

Scaling and Universality of the Complexity of Analog Computation

Yaniv Avizrats ^a, Joshua Feinberg^{a,b}, Shmuel Fishman^a

^aPhysics Department,
Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

^bPhysics Department,
University of Haifa at Oranim, Tivon 36006, Israel

Abstract

We apply a probabilistic approach to study the computational complexity of analog computers which solve linear programming problems. We analyze numerically various ensembles of linear programming problems and obtain, for each of these ensembles, the probability distribution functions of certain quantities which measure the computational complexity, known as the convergence rate, the barrier and the computation time. We find that in the limit of very large problems these probability distributions are universal scaling functions. In other words, the probability distribution function for each of these three quantities becomes, in the limit of large problem size, a function of a single scaling variable, which is a certain composition of the quantity in question and the size of the system. Moreover, various ensembles studied seem to lead essentially to the same scaling functions, which depend only on the variance of the ensemble. These results extend analytical and numerical results obtained recently for the Gaussian ensemble, and support the conjecture that these scaling functions are universal.

PACS numbers: 5.45-a, 89.79+c, 89.75.D

1 Introduction

Digital computers are part of our present civilization. There are, however, other devices that are capable of computation. These are analog computers, that are ubiquitous computational tools. The most relevant examples of analog computers are VLSI devices implementing neural networks [1], or neuromorphic systems [2], whose structure is directly motivated by the workings of the brain. Various processes taking place in living cells can be considered as analog computation [3] as well.

An analog computer is essentially a physical device that performs computation, evolving in continuous time and phase space. It is useful to model its evolution in phase space by dynamical systems (DS) [4], the way classical systems such as particles moving in a potential (or electric circuits), are modeled. For example, there are dynamical systems (described by ordinary differential equations) that are used to solve computational problems [5, 6, 7]. This description makes a large set of analytical tools and physical intuition, developed for dynamical systems, applicable to the analysis of analog computers.

In contrast, the evolution of a digital computer is discrete both in its phase space and in time. Consequently, the standard theory of computation and computational complexity [8] deals with computation in discrete time and phase space, and is inadequate for the description of analog computers. The analysis of computation by analog devices requires a theory that is valid in continuous time and phase space.

Since the systems in question are physical systems, the computation time is the time required for a system to reach the vicinity of an attractor (a stable fixed point in the present work) combined with the time required to verify that it indeed reached this vicinity. This time is the elapsed time measured by a clock, contrary to standard computation theory, where it is the number of discrete steps.

In the exploration of physical systems, it is sometimes much easier to study statistical ensembles of systems, estimating their typical behavior using statistical methods [9, 10, 11]. In [12, 13] a statistical theory was used to calculate the computational complexity of a standard representative problem, namely Linear Programming (LP), as solved by a DS.

A framework for computing with DS that converge exponentially to fixed points was proposed in [14]. For such systems it is natural to consider the *attracting fixed point as the output*. The input can be modeled in various ways. One possible choice is the initial condition. This is appropriate when the aim of the computation is to decide to which attractor out of many possible ones the system flows [15]. Here, in [12, 13], as well as in [14], the parameters on which the DS depends (e.g., the parameters appearing in the vector field F in (1)) are the input.

The basic entity of the computational model is a dynamical system [4], that may be defined by a set of Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs)

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x), \quad (1)$$

where x is an n -dimensional vector, and F is an n -dimensional smooth vector field, which converges exponentially to a fixed point. Eq. (1) solves a computational problem as follows: Given an instance of the problem, the parameters of the vector field F are set (i.e., the input is read), and it is started from some pre-determined initial condition. The result of the computation is then deduced from the fixed point that the system approaches.

In our model we assume we have a physical implementation of the flow equation (1). Thus, the vector field F need not be computed, and the computation time is determined by the convergence time to the attractive fixed point. In other words, the time of flow to the vicinity of the attractor is a good measure of complexity, namely the computational effort, for the class of continuous dynamical systems introduced above [14].

In this paper, as in [12, 13], we will study a specific algorithm for the solution of the LP problem [16]. We will consider real-continuous inputs, as the ones found in physical experiments, and that are studied in the BSS model [17], as well as integer-valued inputs. For computational models defined on the real numbers, worst case behavior, that is traditionally studied in computer science, can be ill-defined and lead to infinite computation times, in particular, for some methods for solving LP [17, 18]. Therefore, we compute the distribution of computation times for a probabilistic model of LP instances with various distributions of the data like in [19, 20]. Ill-defined instances constitute a set of measure zero in our continuous probability ensembles, and need not be concerned about. In the discrete probability ensembles, we treat them by appropriate regularization.

The computational complexity of the method presented in [12, 13] and discussed here is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$, compared to $\mathcal{O}(n^{3.5} \log n)$ found for standard interior point methods [21]. The basic reason is that for standard methods (such as interior point methods), the major component of the complexity of each iteration is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ due to matrix decomposition and inversion of the constraint matrix, while here, because of its analog nature, the system just

flows according to its equations of motion (which need not be computed).

