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Abstract
We prove that with a high probability (whp) our sublinear cost extension of the Sarlós algorithm of 2006 outputs a nearly optimal solution of the Linear Least Squares Regression (LLSR) for a random input. Our extensive tests are in good accordance with this result.
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1 Introduction

The LLSR problem. LLSR is a hot research subject, fundamental for Matrix Computations and Big Data Mining and Analysis. The matrices that define Big Data are frequently so immense that realistically one can access only a tiny fraction of their entries and thus must perform computations at sublinear cost – by using much fewer memory cells and arithmetic operations than the input matrix has entries.

Our progress. Although all LLSR algorithms running at sublinear cost fail on the worst case inputs, we prove that our sublinear cost extension of the Sarlós algorithm of [S06] approximates an optimal solution of the problem arbitrarily closely with a high probability (whp) in the case of a Gaussian random input matrix, filled with independent identically distributed Gaussian (normal) random variables. Hereafter we call such a matrix just Gaussian and call the LLSR problem for such a random input dual.

We performed extensive numerical tests whose results are in good accordance with our theorem, thus suggesting that our sublinear cost solution of the LLSR problem is nearly optimal for a large class of inputs.
Related works. Our transition to dual matrix computations in this paper extends the earlier work in [PQY15] and [PZ16] and complements our work in [PLSZ16, PLSZ17, PLSZa, PLSZb, PLa, LPSa, and Pa] on the solution at sublinear cost of the dual problem of Low Rank Approximation (LRA) of a matrix.

Organization of the paper. In the next section we recall the LLSR problem and its randomized approximate solution by Sarlos’ of [S06]. We cover its sublinear cost extension in Section 3. In Section 4, the contribution of the second author, we cover numerical tests.

2 Linear Least Squares Regression

Problem 2.1. [Least Squares Solution of an Overdetermined Linear System of Equations or Linear Least Squares Regression (LLSR).] Given two integers \( m \) and \( d \) such that \( 1 \leq d < m \), a matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \), and a vector \( b \in \mathbb{R}^m \), compute and output a vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) that minimizes the spectral norm \( \|Ax - b\| \) or equivalently outputs the subvector \( x = (y_j)_{j=0}^{d-1} \) of the vector

\[
y = (y_j)_{j=0}^d = \arg\min_v \|Mv\| \text{ such that } M = (A | b) \text{ and } v = \left( \begin{array}{c} x \\ -1 \end{array} \right).
\]

The minimum norm solution to this problem is given by the vector \( x = A^+b \) for \( A^+ \) denoting the Moore-Penrose pseudo inverse of \( A \); \( A^+b = (A^TA)^{-1}A^Tb \) if a matrix \( A \) has full rank \( d \).

Algorithm 2.1. [Randomized Approximate LLSR from [S06].]

Input: An \( m \times (d + 1) \) matrix \( M \).

Output: A vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) approximating a solution of Problem 2.1.

Initialization: Fix an integer \( s \) such that \( d \leq s \ll m \).

Computations: 1. Generate a matrix \( F \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times m} \).

2. Compute and output a solution \( x \) of Problem 2.1 for the \( s \times (d + 1) \) matrix \( FM \).

The following theorem shows that the algorithm outputs approximate solution to Problem 2.1 for \( M \) whp if \( \sqrt{s} \) \( F \) is in the linear space \( G^{s \times m} \) of \( s \times m \) Gaussian matrices.

Theorem 2.1. (Error Bound for Algorithm 2.1 See [W14 Theorem 2.3].) Let us be given two integers \( s \) and \( d \) such that \( 0 < d \leq s \), two matrices \( M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (d+1)} \) and \( F \in G^{s \times m} \), and two tolerance values \( \gamma \) and \( \epsilon \) such that

\[
0 < \gamma < 1, \quad 0 < \epsilon < 1, \quad \text{and } s = ((d + \log(1/\gamma)^{-2}) \eta
\]

for a constant \( \eta \). Then

\[
\text{Probability}\left\{ 1 - \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \frac{\|FM\|}{\|M\|} \leq 1 + \epsilon \text{ for all vectors } y \neq 0 \right\} \geq 1 - \gamma.
\]
For $m \gg s$ the transition $M \to FM$ substantially decreases the size of Problem 2.1; the computation of the matrix $FM$, however, involves order of $dsb \geq d^2m$ flops, and this dominates the overall arithmetic computational cost of the solution.

