

## Labwork 5: Applied Linear and Convex Optimization

Instructor: Parikshit Pareek

### General Instructions:

- You may use standard optimization modeling languages such as CVXPY (in Python) or JuMP (in Julia) along with a solver like ECOS, SCS, OSQP, or Gurobi.
- Include comments in your code explaining the mathematical formulation.
- For every plot, ensure axes are labeled properly and include legends where multiple curves are shown.

### Part 1: Underdetermined Systems & Regularization (Run Forex Run)

**Objective:** Understand the geometry of least squares, the pseudo-inverse, and Tikhonov ( $L_2$ ) regularization.

**Task 3.1: Create an Underdetermined System:** Generate synthetic data by picking  $m = 5$  points  $x$  evenly spaced in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ , and compute their corresponding  $y$  values using a simple function like  $y = \sin(\pi x)$ . Attempt to fit a polynomial of degree  $k = 8$  (which requires finding  $n = 9$  coefficients).

- Construct the  $m \times n$  Vandermonde matrix  $A$ .
- Since  $m < n$ , the linear system  $Au = y$  is underdetermined and has an infinite number of solutions (an affine subspace).

**Task 3.2: Minimum Norm Solution:**

- Formulate the equality-constrained optimization problem:  $\min \|u\|_2^2$  subject to  $Au = y$ .
- Solve this using CVXPY/JuMP.
- Compute the analytical solution using the pseudo-inverse:  $u = A^T(AA^T)^{-1}y$  and verify it matches your optimizer's output.

**Task 3.3: Regularization Trade-off:**

- Formulate the unconstrained regularized objective:  $\min \|Au - y\|_2^2 + \lambda \|u\|_2^2$ .
- Solve this for  $\lambda \in \{10, 1, 0.1, 0.001\}$ .
- **Analytical Verification:** Verify the class theorem experimentally. Show that as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , the solution of the regularized problem approaches the minimum norm solution found in Task 3.2.

### Part 4: Trajectory Optimization & Pareto Curves (Assemble your Avengers!)

**Objective:** Formulate a multi-objective optimal control problem (Hovercraft model) and analyze optimal trade-offs via a Pareto curve.

**Task 4.1: Kinematic Setup:** Consider a 2D hovercraft. Let  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the position and  $v_t \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the velocity. The control input is thrust  $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

- Dynamics:  $x_{t+1} = x_t + v_t$  and  $v_{t+1} = v_t + u_t$ .
- Initial state:  $x_1 = [0, 0]^T, v_1 = [0, 0]^T$ .

**Task 4.2: Target Waypoints:** The hovercraft must pass as close as possible to the following waypoints at specific times  $T_i$ :

- $T_1 = 20 \rightarrow$  Waypoint 1 =  $[4, 3]^T$
- $T_2 = 50 \rightarrow$  Waypoint 2 =  $[6, 0]^T$
- $T_3 = 60 \rightarrow$  Waypoint 3 =  $[1, 1]^T$

**Task 4.3: Multi-Objective Formulation:** Define two conflicting objectives:

- $J_1 = \sum_t \|u_t\|_2^2$  (Minimize Fuel / Control Effort)
- $J_2 = \sum_i \|x_{T_i} - \text{Waypoint}_i\|_2^2$  (Minimize Waypoint Mismatch)

Combine them into a single objective using a trade-off parameter  $\lambda$ :  $\min J_1 + \lambda J_2$ .

**Task 4.4: Trajectory Generation:** Write a function `solve_hovercraft( $\lambda$ )` that sets up the variables and constraints in your solver, minimizes the combined objective, and returns  $(J_1, J_2, x_{\text{trajectory}})$ .

- Test your function with  $\lambda = 0.01$  and plot the resulting 2D spatial trajectory ( $x_t^{(1)}$  vs  $x_t^{(2)}$ ). Mark the waypoints clearly with red dots.

**Task 4.5: Pareto Trade-off Curve:**

- Generate a logarithmically spaced array of 30  $\lambda$  values ranging from  $10^{-5}$  to  $10^1$ .
- Run `solve_hovercraft( $\lambda$ )` for each value and store the resulting  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ .
- Plot  $J_2$  (Waypoint Mismatch) on the Y-axis vs  $J_1$  (Fuel Cost) on the X-axis.
- **Reflection:** Identify the convex shape of the curve. Mark a region on the plot that represents “Feasible but strictly suboptimal” points, as discussed in the lecture notes. Explain why a designer would strictly pick a point on the line rather than above it.