Since we consider the evolution of a *vector field*, our model is inherently parallel. Therefore, to make the analog vs. digital comparison entirely fair, we should compare the complexity of our method to that of the best parallel algorithm. The latter can reduce the $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time needed for matrix decomposition/inversion to polylogarithmic time (for well-posed problems), at the cost of $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.5})$ processors [22], while our system of equations (1) uses only $\mathcal{O}(n)$ variables.

The main result of [12, 13], in which LP problems were drawn from the Gaussian distribution of the parameters of F (namely, the constraints and cost function in (2)), was that the distribution functions of various quantities that characterize the computational complexity, were found to be scaling functions in the limit of LP problems of large size. In particular, it was found that these distribution functions depend on the various parameters only via specific combinations, namely, the scaling variables. Such behavior is analogous to the situation found for the central limit theorem, for critical phenomena [23] and for Anderson localization [24], in spite of the very different nature of these problems. It was demonstrated in [12, 13] how for the implementation of the LP problem on a physical device, methods used in theoretical physics enable to describe the distribution of computation times in a simple and physically transparent form. Based on experience with certain universality properties of rectangular and chiral random matrix models [25], it was conjectured in [12, 13] that some universality for computational problems should be expected and should be explored. That is, the scaling properties that were found for the Gaussian distributions should hold also for other distributions. In particular, some specific questions were raised in [12, 13]: Is the Gaussian nature of the ensemble unimportant in analogy with [25]? Are there universality classes [23] of analog computational problems, and if they exist, what are they?

Thus, we extend the earlier analysis [12, 13] of the Gaussian distribution to other probability distributions of LP problems, and demonstrate *numerically* that the distribution functions of various quantities that characterize the computational complexity of the analog computer which solves LP problems are indeed *universal* scaling functions, in the limit of large systems. These universal functions depend upon the original probability ensemble of inputs only via the scaling variables, that are proportional to the ones found for the Gaussian distribution. For some distributions of LP problems the scaling variables are even identical (not just proportional) to the ones found for the Gaussian distribution. For other distributions, on the other hand, where some of the parameters defining an LP problem may vanish at random (the so-called diluted ensembles in Section 4), either the convergence to universality is much slower, or universality is only approximate.

The distribution of constraints and cost function of the LP problems that are used in practice is not known. Therefore, the universality of the distribution functions of the computation time and other quantities related to computational complexity is of great importance. It would imply that it may hold also for the distributions of the LP problems solved in applications. In this paper we demonstrate numerically that for several probability distributions universality is satisfied, providing support for the conjecture that it holds in general.

This paper is organized as follows: In the next section we briefly review the dynamical system which solves LP problems. In section 3 we summarize the scaling results of [12, 13] for the Gaussian ensemble. In section 4 we present our numerical results for the distribution

functions of various quantities that characterize the computational complexity of the analog computer for non-Gaussian probability ensembles. In section 5 we demonstrate that these distributions are indeed universal scaling functions. Finally, in section 6 we discuss the significance of our results and also pose some open problems.

2 A dynamical flow for linear programming

Linear programming is a P-complete problem [8], i.e. it is representative of all problems that can be solved in polynomial time. The *standard form* of LP is to find

$$\max\{c^T x : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, Ax = b, x \geq 0\} \quad (2)$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}^m, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $m \leq n$. The set generated by the constraints in (2) is a polyhedron. If a bounded optimal solution exists, it is obtained at one of its vertices. The vector defining this optimal vertex can be decomposed (in an appropriate basis) in the form $x = (x_{\mathcal{N}}, x_{\mathcal{B}})$ where $x_{\mathcal{N}} = 0$ is an $n - m$ component vector, while $x_{\mathcal{B}} = B^{-1}b \geq 0$ is an m component vector, and B is the $m \times m$ matrix whose columns are the columns of A with indices identical to the ones of $x_{\mathcal{B}}$. Similarly, we decompose $A = (N, B)$.

A flow of the form (1) converging to the optimal vertex, introduced by Faybusovich [6] will be studied here. Its vector field F is a projection of the gradient of the cost function $c^T x$ onto the constraint set, relative to a Riemannian metric which enforces the positivity constraints $x \geq 0$ [6]. It is given by

$$F(x) = [X - XA^T(AXA^T)^{-1}AX] c, \quad (3)$$

where X is the diagonal matrix $\text{Diag}(x_1 \dots x_n)$. The $nm + n$ entries of A and c , namely, the parameters of the vector field F , constitute the input; as in other models of computation, we ignore the time it takes to “load” the input, since this step does not reflect the complexity of the computation being performed, either in analog or digital computation. It was shown in [16] that the flow equations given by (1) and (3) are, in fact, part of a system of Hamiltonian equations of motion of a completely integrable system of a Toda type. Therefore, like the Toda system, it is integrable with the formal solution [6]

$$x_i(t) = x_i(0) \exp \left(-\Delta_i t + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{ji} \log \frac{x_{j+n-m}(t)}{x_{j+n-m}(0)} \right) \quad (4)$$

