

# Data-Driven Projection for Reducing Dimensionality of Linear Programs: Generalization Bound and Learning Methods

Shinsaku Sakaue  
The University of Tokyo  
Tokyo, Japan  
sakaue@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Taihei Oki  
The University of Tokyo  
Tokyo, Japan  
oki@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

## Abstract

This paper studies a simple data-driven approach to high-dimensional linear programs (LPs). Given data of past  $n$ -dimensional LPs, we learn an  $n \times k$  *projection matrix* ( $n > k$ ), which reduces the dimensionality from  $n$  to  $k$ . Then, we address future LP instances by solving  $k$ -dimensional LPs and recovering  $n$ -dimensional solutions by multiplying the projection matrix. This idea is compatible with any user-preferred LP solvers, hence a versatile approach to faster LP solving. One natural question is: how much data is sufficient to ensure the recovered solutions' quality? We address this question based on the idea of *data-driven algorithm design*, which relates the amount of data sufficient for generalization guarantees to the *pseudo-dimension* of performance metrics. We present an  $\tilde{O}(nk^2)$  upper bound on the pseudo-dimension ( $\tilde{O}$  compresses logarithmic factors) and complement it by an  $\Omega(nk)$  lower bound, hence tight up to an  $\tilde{O}(k)$  factor. On the practical side, we study two natural methods for learning projection matrices: PCA- and gradient-based methods. While the former is simple and efficient, the latter sometimes leads to better solution quality. Experiments confirm that learned projection matrices are beneficial for reducing the time for solving LPs while maintaining high solution quality.

## 1 Introduction

Linear programming (LP) has arguably been one of the most fundamental tools used in various industrial domains for decades. To date, researchers have developed various efficient LP solvers, most of which stem from the simplex or interior-point method. Still, solving high-dimensional LPs demands considerable computational resources.

To address high-dimensional LPs, various techniques have been studied. Recent advances include a parallelized simplex method (Huangfu and Hall, 2018) and a randomized interior-point method (Chowdhury et al., 2022). Besides these attempts to improve LP solvers, there is a surge of interest in reducing LP sizes via *random projections* (Vu et al., 2018; Chen and Mišić, 2020; Poirion et al., 2023), motivated by the breakthrough of randomized sketching in numerical linear algebra (Woodruff, 2014). Such a projection approach is *solver-agnostic* in that we can use any LP solvers, including those mentioned above, to solve LPs with reduced sizes.<sup>1</sup> This solver-agnostic nature is beneficial, particularly considering that LP solvers have evolved in distinct directions of simplex and interior-point methods.

In the realm of numerical linear algebra, there has been a notable shift towards learning sketching matrices from data, instead of using random sketching matrices (Indyk et al., 2019, 2021; Bartlett et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023; Sakaue and Oki, 2023). This data-driven approach is effective when we frequently address similar instances. Prior research has demonstrated that learning sketching matrices from past data can significantly improve the performance of sketching-based numerical linear algebra methods, particularly low-rank approximation methods.

<sup>1</sup>In terms of numerical stability and sparsity, projections affect downstream solvers' performance. These are beyond the current scope, and we leave further investigation as future work.

## 1.1 Our Contributions

Drawing inspiration from the above background, we study a data-driven projection approach for streamlining repetitive solving of similar LP instances. Our approach inherits the solver-agnostic nature of the random-projection approach, and it can further improve solution quality by learning projection matrices from past data. We present foundational insights—both theoretical and practical—regarding this approach, which will lay the groundwork for new data-driven strategies for reducing the time for solving large LPs.

**Generalization bound.** We address a natural theoretical question: *how much data is sufficient for ensuring the quality of recovered solutions?* Using learning theoretic tools, we show how many samples of LP instances are sufficient to bound the gap between the empirical and expected objective values achieved by the data-driven projection approach. As we will see later, such a generalization bound depends on the *pseudo-dimension* of the class of performance metrics. Our technical contribution is to prove an  $\tilde{O}(nk^2)$  upper bound on the pseudo-dimension, where  $n$  is the original dimensionality,  $k$  is the reduced dimensionality, and  $\tilde{O}$  compresses logarithmic factors. En route to the upper bound, we elucidate a piecewise polynomial structure of LP’s optimal value as a function of input parameters. This general observation is independent of solvers and potentially has broader applications. We also complement the upper bound by an  $\Omega(nk)$  lower bound. As we will experimentally observe later, we can usually set  $k$  to be much smaller than  $n$ . Therefore, the fact that our results only have an  $\tilde{O}(k)$  gap represents the near tightness of our generalization analysis.

**Learning methods.** We then address another natural question on the practical side: *how to learn projection matrices?* We study two natural learning methods based on principal component analysis (PCA) and gradient ascent. The former efficiently constructs a projection matrix by extracting the top- $k$  subspace around which optimal solutions of future instances are expected to appear. The latter, although relatively costly, directly improves LPs’ optimal values via gradient ascent. Experiments on various datasets confirm that using projection matrices learned by the PCA- and gradient-based methods greatly reduces the computation time for solving LPs while maintaining high solution quality.

## 1.2 Related Work

**Data-driven algorithms.** Data-driven numerical linear algebra methods have been gaining much attention (Indyk et al., 2019, 2021; Bartlett et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023; Sakaue and Oki, 2023), which, together with random projections for LPs (Vu et al., 2018; Chen and Mišić, 2020; Poirion et al., 2023), has inspired our data-driven projection approach to LPs. Our theoretical result is based on the idea of *data-driven algorithm design* (Gupta and Roughgarden, 2017; Balcan, 2021), which has provided generalization bounds for various data-driven algorithms (Balcan et al., 2022a,b; Bartlett et al., 2022; Sakaue and Oki, 2022). Among them, the analysis technique for data-driven integer-programming (IP) methods (Balcan et al., 2022a,b) are close to ours. The difference is that while their analysis is intended for IP methods (particularly, branch-and-cut methods), we discuss LPs and study a general property of the optimal value as a function of input parameters. Thus, our analysis is independent of solution methods, which is crucial for dealing with our solver-agnostic approach. Besides, many studies have combined LP/IP methods with machine learning (Berthold and Hendel, 2021; Fan et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023), while learning of projection matrices has not been considered.

