

SPARSE SUB-GAUSSIAN RANDOM PROJECTIONS FOR SEMIDEFINITE PROGRAMMING RELAXATIONS

MONSE GUEDES-AYALA¹, PIERRE-LOUIS POIRION², LARS SCHEWE¹, AND AKIKO TAKEDA^{2,3}

ABSTRACT. Random projection, a dimensionality reduction technique, has been found useful in recent years for reducing the size of optimization problems. In this paper, we explore the use of sparse sub-gaussian random projections to approximate semidefinite programming (SDP) problems by reducing the size of matrix variables, thereby solving the original problem with much less computational effort. We provide some theoretical bounds on the quality of the projection in terms of feasibility and optimality that explicitly depend on the sparsity parameter of the projector. We investigate the performance of the approach for semidefinite relaxations appearing in polynomial optimization, with a focus on combinatorial optimization problems. In particular, we apply our method to the semidefinite relaxations of MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT. We show that for large unweighted graphs, we can obtain a good bound by solving a projection of the semidefinite relaxation of MAXCUT. We also explore how to apply our method to find the stability number of four classes of imperfect graphs by solving a projection of the second level of the Lasserre Hierarchy. Overall, our computational experiments show that semidefinite programming problems appearing as relaxations of combinatorial optimization problems can be approximately solved using random projections as long as the number of constraints is not too large.

1. INTRODUCTION

Random projection (RP), sometimes also referred to as sketching, is a dimensionality reduction technique that has traditionally been used to speed up Euclidean distance-based algorithms such as k -means clustering [6] or k -nearest neighbours [23]. It is based on the Johnson–Lindenstrauss Lemma (JLL), which states that a set of points in a large dimensional space can be projected into a lower dimensional space while approximately preserving the distance between the points, see [52] for more details. However, in recent years RPs have been proven to be useful in solving mathematical programs more efficiently. Several papers have explored how different types of Mathematical Programming (MP) formulation might be approximately invariant (regarding feasibility and optimality) with respect to randomly projecting the input parameters. In [51] the authors explore how to use random projections to approximately solve linear programming problems by projecting their constraints, [13] covers RPs for quadratic programs, while [35] presents results for conic programming. The first and last papers explore how to reduce the size of the problem by projecting the constraints, while the second investigates how to reduce the dimension of the variables.

Semidefinite programming (SDP) is the optimization of linear functions over the intersection of the positive semidefinite cone and an affine subspace. The most common solution approaches for general SDP problems are interior point methods (IPM). However, these methods run into scalability problems since they require storing large dense matrices. The most common solution for increasing scalability of SDP is to exploit some features of the problem such as sparsity

¹SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND

²CENTER FOR ADVANCED INTELLIGENCE PROJECT, RIKEN, JAPAN

³DEPARTMENT OF CREATIVE INFORMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, JAPAN

E-mail addresses: mguedes@ed.ac.uk (M. Guedes-Ayala), pierre-louis.poirion@riken.jp (P.L. Poirion), lars.schewe@ed.ac.uk (L. Schewe), takeda@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp (A. Takeda).

[9, 18, 30, 56] or symmetry [19, 27, 47]. It is also possible to find a feasible solution for large problems by limiting the rank of the solution [10, 11, 24]. Two other proposed solution approaches are the Alternating-Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) [41] and augmented Lagrangian methods [55]. First-order algorithms have also been developed such as that of [45], the iterative projection methods of Henrion and Malick [22], the conditional gradient-based augmented Lagrangian framework of Yurtsever et al. [54], or the regularization methods of Nie and Wang [40], which are tailored to SDP relaxations of polynomial optimization. More recently, RPs have been proposed to reduce the size of SDP problems. Liberti et al. explore in [34] how to use RPs to solve semidefinite programming problems by reducing the number of constraints of the problem. In [44] the authors extend the framework of RPs for constraint aggregation to linear and semidefinite problems with linear inequalities. Articles such as [12, 14, 46] also explore random projections for low-rank approximations for semidefinite programming. The authors of [5] investigate how to reduce the size of the matrix appearing in SDP, instead of aggregating constraints, by applying a congruence operator with a random projection. This is similar to the approach presented in this paper. However, we improve the bounds proposed by [5] and update some of the most basic results of RPs for sub-gaussian projectors to make them dependent of the sparsity parameter of the projector. This is key to be able to estimate in advance the performance of a sparse projector. Moreover, we test the performance of our method, contrary to [5], where only theoretical results are presented.

In this paper, we extend the current theory of RPs for SDP and propose some applications in combinatorial optimization. We propose a new method for reducing the size of the matrices appearing in SDP using sparse sub-gaussian random projections. We update the most basic RP results, including the JLL, to include the sparsity parameter of the sub-gaussian projector in the probabilistic bounds. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that presents optimality and feasibility bounds for MPs that depend on the sparsity of the projector. We show that we can solve a projected version of semidefinite relaxation with a bounded error. We also prove that the projected problem is feasible with high probability, up to some feasibility tolerance. This document is structured as follows. Following this introduction, we present in Section 2 the projected problem and some basic results. In Section 3 we present some of the most important properties of sparse sub-gaussian random projections that will be used throughout the rest of the paper. Section 4 presents the main results of the paper, which state that the feasibility and optimality of SDPs can be approximately preserved by RPs. We discuss the computational complexity of our methodology in Section 5. Then, in Section 6 we present some computational experiments. In particular, we approximately solve the semidefinite relaxations of MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT and the second level of the SOS relaxation of the stable set problem. Lastly, we conclude by discussing possible future research directions.

2. PROJECTING SEMIDEFINITE PROGRAMMING PROBLEMS

A well-known result in geometry and machine learning is the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma (JLL), which states that for a set of high dimensional points, we can randomly project the points to a lower dimensional space while approximately preserving the Euclidean distances between the points. More formally, it states that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any finite set $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with m points and $k = O(\frac{\ln m}{\epsilon^2})$ there is a linear map $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x - y\|^2 \leq \|f(x) - f(y)\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x - y\|^2 \text{ for all } x, y \in T. \quad (1)$$

An even more basic result, which is widely used in [13, 15, 35, 51], is that a random projection is a matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ sampled from a Gaussian distribution such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there is a universal constants \mathcal{C} such that

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x\|^2 \leq \|Px\|^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x\|^2 \quad (2)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-Ce^{2k}}$. Since this probability converges exponentially to 1, we say that the event holds with arbitrarily high probability (w.a.h.p.). The JLL can be seen as a corollary of this statement by applying the union bound to all the differences between distinct points in T . These two results are the foundation of the theory of random projections for MPs. However, dense Gaussian projectors are not computationally efficient in practice. Following this, sparser sub-gaussian projectors have been proposed in papers such as [1, 3, 13, 36], where it has been shown that for sub-gaussian matrices both (1) and (2) hold. Following this, from now on we assume that P can also be a sub-gaussian projector. The specific distribution of the entries of P and how this distribution might affect the probabilistic bounds in (1) and (2) will be discussed in Section 3. For now, let us explore how to use a projector $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ to reduce the variable matrix of semidefinite programming problems.

Recall that the general SDP problem with a matrix variable X over the cone of positive semi-definite (psd) matrices, i.e. matrices with only non-negative eigenvalues, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \langle C, X \rangle & (\text{SDP}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & X \succeq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where X, C, A_i are $n \times n$ matrices, b is a given vector in \mathbb{R}^m , and $\langle M, N \rangle = \text{tr}(M^\top N)$ denotes the Frobenius inner product. As discussed before, the most common methods for solving general SDP problems are interior point methods (IPMs). However, recall that in practice these methods need to store dense matrices at every iteration, making them run into memory problems for large-scale applications. Following this, a reduction in the size of the variable matrix is very desirable for practical applications.

We can use random projections to project the psd matrix X of the SDP problem with the map $\phi_P : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ that maps $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to $PAP^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ is a random projection as defined in (2), or its sub-gaussian extension. Recall that a map is said to be positive if it maps positive elements to positive elements. In our case, ϕ_P preserves the positive definiteness of the matrices, so it is a positive map. Consider the following SDP problem and its dual:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \langle C, X \rangle & (\mathcal{P}) & \max \quad & b^\top y & (\mathcal{D}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m, & & \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i \preceq C, \\ & X \succeq 0 & & & \end{aligned}$$

We can then project these problems using the random projection $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ and the positive map ϕ_P as

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \langle PCP^\top, Y \rangle & (\mathcal{RP}) & \max \quad & b^\top z & (\mathcal{RD}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle PA_i P^\top, Y \rangle = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m, & & \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m PA_i P^\top z_i \preceq PCP^\top, \\ & Y \succeq 0 & & & \end{aligned}$$

where Y is a new matrix of dimension $k \times k$. The authors of [5] already proposed to reduce the size of SDP problems using these positive maps. They show that the difference between the inner product of projected and unprojected matrices cannot be bounded solely by the Frobenius norm and propose to bound it using the nuclear norm of the matrices instead. We update and extend their results by using a tighter bound taken from [44], which combines the nuclear and the Frobenius norm of the matrices. More details of this will be discussed in Section 3. But now, let us see some basic relations between the projected and original problems.

First, it is easy to see that a solution \hat{Y} to problem (\mathcal{RP}) is going to be feasible for (\mathcal{P}) when lifted by $X = P^\top \hat{Y} P$. Similarly, any solution to the original dual is also feasible for the projected dual.

Proposition 1. *For any feasible solution Y to the projected problem (\mathcal{RP}) , $P^\top Y P$ is also feasible for the original problem (\mathcal{P}) .*

Proof. Let \hat{Y} be a feasible solution to the projected problem. Then, $\langle P A_i P^\top, \hat{Y} \rangle = b_i$ holds for all i . Define the lifting of \hat{Y} into the original dimension as $X = P^\top \hat{Y} P$. Then, after some basic algebraic manipulations, one can check that $\langle A_i, P^\top \hat{Y} P \rangle = b_i$ for all i as well. Secondly, since \hat{Y} is psd, $X = P^\top \hat{Y} P$ is psd as well. To see this, consider $z^\top X z = z^\top P^\top \hat{Y} P z$ for any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $z^\top P^\top = w^\top$ and $P z = w$. Then we have that $z^\top X z = z^\top P^\top \hat{Y} P z = w^\top \hat{Y} w \geq 0$ for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$ since \hat{Y} is psd. \square

Proposition 2. *For any feasible dual solution y of the original problem (\mathcal{D}) , y is also feasible for the projected dual (\mathcal{RD}) .*

Proof. Since \hat{y} is feasible for the original dual, it satisfies $\sum A_i \hat{y}_i \preceq C$. Now, since $\phi_P : A \rightarrow P A P^\top$ is a positive map, $\sum \phi_P(A_i) \hat{y}_i \preceq \phi_P(C)$ is also satisfied, i.e. \hat{y} is also feasible for the projected dual. \square

This allows us to get a certificate of feasibility by solving the projected problem. If the projected problem is feasible, since its feasible region is contained in that of the original problem, then the original problem is also feasible. This inclusion of feasible regions can be summarised in the following corollary, which follows directly from Proposition 1 and Proposition 2.