($i = 1, \dots, n - m$), that describes the time evolution of the $n - m$ independent variables $x_{\mathcal{N}}(t)$, in terms of the variables $x_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$. In (4) $x_i(0)$ and $x_{j+n-m}(0)$ are components of the initial condition, $x_{j+n-m}(t)$ are the $x_{\mathcal{B}}$ components of the solution, $\alpha_{ji} = -(B^{-1}N)_{ji}$ is an $m \times (n - m)$ matrix, while

$$\Delta_i = -c_i - \sum_{j=1}^m c_j \alpha_{ji}. \quad (5)$$

For the decomposition $x = (x_{\mathcal{N}}, x_{\mathcal{B}})$ used for the optimal vertex $\Delta_i \geq 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, n - m$, and $x_{\mathcal{N}}(t)$ converges to 0, while $x_{\mathcal{B}}(t)$ converges to $x^* = B^{-1}b$. Note that the analytical solution is only a *formal* one, and does not provide an answer to the LP instance, since the Δ_i depend on the partition of A , and only relative to a partition corresponding to a maximum vertex are all the Δ_i positive.

The second term in the exponent in (4), when it is positive, is a kind of “barrier”: $\Delta_i t$ must be larger than the barrier before x_i can decrease to zero. In the following we ignore the contribution of the initial condition and denote the value of this term in the infinite time limit by

$$\beta_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{ji} \log x_{j+n-m}^*. \quad (6)$$

Note that although one (or more) of the x_{j+n-m}^* may vanish, in the probabilistic ensemble studied here, such an event is of measure zero for the continuous probability distributions, as well as for the regularized discretized ones (see (25)), and therefore should not be considered. In order for $x(t)$ to be close to the maximum vertex we must have $x_i(t) < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - m$ for some small positive ϵ , namely $\exp(-\Delta_i t + \beta_i) < \epsilon$, for $i = 1, \dots, n - m$. Therefore we consider

$$T = \max_i \left(\frac{\beta_i}{\Delta_i} + \frac{|\log \epsilon|}{\Delta_i} \right), \quad (7)$$

as the computation time. We denote

$$\Delta_{\min} = \min_i \Delta_i, \quad \beta_{\max} = \max_i \beta_i. \quad (8)$$

The Δ_i can be arbitrarily small when the inputs are real numbers, but in the probabilistic model, “bad” instances, resulting in computation taking arbitrarily long time, are rare as is clear from¹ (9).

¹Strictly speaking, (9) was derived in [12, 13] for a probabilistic model in which the components of (A, b, c) were independent identically distributed Gaussian random variables. However, one of the main points of this paper is that (9) is valid for a broad class of probability distributions of LP problems.

3 Probability distributions and scaling

Consider an ensemble of LP problems in which the components of (A, b, c) are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables taken from various *even* distributions, with 0 mean and bounded variance. In a probabilistic model of LP instances, Δ_{\min} , β_{\max} and T are random variables. Since the expression for Δ_i , equation (5), is independent of b , its distribution is independent of b . For a given realization of A and c , with a partition of A into (N, B) such that $\Delta_i \geq 0$, there exists² a vector b such that the resulting polyhedron has a bounded optimal solution. Since b in our probabilistic model is independent of A we obtain: $\mathcal{P}(\Delta_{\min} < \Delta | \Delta_{\min} > 0, \text{LP instance has a bounded maximum vertex}) = \mathcal{P}(\Delta_{\min} < \Delta | \Delta_{\min} > 0)$.

In [12, 13], the components of A , b , and c were taken from the Gaussian distribution (see, e.g., Eqs.(12-18) in [12]) with zero mean and variance σ^2 , that was taken as unity in the numerical calculations. It was found analytically, in the large (n, m) limit, that the probability $\mathcal{P}(\Delta_{\min} < \Delta | \Delta_{\min} > 0) \equiv \mathcal{F}^{(n,m)}(\Delta)$ is of the scaling form

$$\mathcal{F}^{(n,m)}(\Delta) = 1 - e^{x_\Delta^2} \operatorname{erfc}(x_\Delta) \equiv \mathcal{F}(x_\Delta). \quad (9)$$

with the scaling variable

$$x_\Delta(n, m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{n}{m} - 1 \right) \frac{\sqrt{m}\Delta}{\sigma}. \quad (10)$$

The scaling function \mathcal{F} contains *all* asymptotic information on Δ . The probability density function derived from $\mathcal{F}(x_\Delta)$ is very wide and does not have a finite variance. Also the average of $1/x_\Delta$ diverges.