**Learning through optimization.** Many recent studies consider learning through optimization processes (Amos and Kolter, 2017; Agrawal et al., 2019; Wilder et al., 2019; Berthet et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2020; Elmachtoub and Grigas, 2022; Amos, 2023). While most of them are intended to develop practical learning methods, several have discussed generalization guarantees (Wang et al., 2020; El Balghiti et al., 2022). Wang et al. (2020) have studied a so-called *decision-focused learning* method with *reparametrization*, which is technically the same as projection. However, their theoretical result focuses on learning models for generating objective functions, assuming fixed reparametrization (or projection) matrices. By contrast, we obtain a generalization bound for learning projection matrices. El Balghiti et al. (2022) have studied generalization bounds in the so-called *smart predict-then-optimize* setting. As with (Wang et al., 2020), they focus on learning models for generating objective’s coefficients from contextual information, while our interest is in learning projection matrices, which affect both objectives and constraints unlike the models for objectives. On the practical side, the above line of work provides useful techniques for differentiating outcomes of optimization with respect to input parameters, which we will use to develop our gradient-based method for learning projection matrices.

### 1.3 Notation

For a positive integer  $n$ ,  $\mathbf{I}_n$  and  $\mathbf{0}_n$  denote the  $n \times n$  identity matrix and the  $n$ -dimensional all-zero vector, respectively; we omit the subscript when it is clear from the context. For two matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  with the same number of rows (columns),  $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}]$  ( $[\mathbf{A}; \mathbf{B}]$ ) denotes the matrix obtained by horizontally (vertically) concatenating  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ .

## 2 Reducing Dimensionality via Projection

We describe the basic idea of the projection-based approach for reducing LP variables. The seminal random-projection method of (Vu et al., 2018) was intended for reducing equality constraints, which was later extended to inequality constraints by Poirion et al. (2023). As discussed therein, reducing the number of LP’s inequality constraints corresponds to reducing the dual LP’s dimensionality (or the number of variables). Chen and Mišić (2020) also studied a randomized method for reducing the dimensionality of LPs. Similar to these previous studies, we consider reducing the dimensionality via projection. For ease of dealing with feasibility issues, we focus on the following inequality-form LP (which we will restate in Assumption 2.2):

$$\underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  are input parameters. If  $n$  is large and directly solving (1) is costly, we may alternatively consider the following *projected LP*:

$$\underset{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\text{maximize}} \quad \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  is a *projection matrix* (typically,  $k \ll n$ ). Once we get an optimal solution  $\mathbf{y}^*$  to the projected LP (2), we can recover an  $n$ -dimensional solution to the original LP (1) as  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y}^*$ . Note that the recovered solution is always feasible for (1), although not always optimal. The solution quality, measured by the objective value  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}$ , depends on  $\mathbf{P}$ . Ideally, if  $\mathbf{P}$ ’s columns span a linear subspace that contains an optimal solution to (1), the recovered solution  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y}^*$  is optimal to (1) from the optimality of  $\mathbf{y}^*$  to (2). Therefore, if we find such a good  $\mathbf{P}$  close to being ideal and  $k$  is small, we can efficiently obtain a high-quality solution  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y}^*$  to (1) by solving the smaller projected LP (2).

**Remark 2.1** (Time complexity). The projection-based approach has two main sources of computation costs, multiplying  $\mathbf{P}$  to reduce the dimensionality and solving the projected LP. Recent studies in theoretical computer science have shown that we can solve an LP in almost the same asymptotic computation time as matrix multiplication (Cohen et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2021). Therefore, projection may not be useful for improving the theoretical time complexity of solving LPs. In practice, however, technological advances in GPUs have enabled very fast parallel matrix multiplication, whereas they have less impact on the speed of LP solvers.<sup>2</sup> Considering this large gap between the times for matrix multiplication and solving LPs, we focus on reducing the empirical computation time for solving LPs via projection and treat the time for multiplying  $\mathbf{P}$  as negligible.

### 2.1 Data-Driven Projection

While the previous studies (Vu et al., 2018; Chen and Mišić, 2020; Poirion et al., 2023) have reduced LP sizes via random projection, we may be able to improve solution quality by learning projection matrices from data. Below we formalize this learning task as a statistical learning problem.

Let  $\Pi$  denote the set of all possible LP instances considered and  $\mathcal{D}$  an unknown distribution on  $\Pi$ . Given LP instances sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$ , our goal is to learn  $\mathbf{P}$  that maximizes the projected LP’s optimal value in expectation over  $\mathcal{D}$ . For technical convenience, we assume the following conditions.

**Assumption 2.2.** (i) Every LP instance  $\pi \in \Pi$  is written in the inequality form (1), (ii)  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}_n$  is feasible for all instances in  $\Pi$ , and (iii) there is a finite constant  $H > 0$  that upper bounds optimal values of all instances in  $\Pi$ .

<sup>2</sup>Such a discussion on Gurobi solver can be found at <https://support.gurobi.com/hc/en-us/articles/360012237852-Does-Gurobi-support-GPUs->.

The first condition, which rules out LPs with equality constraints, is an inevitable limitation in the data-driven projection approach. If equality constraints are allowed, the intersection of feasible regions of multiple instances in  $\Pi$  is likely to be empty; then, we cannot find a projection matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  that always yields *feasible* projected LPs (i.e., feasible regions are non-empty). The second and third conditions ensure that for every  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , projected LPs are feasible and *bounded*, standard requirements when discussing LPs. Specifically, (ii) implies that  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_k$  is always feasible for projected LPs, and (iii) ensures that optimal values of projected LPs are always at most  $H$  since every  $\mathbf{P}$  only narrows the feasible regions. The two conditions also imply that optimal values of projected LPs always fall in  $[0, H]$ , which we will use to derive a generalization bound in Section 3.

Although Assumption 2.2 somewhat narrows the class of LPs we can handle, it is not as restrictive as it seems. For example, suppose LP instances in  $\Pi$  have identical equality constraints. We can convert them into the inequality form (1) by considering the null space of the equality constraints (see Appendix B for details), hence satisfying the first condition. This conversion is useful for dealing with maximum or minimum-cost flow LPs on a fixed graph, where we can remove the flow-conservation equality constraints by considering the null space of the incidence matrix of the graph. Regarding the second condition, we may alternatively assume the existence of an arbitrary common feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$  without loss of generality since shifting the feasible regions by  $\mathbf{x}_0$  makes  $\mathbf{0}_n$  feasible. Considering these things, we can formulate many typical problems, including packing, maximum flow, and minimum-cost flow problems, as LPs satisfying Assumption 2.2 (see also Section 5).

