted to experimental results. Finally, the whole paper is concluded with some remarks.

**2. CCDSVD.** With the technique in [20] for UTV decomposition of dual matrices, we can obtain CCDSVD in the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{DC}^{m \times n}$  with  $m \geq n$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{A}_s = \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{V}_s^*$  is a compact SVD of  $\mathbf{A}_s$ . Then the CCDSVD of  $\mathbf{A}$  exists if and only if*

$$(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{U}_s^*) \mathbf{A}_i (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{V}_s^*) = \mathbf{O}_{m \times n}.$$

\*College of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, P.R. China (995647966@qq.com; zhoujc@cqu.edu.cn; lihy.hy@gmail.com or hyli@cqu.edu.cn).

Furthermore, if  $\mathbf{A}$  has a CCDSVD, then there exists a particular pair  $(\mathbf{U}_s, \mathbf{V}_s)$  such that  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^*$ , where  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_s + \mathbf{U}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_s + \mathbf{V}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$  both have unitary columns and  $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  is diagonal positive. Moreover, the expressions of  $\mathbf{U}_i$  and  $\mathbf{V}_i$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{U}_i &= (\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{U}_s^*) \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1} + \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{P}, \\ \mathbf{V}_i &= \mathbf{A}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s (\mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1})^* - \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s^* \mathbf{P}^* (\mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1})^*,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$  is an arbitrary skew-Hermitian matrix.

The specific algorithm is summarized in [Algorithm 2.1](#).

---

### Algorithm 2.1 CCDSVD

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  with  $m \geq n$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_s + \mathbf{U}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times r}$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_s + \mathbf{V}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ .

- 1: Decompose  $\mathbf{A}_s$  by a compact SVD:  $\mathbf{A}_s = \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{V}_s^*$ , where  $\mathbf{U}_s \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_s \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$  both have unitary columns, and  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$  is diagonal positive.
  - 2: **while** the condition  $(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{U}_s^*) \mathbf{A}_i (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{V}_s^*) = \mathbf{O}_{m \times n}$  is satisfied **do**
  - 3:     Set  $\mathbf{P}$  to be a skew-Hermitian matrix.
  - 4:     Set  $\mathbf{U}_i = (\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{U}_s^*) \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1} + \mathbf{U}_s \mathbf{P}$ .
  - 5:     Set  $\mathbf{V}_i = \mathbf{A}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s (\mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1})^* - \mathbf{V}_s \mathbf{\Sigma}_s^* \mathbf{P}^* (\mathbf{\Sigma}_s^{-1})^*$ .
  - 6: **end while**
- 

*Remark 2.2.* As mentioned in [Section 1](#), the key difference between CDSVD and CCDSVD is that  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  in the latter is a real matrix but not a dual one as in CDSVD. The change reduces the computation of the decomposition to some extent. Another motivation is that the standard part of  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  in CDSVD carries the main information; see [\[18\]](#) for details.

**3. Randomized CCDSVD.** The specific algorithm is provided in [Algorithm 3.1](#).

---

### Algorithm 3.1 Randomized CCDSVD (RCCDSVD)

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ , target rank  $r$ , oversampling parameter  $p$  and power scheme parameter  $q$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_s + \mathbf{U}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times r}$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_s + \mathbf{V}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$  and  $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ .

- 1: Set  $\ell = r + p$ , and draw an  $n \times \ell$  random complex matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$ .
  - 2: Construct  $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Omega}$ .
  - 3: **for**  $j = 1, \dots, q$  **do**
  - 4:     Form  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_j = \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{Y}_{j-1}$  and compute its dual QR factorization  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_j$ .
  - 5:     Form  $\mathbf{Y}_j = \mathbf{A}^* \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_j$  and compute its dual QR factorization  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j \mathbf{R}_j$ .
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: Construct a dual matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  by thin dual QR of  $\mathbf{Y}_q$ .
  - 8: Form  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q}^* \mathbf{A}$ .
  - 9: Compute the CCDSVD of the small dual matrix:  $\mathbf{B} = \bar{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^*$ .
  - 10: Set  $\bar{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{Q} \bar{\mathbf{U}}$ .
- 

*Remark 3.1.* The random matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  in [Algorithm 3.1](#) is complex but not dual. The main purpose is to reduce the computation and to avoid information redundancy.

This is because  $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{A}_s\boldsymbol{\Omega}_s + (\mathbf{A}_i\boldsymbol{\Omega}_s + \mathbf{A}_s\boldsymbol{\Omega}_i)\epsilon$  if  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_s + \boldsymbol{\Omega}_i \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{n \times \ell}$ . Moreover, Proposition 4.4 in [18] shows that the approximation to the standard part of  $\mathbf{A}_s$  plays a key role in the approximation to the original dual matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . This implies that it is reasonable to mainly capture the action of  $\mathbf{A}_s$  when devising randomized algorithms. Besides, numerical experiments in Section 5 also demonstrate that the present setting performs better in most cases.