The amazing point is that in the limit of large m and n , the probability distribution of Δ_{\min} depends on the variables m , n and Δ only via the scaling variable x_Δ . For future reference it is convenient to write x_Δ in the form

$$x_\Delta = a_\Delta^{(g)}(n/m)\sqrt{m}\Delta, \quad (11)$$

with

$$a_\Delta^{(g)}(n/m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{n}{m} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\sigma}, \quad (12)$$

where the superscript refers to the Gaussian distribution. If the limit of infinite m and n is taken, so that n/m is fixed, $a_\Delta^{(g)}$ is constant. It was verified numerically that for the Gaussian ensemble (9) was a good approximation already for $m = 20$, and $n = 40$.

The existence of scaling functions like (9) for the barrier β_{\max} , that is the maximum of the β_i defined by (6) and for T defined by (7) (assuming that ϵ is not too small so that the first term in (7) dominates) was verified numerically for the Gaussian distribution [12, 13]. In particular for fixed m/n , we found that

$$\mathcal{P}(1/\beta_{\max} < 1/\beta) = \mathcal{F}_{1/\beta_{\max}}^{(n,m)}(1/\beta) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{1/\beta}(x_\beta) \quad (13)$$

²The existence of b is guaranteed by the fact that the various probability distributions are even. See [12], Lemma 3.1. The latter was proved in [12] under the assumption that the components of (A, b, c) were i.i.d. Gaussian variables, but the proof extends trivially to the class of probability ensembles of the type specified above.

and

$$\mathcal{P}(1/T < 1/t) = \mathcal{F}_{1/T}^{(n,m)}(1/t) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{1/T}(x_T). \quad (14)$$

The corresponding scaling variables are

$$x_\beta = a_\beta^{(g)}(n/m) \frac{m}{\beta} \quad (15)$$

and

$$x_T = a_T^{(g)}(n/m) \frac{m \log m}{t}. \quad (16)$$

Since the distribution functions (13) and (14) are not known analytically, and since $n = 2m$ was taken in the numerical investigations in [12], we can set arbitrarily $a_\beta^{(g)}(2) = a_T^{(g)}(2) = 1$.

The scaling functions (9), (13) and (14) imply the asymptotic behavior

$$1/\Delta_{\min} \sim \sqrt{m}, \quad \beta_{\max} \sim m, \quad t \sim m \log m \quad (17)$$

with “high probability” [12, 13].

4 Non-Gaussian distributions

In this section we present the results of our numerical calculations of the distribution functions of Δ_{\min} , $1/\beta_{\max}$, and $1/T$ for various probability distributions of A , b , and c . For this purpose we generated full LP instances (A, b, c) with the probability distribution in question. For each instance the LP problem was solved using the linear programming solver of MatLab. Only instances with a bounded optimal solution were kept, and Δ_{\min} was computed relative to the optimal partition and optimality was verified by checking that $\Delta_{\min} > 0$. Using the sampled instances we obtain an estimate of $\mathcal{F}^{(n,m)}(\Delta) = \mathcal{P}(\Delta_{\min} < \Delta | \Delta_{\min} > 0)$, and of the corresponding cumulative distribution functions of the barrier β_{\max} and the computation time T .

The solution of the LP problem is used here in order to identify the optimal partition of A into B and N . This enables one to compute Δ_{\min} , β_{\max} , and t from (5), (6), (7) and (8), and the distributions

$$P_{\Delta}(\Delta) = \mathcal{P}(\Delta_{\min} < \Delta | \Delta_{\min} > 0), \quad (18)$$

$$P_{\beta}(1/\beta) = \mathcal{P}(1/\beta_{\max} < 1/\beta) \quad (19)$$

and

$$P_T(1/t) = \mathcal{P}(1/T < 1/t) \quad (20)$$

are obtained.

It is convenient at first to keep n/m fixed³ and to compute these distributions as functions of the corresponding scaling variables

$$x'_{\Delta} = \sqrt{m}\Delta \quad (21)$$

$$x'_{\beta} = m/\beta \quad (22)$$

and

$$x'_T = m \log m/t \quad (23)$$

These are proportional to x_{Δ} , x_{β} and x_T defined by (10), (15) and (16). We turn now to explore in some detail, various distributions.

4.1 The bimodal distribution

In this case, the various elements of A , b and c take only the values $+1$ or -1 with probability $1/2$ each, namely,

$$P(y) = \frac{1}{2}[\delta(y-1) + \delta(y+1)]. \quad (24)$$

The mean of this distribution is 0, and its variance is 1. One problem associated with the discrete ensemble (24) is the finite probability to draw a degenerate LP problem. (Note that such degenerate, ill-defined LP problems, comprize a set of zero measure in continuous ensembles such as the Gaussian ensemble.) In order to avoid these degenerate solutions,

³In fact, in all our numerical simulations we kept $n/m = 2$ fixed.