Due to the first condition in Assumption 2.2, we can identify each LP instance  $\pi \in \Pi$  with its input parameters  $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})$  in (1). Let  $u(\mathbf{P}, \pi) = \max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$  denote the projected LP's optimal value for  $\pi \in \Pi$  achieved with  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ . Then, our goal is restated as follows: given LP instances sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$ , learn  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  to maximize  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{D}}[u(\mathbf{P}, \pi)]$ . The next section discusses how many samples are sufficient for this purpose.

### 3 Generalization Bound

This section presents a generalization bound for the data-driven projection approach. First, we briefly describe the background of learning theory.

Let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\Pi$  denote a class of functions, where each  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  takes some input  $\pi \in \Pi$  and returns a real value. We use the following *pseudo-dimension* (Pollard, 1984) to measure the complexity of a class of real-valued functions.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $N$  be a positive integer. We say  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\Pi$  *shatters* an input set,  $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\} \subseteq \Pi$ , if there exist threshold values,  $t_1, \dots, t_N \in \mathbb{R}$ , satisfying the following condition: for every  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ , there exists  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $u(\pi_i) \geq t_i$  if and only if  $i \in I$ . The *pseudo-dimension* of  $\mathcal{U}$ , denoted by  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$ , is the maximum cardinality of an input set that  $\mathcal{U}$  can shatter.

That is,  $\mathcal{U}$  shatters  $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$  if all the  $2^N$  outcomes of  $\{u(\pi_i) \geq t_i \mid i = 1, \dots, N\}$  realize for some  $t_1, \dots, t_N \in \mathbb{R}$  by changing  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$  is the largest such  $N$ .

In our case,  $\mathcal{U}$  consists of functions  $u(\mathbf{P}, \cdot) : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for all possible projection matrices  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , where each  $u(\mathbf{P}, \cdot) \in \mathcal{U}$  takes an LP instance  $\pi = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}) \in \Pi$  as input and returns the projected LP's optimal value, i.e.,  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \in \mathbb{R}$ . The range of  $u(\mathbf{P}, \cdot)$  is bounded by  $[0, H]$  for all  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  due to Assumption 2.2. Thus, the well-known uniform convergence result (see, e.g., (Anthony and Bartlett, 2009, Theorems 17.7 and 18.4)) implies that for any distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\Pi$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , if  $N = \Omega((H/\varepsilon)^2(\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U}) \cdot \log(H/\varepsilon) + \log(1/\delta)))$  instances drawn i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{D}$  are given, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , it holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u(\mathbf{P}, \pi_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{D}} [u(\mathbf{P}, \pi)] \right| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3)$$

Roughly speaking, if a projection matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  yields high objective values on  $N \approx (H/\varepsilon)^2 \cdot \text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$  instances sampled i.i.d. from  $\mathcal{D}$ , then it likely achieves high objective values on future instances from  $\mathcal{D}$  as well. Note that the above bound holds uniformly over all  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ , which is crucial for preventing learned  $\mathbf{P}$  from overfitting the sampled instances. Moreover, the uniform bound provides performance guarantees regardless of how  $\mathbf{P}$  is learned. Therefore, we can adopt any learning method based on the empirical performance. We will discuss learning methods in Section 4.

As discussed above, the pseudo-dimension,  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$ , of  $\mathcal{U} = \{u(\mathbf{P}, \cdot) : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}\}$  is the key to deriving a generalization bound. Below we evaluate  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$ .

### 3.1 Upper Bound on the Pseudo-Dimension

We derive an upper bound on the pseudo-dimension by combining the proof idea of data-driven algorithm design (Gupta and Roughgarden, 2017; Balcan, 2021) with our structural observation of LP’s optimal value (Lemma 3.2).

As discussed above, the number of possible outcomes of  $\{u(\mathbf{P}, \pi_i) \geq t_i \mid i = 1, \dots, N\}$  must be  $2^N$  for shattering  $N$  instances. Thus, if we have an upper bound on the number of outcomes that grows more slowly than  $2^N$ , the largest possible  $N$  where the upper bound is no less than  $2^N$  gives an upper bound on  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U})$ .

To evaluate the number of outcomes, we discuss a fundamental question: *how does LP’s optimal value behave when input parameters change?*<sup>3</sup> In our case, a projected LP has input parameters  $(\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times k} \times \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}$  can change with  $\mathbf{P}$ . Thus, answering this question offers insight into the number of outcomes when  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  changes. Lemma 3.2 gives an answer to a more general setting, which may be of independent interest as it may help theoretical analyses of learning through LPs in other contexts, e.g., (Wilder et al., 2019; Berthet et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2020; Elmachtoub and Grigas, 2022).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\pi = (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times k} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  be a bounded feasible LP instance and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that each entry of  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $d$  in  $\nu$  real variables  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ . Then, there exists a set of up to  $\binom{m+2k}{2k} (m+2k+2)$  polynomials of degree at most  $(2k+1)d$  in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  whose sign patterns ( $< 0$ ,  $= 0$ , or  $> 0$ ) partition  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  into some regions such that whether  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \geq t$  is identical within each region.*

*Proof.* We rewrite the input  $k$ -dimensional LP as an equivalent  $2k$ -dimensional LP with non-negativity constraints,  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top (\mathbf{y}^+ - \mathbf{y}^-) \mid \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}^+ - \mathbf{y}^-) \leq \mathbf{b}, [\mathbf{y}^+; \mathbf{y}^-] \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ . The resulting constraint matrix,  $[\mathbf{A}, -\mathbf{A}; -\mathbf{I}_{2k}]$ , has full column rank, simplifying the subsequent discussion. The maximum degree of input parameters remains at most  $d$ . The LP sizes,  $m$  and  $k$ , increase to  $m' := m + 2k$  and  $k' := 2k$ , respectively.<sup>4</sup> Thus, we below suppose that  $\mathbf{A}$  is an  $m' \times k'$  matrix with full column rank and accordingly replace  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  with  $[\mathbf{c}; -\mathbf{c}]$  and  $[\mathbf{b}; \mathbf{0}_{2k}]$ , respectively.