Corollary 1. *Let F denote the feasible region of a given problem. Then the following inclusions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{(\mathcal{RP})} &\subseteq F_{(\mathcal{P})}, \\ F_{(\mathcal{D})} &\subseteq F_{(\mathcal{RD})}. \end{aligned}$$

However, Corollary 1 does not tell us anything about the feasibility of the projected problem nor the boundness of the projected dual. The projected problem may be infeasible while the original problem is feasible. However, as we will see in Section 4, we can bound the ϵ -feasibility of the projected problem with respect to the original problem. In other words, we can bound the probability of the two feasible regions being close to each other, where closeness is defined in terms of some tolerance ϵ . Moreover, assuming that the bounds of the dual variables are known, problem (\mathcal{P}) can be reformulated to ensure the feasibility of the projection. But before presenting the main feasibility and optimality results, we need to introduce some of the main properties of sparse sub-gaussian random projections.

3. PROPERTIES OF SPARSE SUB-GAUSSIAN RANDOM PROJECTIONS

In this section, we provide some background on some properties of sparse sub-gaussian random projections that will be used throughout the rest of the paper. Even though all the properties presented here also hold for the classic Gaussian random projections and have been widely discussed in papers such as [13, 34, 35, 44, 51], we update all results so that the sparsity of the new sparse sub-gaussian random-projector appears in all the bounds, including the feasibility and optimality bounds. The main motivation behind this is that our computational experiments have shown that for practical applications the sparsity of the projector highly influences both the feasibility of the projected problem and the quality of the projection.

There are many examples of sparse sub-gaussian projectors that can be used to project MPs and ML problems. For example, [3, 36] propose to sample the entries of P independently where each entry is 0 with probability $1 - \gamma$, and either $\sqrt{\gamma}$ or $-\sqrt{\gamma}$ with probability $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ each. The authors of [13] propose a new sparse sub-gaussian projector $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, where each entry of P is sampled from a normal distribution $N(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\gamma}})$ with probability γ , and is 0 with probability $1 - \gamma$. In [13] the authors show that this projector is indeed a random projection since all the rows are sub-gaussian isotropic with zero mean. However, the optimality and feasibility bounds presented in [13] are not updated to take the sparsity parameter into account. In the rest of this section, we focus on this last sparse projector and propose new probabilistic bounds that depend on the sparsity parameter γ . To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that explicitly includes the sparsity of the projector in the probabilistic bounds. Let us start by updating Lemma 3.1 in [50].

Lemma 1. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a sparse sub-gaussian matrix in which each component is sampled from a normal distribution $N(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\gamma}})$ with probability $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and is 0 with probability $1 - \gamma$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have that*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{k} P P^\top - I_k \right\|_2 \leq \epsilon$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\left(\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon\gamma k}}{C} - \sqrt{k}\right)^2}$, where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the spectral norm and C is some universal constant.

Proof. By Proposition 3 in [13] we know that P has independent, mean zero, sub-gaussian isotropic rows. Then, we can apply Theorem 4.6.1 in [49], which states that for any $t \geq 0$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} P P^\top - I_k \right\|_2 \leq K^2 \max(\delta, \delta^2) \quad (3)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-t^2}$ where $K = \max_i \|P_i\|_{\psi_2}$, $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ denotes the vector sub-gaussian norm for row i , and $\delta = C_0 \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$ for some constant C_0 . Our first goal is to bound K . Recall that all entries of P are independently drawn from a probability distribution obtained by multiplying a Bernoulli random variable (RV) and a normal RV, i.e. $P_{ij} \sim B(\gamma)N(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\gamma}})$ with Bernoulli parameter γ and standard deviation $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k\gamma}}$. Since all row vectors are drawn independently from the same distribution, we have that $K = \|P_i\|_{\psi_2}$ for any row P_i of P . Following this, and by the definition of the sub-gaussian norm of a random vector, we have that

$$K = \|P_i\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \|\langle P_i, x \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \max_j C_1 \|P_{ij}\|_{\psi_2} \quad (5)$$

$$= C_1 \|P_{ik}\|_{\psi_2} \text{ for any element } k \text{ of } P_i \quad (6)$$

where S^n denotes the unit n -sphere and C_1 is a universal constant. Line (5) follows from Lemma 3.4.2 in [49], while line (6) follows again from the fact that all the entries of P are independently sampled from the same distribution. Therefore, we only need to bound the sub-gaussian norm of any of the entries of P . To do this, we prove that the sub-gaussian norm of the multiplication of a Bernoulli distribution with parameter γ and a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation σ is bounded above by the sub-gaussian norm of the normal distribution, which is known to be bounded by $C_2\sigma$ for some constant C_2 . For this, consider a random variable $Z = XY$ where X, Y are distributed as $X \sim B(\gamma)$ with bernoulli parameter γ , and $Y \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ with variance σ^2 . Now, we can apply the law of total expectation and get that for a function $g(Z)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Z)] = \mathbb{E}[g(Z)|X = 0]\mathbb{P}[X = 0] + \mathbb{E}[g(Z)|X = 1]\mathbb{P}[X = 1] \quad (7)$$

$$= (1 - \gamma)\mathbb{E}[g(Z)|X = 0] + \gamma\mathbb{E}[g(Z)|X = 1] \quad (8)$$

$$= (1 - \gamma)g(0) + \gamma\mathbb{E}[g(Y)] \quad (9)$$

where line (9) follows from the fact that when $X = 0$, then $Z = 0$ as well and the expected value is just the function evaluated at 0. Now, when $X = 1$, Z is equivalent to being drawn from the normal distribution, so the expectation of Z is equal to the expectation of Y . Then, by the definition of sub-gaussian norm, we have that:

$$\|P_{ij}\|_{\psi_2} = \inf \{t > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\exp(Z^2/t^2)] \leq 2\} \quad (10)$$

$$= \inf \{t > 0 : (1 - \gamma)\exp(0^2/t^2) + \gamma\mathbb{E}[\exp(Y^2/t^2)] \leq 2\} \quad (11)$$

$$= \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\exp(Y^2/t^2)] \leq \frac{1 + \gamma}{\gamma} \right\} \quad (12)$$

$$\leq C_2\sigma \quad (13)$$

where line (11) follows from applying (9) to $g(Z) = e^{\frac{Z^2}{t^2}}$, line (13) follows from the fact that, as $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the right hand side of (12) is in the interval $(2, \infty)$, making the norm of Z at most as large as that of Y . Since the sub-gaussian norm of a normal distribution is bounded by $C_2\sigma$ for some universal constant C_2 and variance σ , we obtain the bound of line (13). Following this, substituting in the standard deviation of the normal distribution of the entries of P , we have that $K \leq C_3 \frac{1}{k\gamma} \leq C_3 \frac{\sqrt{n}}{k\gamma}$.

We also need to analyse the max operator involving δ in (3). Consider the term $\delta = C_0 \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$.

From the proof of Theorem 4.6.1 in [49] we know that the constant C_0 in δ is the constant appearing in the sub-exponential norm of the sub-exponential random variable $\langle P_i, x \rangle^2 - 1$, which is bounded below by $C_0 \geq 1$ (this bound follows from the proof of the centering of sub-exponential random variables). For C_0 large enough, C_0 dominates the expression $\delta = C_0 \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$

where $0 \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \leq 1$, which implies that $\max(\delta, \delta^2) = \delta^2$. Following this, we have that with probability $1 - 2e^{-t^2}$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} AA^\top - I_k \right\| \leq K^2 \max(\delta, \delta^2) \quad (14)$$

$$= K^2 C_0^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \quad (15)$$

$$\leq \frac{C_3^2 C_0^2 n}{k^2 \gamma^2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{\mathcal{C}(\sqrt{k} + t)^2}{k^2 \gamma^2} \quad (17)$$

for some universal constant \mathcal{C} . This means that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-(\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}\gamma k}{\mathcal{C}} - \sqrt{k})^2}$ we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{k} PP^\top - I_k \right\|_2 \leq \epsilon \quad (18)$$

as desired. \square

Following this, we can redefine the classic Johnson-Lindstrauss Lemma for sub-gaussian projections taking into account the sparsity parameter.

Lemma 2 (JLL for Sparse Sub-Gaussian Projections). *Let $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a sparse sub-gaussian matrix in which each component is sampled from a normal distribution $N(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}\gamma})$ with probability $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and is 0 with probability $1 - \gamma$ and let $P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Q$. For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any finite*

set $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with m points

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x - y\|_2 \leq \|Px - Py\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x - y\|_2 \quad (19)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-(C\epsilon\sqrt{k^5}\gamma^2 - \sqrt{\log m})^2}$ for some universal constant C .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of the sub-gaussian version of the JLL from [49] section 9.3.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of points in \mathbb{R}^n and define T to be the set of normalised differences between elements of \mathcal{X} :

$$T = \left\{ \frac{x - y}{\|x - y\|_2} : x, y \in \mathcal{X}, x \neq y \right\} \quad (20)$$

Recall from [13] that the rows of Q are independent, isotropic and sub-gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . By the matrix deviation inequality (Theorem 9.1.1 in [49]), for any subset $T \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{x \in T} \left| \|Qx\|_2 - \sqrt{k}\|x\|_2 \right|] \leq C_0 K^2 \gamma(T) \quad (21)$$

where $K = \max_i \|P_i\|_{\psi_2}$, C_0 is a universal constant, and $\gamma(T)$ denotes the gaussian complexity of T . Now, by Exercise 9.1.8 in [49], we also know that for any $u \geq 0$, the event

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left| \|Qx\|_2 - \sqrt{k}\|x\|_2 \right| \leq C_0 K^2 [w(T) + u \cdot \text{rad}(T)] \quad (22)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-u^2}$, where $\text{rad}(T)$ is the radius of T , i.e. $\text{rad}(T) = \sup_{x \in T} \|x\|_2$. From the proof of Lemma 1 we know that K is bounded by $K \leq C_1 \frac{1}{k^\gamma}$ for some constant C_1 . Now, applying equation (22) to our set T in (20), together with the bound on K , we have that

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left| \frac{\|Qx - Qy\|_2}{\|x - y\|_2} - \sqrt{k} \right| \leq C_2 \frac{1}{k^2 \gamma^2} [w(T) + u \cdot \text{rad}(T)] \quad (23)$$

Multiplying both sides by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\|x - y\|_2$ and rearranging we get that, for a matrix $P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Q$, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-u^2}$:

$$\left| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Qx - \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Qy \right\|_2 - \|x - y\|_2 \right| \leq \frac{C_2 \sqrt{\log m} + C_0 u}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{k^5}} \|x - y\|_2 \quad (24)$$

By letting $\epsilon \leq \frac{C_2 \sqrt{\log m} + C_0 u}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{k^5}}$, we have that P is an approximate isometry on \mathcal{X} , i.e.