**4. Error analysis.** We first present the definition of Frobenius norm of dual matrices.

DEFINITION 4.1 ([15]). *Let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ . The Frobenius norm of  $\mathbf{A}$  is defined as*

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \begin{cases} \|\mathbf{A}_s\|_F + \frac{\langle \mathbf{A}_s, \mathbf{A}_i \rangle}{\|\mathbf{A}_s\|_F} \epsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{A}_s \neq \mathbf{O}_{m \times n}, \\ \|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F \epsilon & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the inner product of matrices is over the real number field, that is,  $\langle \mathbf{A}_s, \mathbf{A}_i \rangle = \text{Re}(\text{trace}(\mathbf{A}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i))$ .

THEOREM 4.2 (Average Frobenius error). *The expected approximation error for the approximation  $\widehat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^*$  via RCCDSVD with  $q = 0$ ,  $r \geq 2$  and  $p \geq 2$  satisfying  $r + p \leq \min\{m, n\}$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \left(1 + \frac{r}{p-1}\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j>r} \sigma_j^2\right)^{1/2} + \sqrt{2\langle \mathbf{E}_s, \mathbf{A}_i \rangle} \epsilon,$$

where  $\mathbf{E}_s = \mathbf{A}_s - \mathbf{U}_s\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s\mathbf{V}_s^*$ .

*Proof.* From  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{E}_s + \mathbf{E}_i\epsilon$ , we have  $\mathbf{E}_i = \mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{U}_s\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s\mathbf{V}_i^* - \mathbf{U}_i\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s\mathbf{V}_s^*$  and

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{E}_s + \mathbf{E}_i\epsilon\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{E}_s, \mathbf{E}_i \rangle \epsilon,$$

which together with [7, Theorem 10.5], the result in the proof of [18, Proposition 4.4], and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies the desired result.  $\square$

To interpret the role of the infinitesimal part in low-rank approximation, Wei et al. [18] defined a quasi-metric to measure the distance between two dual matrices.

DEFINITION 4.3 ([18]). *Let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_s + \mathbf{B}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{D}\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ . The quasi-metric of the two dual matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  is defined as*

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_{F^*} = \begin{cases} \|\mathbf{A}_s - \mathbf{B}_s\|_F + \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{B}_i\|_F^2}{2\|\mathbf{A}_s - \mathbf{B}_s\|_F} \epsilon & \text{if } \mathbf{A}_s \neq \mathbf{B}_s, \\ \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{B}_i\|_F \epsilon & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 4.4 (Average quasi-metric error). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 4.2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_{F^*} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{r}{p-1}\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j>r} \sigma_j^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_s\mathbf{B}_i\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s^*\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}_i^*\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2 + \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^*\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2\right)^{1/2} \sqrt{\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}_s$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s^*$  are such that  $[\overline{\mathbf{U}}_s, \widehat{\mathbf{U}}_s] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  and  $[\mathbf{V}_s^*, \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s^*] \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  are unitary and  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i$  is such that  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i = \mathbf{O}$  with  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s$  being such that  $[\mathbf{Q}_s, \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s] \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  is unitary.

*Proof.* From the definition of quasi-metric, we have  $\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A} \right\|_{F^*}^2 = \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2 \epsilon$ . Hence, we only need to obtain the bound for  $\|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2$ .

By the property of Frobenius norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2 &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_s^* \\ \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*) \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^* \\ \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i - \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^* \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i - \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

From the operations in [Algorithm 3.1](#), it is seen that  $\overline{\mathbf{U}}_s = \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s + \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i = \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{Q}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i = \mathbf{B}_i$ . Further, by  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^* = \mathbf{O}$  due to  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s = \mathbf{O}$ , we can check that

$$\mathbf{O} = \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i = \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^* = \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{A}_s + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{A}_i.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2 &= \|\mathbf{B}_i - \mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{A}_s - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* + \mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{A}_s + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^*\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{B}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{Q}_i^* \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^* \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_s^* \mathbf{A}_s\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Considering that  $\overline{\mathbf{U}}_s^* \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i + \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i^* \overline{\mathbf{U}}_s = \mathbf{O}_r$  and  $\mathbf{V}_s^* \mathbf{V}_i + \mathbf{V}_i^* \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s = \mathbf{O}_r$ , similar to [18, Theorem 4.6], we have  $\|\mathbf{B}_i - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \overline{\mathbf{U}}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F^2 = \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{U}}_s \mathbf{B}_i \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s^* \right\|_F^2$ . Hence,

$$\|\mathbf{E}_i\|_F^2 \leq \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{U}}_s \mathbf{B}_i \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_s^* \right\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}_i^*\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2 + \|\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_i^*\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{E}_s\|_F^2,$$

which together with [7, Theorem 10.5] and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies the desired result.  $\square$

