15. Multi-objective least squares
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## Multi-objective least squares

- goal: choose $n$-vector $x$ so that $k$ norm squared objectives

$$
J_{1}=\left\|A_{1} x-b_{1}\right\|^{2}, \ldots, J_{k}=\left\|A_{k} x-b_{k}\right\|^{2}
$$

are all small

- $A_{i}$ is an $m_{i} \times n$ matrix, $b_{i}$ is an $m_{i}$-vector, $i=1, \ldots, k$
- $J_{i}$ are the objectives in a multi-objective optimization problem (also called a multi-criterion problem)
- could choose $x$ to minimize any one $J_{i}$, but we want one $x$ that makes them all small


## Weighted sum objective

- choose positive weights $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{k}$ and form weighted sum objective

$$
J=\lambda_{1} J_{1}+\cdots+\lambda_{k} J_{k}=\lambda_{1}\left\|A_{1} x-b_{1}\right\|^{2}+\cdots+\lambda_{k}\left\|A_{k} x-b_{k}\right\|^{2}
$$

- we'll choose $x$ to minimize $J$
- we can take $\lambda_{1}=1$, and call $J_{1}$ the primary objective
- interpretation of $\lambda_{i}$ : how much we care about $J_{i}$ being small, relative to primary objective
- for a bi-criterion problem, we will minimize

$$
J_{1}+\lambda J_{2}=\left\|A_{1} x-b_{1}\right\|^{2}+\lambda\left\|A_{2} x-b_{2}\right\|^{2}
$$

## Weighted sum minimization via stacking

- write weighted-sum objective as

$$
J=\left\|\left[\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{\lambda_{1}}\left(A_{1} x-b_{1}\right) \\
\vdots \\
\sqrt{\lambda_{k}}\left(A_{k} x-b_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right]\right\|^{2}
$$

- so we have $J=\|\tilde{A} x-\tilde{b}\|^{2}$, with

$$
\tilde{A}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{\lambda_{1}} A_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\sqrt{\lambda_{k}} A_{k}
\end{array}\right], \quad \tilde{b}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{\lambda_{1}} b_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\sqrt{\lambda_{k}} b_{k}
\end{array}\right]
$$

- so we can minimize $J$ using basic ('single-criterion') least squares


## Weighted sum solution

- assuming columns of $\tilde{A}$ are independent,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{x} & =\left(\tilde{A}^{T} \tilde{A}\right)^{-1} \tilde{A}^{T} \tilde{b} \\
& =\left(\lambda_{1} A_{1}^{T} A_{1}+\cdots+\lambda_{k} A_{k}^{T} A_{k}\right)^{-1}\left(\lambda_{1} A_{1}^{T} b_{1}+\cdots+\lambda_{k} A_{k}^{T} b_{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- can compute $\hat{x}$ via QR factorization of $\tilde{A}$
- $A_{i}$ can be wide, or have dependent columns


## Optimal trade-off curve

- bi-criterion problem with objectives $J_{1}, J_{2}$
- let $\hat{x}(\lambda)$ be minimizer of $J_{1}+\lambda J_{2}$
- called Pareto optimal: there is no point $z$ that satisfies

$$
J_{1}(z)<J_{1}(\hat{x}(\lambda)), \quad J_{2}(z)<J_{2}(\hat{x}(\lambda))
$$

i.e., no other point $x$ beats $\hat{x}$ on both objectives

- optimal trade-off curve: $\left(J_{1}(\hat{x}(\lambda)), J_{2}(\hat{x}(\lambda))\right)$ for $\lambda>0$


## Example

$A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ both $10 \times 5$


## Objectives versus $\lambda$ and optimal trade-off curve




## Using multi-objective least squares

- identify the primary objective
- the basic quantity we want to minimize
- choose one or more secondary objectives
- quantities we'd also like to be small, if possible
- e.g., size of $x$, roughness of $x$, distance from some given point
- tweak/tune the weights until we like (or can tolerate) $\hat{x}(\lambda)$
- for bi-criterion problem with $J=J_{1}+\lambda J_{2}$ :
- if $J_{2}$ is too big, increase $\lambda$
- if $J_{1}$ is too big, decrease $\lambda$
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## Control

- $n$-vector $x$ corresponds to actions or inputs
- m-vector y corresponds to results or outputs
- inputs and outputs are related by affine input-output model

$$
y=A x+b
$$

- $A$ and $b$ are known (from analytical models, data fitting ...)
- the goal is to choose $x$ (which determines $y$ ), to optimize multiple objectives on $x$ and $y$


## Multi-objective control

- typical primary objective: $J_{1}=\left\|y-y^{\text {des }}\right\|^{2}$, where $y^{\text {des }}$ is a given desired or target output
- typical secondary objectives:
$-x$ is small: $J_{2}=\|x\|^{2}$
- $x$ is not far from a nominal input: $J_{2}=\left\|x-x^{\text {nom }}\right\|^{2}$


## Product demand shaping

- we will change prices of $n$ products by $n$-vector $\delta^{\text {price }}$
- this induces change in demand $\delta^{\text {dem }}=E^{\mathrm{d}} \delta^{\text {price }}$
- $E^{\mathrm{d}}$ is the $n \times n$ price elasticity of demand matrix
- we want $J_{1}=\left\|\delta^{\mathrm{dem}}-\delta^{\mathrm{tar}}\right\|^{2}$ small
- and also, we want $J_{2}=\left\|\delta^{\text {price }}\right\|^{2}$ small
- so we minimize $J_{1}+\lambda J_{2}$, and adjust $\lambda>0$
- trades off deviation from target demand and price change magnitude