We consider determining  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \geq t$  or not by examining all the vertices of the feasible region. For every size- $k'$  subset  $I$  of row indices of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m' \times k'}$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_I$  be the  $k' \times k'$  submatrix of  $\mathbf{A}$  with rows restricted to  $I$  and  $\mathbf{b}_I \in \mathbb{R}^{k'}$  the corresponding subvector of  $\mathbf{b}$ . If  $\det \mathbf{A}_I \neq 0$ , set  $\mathbf{y}_I := \mathbf{A}_I^{-1} \mathbf{b}_I$  and check whether  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}_I \leq \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_I \geq t$  hold or not. Since the input LP is bounded and feasible, there always exists a vertex optimal solution written as  $\mathbf{y}_I = \mathbf{A}_I^{-1} \mathbf{b}_I$  for some  $I$  (see the proof of (Korte and Vygen, 2012, Proposition 3.1)). Thus, the optimal value is at least  $t$  if and only if  $\det \mathbf{A}_I \neq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}_I \leq \mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_I \geq t$  hold for some  $I$ .

Based on the above observation, we identify polynomials whose sign patterns determine  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \geq t$  or not. Fixing  $I$ , if  $\det \mathbf{A}_I \neq 0$ , Cramer’s rule implies that  $\mathbf{y}_I = \mathbf{A}_I^{-1} \mathbf{b}_I$  is written as  $\mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \det \mathbf{A}_I$ , where  $\mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a  $k'$ -valued polynomial vector of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  with degree at most  $k'd$ . Hence, we can check  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}_I \leq \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y}_I \geq t$  by examining sign patterns of  $m' + 1$  polynomials,  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (\det \mathbf{A}_I)\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - t \det \mathbf{A}_I$ , with degrees at most  $(k' + 1)d$ . Therefore, considering all the  $\binom{m'}{k'}$  choices of  $I$ , there are  $\binom{m'}{k'} (m' + 2)$  polynomials of the form  $\det \mathbf{A}_I$ ,  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (\det \mathbf{A}_I)\mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{f}_I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - t \det \mathbf{A}_I$  with degrees at most  $(k' + 1)d$  whose sign patterns partition  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  into some regions such that  $\max\{\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\} \geq t$  or not is identical within each region. Substituting  $m + 2k$  and  $2k$  into  $m'$  and  $k'$ , respectively, completes the proof.  $\square$

From Lemma 3.2, we can obtain an upper bound on the number of possible outcomes by bounding the number of possible sign patterns of polynomials. Such an upper bound on the number of sign patterns of polynomials is known as *Warren’s theorem*, and we can upper bound the pseudo-dimension by combining it with Lemma 3.2 as follows.

**Theorem 3.3.** *It holds that  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U}) = O(nk^2 \log mk)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\pi, t) \in \Pi \times \mathbb{R}$  be a pair of an LP instance and a threshold value. Letting  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{P}$  and  $d = 1$  in Lemma 3.2, we see that there are up to  $\binom{m+2k}{k} (m + 2k + 2)$  polynomials of degree at most  $2k + 1$  whose sign patterns determine whether  $u_\pi(\mathbf{P}) \geq t$  or not. Therefore, given  $N$  pairs of instances and threshold values, we have up to  $N \times \binom{m+2k}{k} (m + 2k + 2)$  such polynomials whose sign patterns determine  $u_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{P}) \geq t_i$  or not for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . From Warren’s theorem, the number of possible sign patterns of  $\ell$  polynomials of  $\nu$  variables with degree at most  $\Delta$  is bounded by  $(8\ell\Delta/\nu)^\nu$  from above (Warren, 1968) (see also (Goldberg and Jerrum, 1995,

<sup>3</sup>This question is related to *sensitivity analysis* of LPs, and a similar one has been studied in (Balcan et al., 2022b, Theorem 3.1). Unlike Lemma 3.2, their result focuses on the case new constraints are added to LPs to analyze branch-and-cut methods.

<sup>4</sup>These increases will not affect the asymptotic upper bound on the pseudo-dimension discussed later.

Corollary 2.1)). In our case, there are  $\nu = nk$  variables (i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}$ 's entries), and thus the number of all possible outcomes of  $\{u_{\pi_i}(\mathbf{P}) \geq t_i \mid i = 1, \dots, N\}$  is at most  $\left(8eN \binom{m+2k}{2k} (m+2k+2)(2k+1)/(nk)\right)^{nk} \lesssim \left(\frac{N}{nk}\right)^{nk} \text{poly}(m, k)^{nk^2}$ . To shatter  $N$  instances, this bound on the number of outcomes must be at least  $2^N$ . That is, taking the base-2 logarithm, it must hold that  $N \lesssim nk \log_2 \frac{N}{nk} + O(nk^2 \log mk) \leq \frac{2}{3}N + O(nk^2 \log mk)$ . Solving this for the largest possible  $N$  implies the  $O(nk^2 \log mk)$  upper bound on the pseudo-dimension.  $\square$

### 3.2 Lower Bound on the Pseudo-Dimension

We complement the upper bound by proving the following lower bound on the pseudo-dimension.

**Theorem 3.4.** *It holds that  $\text{pdim}(\mathcal{U}) = \Omega(nk)$ .*

We present the proof in Appendix A. Our proof indeed gives the same lower bound on the  $\gamma$ -fat shattering dimension for  $\gamma < 1/2$ , which implies a lower bound of  $\Omega(nk/\varepsilon)$  on the sample size needed to guarantee (3) (see (Anthony and Bartlett, 2009, Theorem 19.5)). Thus, our result implies a sample complexity bound that is tight up to a  $\tilde{O}(k/\varepsilon)$  factor. The  $1/\varepsilon$  gap is known to be inevitable in general, as detailed in (Anthony and Bartlett, 2009, Section 19.5), while closing the  $\tilde{O}(k)$  gap is an interesting open problem.

## 4 Learning Methods

The generalization bound tells us that *regardless of how we learn*, if we can find a projection matrix performing well on sufficiently many sampled LP instances, it is expected to do well on future instances. This in turn motivates us to study how to learn high-performing projection matrices. Below, we discuss two natural methods based on PCA (principal component analysis) and gradient ascent for learning projection matrices given  $N$  past instances.

Note that we learn projection matrices from past data as a pre-processing step before addressing future LP instances. Therefore, learning methods are usually allowed to take much longer than the time for solving new LP instances. The learning methods discussed below are intended for conceptual simplicity but not for efficiency. We leave the development of fast learning methods for future work.

### 4.1 PCA-Based Method

As discussed in Section 2.1, intuitively, a projection matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  should have columns that span a low-dimensional subspace around which future optimal solutions will appear. Therefore, a natural approach is to regard optimal solutions to past LP instances as data points and apply PCA to them to extract such a subspace. We detail this method below.