**5. Numerical experiments.** Two experiments are provided to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms. The main baseline is CCDSVD. We record the running time and relative errors, where the latter are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_s - \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^*\|_F}{\|\mathbf{A}_s\|_F}, & \quad \text{for the standard part,} \\ \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F}{\|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F}, & \quad \text{for the infinitesimal part.} \\ \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{U}_i \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_i \mathbf{V}_s^* - \mathbf{U}_s \Sigma_s \mathbf{V}_i^*\|_F}{\|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F}, & \quad \text{for the infinitesimal part of CDSVD.} \end{aligned}$$

All experiments are performed 20 runs by using Matlab 2022a on a computer equipped with an Intel Core i9-12900KF 3.20GHz CPU and 128 GB memory.

In the first experiment, we consider dual matrices  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon$  of size  $2m \times m$ , where the rank- $r$  matrices  $\mathbf{A}_s$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i$  are formed by multiplying  $\mathbf{B}$  of size  $2m \times r$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  of size  $r \times m$  generated randomly by the Matlab function `RANDN(·)`. The rank  $r$ , the oversampling parameter  $p$ , and the power scheme parameter  $q$  are set to  $m/5$ , 10, and 1, respectively. We implement CDSVD, CCDSVD, RCCDSVD and RCCDSVD with the random dual matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  for  $m = 2500, 5000, 7500$ , and 10000. Note that the aforementioned  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  will be dual real if  $B$  and  $C$  are real, and dual complex if  $B$  and  $C$  are complex.

Table 1 shows the numerical results for this experiment, where RE1 and RE2 represent the relative errors for the standard part and the infinitesimal part, respectively. It can be seen that CCDSVD and CDSVD have similar relative errors, but the running time of the former is a little shorter than that of the latter. The randomized algorithms effectively reduce the computational cost with the accuracy being similar. As for the two randomized algorithms, the one with random dual matrix performs a little worse in terms of errors and running time.

TABLE 1

Numerical results for real and complex matrices for different  $m$ . *RCCDSVD2* denotes *RC-CDSVD* with random dual matrix.

Method	Real matrices				Complex matrices			
	CDSVD	CCDSVD	RCCDSVD	RCCDSVD2	CDSVD	CCDSVD	RCCDSVD	RCCDSVD2
<i>m</i> = 2500								
RE1	3.41E-15	3.41E-15	6.82E-14	3.57E-13	4.95E-15	4.95E-15	2.31E-14	3.67E-14
RE2	1.97E-14	2.12E-14	3.70E-13	2.18E-12	1.38E-14	3.02E-14	1.21E-13	2.67E-13
Time	2.49	2.30	0.68	0.73	9.72	9.05	1.84	2.00
<i>m</i> = 5000								
RE1	5.10E-15	5.10E-15	3.91E-14	1.27E-13	7.10E-15	7.10E-15	3.18E-14	5.56E-14
RE2	2.85E-14	3.07E-14	3.07E-13	1.33E-12	2.07E-14	4.35E-14	2.29E-13	5.73E-13
Time	20.35	18.62	4.14	4.45	91.82	86.62	13.40	14.44
<i>m</i> = 7500								
RE1	5.95E-15	5.95E-15	6.35E-14	5.46E-13	8.93E-15	8.93E-15	4.41E-14	5.24E-14
RE2	3.23E-14	3.77E-14	6.70E-13	8.93E-12	2.70E-14	5.35E-14	3.68E-13	6.81E-13
Time	62.99	57.94	13.11	14.09	318.83	301.48	43.53	46.32
<i>m</i> = 10000								
RE1	6.69E-15	6.69E-15	8.02E-14	8.11E-14	1.02E-14	1.02E-14	5.17E-14	7.23E-14
RE2	3.78E-14	4.38E-14	7.76E-13	1.17E-12	3.10E-14	6.21E-14	5.53E-13	9.71E-13
Time	146.97	135.51	29.16	30.75	740.95	701.63	94.26	100.27

In the second experiment, we test the effect of values of  $q$  on the approximation errors. Two standard images Lena and Pepper with  $512 \times 512$  pixels are first set as  $\overline{\mathbf{A}}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{512 \times 512}$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{A}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{512 \times 512}$ , respectively. Then, we generate complex matrices through 2-dimensional discrete Fourier transform, which results in the test matrix  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_s + \mathbf{A}_i\epsilon \in \mathbb{DC}^{512 \times 512}$ . Figure 1 depicts the approximation errors for the standard part and the infinitesimal part for  $r$  ranging from 5 to 200 and  $p = 4$ . We can see that the power method can indeed improve the accuracy of the algorithm. However, the improvement becomes unremarkable as  $q$  increases.

