$\begin{array}{c} {\rm COMP~3105-Assignment~1~Report}\\ {\rm -~Fall~2025-} \end{array}$

Due: Sunday September 28, 2025 23:59. Group 51 Andrew Wallace -

Question 1: (7.5%) Linear Regression

- (a) (1%) L_2 Regression Please see A1codes.py for implementation.
- (b) (3%) L_{∞} Regression Here we are going to solve the L_{∞} loss regression problem

$$\mathbf{w} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} = ||X\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y}||$$

Recall that this optimization can be expressed as a linear programming problem with

the joint paramters $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ d \times 1 \\ \delta \\ 1 \times 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ as follows

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}, \delta} \delta$$
s.t.
$$\delta \ge 0 \iff -\delta \le 0$$

$$X\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y} \le \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \iff X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \le \mathbf{y}$$

$$\mathbf{y} - X\mathbf{w} \le \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \iff -X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \le -\mathbf{y}$$

In the following answers, we will convert the optimization to a form that is solvable by the **cxvopt** linear programming (LP) solver, which solves the following form of LP

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{u}$$
 s.t. $G\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{h}$

Let the unknown variables be $\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ d \times 1 \\ \delta \\ 1 \times 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$

For the constraints, since we have three sets of constraints, the matrix G and \mathbf{h} can be decomposed into three parts

$$G \cdot \mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} G^{(1)} \\ I \times (d+1) \\ G^{(2)} \\ n \times (d+1) \\ G^{(3)} \\ n \times (d+1) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}^{(1)} \\ I \times 1 \\ \mathbf{h}^{(2)} \\ d \times 1 \\ \mathbf{h}^{(3)} \\ d \times 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

(b.1) (0.25%) For the objective function, we want $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{u} = \delta$. What should $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be? Recall that $\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix}$ For the objective function to be δ we have:

$$\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{u} = [c_1, c_2, \dots c_d, c_{d+1}] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \vdots \\ w_d \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} = c_1 w_1 + c_2 w_2 + \dots + w_d u_d + c_{d+1} \delta$$
Now let $c_1 = c_1 \cdots c_d = 0$

Now let $c_1 = c_2 = \ldots = c_d = 0$

And $c_{d+1} = 1$

This gives us:

 $0w_1 + 0w_2 + \dots 0w_d + \delta$ $-\delta$

Thus $\mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

Where $c_1 = c_2 = \ldots = c_d = 0$ and $c_{d+1} = 1$.

(b.2) (0.25%) We want $G^{(1)}\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{h}^{(1)} \iff \delta \geq 0$. What should $G^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (d+1)}$ and $h^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}$ be?

Recall the first constraint: $-\delta \leq 0$

We want

$$\underset{1\times(d+1)}{G^{(1)}}\cdot\mathbf{u}\preceq \mathbf{h}_{1\times 1}^{(1)}$$

We will now map our constraint into this form.

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_{1\times d}^{(11)} & G_{1\times 1}^{(12)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \preceq \mathbf{h}_{n\times 1}^{(1)} \iff -\delta \leq 0$$
$$G_{1\times d}^{(11)} \cdot \mathbf{w} + G_{1\times 1}^{(12)} \cdot \delta = -\delta \leq 0 = \mathbf{h}_{1\times 1}^{(1)}$$

So,

$$G_{1\times d}^{(11)} = \mathbf{0}_{1\times d}$$

 $G_{1\times 1}^{(12)} = -1$
 $G_{1\times (d+1)}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{1\times d} & -1 \end{bmatrix}$
 $\mathbf{h}_{1\times 1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{0}_{1\times 1}$

(b.3) (0.25%) We want $G^{(2)}\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{h}^{(2)} \iff X\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y} \leq \delta \cdot \mathbf{1_n}$. What should $G^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (d+1)}$ and $h^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be?