Figure 1: \mathcal{P}_Δ is plotted as a function of Δ , for the bimodal distribution (for $n = 2m$). The number of instances used in the simulation is 39732 for the $m = 20$ case, 46583 for the $m = 30$ case and 47169 for the $m = 40$ case. The number of converging instances for each case is 5000.

we introduce a “regularization” by which each matrix element A_{ij} , chosen at random from the ensemble (24), is multiplied by

$$f_{ij} = 1 + [i + 2(j - 1)]\tilde{\epsilon}, \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is a small regularization parameter. (The other entries b_i and c_i take the values chosen at random with the probability (24) without any regularization.) In the numerical calculations we take $\tilde{\epsilon} = 10^{-5}$. (Note that the regularization (25) slightly splits the identical unregulated probability distributions of the independent matrix elements A_{ij} . For small $\tilde{\epsilon}$ we expect this fact to have a negligible effect on the scaling behavior.) In Figs. 1 - 6 the distribution functions (18), (19), and (20) are plotted first as functions of the unscaled variables Δ , $1/\beta$, and $1/t$, followed by the corresponding plots as functions of the scaled variables (21), (22), and (23), respectively, for various values of m while $n = 2m$. Note that in terms of the scaled variables (21)-(23), the data is found to collapse to one distribution.




Figure 2: \mathcal{P}_Δ is plotted as a function of x'_Δ for the bimodal distribution for the instances of Fig. 1




Figure 3: \mathcal{P}_β is plotted as a function of $1/\beta$ for the instances of Fig. 1




Figure 4: \mathcal{P}_β is plotted as a function of x'_β for the instances of Fig. 1.




Figure 5: \mathcal{P}_T is plotted as a function of $1/t$ for the instances of Fig. 1.




Figure 6: \mathcal{P}_T is plotted as a function of x'_T for the instances of Fig. 1.

4.2 The diluted bimodal distribution

This is the distribution in which the random variable defined by (24) is replaced, for some values chosen at random, by 0. The resulting random variable is

$$z = uy \tag{26}$$

where y is distributed according to (24) and u is distributed according to

$$P(u) = p\delta(1 - u) + (1 - p)\delta(u), \tag{27}$$

where $0 \leq p \leq 1$ is the dilution parameter. Thus, in our notations, $p = 1$ corresponds to no dilution. The mean of the distribution of z is 0, and its variance is p . We again apply the regularization process to the matrix A by multiplying the matrix elements A_{ij} , chosen at random in this ensemble by (25).

The calculations were repeated for $p = 0.5$ and $p = 0.2$. In all cases a scaling function was found. The distributions P_Δ as a function of x'_Δ are presented in Fig. 7 for $p = 0.5$, and in Fig. 8 for $p = 0.2$. The analogous graphs of the distribution functions P_β and P_T for these diluted bimodal ensembles are presented in [26]. Figs. 7 and 8, as well as the corresponding figures for P_β and P_T indicate that the convergence in the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ becomes slower as the dilution increases (i.e., as p decreases).




Figure 7: \mathcal{P}_Δ is plotted as a function of x'_Δ for the diluted bimodal distribution, where $p = 0.5$. As before, $n = 2m$. The number of instances used in the simulation is 54951 for the $m = 20$ case, 41107 for the $m = 30$ case and 50863 for the $m = 40$ case. The number of converging instances for each case is 5000.




Figure 8: \mathcal{P}_Δ is plotted as a function of x'_Δ for the diluted bimodal distribution, where $p = 0.2$. As before, $n = 2m$. The number of instances used in the simulation is 54620 for the $m = 20$ case, 37697 for the $m = 30$ case, and 65367 for the $m = 40$ case. The number of converging instances for these cases were, respectively, 4980, 3725 and 5921.




Figure 9: \mathcal{P}_Δ is plotted as a function of x'_Δ for the uniform distribution. As before, $n = 2m$. The number of instances used in the simulation is 121939 for the $m = 20$ case, 91977 for the $m = 30$ case and 112206 for the $m = 40$ case. The number of converging instances for each case is 20000.

4.3 The uniform distribution

The distribution of the elements of A , b and c in this ensemble is

$$P(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & -1/2 < y < 1/2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

For this distribution the mean is 0 and the variance is $\frac{1}{12}$. The distribution function (18) is presented in terms of the scaling variable (21) in Fig. 9. All the other distributions related to this ensemble are presented elsewhere [26].




Figure 10: P_Δ as a function of x_Δ (for $n = 2m$ and $m = 40$). The graphs are scaled to fit the theoretical Gaussian result by appropriate choice of the factors $a_\Delta^{(\mu)}$.

5 Universality

In the previous section we demonstrated that for large m and n , the distribution functions (18) - (20) depend on Δ, β, T and on m and n only via the scaling variables (21) - (23). A natural question which arises is whether the distribution functions P_Δ, P_β and P_T are universal [12, 13]. In other words, we ask whether all probability ensembles of LP problems, or at least a large family thereof, yield the same functions P_Δ, P_β and P_T of the scaling variables

$$x_\Delta = a_\Delta^{(\mu)}(n/m)x'_\Delta, \quad (29)$$

$$x_\beta = a_\beta^{(\mu)}(n/m)x'_\beta \quad (30)$$

and

$$x_T = a_T^{(\mu)}(n/m)x'_T \quad (31)$$

where x'_Δ, x'_β and x'_T are defined by (21),(22) and (23), and the scale factors are the generalizations of $a_\Delta^{(g)}, a_\beta^{(g)}$ and $a_T^{(g)}$ of (12), (15) and (16)?