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x - y\|_2 \leq \|Px - Py\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x - y\|_2 \quad (25)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-(C\epsilon\sqrt{k^5}\gamma^2 - \sqrt{\log m})^2}$ for some constant C , as desired. \square

We can also update the result in (2) for the sparse sub-gaussian projector.

Lemma 3. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a sparse sub-gaussian matrix in which each component is sampled from a normal distribution $N(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}\gamma})$ with probability $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and is 0 with probability $1 - \gamma$ and let $Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}P$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there is a universal constant C such that*

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Px\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x\|_2^2 \quad (26)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$.

Proof. By Exercise 9.1.8 in [49], we know that for any $u \geq 0$ the event

$$\sup_{x \in T} \left| \|Px\|_2 - \sqrt{k}\|x\|_2 \right| \leq C_0 K^2 [w(T) + u \cdot \text{rad}(T)] \quad (27)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-u^2}$, where $\text{rad}(T)$ is the radius of T . Now, if T has only one vector x , then we have that

$$\left| \|Px\|_2 - \sqrt{k}\|x\|_2 \right| \leq C_0 K^2 [w(T) + u \cdot \|x\|_2] \quad (28)$$

$$\leq C_0 K^2 u \|x\|_2 \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \frac{C_0 u}{k^2 \gamma^2} \|x\|_2 \quad (30)$$

since the gaussian width of T is bounded above by the gaussian complexity, which is bounded above by $C\sqrt{\log T} = 0$. By letting $Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}P$ and multiplying both sides by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$, we have that

$$|\|Qx\|_2 - \|x\|_2| \leq \frac{C_0 u}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{k^5}} \|x\|_2. \quad (31)$$

Following this, we have that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x\|_2 \leq \|Qx\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x\|_2. \quad (32)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}{C_0}}$. Now, squaring both sides we get that

$$(1 - \epsilon)^2 \|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Qx\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)^2 \|x\|_2^2. \quad (33)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}{C_0}}$ and since $1 + 2\epsilon + \epsilon^2 \leq 1 + 3\epsilon$ and $1 - 2\epsilon + \epsilon^2 \geq 1 - 3\epsilon$, we have that

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|x\|_2^2 \leq (1 - \epsilon/3)^2 \|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Qx\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon/3)^2 \|x\|_2^2 \leq \|Qx\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|x\|_2^2. \quad (34)$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}{C_0}} = 1 - 2e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$, as desired. \square

We can now use these results to update some of the other peoperties of RPs, such as the invariance of inner products and quadratic forms.

Lemma 4. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a sparse sub-gaussian random projection such as that of Lemma 3 and let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then there is a universal constant C such that, for any vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$*

$$\langle x, y \rangle - \epsilon \|x\|_2 \|y\|_2 \leq \langle Px, Py \rangle \leq \langle x, y \rangle + \epsilon \|x\|_2 \|y\|_2$$

with probability at least $1 - 4e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 1 in [51] and Lemma 1 in [13]. We apply Lemma 26 to any two vectors $u + v, u - v$ for u, v being the normalised vectors for x, y , and then apply the union bound. \square

Lemma 5. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a sparse sub-gaussian random projection such as that of Lemma 3 and let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then there is a universal constant C such that, for any vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and squared matrix Q*

$$x^\top Qy - 3\epsilon \|x\|_2 \|y\|_2 \|Q\|_F \leq x^\top P^\top P Q P^\top P y \leq x^\top Qy + 3\epsilon \|x\|_2 \|y\|_2 \|Q\|_F$$

with probability at least $1 - 8re^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$, where r is the rank of Q .

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [13], but applying Lemma 4. \square

Now, can we find similar bounds for the inner product of two matrices after applying the positive transformation $\phi_P : A \rightarrow PAP^\top$? In general, we cannot bound $|\langle PAP^\top, PBP^\top \rangle - \langle A, B \rangle|$ by just the Frobenius norm, as the following result from [5] states:

Theorem 6. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a random projection and $A \rightarrow PAP^\top$ be a random positive map such that with strictly positive probability for any $A_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ we have*

$$|\langle PA_i P^\top, PA_j P^\top \rangle - \langle A_i, A_j \rangle| \leq \epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|A_j\|_F$$

where n is the original dimension and k is there projected dimension. Then $k = \Omega(k)$, where Ω is used to indicate an asymptotic lower bound.

The proof of Theorem 6 can be found in [5]. This result states that in general, it is not possible to project the original matrix in a nontrivial way while having a positive probability of an error bounded by the Frobenius norm. However, it is possible to bound $|\langle PAP^\top, PBP^\top \rangle - \langle A, B \rangle|$ with the nuclear norm, and with a combination of the nuclear norm and the Frobenius norm. From now on, we denote the nuclear norm by $\|\cdot\|_*$, and recall that the nuclear norm of a matrix is the sum of its singular values. Recall also that the Frobenius norm is always bounded above by the nuclear norm, since $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum \sigma_i^2} \leq \sum \sigma_i = \|A\|_*$, where σ_i are the singular values of the matrix A . Since results from [44] give us a tighter bound than those of [5], we focus on bounding the inner product with a combination of both norms from now on. Moreover, to make this document as self-contained as possible, we include here the proof of Lemma 7, which is taken from paper [44] but needs to be updated to take the sparsity of the sub-gaussian projector into account.

Lemma 7. *Let P be a sparse sub-gaussian random projector such as that of Lemma 2 and let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we have that with probability at least $1 - 8r_A r_B e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$,*

$$|\langle A, B \rangle - \langle PAP^\top, PBP^\top \rangle| \leq 3\epsilon \|A\|_F \|B\|_*,$$

where r_A, r_B are the ranks of A and B .

Proof. Recall from [13] that random projections approximately preserve quadratic forms. This means that for any two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a random projection $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, and a square matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of rank r , with probability at least $1 - 8re^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$ we have

$$x^\top Q y - 3\|x\| \|y\| \|Q\|_F \leq x^\top P^\top P Q P^\top P y \leq x^\top Q y + 3\|x\| \|y\| \|Q\|_F. \quad (35)$$

Now, let A be a $n \times n$ matrix of rank r_1 , and B be a $n \times n$ matrix of rank r_2 . Assume first that $r_2 = 1$. Then there exists scalar $\sigma > 0$ and unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $B = \sigma u v^\top$. Now, by applying (35) to $Q = A$, $x = u$, and $y = v$ we have that

$$\langle PBP^\top, PAP^\top \rangle = \sigma \langle P u v^\top P^\top, P A P^\top \rangle \quad (36)$$

$$= \sigma u^\top P^\top P A P^\top P v \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \sigma u^\top A v - 3\sigma \|u\| \|v\| \|A\|_F \quad (38)$$

$$= \langle B, A \rangle - 3\sigma \|A\|_F \quad (39)$$

with probability at least $1 - 8re^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$. We can do the same to bound $\langle PBP^\top, PAP^\top \rangle$ from the other side. Consider now the case where $r_2 > 1$. We can then write B using its singular value decomposition $B = U \Sigma V^\top$ as

$$B = \sum_i \sigma_i u_i v_i^\top$$

where $\sigma_i > 0$ are the singular values of B , and u_i, v_i are unit vectors. If we apply (39) to all u_i, v_i , the union bound with $i \in \{1, \dots, r_2\}$, and the definition of nuclear norm, we get the desired result. \square

4. FEASIBILITY AND OPTIMALITY BOUNDS OF THE PROJECTED PROBLEM

In this section we present the main feasibility and optimality results of the paper. It is possible that even though the original problem is feasible, the projected one is infeasible. However, we can bound this infeasibility and obtain some probabilistic results about approximate feasibility. We say a problem is ϵ -feasible if all constraints are satisfied with a tolerance of ϵ . For example, the constraint $\langle A, X \rangle = b$ is ϵ -feasible if there is an X such that $b - \epsilon \leq \langle A, X \rangle \leq b + \epsilon$. Following this, we show that random projections can approximately preserve feasibility up to some tolerance.

Theorem 8 (Approximate Feasibility). *Assume that the original problem (\mathcal{P}) is feasible and that $\text{Tr}(X) \leq w^2$ for all feasible solutions. Let $\epsilon \geq 3(m+1)\delta w^2 \max(\|A_i\|_F)$, then the projected problem (\mathcal{RP}) is ϵ -feasible with probability at least $1 - 16 \sum_i^m r_{A_i} e^{-\mathcal{C}\delta^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$ where r_{A_i} is the rank of A_i .*

Proof. Semidefinite programming feasibility is equivalent to testing membership to the convex hull relaxation of the quadratic forms obtained from the data matrices of the constraints [25]. In particular, a SDP such as (\mathcal{P}) with the additional assumption of $\text{Tr}(X) \leq w^2$ is feasible if and only if \mathbf{b} is in

$$CHR = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i Q(\mathbf{x}_i) : \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i = 1, \alpha_i \geq 0, \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq w, \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \quad (40)$$

for some t , where $Q(\mathbf{x}_i) = (\mathbf{x}_i^\top A_1 \mathbf{x}_i, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i^\top A_m \mathbf{x}_i)^\top$. By Carathéodory's theorem, if a point lies in the convex hull of a n -dimensional set, then it can be written as a convex combination of at most $n+1$ points. Since $Q(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is m dimensional, we can bound t to be at most $m+1$. Following this, we say that b is in C if there exists pairs $(\alpha_1, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, (\alpha_{m+1}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1}) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i Q(\mathbf{x}_i) = b$.

