Consider the LASSO problem that you solved last week!! $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \; rac{1}{2} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + au \|x\|_1,$ where $\tau>0$ is a weighting parameter, $A\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $b\in\mathbb{R}^m$ are given data. Use the following Matlab code to generate the data: m = 300; n = 500; s = 2; A = randn(m,n);xs = zeros(n,1); picks = randperm(n); xs(picks(1:s)) = 100*rand(s,1);b = A*xs;tau = 1;Note that xs is the true solution that you want to find. Also this set of data is easier than the one from last week. So you should be able to achieve the targeted accuracy. Write codes as requested below. For all codes, choose x=0 as the starting point, and terminate your codes when your iterate x^k satisfies for $arepsilon=10^{-3}$. In [11]: **import** numpy **as** np import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import time np.seterr(all='ignore') m = 300n = 500s = 2A = np.random.standard_normal((m, n)) xs = np.zeros((n, 1))picks = np.random.choice(n, s, replace=False) xs[picks] = 100 * np.random.standard_normal((s, 1)) b = A @ xsReusable plotting code In [12]: **import** numpy **as** np import matplotlib.pyplot as plt from typing import List, Dict, Tuple def plot_runs(runs: List[Dict], title: str = "A Title for the Plots"): $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}$ Draw two figures: cumulative CPU time and objective error for the given runs. Parameters runs : list of dict Each element is exactly the dictionary returned by `sg_method_solve`. Design matrix and response vector (needed for objective values). figure_size = (10, 6)# Figure 1: objective value relative error vs cumulative CPU time plt.figure(figsize=figure_size) for run in runs: method, step_method, times, f_rel_err = run["method"], run["step_method"], run["times"], run["f_rel_err"] plt.semilogy(times, f_rel_err, label=rf"\$method: {method}, step: {step_method}\$") plt.xlabel("Time (s)") $plt.ylabel(r"$(f(x_k)-f(xs))/f(xs)$")$ plt.title(fr"{title}: obj rel error vs time") plt.legend() plt.grid(True) plt.show() # Figure 2: objective value relative error vs iterations plt.figure(figsize=figure_size) for run in runs: method, step_method, f_rel_err = run["method"], run["step_method"], run["f_rel_err"] plt.semilogy(np.arange(len(f_rel_err)), f_rel_err, label=rf"\$method: {method}, step: {step_method}\$") plt.xlabel("Iteration \$k\$") plt.ylabel(r"\$($f(x_k)-f(x_s)$)/ $f(x_s)$ \$") plt.title(fr"{title}: obj rel error vs iteration") plt.legend() plt.grid(True) plt.show() # Figure 3: relative error vs cumulative CPU time # plt.figure(figsize=figure_size) # for run in runs: method, $step_method$, times, $x_rel_err = run["method"]$, $run["step_method"]$, run["times"], $run["x_rel_error"]$ plt.semilogy(times, x_rel_err, label=rf"\$method: {method}, step: {step_method}\$") # plt.xlabel("Time (s)") # plt.ylabel("|xk - xs|/|xs| Relative Error") # plt.title(fr"{title}: xk rel error vs time") # plt.legend() # plt.grid(True) # plt.show() # Figure 4: relative error vs iterations # plt.figure(figsize=figure_size) # for run in runs: method, step_method, x_rel_err = run["method"], run["step_method"], run["x_rel_error"] plt.semilogy(np.arange(len(x_rel_err)), x_rel_err, label=rf"\$method: {method}, step: {step method}\$") # plt.xlabel("Iteration \$k\$") # plt.ylabel("|xk - xs|/|xs| Relative Error") # plt.title(fr"{title}: xk rel error vs iteration") # plt.legend() # plt.grid(True) # plt.show() ISTA + FISTA Method Run the proximal gradient method (ISTA) you implemented last week to solve the Lasso problem. Try both fixed step size, and backtracking line search. In [13]: **from** enum **import** Enum def tol_check(x_k, xs, tol, eps=1e-14): norm_xs = np.linalg.norm(xs) **if** norm_xs < 1e-14: error = np.linalg.norm(x_k) else: error = np.linalg.norm(x_k - xs) / norm_xs return error < tol, error</pre> def soft_threshold(u, t): return np.sign(u) * np.maximum(np.abs(u) - t, 0) def lasso_obj(A: np.ndarray, b: np.ndarray, x: np.ndarray, tau: float) -> float: return (1 / 2) * np.linalg.norm(A @ x - b)**2 + tau * np.linalg.norm(x, 1)def ls_obj(A, x, b): return (1/2) * np.linalg.norm(A @ x - b) ** 2 def ls_grad(A, x, b): return np.transpose(A) @ (A @ x - b) def backtracking_check(g, grad_g, Gt, g_Gt, t): $lhs = g_Gt$ rhs = $g - t * np.transpose(grad_g) @ Gt + (t / 2) * np.linalg.norm(Gt) ** 2$ return lhs < rhs</pre> def backtracking_search(A, b, x, tau, t_0, beta=0.6, max_iter=100): """Compute the step size via backtracking""" $t = t_0$ $g = ls_obj(A, x, b)$ $grad_g = ls_grad(A, x, b)$ for _ in range(max_iter): $Gt = (1 / t) * (x - soft_threshold(x - t * grad_g, tau * t))$ $g_Gt = ls_obj(A, x - t * Gt, b)$ if backtracking_check(g, grad_g, Gt, g_Gt, t): return t t = beta * t# Return last t if max iterations reached return t class IstaMethodEnum(Enum): STANDARD = "ISTA" FAST = "FISTA" class StepMethodEnum(Enum): FIXED = "fixed" BACKTRACKING = "backtracking" def ista_method_solve(A, b, x0, xs, tau=1, eps=1e-6, max_iter=100000, method: IstaMethodEnum = IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, step_method: StepMethodEnum = StepMethodEnum.FIXED): x prev = x0.copy()x = x0.copy() $x_ks = []$ times = []time_s = time.time() $t_0 = 1$ $t = t_0$ if step_method == StepMethodEnum.FIXED: L = np.linalg.norm(A, 2)**2t = 1/Lfor k in range(1, max_iter + 1): if method == IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD: y = xif method == IstaMethodEnum.FAST: $y = x + (k - 2) / (k + 1) * (x - x_prev)$ $grad = ls_grad(A, y, b)$ if step_method == StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING: t = backtracking_search(A, b, y, tau, t_0) $x_prev = x$ x = soft_threshold(y - t * grad, tau * t) done, error = tol_check(x, xs, eps) x ks.append(x) times.append(time.time() - time_s) if done: elapsed_time = time.time() - time_s print(f"[eps={eps:.0e}] Converged in {k} iterations ({elapsed_time:.2f} s). Final error: {error:.2e}") break else: print(f"[eps={eps:.0e}] Did not converge in {max_iter} iterations.") $x_rel_err = [np.linalg.norm(xk - xs) / np.linalg.norm(xs) for xk in x_ks]$ f_xks = [lasso_obj(A, b, xk, tau) for xk in x_ks] f_err = [lasso_obj(A, b, xk, tau) - lasso_obj(A, b, xs, tau) for xk in x_ks] f_rel_err = [fe / lasso_obj(A, b, xs, tau) for fe in f_err] return { "x_ks": x_ks, "x_rel_error": x_rel_err, "f xks": f xks, "f_rel_err": f_rel_err, "times": times, "iters": k, "tau": tau, "eps": eps, "method": method.value, "step_method": step_method.value, In []: def run_ista_grid_and_plot(A: np.ndarray, b: np.ndarray, x0: np.ndarray, xs: np.ndarray, params: List[Tuple[IstaMethodEnum, StepMethodEnum]], tau: float = 1, eps: float = 1e-3, max_iter: int = 1000000): all_runs = [] for (ista_method, step_method) in params: result = ista_method_solve(A, b, x0, xs, tau=tau, eps=eps, max_iter=max_iter, method=ista_method, step_method=step_method all_runs.append(result) plot_runs(all_runs, fr"\$\tau\$={tau:.1f}, \$\varepsilon\$={eps:.0e}") x0 = np.zeros((n, 1))tau = 1eps = 1e-3params = [(IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), (IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING) run_ista_grid_and_plot(A, b, x0, xs, params, tau, eps) **Analysis and Comparison** Answer these two questions: 1. When you use fixed step size for both ISTA and FISTA, is FISTA significantly faster than ISTA? Support your conclusion by figures/experiments. 