For the Gaussian distribution we denote $\mu = g$, for the undiluted bimodal distribution $\mu = p = 1$, for the various diluted bimodal distributions $\mu = p := 0.5, 0.2$, and for the uniform distribution $\mu = u$. Throughout this paper we take $n = 2m$. The distributions of the Δ_{min} for $m = 40$ for the various ensembles are presented in Fig. 10.

The scale factors $a_\Delta^{(\mu)}$ are chosen so as to minimize the deviation of the specific distribution P_Δ from the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{F}(x_\Delta)$ of (9), that was calculated analytically in [12, 13]. This is done, as usual, by least squares fit. The Gaussian distribution was taken with variance $\sigma_{(g)}^2 = 1$ in our calculation. For the Gaussian distribution the numerical

results were found to fit the analytical result (9) with $a_{\Delta}^{(g)} \simeq 0.564 \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}$, as expected from (12) for $n = 2m$. For the bimodal distribution it was found that $a_{\Delta}^{(1)} \simeq 0.558 \simeq \frac{0.989}{\sqrt{\pi}}$. For the diluted bimodal distributions at $p = 0.5$ we found $a_{\Delta}^{(0.5)} \simeq 0.581 \simeq \frac{1.030}{\sqrt{\pi}}$, and for the more diluted ensemble at $p = 0.2$ we found $a_{\Delta}^{(0.2)} \simeq 0.687 \simeq \frac{1.218}{\sqrt{\pi}}$. Finally, for the uniform distribution we obtained $a_{\Delta}^{(u)} \simeq 1.957 \simeq \frac{3.469}{\sqrt{\pi}} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{12.030}{\pi}}$. Recall that the variances of these distributions are $\sigma_{(1)}^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_{(u)}^2 = \frac{1}{12}$, respectively. Therefore, on the basis of these numerical results we conjecture that

$$\sigma_{(g)} a_{\Delta}^{(g)} = \sigma_{(1)} a_{\Delta}^{(1)} = \sigma_{(u)} a_{\Delta}^{(u)}, \quad (32)$$

and that their common value is given by (12), that is equal to $1/\sqrt{\pi}$ for $n = 2m$.

Our numerical results indicate that the scale factors $a_{\Delta}^{(p)}$ of the diluted distributions deviate from this simple law, and this deviation seems to be more pronounced for higher dilution (smaller p). For these distributions $\sigma_{(p)}^2 = p$, leading to $a_{\Delta}^{(0.5)} \sigma_{(0.5)} \simeq 0.411$ and $a_{\Delta}^{(0.2)} \sigma_{(0.2)} \simeq 0.307$, which differ significantly from the more or less common value of this product for the undiluted distributions, namely $1/\sqrt{\pi} \simeq 0.564$.

From Fig. 10 we see that the distribution functions of the scaling variables x_{Δ} corresponding to the convergence rates Δ approach a universal function, that is identical to the one that is found analytically for the Gaussian distribution, and is given by (9). For the undiluted distributions also the scale factors were found to agree with (12).

The proportionality of $a_{\Delta}^{(\mu)}$ to $1/\sigma_{(\mu)}$ probably results from the fact that if all parameters c_i and A_{ij} in (2) are rescaled by some common factor, also the Δ_i , defined by (5), are rescaled by the same factor. For the diluted distributions, the behavior of the scaling factors is different. Behavior of similar nature is found also for the distribution functions P_{β} and P_T .

The distributions P_{β} in terms of x_{β} are presented in Fig. 11 for $m = 40$. Using the scale factor $a_{\beta}^{(g)} = 1$, we find numerically, by least square fit to the case of the Gaussian distribution (that was also found numerically), the other scale factors to be $a_{\beta}^{(1)} \simeq 0.952$, $a_{\beta}^{(0.5)} \simeq 1.189$, $a_{\beta}^{(0.2)} \simeq 1.943$ and $a_{\beta}^{(u)} \simeq 0.960$.

The scale factors $a_{\beta}^{(g)}$, $a_{\beta}^{(1)}$ and $a_{\beta}^{(u)}$ are pretty close to each other (and to unity), while $a_{\beta}^{(0.5)}$ and $a_{\beta}^{(0.2)}$ deviate from them significantly.

We note from (6) that the barriers β_i are invariant under global rescaling of all the matrix elements A_{ij} by the same factor. Thus, as long as the optimal vertex x_B^* does not have too many anomalously small or large components, P_{β} is expected to be independent of the variance, and the numerical values we obtained for $a_{\beta}^{(1)} \simeq a_{\beta}^{(u)} \simeq a_{\beta}^{(g)}$ seem to support this expectation for the undiluted ensembles. The scale factors $a_{\beta}^{(0.5)}$, $a_{\beta}^{(0.2)}$ deviate from that common value, with $a_{\beta}^{(0.2)}$ deviating very significantly.