## Robust control

- we have $K$ different input-output models (a.k.a. scenarios)

$$
y^{(k)}=A^{(k)} x+b^{(k)}, \quad k=1, \ldots, K
$$

- these represent uncertainty in the system
- $y^{(k)}$ is the output with input $x$, if system model $k$ is correct
- average cost across the models:

$$
\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left\|y^{(k)}-y^{\operatorname{des}}\right\|^{2}
$$

- can add terms for $x$ as well, e.g., $\lambda\|x\|^{2}$
- yields choice of $x$ that does well under all scenarios
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## Estimation

- measurement model: $y=A x+v$
- $n$-vector $x$ contains parameters we want to estimate
- $m$-vector $y$ contains the measurements
- $m$-vector $v$ are (unknown) noises or measurement errors
- $m \times n$ matrix $A$ connects parameters to measurements
- basic least squares estimation: assuming $v$ is small (and $A$ has independent columns), we guess $x$ by minimizing $J_{1}=\|A x-y\|^{2}$


## Regularized inversion

- can get far better results by incorporating prior information about $x$ into estimation, e.g.,
- $x$ should be not too large
- $x$ should be smooth
- express these as secondary objectives:
- $J_{2}=\|x\|^{2}$ ('Tikhonov regularization')
- $J_{2}=\|D x\|^{2}$
- we minimize $J_{1}+\lambda J_{2}$
- adjust $\lambda$ until you like the results
- curve of $\hat{x}(\lambda)$ versus $\lambda$ is called regularization path
- with Tikhonov regularization, works even when $A$ has dependent columns (e.g., when it is wide)


## Image de-blurring

- $x$ is an image
- $A$ is a blurring operator
- $y=A x+v$ is a blurred, noisy image
- least squares de-blurring: choose $x$ to minimize

$$
\|A x-y\|^{2}+\lambda\left(\left\|D_{\mathrm{v}} x\right\|^{2}+\left\|D_{\mathrm{h}} x\right\|^{2}\right)
$$

$D_{\mathrm{v}}, D_{\mathrm{h}}$ are vertical and horizontal differencing operations

- $\lambda$ controls smoothing of de-blurred image


## Example

blurred, noisy image


Image credit: NASA

## Regularization path

$$
\lambda=10^{-6}
$$



## Regularization path

$$
\lambda=10^{-2}
$$



## Tomography

- $x$ represents values in region of interest of $n$ voxels (pixels)
- $y=A x+v$ are measurements of integrals along lines through region

$$
y_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{i j} x_{j}+v_{i}
$$

- $A_{i j}$ is the length of the intersection of the line in measurement $i$ with voxel $j$



## Least squares tomographic reconstruction

- primary objective is $\|A x-y\|^{2}$
- regularization terms capture prior information about $x$
- for example, if $x$ varies smoothly over region, use Dirichlet energy for graph that connects each voxel to its neighbors


## Example



## ${ }^{3}$ 三III ${ }^{4}$ 三III 5 III

- left: 4000 lines (100 points, 40 lines per point)
- right: object placed in the square region on the left
- region of interest is divided in 10000 pixels

Regularized least squares reconstruction

$\lambda=5$


Introduction to Applied Linear Algebra

$\lambda=10$
$\lambda=100$


Boyd \& Vandenberghe
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## Motivation for regularization

- consider data fitting model (of relationship $y \approx f(x)$ )

$$
\hat{f}(x)=\theta_{1} f_{1}(x)+\cdots+\theta_{p} f_{p}(x)
$$

with $f_{1}(x)=1$

- $\theta_{i}$ is the sensitivity of $\hat{f}(x)$ to $f_{i}(x)$
- so large $\theta_{i}$ means the model is very sensitive to $f_{i}(x)$
- $\theta_{1}$ is an exception, since $f_{1}(x)=1$ never varies
- so, we don't want $\theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{p}$ to be too large


## Regularized data fitting

- suppose we have training data $x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(N)}, y^{(1)}, \ldots, y^{(N)}$
- express fitting error on data set as $A \theta-y$
- regularized data fitting: choose $\theta$ to minimize

$$
\|A \theta-y\|^{2}+\lambda\left\|\theta_{2: p}\right\|^{2}
$$

- $\lambda>0$ is the regularization parameter
- for regression model $\hat{y}=X^{T} \beta+v \mathbf{1}$, we minimize

$$
\left\|X^{T} \beta+v \mathbf{1}-y\right\|^{2}+\lambda\|\beta\|^{2}
$$

- choose $\lambda$ by validation on a test set


## Example



- solid line is signal used to generate synthetic (simulated) data
- 10 blue points are used as training set; 20 red points are used as test set
- we fit a model with five parameters $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{5}$ :

$$
\left.\hat{f}(x)=\theta_{1}+\sum_{k=1}^{4} \theta_{k+1} \cos \left(\omega_{k} x+\phi_{k}\right) \quad \text { (with given } \omega_{k}, \phi_{k}\right)
$$

## Result of regularized least squares fit

RMS error versus $\lambda$


Coefficients versus $\lambda$


- minimum test RMS error is for $\lambda$ around 0.08
- increasing $\lambda$ 'shrinks' the coefficients $\theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{5}$
- dashed lines show coefficients used to generate the data
- for $\lambda$ near 0.08 , estimated coefficients are close to these 'true' values