Let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$  be a matrix whose  $i$ th row is an optimal solution to the  $i$ th past instance. We apply PCA to  $\mathbf{X}$  to obtain a basis of a low-dimensional subspace around which the data points (i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}$ 's rows) exist. As with the standard PCA, we subtract the mean,  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{1}_N$ , from each row of  $\mathbf{X}$ , and apply the singular value decomposition (SVD) to the resulting matrix. Suppose that  $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{1}_N \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top$  is decomposed as  $\mathbf{U} \Sigma \mathbf{V}^\top$ . Let  $\mathbf{V}_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k-1)}$  be the submatrix of  $\mathbf{V}$  whose columns are the top  $k-1$  right-singular vectors of  $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{1}_N \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top$ . We use  $\mathbf{P} = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{k-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$  as a projection matrix, where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is concatenated so that  $\mathbf{P}$  can span a subspace that better covers the rows of  $\mathbf{X}$ . More precisely, since  $\mathbf{V}_{k-1}$  is constructed so that  $\mathbf{V}_{k-1} \mathbf{Y}' \approx \mathbf{X}^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{1}_N^\top$  holds for appropriate  $\mathbf{Y}' \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1) \times N}$ , it is expected that  $[\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{k-1}] \mathbf{Y} \approx \mathbf{X}^\top$  holds for appropriate  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times N}$ , hence the choice of  $\mathbf{P} = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{V}_{k-1}]$ .

Given optimal solutions to past LP instances, this method only requires computing the top  $k-1$  right-singular vectors of  $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{1}_N \bar{\mathbf{x}}^\top$ , hence is fairly efficient.

### 4.2 Gradient-Based Method

While the PCA-based method aims to span the subspace where future optimal solutions are likely to be, it only uses information from optimal solutions and does not directly consider LP's input parameters. To complement this, we present another method that directly improves the LP's optimal value via gradient ascent.

Table 1: Sizes of inequality-form LPs used in experiments.  $m$  and  $n$  are the number of constraints and variables, respectively.

	Synthetic			Netlib				
	Packing	MaxFlow	MinCostFlow	GROW7	ISRAEL	SC205	SCAGR25	STAIR
$m$	50	1000	1000	581	316	317	671	696
$n$	500	500	500	301	142	203	500	467

For an LP instance  $\pi = (c, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})$ , we consider maximizing  $u(\mathbf{P}, \pi) = \max\{c^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$  via gradient ascent. As in the proof of (Tan et al., 2020, Theorem 1), if the projected LP satisfies *Slater’s condition* (i.e., a strictly feasible solution exists) and has an optimal solution  $\mathbf{y}^*$  such that constraints active at  $\mathbf{y}^*$  are linearly independent,  $u(\mathbf{P}, \pi)$  is differentiable in  $\mathbf{P}$  and the gradient is written as

$$\nabla u(\mathbf{P}, \pi) = c\mathbf{y}^{*\top} - \mathbf{A}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \mathbf{y}^{*\top}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a dual optimal solution. Hence, we can apply gradient ascent to  $\mathbf{P}$  to maximize  $u(\mathbf{P}, \pi)$  if Slater’s condition holds and active constraints at  $\mathbf{y}^*$  are linearly independent. The latter is satisfied for generic LP instances and projection matrices  $\mathbf{P}$ . However, Slater’s condition is prone to be violated. For example, if the original feasible region,  $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$ , lies in the non-negative orthant but each column of  $\mathbf{P}$  has both positive and negative entries, then the projected feasible region,  $\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$ , is likely to be a singleton of  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_k$ . Satisfying Slater’s condition is indeed essential for the gradient (4) to be valid since (4) follows from the *implicit function theorem* applied to the *Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) condition*, which is necessary for the optimality only when Slater’s condition holds.

To alleviate this issue, we apply the following projection for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  before computing the gradient in (4):

$$\mathbf{P}_{:,j} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{P}_{:,j}\|_2 \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_{:,j}$  denotes the  $j$ th column of  $\mathbf{P}$ . This projection minimally changes each column  $\mathbf{P}_{:,j}$  to satisfy the original constraints. Consequently, any convex combination of the columns of  $\mathbf{P}$  is feasible for the original LP, increasing the chance that a strictly feasible solution exists for  $\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$ , although it is not guaranteed.

In practice, we learn  $\mathbf{P}$  from a training dataset of sampled LP instances,  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N$ . For ease of computation, we update  $\mathbf{P}$  stochastically as with SGD, i.e., we iteratively compute the gradient (4) for a single instance,  $\pi_i$ , and update  $\mathbf{P}$  with it for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Note that the projection (5) onto the feasible region of  $\pi_i$  comes before the gradient update. We refer to this method as SGA (stochastic gradient ascent).

### 4.3 Final Projection for Improving Feasibility

As highlighted in the above discussion, ensuring that each column of  $\mathbf{P}$  is feasible for past LPs can increase the likelihood that projected LPs of future instances will have strictly feasible solutions. Considering this, after obtaining a projection matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  with either the PCA- or the gradient-based method, we project each column of  $\mathbf{P}$  onto the intersection of the feasible regions of past LP instances, which we call the *final projection*. This can be done similarly to (5) replacing the constraints with  $[\mathbf{A}_1; \dots; \mathbf{A}_N]\mathbf{x} \leq [\mathbf{b}_1; \dots; \mathbf{b}_N]$ . If  $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N$  are identical, we can do it more efficiently by replacing the constraints with  $\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{x} \leq \min\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N\}$ , where the minimum is taken elementwise. Note that while the final projection can be costly, it needs to be done only once at the end of learning  $\mathbf{P}$ .

## 5 Experiments

We conducted experiments to evaluate the performance of the data-driven projection approach. We used MacBook Air with Apple M2 chip, 24 GB of memory, and macOS Ventura 13.5. We implemented algorithms in Python 3.9.7 with libraries such as NumPy 1.23.2. We used Gurobi 10.0.1 (Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2023) for solving LPs and quadratic programs for projection (5).




Figure 1: Average objective ratios (upper) and running times (lower) of Full, Random, PCA, and SGA for solving test LPs. Full’ results are shown for every  $k$  for reference, although it always solves  $n$ -dimensional LPs and hence is independent of  $k$ .