The current record upper estimate for this cost is $O(d^2m)$ (see [CW17, W14 Section 2.1]), while the record lower bound of [CW09] has order $(s/\epsilon)(m + d)\log(md)$ provided that the relative output error norm is within a factor of $1 + \epsilon$ from its minimal value.

3 Dual LLSR at Sublinear Cost

If an LLSR algorithm runs at sublinear cost, then it does not access an entry $m_{i,j}$ for some pair $i$ and $j$ and so cannot minimize the norm $|My|$ for the worst case input $M$. Indeed modification of $m_{i,j}$ does not change the output of such an algorithm but can dramatically change an optimal solution to the LLSR problem. This argument can be immediately extended to randomized LLSR algorithms, but next we compute at sublinear cost a solution of LLSR which is nearly optimal whp provided that the input $M$ is a scaled Gaussian matrix. We call this variation of LLSR dual.

Namely we modify Algorithm 2.1 by allowing any orthogonal multiplier $F$, including sparse ones with which the algorithm runs at sublinear cost. Then according to the next theorem the output of this algorithm is nearly optimal whp in the case of a random Gaussian input.

**Theorem 3.1.** [Error Bounds for Dual LLSR.] Suppose that we are given three integers $s$, $m$, and $d$ such that $0 < d \leq s < m$, and two tolerance values $\gamma$ and $\epsilon$ satisfying (2.2). Define an orthogonal matrix $Q_{s,m} \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times m}$ and a matrix $G_{m,d+1} \in \mathbb{G}^{m \times (d+1)}$ and write

$$F := a Q_{s,m} \text{ and } M := b G_{m,d+1}$$

for two scalars $a$ and $b$ such that $ab\sqrt{s} = 1$. Then

$$\text{Probability}\{1 - \epsilon \leq \frac{||FMz||}{||Mz||} \leq 1 + \epsilon \text{ for all vectors } z \neq 0\} \geq 1 - \gamma.$$ 

**Proof.** Observe that the theorem is equivalent to Theorem 2.1 because the $s \times (d+1)$ matrix $\frac{1}{ab}FM$ is Gaussian by virtue of orthogonality invariance of Gaussian matrices.

The theorem shows that Algorithm 2.1 for any properly scaled orthogonal matrix $F$ of (3.1) outputs a solution of the LLSR problem whp being within a factor from in range $[1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ from optimal.

We can increase chances for success by applying this algorithm repeatedly for the same multiplier $F$ and a sequence of input matrices $M_i$ or equivalently, for the same matrix $M$ and various multipliers $F_i$ such that $FM_i = F_iM$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, u$. The latter way should be preferred because it runs at sublinear cost in the case of sparse multipliers $F_1, \ldots, F_u$ and a sufficiently small integer $u$.

4 Numerical Tests for LLSR

In this section we present the results of our tests of Algorithm 2.1 for LLSR on both synthetic and real-world data. We worked with random orthogonal multipliers, let $\bar{x} := \arg\min_x ||FAx - Fb||$, and computed the relative residual norms

$$\frac{||A\bar{x} - b||}{\min_x ||Ax - b||}.$$
In our tests these ratios quite closely approximated one from above.

We used the following random multipliers $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$:

(i) submatrices of $m \times m$ random permutation matrices,

(ii) block permutation matrices, which are formed by filling $k \times m$ matrices with $c$ identity matrices of size $k \times k$, and performing random column permutations. Here we choose $c = 8$ to match the computation cost of ASPH multipliers.

(iii) ASPH matrices from [PLSZa] and [PLSZb], which we output after performing just the first three recursive steps out of $\log_2 m$ steps involved into the generation of subsampled matrices of Hadamard transform.

(iv) For comparison we also included the test results with Gaussian multipliers.

We performed our tests on a machine with Intel Core i7 processor running Windows 7 64bit; we invoked the $\text{lstsq}$ function from Numpy 1.14.3 for solving the LLSR problems.