Testing the feasibility of the projected problem is equivalent to testing if \mathbf{b} is in

$$CHR' = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i Q'(\mathbf{y}_i) : \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha_i \geq 0, \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \leq w, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k \right\} \quad (41)$$

where $Q'(\mathbf{y}_i) = (\mathbf{y}_i^\top P A_1 P^\top \mathbf{y}_i, \dots, \mathbf{y}_i^\top P A_m P^\top \mathbf{y}_i)^\top$. To show that the projected problem is ϵ -feasible for $\epsilon \geq 12\delta r^2 \max(\|A_i\|_F)$, consider the distance between \mathbf{b} and the the projection of C for arbitrary $(\alpha_1, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, (\alpha_{m+1}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1}) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i Q(\mathbf{x}_i) = b$. This distance vector is then

$$\mathbf{d} = \left| \mathbf{b} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^\top P^\top P A_1 P^\top P \mathbf{x}_i \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_i^\top P^\top P A_m P^\top P \mathbf{x}_i \end{bmatrix} \right) \right|. \quad (42)$$

By the approximate preservation of quadratic forms presented in the proof of Lemma 7, we know that for a random projection $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, $|\mathbf{x}^\top A \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x} P^\top P A P^\top P \mathbf{x}| \leq 3\delta \|x\|^2 \|A\|_F$ with probability at least $1 - 8(m+1) \sum_i^m \text{rank}(A_i) e^{-\mathcal{C}\delta^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$ where \mathcal{C} is some universal constant. Following this, we have that

$$\mathbf{d} \leq \left| \mathbf{b} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^\top A_1 \mathbf{x}_i + 3\delta \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \|A_1\|_F \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_i^\top A_m \mathbf{x}_i + 3\delta \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \|A_m\|_F \end{bmatrix} \right) \right| \quad (43)$$

$$= \left| \mathbf{b} - \left(\mathbf{b} + \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \begin{bmatrix} 3\delta \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \|A_1\|_F \\ \vdots \\ 3\delta \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \|A_m\|_F \end{bmatrix} \right) \right| \quad (44)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 3\delta \|A_1\|_F (\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2) \\ \vdots \\ 3\delta \|A_m\|_F (\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2) \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 3(m+1)\delta w^2 \|A_1\|_F \\ \vdots \\ 3(m+1)\delta w^2 \|A_m\|_F \end{bmatrix} \leq \epsilon \mathbf{1} \quad (45)$$

with probability at least $1 - 8(m+1) \sum_i^m \text{rank}(A_i) e^{-\mathcal{C}\delta^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$. We have done all calculations with the right-hand side of the quadratic form bound, but similar results are obtained from the other side. We take the maximum among all A_i to define ϵ we obtain the desired result. \square

Note that this might limit the applicability of Proposition 1 since implies that for some cases we cannot obtain a solution to the projected problem that we can lift back to the space of the

original problem. In order to overcome this issue, we solve the following SDP (or its dual), which is guaranteed to have a feasible and bounded solution when projected.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \langle C, X \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i lb_i \quad (\mathcal{P}_\lambda) & \max \quad & b^\top z \quad (\mathcal{D}_\lambda) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m, & \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m A_i y_i \preceq C, \\
 & X \succeq 0, & & lb_i \leq y_i \leq ub_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \\
 & \bar{\lambda}_i \geq 0, \underline{\lambda}_i \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

We can now apply the positive map $\phi_P : A \rightarrow PAP^\top$ as we did for problems (\mathcal{RP}) and (\mathcal{RD}) , and get the following primal/dual pair:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \langle PCP^\top, Y \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i lb_i \quad (\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) & \max \quad & b^\top z \quad (\mathcal{RD}_\lambda) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle PA_i P^\top, Y \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m, & \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m PA_i P^\top z_i \preceq PCP^\top, \\
 & Y \succeq 0, & & lb_i \leq z_i \leq ub_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \\
 & \bar{\lambda}_i \geq 0, \underline{\lambda}_i \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9. *Assume that problem (\mathcal{P}_λ) is bounded and feasible. Then the projected problem (\mathcal{RP}_λ) and its dual (\mathcal{RD}_λ) are also bounded and feasible.*

Proof. Since the dual variables of the projected problem are all bounded, and the feasible region of the original problem is contained in the projected problem by Corollary 1, the projected dual (and projected primal) is bounded and feasible as desired. \square

Moreover, strong duality is also preserved after projection, as the following result shows.

Lemma 10. *Assume that Slater's condition holds for (\mathcal{P}_λ) , then it also holds for (\mathcal{RP}_λ) .*

Proof. Since Slater's condition of (\mathcal{P}_λ) holds, we know that there is a matrix \hat{X} and variables $\bar{\alpha}_i, \underline{\alpha}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ that satisfy the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \langle A_i, X \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i & i = 1, \dots, m, \\ X \succ 0, \\ \bar{\lambda}_i > 0, \underline{\lambda}_i > 0. \end{cases}$$

Recall that positive definiteness is preserved by applying the map ϕ_P . Let $\hat{Y} = P\hat{X}P^\top$ and $\bar{\beta}_i - \underline{\beta}_i = \langle A_i, \hat{X} \rangle + \bar{\alpha}_i - \underline{\alpha}_i - \langle PA_i P^\top, \hat{Y} \rangle$. Since they satisfy the following equations

$$\begin{cases} \langle PA_i P^\top, \hat{Y} \rangle + \bar{\beta}_i - \underline{\beta}_i = b_i, & i = 1, \dots, m, \\ \hat{Y} \succ 0 \\ \bar{\beta}_i > 0, \underline{\beta}_i > 0 \end{cases}$$

there is a point in the interior of the feasible region of (\mathcal{RP}_λ) , which means that the condition also holds. \square

Under the assumption that (\mathcal{P}) is bounded and feasible and that the dual variables y_i are within the interval (ub_i, lb_i) , we can show that problem (\mathcal{P}) and (\mathcal{P}_λ) have the same optimal solution.

Proposition 3. *If problem (\mathcal{P}) is bounded and feasible and all the dual variables y_i are within the bounded intervals (ub_i, lb_i) , then the following problems have the same optimal solution*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \langle C, X \rangle & (\mathcal{P}) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
 & X \succeq 0.
 \end{aligned}
 \qquad
 \begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \langle C, X \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i lb_i & (\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
 & X \succeq 0 \\
 & \bar{\lambda}_i \geq 0, \underline{\lambda}_i \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We know by assumption that (\mathcal{D}) is bounded and feasible and that all dual variables y_i are bounded by (ub_i, lb_i) . Adding the constraints $lb_i \leq y_i \leq ub_i$ to (\mathcal{D}) does not change the optimal value, which means that $\sigma(\mathcal{D}) = \sigma(\mathcal{D}_\lambda)$. Now, to see that at optimality all elements of $\lambda = \{\bar{\lambda}_i, \underline{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are equal to 0, consider the KKT conditions of (\mathcal{D}_λ) . By the complementarity condition, either $y_i = ub_i$, or we must have the multiplier $\bar{\lambda}_i$ equal to 0. Since we know by construction that $y_i \in (lb_i, ub_i)$, we have that $y_i \neq ub_i$ and therefore $\bar{\lambda}_i = 0$ for all i . A similar reasoning applies to all $\underline{\lambda}_i$. \square

Note that Proposition 1, Proposition 2, and Corollary 1 also hold for (\mathcal{P}_λ) and (\mathcal{RP}_λ) . However, the problem is that contrary to Proposition 3, some elements of $\lambda = \{\bar{\lambda}_i, \underline{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ might not be equal to 0 at the optimal solution of (\mathcal{RP}_λ) . This means that we cannot get a feasible solution of (\mathcal{P}) by solving (\mathcal{RP}_λ) even though we have a feasible solution for (\mathcal{RP}_λ) . However, this is not always the case, and for many practical applications the projected problem \mathcal{RP} is feasible for large enough projections. However, we can establish some results and bounds of how to approximate the optimal solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) (and consequently (\mathcal{P}) by Proposition 3) by solving the projected problem (\mathcal{RP}_λ) . To do this, we want to show that the optimal objective value of (\mathcal{P}) is close to the optimal objective of (\mathcal{RP}_λ) up to some approximation error. Namely, we want to find E such that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E \leq \sigma(\mathcal{P}) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda), \quad (46)$$

where σ denotes the optimal objective value of the problems.

Recall that $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)$ under the assumption that all the dual variables of (\mathcal{P}) are bounded. This means that we can find E for $\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E \leq \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda)$ instead of (46). The right-hand side is straightforward, since for any projected solution we can find a feasible solution of the original problem with the same objective value. To find the left-hand side $\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E \leq \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)$, we follow a similar approach to that presented in [13], but adapted for the SDP case.

Proposition 4. *Let $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)$ be the objective value of the original problem, and $\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda)$ be the objective value of the projected problem. Then we have that*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda).$$

Proof. Let (Y^*, λ^*) be the optimal solution of the projected problem. Then, the objective value will be $\sigma(\mathcal{RP}) = \langle PCP^\top, Y^* \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i = \sum_{(i,j)} (PCP^\top)_{i,j} Y_{i,j}^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i$. Let $\hat{X} = P^\top Y^* P$. Then the objective evaluated at feasible \hat{X} is $\langle C, P^\top Y^* P \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i = C_{i,j} (P^\top V^* P)_{i,j} + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i = \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda)$. Since the optimal value of the projected problem can always be mapped to a feasible solution of the original problem with the same objective value, we have that $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 11 (Approximate Optimality). *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a RP as that of Lemma 7, (X^*, λ^*) be the optimal solution of (\mathcal{P}_λ) , and z^* be the optimal solution of (\mathcal{RD}_λ) . Then, with probability at least $1 - 8(r_C r_{X^*} + \sum_i^m r_{A_i} r_{X^*}) e^{-c\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$ we have*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E \leq \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda),$$

where $E = 3\epsilon \|C\|_F \|X^*\|_* + \sum_i^m \max\{3z_i^* \epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*, -3z_i^* \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*\}$, r_C is the rank of C , r_{X^*} is the rank of X^* , and r_{A_i} denotes the ranks of A_i .

Proof. Let (X^*, λ^*) be the optimal solution to \mathcal{P}_λ and $Y' = PX^*P^\top$ be its projection. Then, we start by constructing the following auxiliary problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \langle PCP^\top, Y \rangle + \sum_i^m \bar{\lambda}_i ub_i - \sum_i^m \underline{\lambda}_i lb_i & (\mathcal{RP}'_\lambda) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle PA_iP^\top, Y \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i - ((\langle A_i, X^* + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^* \rangle) - (\langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*)), \\ & Y \succeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The projected solution (Y', λ^*) is feasible for the auxiliary problem. To see this, note that since (X^*, λ^*) is feasible for (\mathcal{P}_λ) , $\langle A_i, X^* \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^* = b_i$ for all i . Therefore, $\langle PA_iP^\top, Y \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i - \underline{\lambda}_i = b_i - b_i + \langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*$, which is satisfied by (Y', λ^*) . Since (Y', λ^*) is feasible for the auxiliary problem and we are minimising, we know that the objective value evaluated at Y' is greater than or equal to the optimal objective of the auxiliary problem, namely that

$$\langle PCP^\top, Y' \rangle + \sum_i^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_i^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i \geq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}'_\lambda).$$

Now, we want to find M_1, M_2 such that

$$M_1 \geq \langle PCP^\top, Y' \rangle + \sum_i^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_i^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i \geq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}'_\lambda) \geq M_2.$$

To find M_1 , note that from Lemma 7, $\langle PCP^\top, Y' \rangle \leq \langle C, X^* \rangle + 3\epsilon \|C\|_F \|X^*\|_*$ with probability at least $1 - 8(r_{C^*} r_{X^*}) e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$, where $\langle C, X^* \rangle + \sum_i^m \bar{\lambda}_i^* ub_i - \sum_i^m \underline{\lambda}_i^* lb_i = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)$ and $\lambda^* \geq 0$. Therefore, we have that

$$M_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) + 3\epsilon \|C\|_F \|X^*\|_*.$$

Now, to find M_2 consider the dual of (\mathcal{RP}'_λ) :