Our numerical results, displayed in Fig. 11, show that the distributions $P_{\beta}(x_{\beta})$ found for the diluted ensembles deviate from the ones found for the undiluted ensembles. Therefore, for the diluted ensembles, although we have good indication for universality, this point clearly requires further research.

The distributions P_T in terms of x_T are presented in Fig. 12, for $m = 40$.




Figure 11: P_β as a function of x_β for all the distributions checked (for $n = 2m$ and $m = 40$), where the scale factors $a_\beta^{(\mu)}$ were found by least squares fit to the distribution for the Gaussian ensemble, which was found numerically as well.




Figure 12: P_T as a function of x_T for all the distributions checked (for $n = 2m$ and $m = 40$). The scale factors $a_T^{(\mu)}$ were found by least squares fit to the distribution for the Gaussian ensemble, which was found numerically as well.

Using the scale factor $a_T^{(g)} = 1$ we find numerically $a_T^{(1)} \simeq 1.008$, $a_T^{(0.5)} \simeq 1.240$, $a_T^{(0.2)} \simeq 2.088$, and $a_T^{(u)} \simeq 3.399 \simeq \sqrt{11.553}$. From (7) we see that under global rescaling of the parameters A_{ij}, b_i, c_i in (2), the scaled variables x'_Δ and x'_T are rescaled in the same way. Thus, since $a_\Delta^{(g)}$ is proportional to $1/\sigma$, also $a_T^{(g)}$ should satisfy a similar proportionality. Since for the Gaussian distribution we have taken $\sigma_{(g)}^2 = 1$ and $a_T^{(g)} = 1$, our numerical results, where we find $a_T^{(u)} \simeq \sqrt{12}$, suggest that for the undiluted ensembles

$$\sigma_{(g)} a_T^{(g)} = \sigma_{(1)} a_T^{(1)} = \sigma_{(u)} a_T^{(u)}, \quad (33)$$

taking the value unity in our case. For the diluted ensembles we find $\sigma_{(0.5)} a_T^{(0.5)} \simeq 0.877$ and $\sigma_{(0.2)} a_T^{(0.2)} \simeq 0.933$, deviating significantly from unity. For $p = 0.2$ a significant deviation of P_T from the other distributions is found.

6 Summary and Discussion

In this paper we have presented ample numerical evidence for the fact that the asymptotic distribution functions P_Δ, P_β and P_T are scaling functions.

In particular, all the *undiluted* ensembles of LP problems which we studied, seem to have the *same* set of asymptotic distribution functions, when the latter are expressed in terms of the scaling variables x_Δ, x_β and x_T . Furthermore, we have found that then the following combinations of scaling factors, $\sigma_{(\mu)} a_\Delta^{(\mu)}, a_\beta^{(\mu)}$ and $\sigma_{(\mu)} a_T^{(\mu)}$ are independent of the probability distribution. Therefore, in particular, $a_\Delta^{(\mu)}$ should satisfy (12) that was found for the Gaussian distribution, while $a_\beta^{(\mu)}$ and $a_T^{(\mu)}$, as well as corresponding distributions, are yet to be found analytically.

Based the results presented in this paper, as well as the results of [12, 13], we conjecture the scaling behavior of the various undiluted distribution functions (and the corresponding scaling factors) is *universal*, i.e., that it is robust and should be valid in a large class of ensembles of LP problems, in which the (A, b, c) data are taken from a distribution with zero mean and finite variance.

We have also studied the effect of dilution, namely, imposing that the parameters A_{ij}, c_i and b_i in (2) could vanish with finite probability $1 - p$. Specifically, we have studied the effects of dilution only on the bimodal distribution.

Our findings, depicted in Figs. 7 and 8, as well as the corresponding figures for P_β and P_T , indicate that the convergence in the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ becomes slower as the dilution increases (i.e., as p decreases). More importantly, our numerical results *indicate* that the diluted distributions may exhibit scaling behavior as well, but with scaling factors which are different from those of the undiluted ensembles which belong in the universality class of the undiluted Gaussian ensemble. Moreover, the corresponding asymptotic scaling distribution functions P_Δ, P_β and P_T of these diluted ensembles deviate sometimes from those of the corresponding ones of the undiluted Gaussian universality class. This deviation appears to become more pronounced as dilution increases, and it may be related to the fact that a finite fraction of the admissible LP instances in diluted ensemble may have an optimal vertex x_B^* which has too many anomalously small or large components.

Generally speaking, dilution seems to have interesting effects, which are not completely understood, and call for further investigation. Specific questions are motivated by the present work. In particular, are the asymptotic scaling distribution functions P_Δ , P_β and P_T , which we computed numerically, really different from the ones found for the undiluted Gaussian ensemble (with possibly scale factors which differ from the Gaussian ones), or the deviations of these functions, indicated by our numerical results, are merely effects of the slower convergence towards asymptotics? If they are different - do they form another universality class?