2. When you use backtracking line search for both ISTA and FISTA, is FISTA significantly faster than ISTA? Support your conclusion by figures/experiments. **Question A** With fixed step sizes, FISTA is seen to be significantly faster than ISTA. From the plot of objective function relative error vs time, the difference is around .02 seconds for FISTA with fixed size vs .027 for ISTA. FISTA also takes significantly fewer iterations to converge. The step fixed step sizes used in the code are based on the theoretical results based on the 2-norm of the matrix (largest singular value): $L = ||A||_2^2, \ t = 1/L$ In []: x0 = np.zeros((n, 1))tau = 1eps = 1e-3params = (IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), run_ista_grid_and_plot(A, b, x0, xs, params, tau, eps) [eps=1e-03] Converged in 16426 iterations (0.27 s). Final error: 9.90e-04 [eps=1e-03] Converged in 821 iterations (0.02 s). Final error: 5.08e-04 τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs time method: ISTA, step: fixed method: FISTA, step: fixed 10^{3} 10² $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 0.25 0.00 Time (s) τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs iteration method: ISTA, step: fixed method: FISTA, step: fixed 10^{3} 10² $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 7500 10000 0 2500 5000 12500 15000 Iteration k **Question B** FISTA continues to outperform ISTA when using backtracking. For the plots below, the initial step size for backtracking was set to 1 with a value of $\beta=0.6$ for backtracking. Based on the times, I get the following relative ordering of performance: FISTA fixed < FISTA backtracking < ISTA fixed < ISTA backtracking In [17]: x0 = np.zeros((n, 1))tau = 1eps = 1e-3params = [(IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING), run_ista_grid_and_plot(A, b, x0, xs, params, tau, eps) [eps=1e-03] Converged in 2607 iterations (0.63 s). Final error: 9.94e-04 [eps=1e-03] Converged in 616 iterations (0.16 s). Final error: 7.06e-04 τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs time method: ISTA, step: backtracking method: FISTA, step: backtracking 10^{3} 10^{2} $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 Time (s) τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs iteration method: ISTA, step: backtracking method: FISTA, step: backtracking 10^{3} 10^{2} $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 500 1000 1500 2000 2500 Iteration k All in one plot Plotting all four variants on the same plot shows the relative ordering of performance visually. Note that the backtracking variants use less iterations than fixed step size, but the wall time is higher than their counterparts. In [18]: x0 = np.zeros((n, 1))tau = 1eps = 1e-3params = [(IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.FIXED), (IstaMethodEnum.STANDARD, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING), (IstaMethodEnum.FAST, StepMethodEnum.BACKTRACKING), run_ista_grid_and_plot(A, b, x0, xs, params, tau, eps) [eps=1e-03] Converged in 16426 iterations (0.27 s). Final error: 9.90e-04 [eps=1e-03] Converged in 821 iterations (0.02 s). Final error: 5.08e-04 [eps=1e-03] Converged in 2607 iterations (0.63 s). Final error: 9.94e-04 [eps=1e-03] Converged in 616 iterations (0.16 s). Final error: 7.06e-04 τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs time method: ISTA, step: fixed method: FISTA, step: fixed 10^{3} method: ISTA, step: backtracking method: FISTA, step: backtracking 10² $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.0 Time (s) τ =1.0, ε =1e-03: obj rel error vs iteration method: ISTA, step: fixed method: FISTA, step: fixed 10^{3} method: ISTA, step: backtracking method: FISTA, step: backtracking 10² $(f(x_k) - f(xs))/f(xs)$ 10¹ 10⁰ 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 2500 7500 5000 10000 12500 15000 Iteration k

Mat 258A HW 8