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_i^m y_i (b_i - ((\langle A_i, X^* \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*) - (\langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*))) & (\mathcal{RD}'_\lambda) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum PA_iP^\top y_i \preceq PCP^\top \\ & lb_i \leq y_i \leq ub_i. \end{aligned}$$

By weak duality of the auxiliary problem, we have that $\sigma(\mathcal{RP}'_\lambda) \geq \sigma(\mathcal{RD}'_\lambda)$. Now, the original projected dual (\mathcal{RD}_λ) and the auxiliary projected dual (\mathcal{RD}'_λ) have the same feasible region, which means that the optimal solution of the projected dual z^* is feasible for the auxiliary dual. This implies that $\sigma(\mathcal{RD}'_\lambda) \geq \sum_i^m z_i^* (b_i - ((\langle A_i, X^* \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*) - (\langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*)))$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathcal{RP}'_\lambda) & \geq \sum_i^m z_i^* (b_i - ((\langle A_i, X^* \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*) - (\langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle + \bar{\lambda}_i^* - \underline{\lambda}_i^*))) \\ & = \sigma(\mathcal{RD}_\lambda) - \sum_i^m z_i^* (\langle A_i, X^* \rangle - \langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle) \\ & = \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - \sum_i^m z_i^* (\langle A_i, X^* \rangle - \langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 7, $|\langle A_i, X^* \rangle - \langle PA_iP^\top, Y' \rangle|$ is bounded by $3\epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*$ for each i with probability at least $1 - 8(r_{A_i} r_{X^*}) e^{-C\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$. Following this, we have that

$$M_2 = \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E_1$$

where $E_1 = \sum_i \max\{3z_i^* \epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*, -3z_i^* \epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*\}$. Note that E_1 is never non-negative. If the dual variable z_i^* is negative, then the right-hand side term of E_1 will be chosen. On the

other hand, if z_i^* is positive, then the left term will be chosen. Adding everything together we get that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) + 3\epsilon\|C\|_F\|X^*\|_* \geq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E_1$$

with probability at least $1 - 8(r_C r_{X^*} + \sum_i^m r_{A_i} r_{X^*})e^{-\mathcal{C}\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$. Therefore, we obtain the desired result that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \geq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E$$

for $E = 3\epsilon\|C\|_F\|X^*\|_* + E_1$ with probability at least $1 - 8(r_C r_{X^*} + \sum_i^m r_{A_i} r_{X^*})e^{-\mathcal{C}\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$. \square

Recall that since (\mathcal{P}_λ) and (\mathcal{P}) share the same objective, this bound also applies to the optimal value of (\mathcal{P}) . This is captured in the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a RP as that of Lemma 7, (X^*, λ^*) be a solution to (\mathcal{P}_λ) , and z^* be a solution of (\mathcal{RD}_λ) . Then, with probability at least $1 - 8(r_C r_{X^*} + \sum_i^m r_{A_i} r_{X^*})e^{-\mathcal{C}\epsilon^2 k^5 \gamma^4}$ we have*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda) - E \leq \sigma(\mathcal{P}) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{RP}_\lambda),$$

where $E = 3\epsilon\|C\|_F\|X^*\|_* + \sum_i^m \max\{3z_i^* \epsilon \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*, -3z_i^* \|A_i\|_F \|X^*\|_*\}$, and r_C is the rank of C , r_{X^*} is the rank of X^* , and r_{A_i} are the rank of A_i .

It is important to recall again that by solving (\mathcal{RP}_λ) we do not necessarily get a feasible solution for (\mathcal{P}) . Moreover, we need to assume that the dual variables of the original problem are bounded and we need to know these bounds in advance, which is not always straightforward. However, there are some applications such as polynomial optimization that satisfy this assumption and where having a feasible solution to the original problem is not necessary. For most practical applications computational experiments show that if the projected dimension is large enough and the projector is dense enough the projection is almost always feasible. However, knowing this in advance for general problems is hard. There are some applications of SDP relaxations of QCQP such as MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT where the projected problem is almost always feasible. This allows us to not need dual bounds in advance, and also to retrieve a feasible solution for the original problem after projection.

Lastly, we want to present an updated lower bound on k that ensures that the probability of Corollary 2 stays close enough to 1. Assume we want to probability to be at least $1 - \delta$, then we have that

$$k \geq \left(\frac{\ln(8(r_C r_{X^*} + \sum_i^m r_{A_i} r_{X^*})/\delta)}{\mathcal{C}\epsilon^2 \gamma^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}}.$$

5. COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY

In this section, we aim to answer the question of how much it is saved in terms of computational complexity when solving the projected problem. We compare the complexity of solving the two problems using IPMs, but we also take into account the complexity of projecting down the original problem. It is important to point out that we are comparing the time complexity of the original problem and an approximation. However, knowing how much faster the projected problem is can still be very valuable, even if the solution quality is worse. Big saving of the projected problem, even at the cost of accuracy, can motivate the use of random projections embedded into iterative algorithms.

Let us start by considering the differences in complexity when solving a semidefinite programming problem and its projection using IPMs. For this solution approach and a problem of matrix size n and m constraints, the complexity of each iteration is $\mathcal{O}(mn^3 + m^2 n^2 + m^3)$, and we need $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} \log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations to get an ϵ solution. Note that we do not assume that $n > m$, since

for some applications such as polynomial optimization we might have more constraints than the size of the matrix variable. This means that it takes

$$\mathcal{O}((mn^{3.5} + m^2n^{2.5} + \sqrt{nm^3}) \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad (47)$$

to solve the problem to ϵ accuracy. Recall that the projected problem has a variable matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ and m constraints. However, since $k = \mathcal{O}(\ln n)$ the complexity of solving the projected problem to ϵ accuracy is

$$\mathcal{O}((m \ln^{3.5} n + m^2 \ln^{2.5} n + \sqrt{\ln nm^3}) \log(1/\epsilon)). \quad (48)$$

Now, it is necessary to clarify that the accuracy ϵ in (47) and (48) does not refer to the same solution. Since the projected problem is an approximation of the original problem, (48) refers to the complexity of getting ϵ accuracy with respect to the approximation, whose value is worse than that of the original SDP.

Moreover, we also need to take into account the complexity of projecting all the matrices in the problem. The methodology proposed in this paper can be broken down into three main steps: sampling the random projector, projecting all the matrices of the problem with this projector, and solving the projected problem. The computational complexity of sampling the projector P is roughly $\mathcal{O}(1)$ per entry, which makes the total complexity $\mathcal{O}(kn)$ for the projected dimension k and the original dimension n . We do not need to perform a matrix transpose operator to get P^\top since we can just swap the indices of entries of P . For a problem with m constraints we need to project $m + 1$ matrices of size $n \times n$. Matrices are projected using the positive map $\phi_P : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ that maps $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to $PAP^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$. The complexity of applying this map is $\mathcal{O}(kn^2 + nk^2)$. Since we have to project $(m + 1)$ matrices of size $n \times n$, the total complexity is $\mathcal{O}((m + 1)(kn^2 + nk^2))$. If matrix P has r non-zero entries per column and P^\top has z , then the complexity of PA is $\mathcal{O}(knr)$ and the complexity of PAP^\top is $\mathcal{O}(knr + knz)$. Again, since we have to project $m + 1$ of these matrices, the total complexity of projecting using a sparse projector is $\mathcal{O}((m + 1)(knr + knz))$. Note that for some applications such as MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT, the number of non-zero entries per column is 1, so the complexity is even smaller. For this case, projecting a matrix A_i with 0s everywhere except a 1 in entry A_{ii} is equivalent to taking the outer product of the i th columns of P . The complexity of the outer product of two vectors is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ where n is the length of the vector. When the vector is sparse and only r entries are non-zero, the complexity is $\mathcal{O}(r^2)$.

Adding everything together we have that the original complexity to achieve ϵ accuracy (for the original problem) is

$$\mathcal{O}((mn^{3.5} + m^2n^{2.5} + m^3\sqrt{n}) \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad (49)$$

while the complexity to solve the projection up to ϵ (with respect to the projected objective, which is known to be close to the original one with high probability) is

$$\mathcal{O}(kn) + \mathcal{O}((m + 1)(kn^2 + nk^2)) + \mathcal{O}((m \ln^{3.5} n + m^2 \ln^{2.5} n + m^3 \sqrt{\ln n}) \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad (50)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(mn^2 \ln n) + \mathcal{O}((m \ln^{3.5} n + m^2 \ln^{2.5} n + m^3 \ln^{0.5} n) \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad (51)$$

Also, recall that to retrieve a feasible solution to the original problem we need to apply the inverse of the congruence map. However, this does not change the complexity since it would be $\mathcal{O}((m + 1)(kn^2 + nk^2))$, which is already considered.

By using *soft- \mathcal{O}* notation, which hides polylogarithmic factors, we are able to compare them easier. For the original problem, the complexity remains the same, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((mn^{3.5} + m^2n^{2.5} + m^3n^{0.5}) \log(1/\epsilon))$. However, for the projected case, the complexity reduces to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(mn^2) + \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m^3 \log(1/\epsilon)). \quad (52)$$

Note that for the projection method, we have the constant term $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(mn^2)$, which comes from the matrix multiplication before projection. In reality, since the projector is sparse, the complexity of matrix multiplication can be reduced. Moreover, computational experiments show that we

can usually increase the sparsity parameter sub-linearly with respect to the dimension. This means that the larger the dimension, the sparser we can make the projector, and this relation does not seem to show a linear behavior. Our belief is that it might be logarithmic. However, proving this formally is out of the scope of this paper. Lastly, it is important to bear in mind that one of the main drawbacks of interior point methods is running into memory issues. These memory problems can be drastically reduced by the use of random projections.

6. COMPUTATIONAL EXPERIMENTS

We now present some computational experiments and test our method on different applications. Recall that the optimality bound is additive in terms of the constraints, and depends on the nuclear and Frobenius norm of the data matrices and the solution matrix. This means that projections of SDP problems with a small number of constraints and data matrices with a small nuclear norm or small Frobenius norm will work better. Following this, we apply our method to the semidefinite relaxations of MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT, since the constraint data matrices of these problems have nuclear and Frobenius norm equal to one. The norm of the objective matrix C is problem-dependent, but one can estimate its dimension depending on the parameters of the problems such as the number of variables and the ratio of clauses for MAX-2-SAT, or the number of vertices and the density of the graph for MAXCUT. For these problems, we show that a projected SDP relaxation that considerably reduces the dimension of the SDP problem can be solved while getting reasonable bounds for the original problems. We also explore applications of our method to binary polynomial optimization problems. In particular, we show that it can be applied to solve the second level of the Lasserre Hierarchy for some instances of the Stable Set Problem.