Finally, we would like to raise a question which may be of practical importance. Thus, imagine that all LP problems used in practice (or at least, a large fraction thereof) are collected into an unbiased probability ensemble. How is this distribution of *realistic* LP problems related to the ensembles studied in this paper? Does it really relate to a universality class (or classes) of ensembles of LP problems studied here? Does it agree more with the diluted or the undiluted ensembles? These questions clearly pose important conceptual challenges for further investigation, and also have practical implications.

Acknowledgements: It is a great pleasure to thank our colleagues Asa Ben-Hur and Hava Siegelmann for very useful advice and discussions. This research was supported in part by the Shlomo Kaplansky Academic Chair, by the Technion-Haifa University Collaboration Fund, by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), by the Israeli Science Foundation (ISF), and by the Minerva Center of Nonlinear Physics of Complex Systems.

References

- [1] J. Hertz, A. Krogh, and R. Palmer. *Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation*. Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1991.
- [2] C. Mead. *Analog VLSI and Neural Systems*. Addison-Wesley, 1989.
- [3] D. Bray. *Nature* **376**, 307 (1995); A. Ben-Hur and H.T. Siegelmann. *Proceedings of MCU 2001, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **2055**, pages 11-24, M. Margenstern and Y. Rogozhin (Editors), Springer Verlag, Berlin 2001 (and references therein).
- [4] E. Ott, *Chaos in Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1993.
- [5] R. W. Brockett. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* **146**, 79 (1991); M.S. Branicky. Analog computation with continuous ODEs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Workshop on Physics and Computation*, pages 265–274, Dallas, TX, 1994.
- [6] L. Faybusovich. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information* **8**, 135 (1991).
- [7] U. Helmke and J.B. Moore. *Optimization and Dynamical Systems*. Springer Verlag, London, 1994.
- [8] C. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1995.
- [9] M.L. Mehta. *Random Matrices* (2nd ed.). Academic Press, San-Diego, CA, 1991.
- [10] T.A. Brody, J. Flores, J.B. French, P.A. Mello, A. Pandey and S.S.M. Wong. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53**, 385 (1981).
- [11] O. Bohigas, M.-J. Giannoni and C. Schmit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1 (1984); O. Bohigas. Random Matrix Theories and Chaotic Dynamics. In *Chaos and Quantum Physics*, Proceedings of the Les-Houches Summer School, Session LII, 1989, M.-J. Giannoni, A. Voros and J. Zinn-Justin, (eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1991.
- [12] A. Ben-Hur, J. Feinberg S. Fishman, and H.T. Siegelmann, *J. Complexity* **19**, 474 (2003) (preprint cs.CC/0110056).
- [13] A. Ben-Hur, J. Feinberg S. Fishman, and H.T. Siegelmann, *Phys. Lett. A* **323**, 204 (2004) (preprint cond-mat/0110655).
- [14] H.T. Siegelmann, A. Ben-Hur and S. Fishman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1463 (1999); A. Ben-Hur, H.T. Siegelmann, and S. Fishman. *J. Complexity* **18**, 51 (2002).

- [15] H.T. Siegelmann and S. Fishman. *Physica* **120**, 214 (1998).
- [16] L. Faybusovich. *Physica* **D53**, 217 (1991).
- [17] L. Blum, F. Cucker, M. Shub, and S. Smale. *Complexity and real Computation*. Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [18] S. Smale. *Math. Programming* **27**, 241 (1983); M.J. Todd. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **16**, 671 (1991).
- [19] S. Smale. *Math. Programming* **27**, 241 (1983).
M.J. Todd. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **16**, 671 (1991).
- [20] R. Shamir. *Management Science* **33**(3), 301 (1987).
- [21] Y. Ye. *Interior Point Algorithms: Theory and Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1997.
- [22] V. Y. Pan and J. Reif, *Computers and Mathematics (with Applications)* **17**, 1481 (1989).
- [23] K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, *Phys. Rep.* **12**, 75 (1974).
- [24] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardelo and T. V. Ramakrishnan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42** 673 (1979).
- [25] Some papers that treat random *real* rectangular matrices, such as the matrices relevant for this work (which are not necessarily Gaussian), are: A. Anderson, R. C. Myers and V. Periwal, *Phys. Lett.***B 254**, 89 (1991); *Nucl. Phys.* **B 360**, (1991) 463 (Section 3); J. Feinberg and A. Zee, *J. Stat. Mech.* **87**, 473 (1997); For earlier work see: G.M. Cicuta, L. Molinari, E. Montaldi and F. Riva, *J. Math.Phys.* **28**, 1716 (1987).
- [26] Y. S. Avizrats, J. Feinberg and S. Fishman, *Scaling and Universality of the Complexity of Analog Computation*, to appear.