### 4.1 Synthetic Input Matrices

For synthetic inputs, we generated input matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ by following (with a few modifications) the recipes of extensive tests in [AMT10], which compared the running time of the regular LLSR problems and the reduced ones with WHT, DCT, and DHT pre-processing.

We used input matrices $A$ of size $4096 \times 50$ and $16834 \times 100$ being either Gaussian matrices or random ill-conditioned matrices. We generated the input vectors $b = \frac{1}{\|w\|}A w + 0.001 \|v\| v$, where $w$ and $v$ were random Gaussian vectors of size $d$ and $m$, respectively, and so $b$ was in the range of $A$ up to a smaller term $0.001 \|v\| v$.

Figure 1 displays the test results for Gaussian input matrices.

Figure 2 displays the results for ill-conditioned random inputs generated through SVD $A = U \Sigma V^*$ where the orthogonal matrices $U$ and $V$ of singular vectors were given by the $Q$ factors in QR-factorization of two independent Gaussian matrices and where $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_j)$ with $\sigma_j = 10^{5-j}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 14$ and $\sigma_j = 10^{-10}$ for $j > 14$.

**Remark 4.1.** The coherence of a matrix $A_{m \times d}$ with SVD $U \Sigma V^*$ is defined as the maximum squared row norm of its left singular matrix $U$, with 1 being its maximum and $d/m$ being its minimum. If the test input has coherence 1, then in order to have an accurate result the multiplier must "sample" the corresponding rows with maximum row norm in the left singular matrix. Such a sublinear cost algorithm outputs an accurate solution to the LLSR problem if its input matrix has a relatively small coherence.

Our input matrices $A$ are highly over-determined, having many more rows than columns. We have chosen $k = rd$, $r = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ for the multipliers $F$. By decreasing the ratio $r = k/d$ we would accelerate the computations of our algorithm, but we had to keep it large enough in order to yield accurate solution.

We performed 100 tests for every triple of the input class, multiplier class, and test sizes, and computed the mean of the relative residual norm.

The test results displayed in Figures 1 and 2 show that our multipliers were consistently effective for random matrices. The performance was not affected by the conditioning of input matrices.

### 4.2 Red Wine Quality Data and California Housing Prices Data

In this subsection we present the test results for real world inputs, namely the Red Wine Quality Data and California Housing Prices Data. For each triple of the datasets, multiplier type and
Figure 1: Relative error ratio in tests with Gaussian inputs

Figure 2: Relative error norm in tests with ill-conditioned random inputs
multiplier size, we repeated the test 100 times and computed the mean relative residual norm. The results for these two input classes are displayed in Figures 3 and 4.

11 physiochemical feature data of the Red Wine Quality Data such as fixed acidity, residual sugar level, and pH level were the input variables in our tests and one sensory data wine quality were the output data; the tests covered 1599 different variants of the Portuguese "Vinho Verde" wine. See further information in [CCAMR09]. This dataset is often applied in regression tests that use physiochemical data of a specific wine in order to predict its quality, and among various types of regression LLSR is regarded as a popular choice.

From this dataset we constructed 2048 × 12 input matrix $A$ with each row representing one variant of red wine, and with columns consisting of a bias column and eleven physiochemical feature columns. The input vector $b$ is a vector consisting of the wine quality level (between 0 and 10) for each variant. Besides the 1599 rows of the original data, we padded the rest of rows with zeros and performed a full row permutation of $A$.

The California Housing Prices data appeared in [PB97] and were collected from the 1990 California Census, including 9 attributes for each of the 20,640 Block Groups observed. This dataset is used for regression tests in order to predict the median housing value of a certain area given collected information of this area, such as population, median income, and housing median age.

We randomly selected 16,384 observations from the dataset in order to construct independent input matrix $A_0$ of size $16384 \times 8$ and dependent input vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^{16384}$. Furthermore, we augmented $A_0$ by a single bias column, i.e. $A = [A_0 \quad 1]$.

Figure 3 and 4 shows that the approximate solution obtained by applying our multipliers was almost as accurate as the optimal solution. Moreover, using Gaussian multipliers rather than our sparse multipliers only provided a marginal improvement in terms of relative residual norm.
Figure 3: Relative residual ratio in tests with Red Wine Quality Data
Figure 4: Relative residual ratio in tests with California Housing Prices Data
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