We present MAXCUT results for two types of graphs. First, we explore the G-set dataset taken from [53]. However, this first experiment shows that our method performs much better on unweighted graphs and that the larger the graph, the better the quality of the projection. Following this, we also explore some larger unweighted random graphs generated using the rudy¹ graph generator by G. Rinaldi. For MAX-2-SAT, we use randomly generated formulas generated from a DIMACS² challenge. For the stable set problem, we study the complement of generalised Petersen graphs, the complement of Helm graphs, the complement of Jahangir’s graphs, and the complement of the graphs presented in [16]. All computational experiments were conducted on a Dell PowerEdge R740 server, equipped with 4 Intel Gold 6234 processors of 3.3GHz, 8 cores, and 16 threads. The main implementation is in Python [48], and we use Mosek as the SDP solver with default configuration [4].

6.1. Semidefinite Relaxations. Semidefinite programming programs are particularly useful when approximating hard classes of optimization problems such as non-convex quadratic programs [8, 17, 37]. These relaxations are more powerful than linear programming (LP) relaxations and often provide a good approximation of the original problem. In this subsection, we present computational results for two of these problems: MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT. The maximum cut problem (MAXCUT) is the problem of finding the partition of a graph where the number of edges connecting the two new sets is maximised. This problem is known to be NP-hard [33]. Let $G = (E, V)$ be a non-directed graph where E is the set of edges and V is the set of vertices. We define the variables x_v for $v \in V$, and z_{uv} for $uv \in E$. We want to maximize the number of edges connecting vertices belonging to different sets after we cut the set by half. The SDP relaxation of MAXCUT is

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \langle L, X \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle A_i, X \rangle = 1 \quad i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

¹<https://www-user.tu-chemnitz.de/~helmberg/rudy.tar.gz>

²<https://dimacs.rutgers.edu/pub/challenge/satisfiability/contributed/selman/>

$$X \succeq 0$$

where $L \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the Laplacian matrix of the graph, and A_i are the matrices that makes sure that the diagonal element i th of X is equal to one. On the other hand, the maximum 2-satisfiability problem (MAX-2-SAT) seeks to find an assignment to the variables of a logic formula such that the maximum number of clauses is satisfied, where we have at most two variables per clause. An example of such a formula with three clauses and 5 variables is:

$$(x_1 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee x_5) \quad (53)$$

The formulation of the SDP relaxation of MAX-2-SAT is very similar to that of MAXCUT. The only difference is that instead of L we have a matrix W that represents the sum of the clauses in the formula. Both MAXCUT and MAX-2-SAT share the same feasible region, i.e. psd matrices with 1s in the diagonal. Applying the projection PA_iP^\top to these data matrices is equivalent to taking the outer product of the i th column of the projector P . This makes computing the projections much more efficient, and also allows us to investigate the feasibility of the projected problem in more detail. Moreover, the larger the problem size, the sparser we can make the projector without getting an infeasible projection. Following this, we use different projectors depending on the problem size: the classic sparse Achlioptas projector [1], which has a density of 0.3, is used for problems of size 800 and the sparse projector from [13] with densities 0.05 and 0.03 is used for matrices of size 5000 and 7000, respectively.

We start testing MAXCUT on the standard G-set library, a collection of 67 medium to large-scale graphs [53]. Results for G-set graphs with 800 nodes are shown in Table 1. Graphs G1 to G5 are random graphs with 800 vertices, unit weights and a density of 6%. Graphs G6 to G10 are the same graphs with edge weights taken randomly from $\{-1, 1\}$. Graphs G11 to G13 are toroidal grids that also have random edge weights from $\{-1, 1\}$ and 800 vertices, while G14 to G17 are composed of the union of two (almost maximal) planar graphs with unit weights. Graphs G18 to G21 are 800 vertices planar graphs but with random $\{-1, 1\}$ edge weights. The rest of the graphs in the dataset follow the same generation pattern but with more nodes. In this paper, we only present the results for graphs of size 800 since the insights we get from larger graphs are similar.

In all the computational experiments we present results in terms of relative time and relative quality percentages. Relative time of the projected problem is the proportion of time taken to solve the projected problem compared to solving the original SDP problem. For example, a relative time of 5% implies that we can solve the projected problem in 5% of the time taken to solve the original sdp. Relative quality measures the quality of the bound obtained with the projection with respect to the quality of the original sdp. From these experiments, we can see that our method performs much better on unweighted graphs. For graphs G1 to G5, which are random unweighted graphs with a density of 6%, we can solve a problem whose variable matrix is a tenth of the size of the original relaxation while getting an approximation quality of over 80%. For the other types of unweighted graphs, from G14 to G17, similar results are obtained. However, results for weighted graphs are not as positive. This might be because the norm of the Laplacian matrix of weighted graphs is larger. Since the computational times with the Achlioptas projector were generally slower than those of sparse matrices, we switch to using the projectors proposed by D'Ambrosio et al. in [13] for the rest of the experiments. The reason we have not presented those results directly in Table 1 is so that they can be compared with future performance.

Following this, we now present in Table 2 results for unweighted graphs of dimension 5000 generated using rudy. We show results for different graphs generated with two different seeds for densities of 5% or 10%, 15%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50%. We present analogous results for dimension 7000 in Table 3. For these, we just present results for 10% since this projection has more computational savings. We can get an approximation quality of over 95% by solving the problem in a third of the time for 5000 node graphs and half of the time for 5000 node graphs.

TABLE 1. Relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to the original relaxation of MAXCUT of G-graphs with 800 nodes using an Achlioptas projector [1]

Instance	m	10% projection		20% projection	
		Time	Quality	Time	Quality
G1	19176	52.78	82.79	261.86	86.99
G2	19176	46.28	82.61	222.94	86.63
G3	19176	42.57	82.58	259.63	86.65
G4	19176	49.62	82.56	273.76	86.44
G5	19176	47.65	82.51	200.39	86.67
G6	19176	52.67	18.52	255.35	37.09
G7	19176	55.69	14.33	238.72	34.08
G8	19176	56.10	13.16	384.84	33.17
G9	19176	62.13	14.96	316.96	34.67
G10	19176	45.42	14.44	292.81	34.33
G11	1600	51.93	22.17	243.63	44.71
G12	1600	56.37	19.97	313.99	42.88
G13	1600	47.95	20.74	319.77	42.62
G14	4694	45.97	79.77	262.67	85.80
G15	4661	43.82	79.53	191.34	85.61
G16	4672	47.32	79.98	233.20	85.94
G17	4667	39.36	79.74	197.72	85.89
G18	4694	54.25	20.80	242.70	40.18
G19	4661	46.54	14.44	231.37	35.33
G20	4672	51.99	15.59	236.06	37.68
G21	4667	53.43	14.63	216.14	36.51

The longer time for larger graphs might be due to the tuning of the sparsity parameter. As we will see later in Table 4, when the projector is tuned correctly we can solve the problem with high accuracy a fourth of the time even for large graphs.

In tables 2 and 3 we can see how random projections seem to work better for denser graphs. Overall, for the same density, the projection quality is better for larger graphs. This is illustrated better in Figure 1, which shows the quality of the projections for several graphs with density 30% and increasing size. These results are taken from an average of 5 different graphs for each size.

From current results, we can assume that the quality of projections will keep increasing, or at least be maintained, for even larger graphs. Very large graphs cannot be directly solved using Mosek since it runs into memory problems so they are harder to compare. We can instead use random projections to solve large-scale MAXCUT problems generated by rudy with a good approximation quality. However, the sparsity parameter of the projector is key to getting a feasible approximation that is solved in a reasonable amount of time. Too dense projectors might lead to too long computational times. An analysis of this sparsity parameter for a 10k nodes graph is presented in Table 4.

It is also interesting to see the results of MAX-2-SAT since even though the feasible region is the same (meaning that the same feasibility argument applies), the objective matrix is different. Results for randomly generated formulas generated from a DIMACS³ challenge are presented

³<https://dimacs.rutgers.edu/pub/challenge/satisfiability/cotributed/selman/>

TABLE 2. Relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to the original relaxation of MAXCUT of 5000 vertices rudy graphs of different densities (%) for 10% projection using a 5% sparse projector from D’Ambrosio et al. [13]

Instance	m	Density	10% projection	
			Time	Quality
mcp-5000-5-1	624875	5	37.53	91.16
mcp-5000-5-2	624875	5	33.07	91.14
mcp-5000-10-1	1249750	10	30.88	93.69
mcp-5000-10-2	1249750	10	24.32	93.68
mcp-5000-15-1	1874625	15	29.83	94.89
mcp-5000-15-2	1874625	15	26.15	94.90
mcp-5000-20-1	2499500	20	34.59	95.67
mcp-5000-20-2	2499500	20	27.68	95.68
mcp-5000-30-1	3749250	30	27.41	96.65
mcp-5000-30-2	3749250	30	28.91	96.66
mcp-5000-40-1	4999000	40	32.97	97.29
mcp-5000-40-2	4999000	40	29.05	97.30
mcp-5000-50-1	6248750	50	23.72	97.78
mcp-5000-50-2	6248750	50	29.66	97.78

TABLE 3. Relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to the original relaxation of MAXCUT of 7000 vertices rudy graphs of different densities (%) for 10% projection using a 4% sparse projector from D’Ambrosio et al. [13]

Instance	m	Density	10% projection	
			Time	Quality
mcp-7000-5-1	1224825	5	54.24	92.62
mcp-7000-5-2	1224825	5	61.82	92.61
mcp-7000-10-1	2449650	10	64.24	94.77
mcp-7000-10-2	2449650	10	56.90	94.76
mcp-7000-15-1	3674475	15	55.91	95.78
mcp-7000-15-2	3674475	15	68.48	95.79
mcp-7000-20-1	4899300	20	55.70	96.43
mcp-7000-20-2	4899300	20	54.67	96.43
mcp-7000-30-1	7348950	30	56.24	97.24
mcp-7000-30-2	7348950	30	54.33	97.24
mcp-7000-40-1	9798600	40	54.45	97.78
mcp-7000-40-2	9798600	40	48.72	97.77
mcp-7000-50-1	12248250	50	35.32	98.18
mcp-7000-50-2	12248250	50	53.69	98.17

in Table 5. We can see how we can get an approximation of around 70% for most cases by projecting to either 10% or 20% of the original size.