**General settings.** We used three types of synthetic LPs (Packing, MaxFlow, and MinCostFlow) and five types of realistic LPs (GROW7, ISRAEL, SC205, SCAGR25, and STAIR) fetched from Netlib (Browne et al., 1995). Section 5 summarizes the problem sizes.<sup>5</sup> For each problem, we created an initial LP instance and perturbed it to make a dataset of 300 random instances (200/100 for training/testing). We generated noises by multiplying certain parameters of an initial instance by  $1 + 0.1\sigma$ , thus making the noise strength invariant to the scale of parameters. We draw  $\sigma$  from either the standard normal distribution or uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ , depending on whether we intend to preserve the expected value or the non-negativity of perturbed parameters, respectively. How to create an initial instance and which parameters to perturb are problem-specific, hence described below. Since the original LPs of MaxFlow, MinCostFlow, GROW7, SC205, SCAGR25, and STAIR had equality constraints, we obtained equivalent inequality-form LPs as in Appendix B. The procedure described there uses a (trivially) feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . Below, we detail the problem-specific setups, including how we obtained  $\mathbf{x}_0$  for the six problems.

<sup>5</sup>We used moderate-size LPs to prevent the learning methods from taking too long. While we acknowledge that larger instances might introduce new challenges, the trends observed in our results offer informative insights for larger scenarios as well.

**Packing.** We consider packing LPs, i.e., all entries of  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}$  are non-negative. We created an initial instance with  $(m, n) = (50, 500)$  by drawing every entry of  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}$  from the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$  and multiplying  $\mathbf{b}$  by  $n$ . We obtained random instances by perturbing all entries of  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}$  by drawing  $\sigma$  from the uniform distribution.

**MaxFlow and MinCostFlow.** We consider maximum and minimum-cost flow problems, referred to as MaxFlow and MinCostFlow, respectively. We first randomly created a directed graph with 50 vertices and 500 arcs and specified source and sink vertices, denoted by  $s$  and  $t$ , respectively. We confirmed that there was an arc from  $s$  to  $t$  for the sake of feasibility. We set initial arc capacities to 1, which we perturbed by drawing  $\sigma$  from the uniform distribution to obtain training and test instances. For MinCostFlow, we set initial arc costs to 1 for all arcs but  $(s, t)$ , to which we assigned a sufficiently large cost, and perturbed them with  $\sigma$  drawn from the uniform distribution. We set supply at  $s$  and demand at  $t$  to 1. We thus created MaxFlow (and MinCostFlow) instances with random capacities (and costs). These random instances have identical equality constraints representing flow conservation (and demands), which we removed as in Appendix B. For MaxFlow, we used  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$  (i.e., no flow) as a trivially feasible solution. For MinCostFlow, we let  $\mathbf{x}_0$  be all zeros but a single 1 at the entry of  $(s, t)$ , which is a trivially feasible (but costly) solution.

**Netlib problems.** We also addressed five LP instances (GROW7, ISRAEL, SC205, SCAGR25, and STAIR) provided in Netlib. Using the original LPs as initial instances, we obtained random instances by perturbing coefficients of objective functions with  $\sigma$  drawn from the normal distribution. Except for ISRAEL, all the original LPs had equality constraints. We removed them as described in Appendix B using  $\mathbf{x}_0$  found by the initialization procedure of Gurobi’s interior-point method.<sup>6</sup>

**Methods.** We compared four methods, Full, Random, PCA, and SGA, detailed below. The last two are data-driven projection methods, while the first two are baselines.

**Full:** A standard method that solves original  $n$ -dimensional LPs without reducing the dimensionality.

**Random:** A baseline column-randomization method based on (Chen and Mišić, 2020) that reduces the dimensionality by randomly selecting  $k$  out of  $n$  variables and fixing those unselected to zeros.

**PCA:** The PCA-based method presented in Section 4.1 followed by the final projection onto the intersection of feasible regions of training instances, as in Section 4.3.

**SGA:** The gradient-based method described in Section 4.2 followed by the final projection. We initialized  $\mathbf{P}$  with that obtained by PCA and ran one epoch of training with the learning rate of 0.01.

For Random, PCA, and SGA, we used increasing values of the reduced dimensionality  $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{100} \rfloor, 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{100} \rfloor, 3 \lfloor \frac{n}{100} \rfloor, \dots$  until it reached the maximum value no more than  $\lfloor \frac{n}{10} \rfloor$ , i.e., up to 10% of the original dimensionality. PCA and SGA learned  $n \times k$  projection matrices on the 200 training instances, which were used to reduce the dimensionality of the 100 test instances. For Random, we tried 10 independent choices of  $k$  variables and reported the average and standard deviation of the results.

**Results.** We compared the four methods regarding objective values and running times for solving test LP instances. Figure 1 shows the results. We normalized the objective values by those of Full, which we call objective ratios. For all instances except STAIR, PCA and/or SGA with the largest  $k$  ( $\leq \lfloor \frac{n}{10} \rfloor$ ) achieved objective values that were approximately 97% to 99% of Full’s objective values, while running about 4 to 80 times faster. As for STAIR, PCA and SGA attained 12.6% and 53.6% of Full’s values, respectively. By stark contrast, Random resulted in objective ratios close to zero for most instances except for Packing and ISRAEL. The results suggest that if past data is informative, we can achieve significantly better objective values than Random by learning projection matrices. As for running times, there are noticeable differences between PCA/SGA and Random, which probably stemmed from Gurobi’s numerical property. That being said, the three were significantly faster than Full.

<sup>6</sup>We expect such an  $\mathbf{x}_0$  to be an analytic center of the feasible region, although we could not verify Gurobi’s internal processes.

Comparing PCA and SGA, SGA improved PCA’s performance in Packing, MaxFlow, MinCostFlow, and STAIR, while performing similarly in GROW7 and SC205. However, in ISRAEL and SCAGR25, SGA performed worse than PCA, which is not surprising since the maximization of  $u(\mathbf{P}, \pi)$  is a non-concave problem, and we did not meticulously tune the learning rate of SGA. This observation suggests that no method could be the best for all instances. Fortunately, whatever method we choose based on the empirical performance, our generalization bound can ensure its expected performance in future instances. We also show the training times of PCA and SGA in Appendix C.

## 6 Concluding Remarks

We have studied the data-driven projection approach to LPs. We have obtained a generalization bound by proving an  $\tilde{O}(nk^2)$  upper bound on the pseudo-dimension and complemented it by an  $\Omega(nk)$  lower bound. We have also studied PCA- and gradient-based learning methods and experimentally confirmed their effectiveness. These theoretical and empirical findings serve as cornerstones of the data-driven projection, which we believe is a promising approach, particularly due to its solver-agnostic and GPU-friendly natures.

