As a class we now have several versions of the "same" code running gradient descent methods. However, the comparative run times are not the "same". For example, on my laptop I can run 100,000 iterations of the Data-Fitting problem. Using Strong Wolfe in 25 seconds (matlab). If your implementation is significantly slower there are likely code changes that can improve efficiency. Here are some suggestions:

- · Read the data file once not every time the function is evaluated.
- · Move away from symbolic representation coding
- · Compute reused quantities once (or at least less often). Example:

$$T = (A * Q + P) / (N - 14) + (A * Q) + (N - 14)$$
 Slow
 $a = A * Q$
 $b = N - 14$
 $T = (A + P) / b + a + b$

· Avoid for loop computations where possible. Example:

$$T = Zeros(\cdot_1, m)$$

$$for | k = 1 : m$$

$$T(k) = P(k) - L(k) *3$$

$$end$$

$$T = P - 3 * L \qquad fas$$

Example:

$$T=0$$

for $k=1:m-1$
 $T=T+S(k+1)-S(k)$

end

Slow

Example: Data-Fitting Objective

```
function [f,g]=functionfit(x,par)
t=par(:,1);
v=par(:,2);
exarg=exp(-t/x(3));
sarg=(x(4)+x(5)*t)*.*t+x(6);
S=exarg.*sin(sarg);
C=exarg.*cos(sarg);
vfit=x(1)+x(2)*S;
dv=vfit-v;
f=sum(dv.^2);
if nargout>1
    g=zeros(6,1);
    Sdv=dv.*S;
    Cdv=dv.*C;
    g(1) = sum(dv);
    g(2) = sum(Sdv);
    g(3) = (x(2)/x(3)^2) * sum(Sdv.*t);
    g(4) = x(2) * sum(Cdv.*t);
    g(5) = x(2) * sum(Cdv.*(t.^2));
    g(6) = x(2) * sum(Cdv);
    g = 2 * g;
end
return
```

FAST!

(and could be faster, but would start to be less readable)