Now, we are interested to see if the quality of the projections becomes better as we increase the dimension of the graphs. Following this, Figure 1 shows the average (among 5 graphs per size) progression of the quality as we increase the number of vertices of graphs generated by rudy with a density of 30%. Here we can see that we get better and better approximations by projecting the matrix to a tenth of its original size. Moreover, the computation savings also

TABLE 4. Comparison of relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to the original SDP relaxation for different sparsity parameters (%) of the sparse projectors from D’Ambrosio et al. [13] for a 5% and 10% projection of a 10.000 nodes rudy graph with 20% edge density, where infeasibility is denoted by -

Sparsity	5% projection		10% projection	
	Time	Quality	Time	Quality
99	-	-	-	-
98	-	-	27.80	96.64
97	-	-	39.29	97.04
96	-	-	79.11	97.13
95	-	-	114.72	97.16
94	-	-	80.08	97.18
93	24.91	96.37	101.40	97.20
92	23.57	96.50	157.81	97.21

TABLE 5. Relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to the original relaxation of MAX-2-SAT for formulas with different number of clauses n and clause to variable ratio C with sparse projectors from D’Ambrosio et al. [13]

Instance	n	C	10% projection		20% projection	
			Time	Quality	Time	Quality
urand-5000-5000	5000	1.0	11.54	66.95	45.78	75.87
urand-5000-5100	5000	1.02	22.03	67.28	39.82	75.52
urand-5000-5200	5000	1.04	15.90	67.27	44.07	75.62
urand-5000-5300	5000	1.06	13.87	66.78	44.26	75.38
urand-5000-5500	5000	1.1	11.35	67.09	41.66	75.46
urand-5000-5800	5000	1.16	16.29	66.63	34.65	74.97
urand-5000-5900	5000	1.18	11.32	66.92	40.89	75.13
urand-5000-6000	5000	1.2	10.62	66.25	44.20	75.10
urand-5000-6100	5000	1.22	20.97	66.71	39.44	74.89
urand-5000-6200	5000	1.24	19.39	66.81	38.51	75.31
urand-5000-6300	5000	1.26	14.68	67.02	44.66	75.21
urand-5000-6400	5000	1.28	18.34	66.80	41.28	74.93
urand-5000-6500	5000	1.3	19.74	66.63	43.44	74.55
urand-5000-6600	5000	1.32	13.49	66.49	46.54	74.74
urand-5000-6700	5000	1.34	18.65	66.64	46.45	74.88
urand-5000-6800	5000	1.36	14.86	66.61	44.34	75.08
urand-5000-6900	5000	1.38	12.67	66.59	45.53	74.55
urand-5000-7100	5000	1.42	14.96	66.55	41.86	74.39

grow with dimension, reaching a point in which the original problem cannot be solved but the projected one can.

Lastly, Lemma 8 can also be used to solve SDP feasibility problems of reduced dimension. By correctly picking the projection size and the projector density we can ensure that the projected feasibility problem will be feasible with high probability given that the original problem is feasible. If the original problem is infeasible, the projected problem is infeasible with probability 1 since the feasible region of the projected problem is always contained in the feasible region of the original problem, as indicated in Corollary 1. Now, a possible application of this is solving the Gap Relaxation of the satisfiability problem 2-SAT, or other SDP relaxations of more general




FIGURE 1. Geometric mean of approximation for a 10% projection of MAXCUT for different graph sizes of rudy graphs with 30% density

k -SAT problems [26, 28]. The SDP relaxation of 2-SAT is

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{find } X \succeq 0 && (54) \\
 &\text{s.t. } \text{diag}(X) = 1 \\
 &\quad \text{sign}(x_i)X_{0,i} + \text{sign}(x_j)X_{0,j} - \text{sign}(x_i x_j)X_{0,j} = 1 \quad \forall (i, j) \in C,
 \end{aligned}$$

where C is the set of clauses involving two variables, and entry $X_{0,i}$ is associated with x_i and $X_{i,j}$ with $x_i x_j$. We can solve this problem to detect unsatisfiability. If this relaxation is not feasible, then the formula is not satisfiable. If the projected problem is not feasible, then we know for sure that the gap relaxation (54) is also infeasible. However, the projected problem may be infeasible while the original one is feasible. But if the projected dimension and the sparsity of the projector are chosen right, this happens with very low probability. Table 6 shows how for 20% and 50% projections, we can in many cases trust the result of the projection.

TABLE 6. Proportion (%) of feasible (satisfiable) instances of 2-SAT that are also feasible after projection (among 10 satisfiable randomly generated formulas).

n	C	20% projection	50% projection
500	0.5	100	100
	1	0	100
	2	0	100
1000	0.5	100	100
	1	0	100
	2	0	100
2000	0.5	100	100
	1	0	100
	2	0	100

6.2. Binary Polynomial Optimization. Polynomial optimization refers to the study of optimization problems where the objective and the constraint functions are polynomials. Many optimization problems fall into this category, including binary problems since one can encode binary variables in polynomial constraints. Problems with binary variables can be written as

polynomial optimization problems by adding the constraint $x^2 = x$. However, polynomial optimization problems become nonlinear as soon as the degree of the polynomial is larger than 1, and one does not have to increase the degree too much before these problems become extremely difficult to solve. For instance, polynomial optimization problems with objective function and constraints of degree 2 are quadratically constrained quadratic programs (QCQP), which are known to be NP-hard for the general case [7]. Moreover, Nesterov showed in [38] that the maximization of cubic or quartic forms over the Euclidean ball is NP-hard. But still, polynomial optimization problems appear in many applications, such as graph and combinatorics problems [20, 31, 32], or to search for Lyapunov functions in control problems [21, 43]. In the early 2000s, a new theory was developed that allowed to approximate any polynomial optimization problem by solving a sequence of convex optimization problems. In particular, Lasserre [29] and Parrilo [42] showed that we can construct a hierarchy of semidefinite programming (SDP) problems that converges to the optimal global solution of the polynomial optimization problem. Even though SDP problems can be solved to any desired accuracy in polynomial time using algorithms such as interior method (IP) methods [39], they scale quite badly in practice since current technology cannot handle the memory requirements of IP methods. This means that in practice, since the size of the aforementioned hierarchies grows very quickly, for most practical applications one cannot solve more than the first level of problems of up to 10 variables [2].

We now present experiments for the SOS relaxation of the Stable Set Problem. But first, let us quickly introduce SOS relaxations of PO problems. consider the following polynomial optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(x) && \text{(PO)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g_i(x) \geq 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, s \end{aligned}$$

where $f(x)$ and $g_i(x)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ are polynomials. Note that finding the optimal value of this function is equal to finding the largest γ so that when we subtract γ from the objective function we remain nonnegative for all feasible x . Following this, the optimal value of (PO) is equivalent to that of the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \gamma \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in K \end{aligned}$$

where K is the semialgebraic set $K = \{x \mid g_i(x) \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, s\}$. In general, characterising the non-negativity of a polynomial over a semialgebraic set is a hard problem. Under an assumption on K called the archimedean condition, which is similar to compactness (see [32] for more details), one can use Putinar's Positivstellensatz to replace the non-negativity condition $f(x) - \gamma \geq 0$ by the following positivity certificate

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \gamma && \text{(SOS)} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f(x) - \gamma = \sigma_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i(x)g_i(x), \\ & \sigma_0, \sigma_i(x) \in \Sigma[x] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, s \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma[x]$ is the subring of sum-of-squares polynomials. We can then bound the degree of the polynomials $\sigma_0, \sigma_i(x)$ by t to get a hierarchy of approximations (SOS- t) of the original problem [29, 42]. This hierarchy converges to the optimal solution as we increase the degree bound t . We can then use the fact that a polynomial p of degree $2d$ is a SOS polynomial if and only if it can be written as

$$p(x) = z(x)^\top Q z(x)$$

for some positive semidefinite matrix Q and the vector $z(x)$ of monomials of degree up to d . Following this, we rewrite the previous (bounded degree) problem as an SDP problem by adding a psd matrix for each SOS polynomial in (SOS- t). The size of these matrices will be $\binom{n+d}{d} \times \binom{n+d}{d}$ where $2d$ is the degree of the SOS polynomials we want to represent, and n is the number of variables of the problem.

The stable set problem is the problem of finding the maximum stable set in a graph, where a set of vertices is stable if no vertices are connected with an edge. Let $G = (E, V)$ be a non-directed graph defined by the set of vertices E , and edges V . We want to find the maximum number of vertices $v \in V$ such that no two chosen vertices are connected by an edge. In the polynomial optimization problem, we encode the binary variables using the polynomial $x_v^2 = x_v$ for each vertex. An advantage of the polynomial formulation is that we can use the Lasserre Hierarchy to obtain tighter bounds than for the IP formulation.

For some classes of graphs, such as perfect graphs, the first level of the relaxation is enough to get the optimal independence number. However, for so-called imperfect graphs, one needs to go to the second, or even further, level to get the optimal solution. We are interested in this class of graphs and show that our methodology can be applied to them to reduce the computational burden of solving the second level of the hierarchy. We focus on four sets of imperfect graphs: generalised Petersen graphs, helm graphs, Jahagir’s graph, and imperfect graphs generated with the method introduced in [16], which we refer to as cordones graphs. We decided to work with the complement since the resulting SDPs will have fewer constraints, which is a desirable feature for our method. We denote generalised Petersen graphs as *petersen- v - k* , where v is the number of vertices in the inner circle, and k is the modulo of the subscripts of the edges. Similarly, we denote helm graphs as *helm- v* where v is the number of vertices in the inner and outer circle, and Jahagir’s graph as *jahagir- v - k* where v is the number of vertices between inner vertices, and k is the number of inner vertices. We denote the graphs taken from Dobre and Vera [16] as *cordones- n* , and these graphs have $3n + 2$ vertices. For all graphs, we add the prefix *c-* to denote the complement of the graph.

TABLE 7. Relative time (%) and relative quality (%) with respect to different projections of the second level of the Stable Set Problem for dense imperfect graphs with n vertices, m edges and c constraints.

Graph	n	m	c	original 2 nd level		projected 2 nd level	
				Size	Qlt	Size	Time
c-petersen-20-2	40	720	102	821	82	99	7.63
c-petersen-30-2	60	1680	152	1831	183	100	2.24
c-petersen-40-2	80	3040	202	3241	324	100	4.48
c-cordones-20	62	1430	525	1954	195	75	7.27
c-cordones-30	92	3195	1085	4279	428	87	20.48
c-cordones-40	122	5660	1845	7504	750	89	18.33
c-helm-21	43	840	129	947	95	100	14.55
c-helm-31	63	1860	189	2017	202	100	2.29
c-helm-41	83	3280	249	3487	349	100	7.00
c-jahangir-17-2	35	544	88	631	63	99	5.88
c-jahangir-19-3	58	1577	136	1712	171	100	1.94
c-jahangir-41-2	83	3280	208	3487	349	100	4.18

It is important to note that for graphs with a large number of vertices, the moment approach is also simplified considerably. This means that if were to solve the problem using this method, the size of the psd matrices of the second level would not be as large as those of Table 7. However, these experiments show that for polynomial optimization problems with a small number of constraints random projections work well.