We discuss limitations and future directions. While we have focused on reducing the dimensionality of LPs, we have not discussed how to reduce the number of constraints, mainly for avoiding theoretically intricate discussions on infeasible cases. Also, as mentioned in Remark 2.1, the projection-based approach has a limited effect on the theoretical time complexity for solving LPs. As stated in Assumption 2.2, our current approach cannot deal with equality constraints that vary across instances. While the learning methods we presented are intended for conceptual simplicity, developing more efficient learning methods is an important future direction. For example, Indyk et al. (2021) has found that a few-shot learning method is useful for learning sketching matrices for low-rank approximation efficiently. We expect that similar efficient methods can be developed for learning projection matrices for LPs, which will ease the application of the data-driven projection approach to large-scale LPs.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER1903 and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22K17853.

## References

- Warren, H. E. (1968). “Lower Bounds for Approximation by Nonlinear Manifolds”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 133.1, pp. 167–178 (cit. on p. 5).
- Pollard, D. (1984). *Convergence of Stochastic Processes*. 1st. Springer (cit. on p. 4).
- Browne, S., J. Dongarra, E. Grosse, and T. Rowan (1995). “The Netlib mathematical software repository”. In: *D-lib Magazine*. <https://www.netlib.org/lp/data/> (cit. on p. 8).
- Goldberg, P. W. and M. R. Jerrum (1995). “Bounding the Vapnik–Chervonenkis dimension of concept classes parameterized by real numbers”. In: *Machine Learning* 18.2, pp. 131–148 (cit. on p. 5).
- Anthony, M. and P. L. Bartlett (2009). *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press (cit. on pp. 4, 6).
- Korte, B. and J. Vygen (2012). *Combinatorial Optimization: Theory and Algorithms*. 5th. Springer (cit. on p. 5).
- Woodruff, D. P. (2014). “Sketching as a Tool for Numerical Linear Algebra”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science* 10.1–2, pp. 1–157 (cit. on p. 1).
- Amos, B. and J. Z. Kolter (2017). “OptNet: Differentiable Optimization as a Layer in Neural Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2017)*. Vol. 70. PMLR, pp. 136–145 (cit. on p. 2).
- Gupta, R. and T. Roughgarden (2017). “A PAC Approach to Application-Specific Algorithm Selection”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 46.3, pp. 992–1017 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Huangfu, Q. and J. A. J. Hall (2018). “Parallelizing the dual revised simplex method”. In: *Mathematical Programming Computation* 10.1, pp. 119–142 (cit. on p. 1).
- Vu, K., P.-L. Poirion, and L. Liberti (2018). “Random Projections for Linear Programming”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 43.4, pp. 1051–1071 (cit. on pp. 1–3).

- Agrawal, A., B. Amos, S. Barratt, S. Boyd, S. Diamond, and J. Z. Kolter (2019). “Differentiable Convex Optimization Layers”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*. Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. (cit. on p. 2).
- Indyk, P., A. Vakilian, and Y. Yuan (2019). “Learning-Based Low-Rank Approximations”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*. Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- Wilder, B., B. Dilkina, and M. Tambe (2019). “Melding the Data-Decisions Pipeline: Decision-Focused Learning for Combinatorial Optimization”. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2019)*. Vol. 33, pp. 1658–1665 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Berthet, Q., M. Blondel, O. Teboul, M. Cuturi, J.-P. Vert, and F. Bach (2020). “Learning with Differentiable Perturbed Optimizers”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 9508–9519 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Chen, Y.-C. and V. V. Mišić (2020). “Column-Randomized Linear Programs: Performance Guarantees and Applications”. In: *arXiv:2007.10461* (cit. on pp. 1–3, 9).
- Tan, Y., D. Terekhov, and A. Delong (2020). “Learning Linear Programs from Optimal Decisions”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 19738–19749 (cit. on pp. 2, 5, 7).
- Wang, K., B. Wilder, A. Perrault, and M. Tambe (2020). “Automatically Learning Compact Quality-aware Surrogates for Optimization Problems”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*. Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 9586–9596 (cit. on p. 2).
- Balcan, M.-F. (2021). “Data-Driven Algorithm Design”. In: *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 626–645 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Berthold, T. and G. Hendel (2021). “Learning To Scale Mixed-Integer Programs”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2021)*. Vol. 35, pp. 3661–3668 (cit. on p. 2).
- Cohen, M. B., Y. T. Lee, and Z. Song (2021). “Solving Linear Programs in the Current Matrix Multiplication Time”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 68.1, pp. 1–39 (cit. on p. 3).
- Indyk, P., T. Wagner, and D. Woodruff (2021). “Few-Shot Data-Driven Algorithms for Low Rank Approximation”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2021)*. Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 10678–10690 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 10).
- Jiang, S., Z. Song, O. Weinstein, and H. Zhang (2021). “A faster algorithm for solving general LPs”. In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 823–832 (cit. on p. 3).
- Balcan, M.-F., S. Prasad, T. Sandholm, and E. Vitercik (2022a). “Improved sample complexity bounds for branch-and-cut”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming (CP 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (cit. on p. 2).
- (2022b). “Structural Analysis of Branch-and-Cut and the Learnability of Gomory Mixed Integer Cuts”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2022)*. Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 33890–33903 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Bartlett, P. L., P. Indyk, and T. Wagner (2022). “Generalization Bounds for Data-Driven Numerical Linear Algebra”. In: *Proceedings of 35th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT 2022)*. Vol. 178. PMLR, pp. 2013–2040 (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- Chowdhury, A., G. Dexter, P. London, H. Avron, and P. Drineas (2022). “Faster Randomized Interior Point Methods for Tall/Wide Linear Programs”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23.336, pp. 1–48 (cit. on p. 1).
- El Balghiti, O., A. N. Elmachtoub, P. Grigas, and A. Tewari (2022). “Generalization Bounds in the Predict-Then-Optimize Framework”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 0.0, null (cit. on p. 2).
- Elmachtoub, A. N. and P. Grigas (2022). “Smart “Predict, then Optimize””. In: *Management science* 68.1, pp. 9–26 (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- Sakaue, S. and T. Oki (2022). “Sample Complexity of Learning Heuristic Functions for Greedy-Best-First and A\* Search”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2022)*. Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 2889–2901 (cit. on p. 2).