Recall our second constraint is

 $X\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y} \leq \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \iff X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \leq \mathbf{y}$

We want

$$G^{(2)}_{n\times(d+1)}\cdot\mathbf{u}\preceq\mathbf{h}^{(2)}_{n\times1}$$

We will now map our constraint into this form.

$$\begin{bmatrix} G^{(21)} & G^{(22)} \\ n \times d & n \times 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \preceq \mathbf{h}^{(2)} \iff X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \preceq \mathbf{y}$$
$$G^{(21)}_{n \times d} \cdot \mathbf{w} + G^{(22)}_{n \times 1} \cdot \delta = X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \preceq \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h}^{(1)}_{n \times 1}$$

So,

$$G_{n \times d}^{(21)} = X$$

 $G_{n \times 1}^{(22)} = -\mathbf{1}_{n \times 1}$
 $G_{n \times (d+1)}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} X & -\mathbf{1}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$
 $h_{n \times 1}^{(2)} = \mathbf{y}$

(b.4) (0.25%) We want $G^{(3)}\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{h}^{(3)} \iff \mathbf{y} - X\mathbf{w} \leq \delta \cdot \mathbf{1_n}$. What should $G^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (d+1)}$ and $h^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be?

Recall our third constraint is

$$\mathbf{y} - X\mathbf{w} \leq \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \iff -X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \leq -\mathbf{y}$$

We want

$$\underset{n\times(d+1)}{G^{(3)}}\cdot\mathbf{u}\preceq\underset{n\times1}{\mathbf{h}^{(3)}}$$

We will now map our constraint into this form.

$$\begin{bmatrix} G^{(31)}_{n \times d} & G^{(32)}_{n \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \preceq \mathbf{h}^{(3)}_{n \times 1} \iff -X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \preceq -\mathbf{y}$$
$$G^{(31)}_{n \times d} \cdot \mathbf{w} + G^{(32)}_{n \times 1} \cdot \delta = -X\mathbf{w} - \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_n \preceq -\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h}^{(3)}_{n \times 1}$$

So,

$$G_{n\times d}^{(31)} = -X$$

 $G_{n\times d}^{(32)} = -\mathbf{1}_{n\times 1}$
 $G_{n\times (d+1)}^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} -X & -\mathbf{1}_{n\times 1} \end{bmatrix}$
 $h_{n\times 1}^{(3)} = -\mathbf{y}$

(b.5) (2%) Based on your derivations in (b), implement a Python function

$$\mathbf{w} = \min \operatorname{minimizeLinf}(X, y)$$

that returns a $d \times 1$ vector of weights/parameters **w** corresponding to the solution of minimum L_{∞} loss.

$$\mathbf{w} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} ||X\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y}||$$

Based on our derivations in (b), we result in

$$\mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$$

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{1 \times d} & -1 \\ X & -\mathbf{1}_n \\ -X & -\mathbf{1}_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n+1) \times (d+1)}$$

$$\mathbf{h} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{y} \\ -\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$$

$$\mathbf{s.t.}$$

$$G \cdot \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{h}$$

$$(2n+1) \times (d+1) \cdot (d+1) \times \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{h}$$

Please see A1codes.py for full implementation.

- (c) (2%) Synthetic Regression Problem

 In this part, you will evaluate your implemented algorithms on a synthetic dataset.
 - (c.1) (1%) Implement a Python function

train_loss, test_loss = synRegExperiments()

that returns a 2×2 matrix train loss of average training losses and a 2×2 matrix test loss of average test losses (See Table 1 and Table 2 below.) It repeats 100 runs as follows

Please see Alcodes.py for full details.

(c.2) (1%) Looking at your tables from above, analyze the results and discuss any findings you may have and the possible reason behind them.

Note that the matrices below are representative of the following table:

Model	Average L_2 loss	Average L_{∞} loss
L_2 model		
L_{∞} model		

Table 1: Different training losses for different models

After running synRegExperiments on the regression_train.csv and regression_test.csv data sets we get the following results:

For training data:

 $\begin{bmatrix} 2.00305568 & 7.31711154 \\ 2.36347873 & 6.6215357 \end{bmatrix}$

For test data:

```
[1.66071948 5.58874693]
1.9868478 5.02664782]
```

For a randomly generated training and test data set using seed 101210291, we get the following results:

For training data:

```
\begin{bmatrix} 0.11160734 & 1.68718399 \\ 0.27832791 & 0.91119205 \end{bmatrix}
```

For test data:

[0.05252988 1.02181983] 0.35054548 2.26890905

This shows that our L_2 loss, overall, has a lower average loss compared to the L_{∞} loss.