**6. Concluding remarks.** In this paper, we first simplify CDSVD and then propose its randomized version. Further, the expected approximation errors of the randomized algorithm under Frobenius norm and a quasi-metric are provided. Numerical experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our CCDSVD and the speedup of the randomized algorithm.

Currently, dual quaternions are becoming increasingly popular [16, 8]. Future work can explore randomized algorithms for dual quaternions problems.




FIG. 1. Errors incurred for different power schemes.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. ANGELES, *The application of dual algebra to kinematic analysis*, Computational Methods in Mechanical Systems: Mechanism Analysis, Synthesis, and Optimization, (1998), pp. 3–32.
- [2] CLIFFORD, *Preliminary sketch of biquaternions*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 1 (1871), pp. 381–395.
- [3] I. FISCHER, *Dual-Number Methods in Kinematics, Statics and Dynamics*, CRC Press, 1998.
- [4] M. GU, *Subspace iteration randomization and singular value problems*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 37 (2015), pp. A1139–A1173.
- [5] Y.-L. GU AND J. LUH, *Dual-number transformation and its applications to robotics*, IEEE Journal on Robotics and Automation, 3 (1987), pp. 615–623.
- [6] R. GUTIN, *Generalizations of singular value decomposition to dual-numbered matrices*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra, 70 (2022), pp. 5107–5114.
- [7] N. HALKO, P.-G. MARTINSSON, AND J. A. TROPP, *Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions*, SIAM review, 53 (2011), pp. 217–288.
- [8] C. LING, H. HE, AND L. QI, *Singular values of dual quaternion matrices and their low-rank approximations*, Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, 43 (2022), pp. 1423–1458.
- [9] P.-G. MARTINSSON AND S. VORONIN, *A randomized blocked algorithm for efficiently computing rank-revealing factorizations of matrices*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 38 (2016), pp. S485–S507.
- [10] E. PENNESTRÌ AND R. STEFANELLI, *Linear algebra and numerical algorithms using dual numbers*, Multibody System Dynamics, 18 (2007), pp. 323–344.
- [11] E. PENNESTRÌ, P. VALENTINI, AND D. DE FALCO, *The moore–penrose dual generalized inverse matrix with application to kinematic synthesis of spatial linkages*, Journal of Mechanical Design, 140 (2018), p. 102303.
- [12] E. PENNESTRÌ AND P. P. VALENTINI, *Linear dual algebra algorithms and their application to kinematics*, in Multibody Dynamics: Computational Methods and Applications, Springer, 2009, pp. 207–229.
- [13] F. PEÑUÑURI, O. CARVENTE, M. ZAMBRANO-ARJONA, R. PEÓN, AND C. A. CRUZ-VILLAR, *Dual numbers for algorithmic differentiation*, Ingeniería, 23 (2019), pp. 71–81.
- [14] A. PRADEEP, P. J. YODER, AND R. MUKUNDAN, *On the use of dual-matrix exponentials in robotic kinematics*, The International Journal of Robotics Research, 8 (1989), pp. 57–66.
- [15] L. QI, D. M. ALEXANDER, Z. CHEN, C. LING, AND Z. LUO, *Low rank approximation of dual complex matrices*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12781, (2022).
- [16] L. QI, C. LING, AND H. YAN, *Dual quaternions and dual quaternion vectors*, Communications on Applied Mathematics and Computation, 4 (2022), pp. 1494–1508.
- [17] H. WANG, C. CUI, AND X. LIU, *Dual  $r$ -rank decomposition and its applications*, Computational and Applied Mathematics, 42 (2023), p. 349.
- [18] T. WEI, W. DING, AND Y. WEI, *Singular value decomposition of dual matrices and its appli-*

- cation to traveling wave identification in the brain*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 45 (2024), pp. 634–660.
- [19] R. XU, T. WEI, Y. WEI, AND P. XIE, *QR decomposition of dual matrices and its application*, Applied Mathematics Letters, (2024), p. 109144.
- [20] R. XU, T. WEI, Y. WEI, AND H. YAN, *UTV decomposition of dual matrices and its applications*, Computational and Applied Mathematics, 43 (2024), p. 41.
- [21] W. YU, Y. GU, AND Y. LI, *Efficient randomized algorithms for the fixed-precision low-rank matrix approximation*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 39 (2018), pp. 1339–1359.