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have presented updated probabilistic bounds for some of the most used results in the theory of RPs for MPs that depend on the sparsity parameter of a sub-gaussian projection. We have then built on these bounds to show that we can approximately solve semidefinite programming problems by applying RPs. We then evaluated the performance of the proposed method with some well-known applications of semidefinite relaxations. In particular, we show that we can project unweighted SDP relaxations of MAXCUT instances while achieving very high quality solutions. Slightly weaker results are obtained for relaxations of MAX-2-SAT. We also show that random projections can be applied to feasibility problems, such as the Gap relaxation of 2-SAT. Lastly, we also project the SDP appearing in the second level of the Lasserre Hierarchy of the Stable Set Problem. We show that for problems with very few constraints, RPs work well. Since in practice, we could only apply this methodology for PO problems that have few constraints, it is also sensible to think that the constraint aggregation approach of [35] might also be promising for this application. We have started exploring this research direction, but presenting it here is beyond the scope of this paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project has been partially funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) through their pre-doctoral fellowship programme.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Achlioptas. “Database-friendly random projections”. In: *Proceedings of the twentieth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*. SIGMOD/PODS01. ACM, May 2001. DOI: 10.1145/375551.375608.
- [2] A. A. Ahmadi, S. Dash, and G. Hall. *Optimization over Structured Subsets of Positive Semidefinite Matrices via Column Generation*. 2015. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1512.05402.
- [3] N. Ailon and B. Chazelle. “The Fast Johnson–Lindenstrauss Transform and Approximate Nearest Neighbors”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 39.1 (Jan. 2009), pp. 302–322. DOI: 10.1137/060673096.
- [4] M. ApS. *The MOSEK Optimizer API for Python 10.1.28*. 2024.
- [5] A. Bluhm and D. S. Franca. “Dimensionality reduction of SDPs through sketching”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 563 (Feb. 2019), pp. 461–475. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2018.11.012.
- [6] C. Boutsidis, A. Zouzias, and P. Drineas. *Random Projections for k-means Clustering*. 2010. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1011.4632.
- [7] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511804441.
- [8] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. “Semidefinite Programming Relaxations of Non-Convex Problems in Control and Combinatorial Optimization”. In: *Communications, Computation, Control, and Signal Processing*. Springer US, 1997, pp. 279–287. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4615-6281-8_15.
- [9] S. Burer. “Semidefinite Programming in the Space of Partial Positive Semidefinite Matrices”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 14.1 (Jan. 2003), pp. 139–172. DOI: 10.1137/s105262340240851x.
- [10] S. Burer and R. D. Monteiro. “A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 95.2 (Feb. 2003), pp. 329–357. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-002-0352-8.

- [11] S. Burer and R. D. Monteiro. “Local Minima and Convergence in Low-Rank Semidefinite Programming”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 103.3 (Dec. 2004), pp. 427–444. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-004-0564-1.
- [12] K. L. Clarkson and D. P. Woodruff. “Low-Rank PSD Approximation in Input-Sparsity Time”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2017. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611974782.134.
- [13] C. D’Ambrosio, L. Liberti, P.-L. Poirion, and K. Vu. “Random projections for quadratic programs”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 183.1-2 (June 2020), pp. 619–647. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-020-01517-x.
- [14] L. Ding and B. Grimmer. *Bundle Method Sketching for Low Rank Semidefinite Programming*. 2019. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1911.04443.
- [15] S. Dirksen. “Dimensionality Reduction with Subgaussian Matrices: A Unified Theory”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 16.5 (Aug. 2015), pp. 1367–1396. DOI: 10.1007/s10208-015-9280-x.
- [16] C. Dobre and J. Vera. “Exploiting symmetry in copositive programs via semidefinite hierarchies”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 151.2 (Mar. 2015), pp. 659–680. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-015-0879-0.
- [17] T. Fujie and M. Kojima. In: *Journal of Global Optimization* 10.4 (1997), pp. 367–380. DOI: 10.1023/a:1008282830093.
- [18] M. Fukuda, M. Kojima, K. Murota, and K. Nakata. “Exploiting Sparsity in Semidefinite Programming via Matrix Completion I: General Framework”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 11.3 (Jan. 2001), pp. 647–674. DOI: 10.1137/s1052623400366218.
- [19] K. Gatermann and P. A. Parrilo. “Symmetry groups, semidefinite programs, and sums of squares”. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 192.1-3 (Sept. 2004), pp. 95–128. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpaa.2003.12.011.
- [20] N. Gvozdenović and M. Laurent. “Semidefinite bounds for the stability number of a graph via sums of squares of polynomials”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 110.1 (Dec. 2006), pp. 145–173. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-006-0062-8.
- [21] D. Henrion and A. Garulli, eds. *Positive Polynomials in Control*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. DOI: 10.1007/b96977.
- [22] D. Henrion and J. Malick. “Projection methods for conic feasibility problems: applications to polynomial sum-of-squares decompositions”. In: *Optimization Methods and Software* 26.1 (Feb. 2011), pp. 23–46. DOI: 10.1080/10556780903191165.
- [23] P. Indyk and A. Naor. “Nearest-neighbor-preserving embeddings”. In: *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 3.3 (Aug. 2007), p. 31. DOI: 10.1145/1273340.1273347.
- [24] M. Journée, F. Bach, P.-A. Absil, and R. Sepulchre. “Low-Rank Optimization on the Cone of Positive Semidefinite Matrices”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20.5 (Jan. 2010), pp. 2327–2351. DOI: 10.1137/080731359.
- [25] B. Kalantari. *On the Equivalence of SDP Feasibility and a Convex Hull Relaxation for System of Quadratic Equations*. 2019. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1911.03989.
- [26] E. de Klerk and H. van Maaren. In: *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 37.3 (2003), pp. 285–305. DOI: 10.1023/a:1021208315170.
- [27] E. de Klerk. “Exploiting special structure in semidefinite programming: A survey of theory and applications”. In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 201.1 (Feb. 2010), pp. 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejor.2009.01.025.
- [28] E. de Klerk, H. van Maaren, and J. P. Warners. In: *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 24.1/2 (2000), pp. 37–65. DOI: 10.1023/a:1006362203438.
- [29] J. B. Lasserre. “Global Optimization with Polynomials and the Problem of Moments”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 11.3 (Jan. 2001), pp. 796–817. DOI: 10.1137/s1052623400366802.
- [30] J.-B. Lasserre, T. Kim-Chuan, and Y. Shouguang. *A bounded degree SOS hierarchy for polynomial optimization*. 2015. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1501.06126.

- [31] M. Laurent. “A Comparison of the Sherali-Adams, Lovász-Schrijver, and Lasserre Relaxations for 0–1 Programming”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 28.3 (Aug. 2003), pp. 470–496. DOI: 10.1287/moor.28.3.470.16391.
- [32] M. Laurent. “Sums of Squares, Moment Matrices and Optimization Over Polynomials”. In: *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry*. Springer New York, Sept. 2008, pp. 157–270. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-387-09686-5_7.
- [33] H. R. Lewis. “Computers and intractability. A guide to the theory of NP-completeness.” In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 48.2 (June 1983), pp. 498–500. DOI: 10.2307/2273574.
- [34] L. Liberti, B. Manca, A. Oustry, and P.-L. Poirion. “Random Projections for Semidefinite Programming”. In: *Optimization and Decision Science: Operations Research, Inclusion and Equity*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023, pp. 97–108. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-28863-0_9.
- [35] L. Liberti, P.-L. Poirion, and K. Vu. “Random projections for conic programs”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 626 (Oct. 2021), pp. 204–220. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2021.06.010.
- [36] J. Matoušek. “On variants of the Johnson–Lindenstrauss lemma”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 33.2 (Apr. 2008), pp. 142–156. DOI: 10.1002/rsa.20218.
- [37] Y. Nesterov, H. Wolkowicz, and Y. Ye. “Semidefinite Programming Relaxations of Non-convex Quadratic Optimization”. In: *Handbook of Semidefinite Programming*. Springer US, 2000, pp. 361–419. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4615-4381-7_13.
- [38] Y. Nesterov. “Random walk in a simplex and quadratic optimization over convex polytopes”. In: 2003.
- [39] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 1994. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611970791.
- [40] J. Nie and L. Wang. *Regularization Methods for SDP Relaxations in Large Scale Polynomial Optimization*. 2009. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.0909.3551.
- [41] B. O’Donoghue, E. Chu, N. Parikh, and S. Boyd. “Conic Optimization via Operator Splitting and Homogeneous Self-Dual Embedding”. In: (2013). DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1312.3039.
- [42] P. A. Parrilo. “Semidefinite programming relaxations for semialgebraic problems”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 96.2 (May 2003), pp. 293–320. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-003-0387-5.
- [43] P. A. Parrilo and A. Jadbabaie. “Approximation of the joint spectral radius using sum of squares”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 428.10 (May 2008), pp. 2385–2402. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2007.12.027.
- [44] P.-L. Poirion, B. F. Lourenço, and A. Takeda. “Random projections of linear and semidefinite problems with linear inequalities”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 664 (May 2023), pp. 24–60. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2023.01.013.
- [45] J. Renegar. “Accelerated first-order methods for hyperbolic programming”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 173.1-2 (Nov. 2017), pp. 1–35. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-017-1203-y.
- [46] J. A. Tropp, A. Yurtsever, M. Udell, and V. Cevher. “Practical Sketching Algorithms for Low-Rank Matrix Approximation”. In: *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 38.4 (Jan. 2017), pp. 1454–1485. DOI: 10.1137/17m1111590.
- [47] F. Vallentin. “Symmetry in semidefinite programs”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 430.1 (Jan. 2009), pp. 360–369. DOI: 10.1016/j.laa.2008.07.025.
- [48] G. Van Rossum and F. L. Drake. *Python 3 Reference Manual*. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace, 2009.
- [49] R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge University Press, Sept. 2018. DOI: 10.1017/9781108231596.
- [50] K. Vu, P.-L. Poirion, C. D’Ambrosio, and L. Liberti. “Random Projections for Quadratic Programs over a Euclidean Ball”. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 442–452. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-17953-3_33.

- [51] K. Vu, P.-L. Poirion, and L. Liberti. “Random Projections for Linear Programming”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 43.4 (Nov. 2018), pp. 1051–1071. DOI: 10.1287/moor.2017.0894.
- [52] D. P. Woodruff. “Sketching as a Tool for Numerical Linear Algebra”. In: (2014). DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1411.4357.
- [53] Y. Ye. *G-set Dataset*. 2003. DOI: [https://web.stanford.edu/yye/yye/Gset/..](https://web.stanford.edu/yye/yye/Gset/)
- [54] A. Yurtsever, O. Fercoq, and V. Cevher. *A Conditional Gradient-Based Augmented Lagrangian Framework*. 2019. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1901.04013.
- [55] X.-Y. Zhao, D. Sun, and K.-C. Toh. “A Newton-CG Augmented Lagrangian Method for Semidefinite Programming”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20.4 (Jan. 2010), pp. 1737–1765. DOI: 10.1137/080718206.
- [56] Y. Zheng, R. P. Mason, and A. Papachristodoulou. “Scalable Design of Structured Controllers Using Chordal Decomposition”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 63.3 (Mar. 2018), pp. 752–767. DOI: 10.1109/tac.2017.2726578.