Labs
Optimization for Machine Learning
Spring 2021

EPFL
School of Computer and Communication Sciences
Martin Jaggi & Nicolas Flammarion
github.com/epfml/OptML_course

Problem Set 4 — Solutions (Proximal Gradient and Subgradient Descent)

Proximal Gradient and Subgradient Descent

Solve Exercises 24, 25, 26, 27 from the lecture notes.

Exercise 24. *Prove Lemma 3.12!*

Hint: *It is useful to prove that with $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ as in (3.12) and satisfying (3.13),*

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}.$$

Solution: We claim that for any $1 \le p \le d$

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}.$$

- Assume for the moment that this claim is true. The claim means that if $p_1 \le p_2$, then $\|\mathbf{x}^\star(p_1) - \mathbf{v}\| \ge \|\mathbf{x}^\star(p_2) - \mathbf{v}\|$ since $\mathbf{x}^\star(p_2)$ is a solution of minimization problem with less constraints than for $\mathbf{x}^\star(p_1)$ (components $p_1 + 1$ to p_2 do not have to be equal to 0).

  Now suppose Lemma 3.12 is wrong and $x^\star(p^*)$ is not a solution and there exists another $p \ne p^\star$ such that $\Pi_X(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{x}^\star(p)$. Notice that such p can be only smaller than $p^\star$ as for greater values p, $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ (from Lemma 3.11) would have negative components and contradict Lemma 3.10. But for $p < p^\star$, $\|\mathbf{x}^\star(p) - \mathbf{v}\| \ge \|\mathbf{x}^\star(p^\star) - \mathbf{v}\|$, so if $\Pi_X(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ then it has to hold that $\|\mathbf{x}^\star(p) - \mathbf{v}\| = \|\mathbf{x}^\star(p^\star) - \mathbf{v}\|$ and $\mathbf{x}^\star(p^\star)$ is also a projection. We know that the projection on a convex set is unique, and thus $\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \mathbf{x}^\star(p^\star)$, which is impossible by the construction ($p+1$ component of $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ is equal to 0, and that of $\mathbf{x}^\star(p^\star)$ is strictly positive), which leads to a contradiction.

- It remains only to prove our claim. That is, to show that for a given $1 \le p \le d$ indeed

  $$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\},$$

  provided that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ satisfies conditions (3.12) and (3.13).

  Let $Y = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}$, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as $f(x) = \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}\|^2$. To prove our claim, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p) \in Y$ is a minimizer of f over Y. By the optimality condition of Lemma 1.27, it suffices to show that $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*(p)) \ge 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Y$. Because $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x})$, we want to show that

  $$-2(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*(p)) \ge 0. \tag{1}$$

  Notice that the first p coordinates of $(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))$ are all equal to Θ_p. Moreover, the last $(d-p)$ coordinates of both $\mathbf{x} \in Y$ and $\mathbf{x}^*(p)$ are all equal to 0. Therefore, we get that $(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))$ equals

  $$(\Theta_p, \ldots, \Theta_p, v_{p+1}, \ldots, v_d)^\top(x_1 - v_1 + \Theta_p, \ldots, x_p - v_p + \Theta_p, 0, \ldots, 0)$$

  Expanding this product, we get

  $$(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*(p)) = \Theta_p \sum_{i=1}^{p}(x_i - v_i + \Theta_p) = \Theta_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} x_i - \sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i + p\Theta_p\right).$$

Because $\mathbf{x} \in Y$, we know that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} x_i = 1$, and since $\Theta_p = \frac{1}{p}(\sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i - 1)$, we get that

$$(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*(p)) = \Theta_p \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i + p\frac{1}{p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i - 1\right)\right) = 0.$$

That is, equation (1) holds, and by Lemma 1.27 we conclude that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ is a minimizer of f over Y proving our claim.

Exercise 25. *Prove Theorem 3.14!*

Solution: From (3.17), the proximal step could be written as

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \underset{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmin}}\{g(\mathbf{x}_t) + \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y})\} = \underset{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmin}}\{\psi(\mathbf{y})\},$$

where the function $\psi(\mathbf{y}) = g(\mathbf{x}_t) + \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y})$ is strongly convex with the parameter L. Use an alternative definition of strongly convexity [1] and optimality of $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ we have

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq \psi(\alpha\mathbf{x}_{t+1} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{y}) \leq \alpha\psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + (1-\alpha)\psi(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)L}{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2, \quad \forall\alpha \in [0,1].$$

Rearranging the terms give $\psi(\mathbf{y}) \geq \psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{\alpha L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2$. By taking $\alpha = 1$ we have $\psi(\mathbf{y}) \geq \psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2$. This is equivalent to

$$\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y}) \geq \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2,$$

Rearranging terms and subtracting $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$ from both sides,

$$\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t)+\frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2-\frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2+h(\mathbf{y})-h(\mathbf{x}_t) \geq \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t)+\frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2+h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})-h(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