- Amos, B. (2023). “Tutorial on amortized optimization”. In: *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 16.5, pp. 1935–8237 (cit. on p. 2).
- Fan, Z., X. Wang, O. Yakovenko, A. A. Sivas, O. Ren, Y. Zhang, and Z. Zhou (2023). “Smart Initial Basis Selection for Linear Programs”. In: *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2023)*. Vol. 202. PMLR, pp. 9650–9664 (cit. on p. 2).
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC (2023). *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*. <https://www.gurobi.com> (cit. on p. 7).
- Li, Y., H. Lin, S. Liu, A. Vakilian, and D. Woodruff (2023). “Learning the Positions in CountSketch”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2023)* (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- Poirion, P.-L., B. F. Lourenço, and A. Takeda (2023). “Random projections of linear and semidefinite problems with linear inequalities”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 664, pp. 24–60 (cit. on pp. 1–3).
- Sakaue, S. and T. Oki (2023). “Improved Generalization Bound and Learning of Sparsity Patterns for Data-Driven Low-Rank Approximation”. In: *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS 2023)*. Vol. 206. PMLR, pp. 1–10 (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- Sun, Y., A. T. Ernst, X. Li, and J. Weiner (2023). “Learning to Generate Columns with Application to Vertex Coloring”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2023)* (cit. on p. 2).

# Appendix

## A Proof of the Lower Bound on the Pseudo-Dimension

We prove Theorem 3.4 by providing concrete  $(n - 2k)k$  LP instances that  $\mathcal{U}$  can shatter. The instances are written as  $\pi_{r,s} = (\mathbf{c}_r, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}_s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{2k \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{2k}$  for  $r = 1, \dots, n - 2k$  and  $s = 1, \dots, k$ , where  $\mathbf{c}_r = [\mathbf{e}_r; \mathbf{0}_{2k}]$ ,  $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{0}_{2k, n-2k}, \mathbf{I}_{2k}]$ , and  $\mathbf{b}_s = [\mathbf{e}_s; \mathbf{0}_k]$ . Here,  $\mathbf{e}_r$  and  $\mathbf{e}_s$  are the  $r$ th and  $s$ th standard basis vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-2k}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , respectively, and  $\mathbf{0}_{a,b}$  is the  $a \times b$  matrix of all zeros.

We consider projection matrices of the form  $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{I}_k; -\mathbf{I}_k]$ , where  $\mathbf{Q} \in \{0, 1\}^{(n-2k) \times k}$  is a binary matrix that we use as tunable parameters. Let  $y_j$  denote the  $j$ th entry of the variable vector  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Since we have  $\mathbf{AP} = [\mathbf{I}_k; -\mathbf{I}_k]$ , the constraints,  $\mathbf{AP}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}_s$ , imply  $y_j = 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  with  $j \neq s$  and  $y_s \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $\mathbf{y}$  be such a feasible solution. Then, the objective value is written as  $\mathbf{c}_r^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{e}_r^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{y} = Q_{r,s}y_s$ , where  $Q_{r,s}$  is the  $(r, s)$  entry of  $\mathbf{Q} \in \{0, 1\}^{(n-2k) \times k}$ . Since  $Q_{r,s} \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $y_s \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\max\{\mathbf{c}_r^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{AP}\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{b}_s\} = Q_{r,s}$ . This means that the  $(n - 2k)k$  instances can be shattered by setting all threshold values to  $1/2$  and appropriately choosing each entry of  $\mathbf{Q} \in \{0, 1\}^{(n-2k) \times k}$ . (In other words, all the  $2^{(n-2k)k}$  outcomes of  $\{u(\mathbf{P}, \pi_{r,s}) = Q_{r,s} \geq 1/2 \mid r = 1, \dots, n - 2k, s = 1, \dots, k\}$  can realize by changing  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ .) Thus, we obtain an  $\Omega(nk)$  lower bound on the pseudo-dimension of  $\mathcal{U} = \{u(\mathbf{P}, \cdot) : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}\}$ .

## B How to Remove Equality Constraints

Suppose that we are given an LP of the form  $\max\{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}}, \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{b}_{\text{eq}}\}$ , which has both inequality and equality constraints. Assuming that a (trivially) feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is available (i.e.,  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{x}_0 \leq \mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{b}_{\text{eq}}$ ), we equivalently convert the LP into an inequality-form. We first replace the variable vector  $\mathbf{z}$  with  $\mathbf{z}' + \mathbf{x}_0$ , obtaining an equivalent LP of the form  $\max\{\mathbf{w}^\top (\mathbf{z}' + \mathbf{x}_0) \mid \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{z}' \leq \mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{0}\}$ . The equality constraints,  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{0}$ , mean that  $\mathbf{z}'$  must be in the null space of  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{z}'$  is always represented as  $\mathbf{z}' = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})\mathbf{x}$  with some  $\mathbf{x}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger$  is the pseudo-inverse of  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$  and  $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$  is the orthogonal projection matrix onto the null space of  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$ .<sup>7</sup> Substituting  $\mathbf{z}' = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})\mathbf{x}$  into the LP, we can remove the equality constraints since they are automatically satisfied for every  $\mathbf{x}$ . After all, by transforming the variable vector as  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}_0$ , we can obtain an equivalent LP of the form  $\max\{\mathbf{w}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{x}_0\}$  (omitting the constant term,  $\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_0$ , in the objective function), which is an inequality-form LP (1) with  $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})^\top \mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}^\dagger \mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}})$ , and  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}} - \mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}\mathbf{x}_0$ . Note that  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$  is always feasible for the resulting LP and that we can use this transformation even when  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{ineq}}$ , and/or  $\mathbf{b}_{\text{ineq}}$  can change across instances if  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{\text{eq}}$  are fixed.

## C Running Time of Learning Methods

Figure 2 shows the time taken by PCA and SGA for learning projection matrices on the training datasets. (Full and Random are not included since they do not learn projection matrices.) We assumed that optimal solutions of training instances were given, and hence the time for solving original LPs was not included. We see that SGA took much longer than PCA, which is natural since SGA iteratively solves LPs for computing gradients (4) and quadratic programs for projection (5).

<sup>7</sup>We may also represent  $\mathbf{z}'$  by a linear combination of a basis of the null space of  $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eq}}$ , which we can compute via SVD. However, we found that this representation is numerically unstable in our experiments.




Figure 2: Average running times of PCA and SGA for learning projection matrices on the training datasets.