As the function g is L-smooth, we can estimate the right side as $g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \geq g(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - g(\mathbf{x}_t)$, and because g is convex, on the left side we estimate $\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t) \leq g(\mathbf{y}) - g(\mathbf{x}_t)$. Putting this together

$$f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

This holds for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Lets take $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^*$ and sum up the inequation above from $t = 0$ to $t = T - 1$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_T\|^2 \geq f(\mathbf{x}_T) - f(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_T\|^2 \leq \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2$$

Because $f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_t)$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} (f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \frac{L}{2T}\|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}_0\|^2.$$

Exercise 26. *Prove Lemma 4.2, meaning that a function that is differentiable at $\mathbf{x}$ has at most one subgradient there, namely $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$.*

Solution: Let $\mathbf{g}$ be a subgradient at $\mathbf{x}$. Together with differentiabilty at $\mathbf{x}$ (Definition 1.5), we derive the inequality

$$(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \leq r_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$$

[1] `https://xingyuzhou.org/blog/notes/strong-convexity`

for all $\mathbf{y}$ in some neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}$, where $r_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a sublinear error function ($r_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{v})/\|\mathbf{v}\| \to 0$ as $\mathbf{v} \to 0$). Then it should also hold for all $\mathbf{y}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \text{sign}(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))_i \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{x}$ for small enough ε, where $\mathbf{e}_i$ is the i-th coordinate vector. Substituting $\mathbf{y}_\varepsilon$ and dividing both sides with $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|$ we get

$$\frac{(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))^\top (\varepsilon \text{sign}(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))_i \mathbf{e}_i)}{\varepsilon \|\mathbf{e}_i\|} = |(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))_i| \leq \frac{r_{\mathbf{x}}(\varepsilon \mathbf{e}_i)}{\|\varepsilon \mathbf{e}_i\|}$$

We see that on the left hand side ε cancels and the term does not depend on it, while the right part goes to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$ since r_x is sublinear function. This means that the left part has to be zero, i.e. $(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))^\top \mathbf{e}_i = 0$ and this should hold for any i. This is possible only when $\mathbf{g} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x})$.

Exercise 27. *Prove the easy direction of Lemma 4.3, meaning that the existence of subgradients everywhere implies convexity!*

Solution: Let's assume that we have subgradients everywhere. With $\mathbf{g} \in \partial f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y})$, (4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &\geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{g}^\top((1-\lambda)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})), \\ f(\mathbf{y}) &\geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{g}^\top(\lambda(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$

Adding up these two inequalities with multiples λ and $1 - \lambda$ cancels the subgradient terms and yields

$$\lambda f(\mathbf{x}) + (1-\lambda) f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}),$$

which is convexity.

Random Walks

Gradient descent turns up in a surprising number of situations which apriori have nothing to do with optimization. In this exercise, we will see how performing a random walk on a graph can be seen as a special case of gradient descent.

We are given an *undirected* graph $G(V, E)$ with vertices $V = [n]$ labelled 1 through n, and edges $E \subseteq [n]^2$ such that if $(i, j) \in E$, then $(j, i) \in E$. Further, we assume that the graph is *regular* in the sense that every edge has the same degree. Let d be the degree of each node such that if we denote $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{j : (i, j) \in E\}$ to be the neighbors of i, then $|\mathcal{N}(i)| = d$. We assume that every node is connected to itself and so $(i, i) \in \mathcal{N}(i)$.

Now we start our random walk from node 1, jumping randomly from a node to its neighbor. More precisely, suppose at time step t we are at node i_t. Then i_{t+1} is picked uniformly at random from $\mathcal{N}(i)$. If we run this random walk for a large enough T steps, we expect that $\Pr(i_T = j) = 1/n$ for any $j \in [n]$. This is called the stationary distribution.

Problem A. Let us represent the position at time step t in the graph with $\mathbf{e}_{i_t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where the i_tth coordinate is 1 and all others are 0. Then, the vector $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]$ denotes the probability distribtion over the n nodes of the graph. Further, let us denote $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the transition probability matrix such that

$$\mathbf{G}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d} & \text{if } (i,j) \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Show that

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t \tag{2}$$

Solution: Let look at one coordinate j of random vector $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]$. Then by the low of total probability, the expectation of this coordinate would be

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_j = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]_j = \Pr\left([\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]_j = 1\right) &= \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \Pr(i_t = k) = \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \Pr\left([\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]_k = 1\right) \\ &= \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]_k = \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) [\mathbf{x}_t]_j \end{aligned}$$

Note, that for $k: \ (j,k) \notin E$, $\Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) = 0 = \mathbf{G}_{j,k}$ and for $k: \ (j,k) \in E$, $\Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) = \frac{1}{d} = \mathbf{G}_{j,k}$. This means that

$$[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_j = \sum_k \mathbf{G}_{jk} [\mathbf{x}_t]_k ,$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t \tag{3}$$

Problem B. Simulate the random walk above over a torus and confirm that we indeed converge to a uniform distribution over the nodes. What is the *rate* at which this convergence occurs?

Follow the Python notebook provided here:

github.com/epfml/OptML_course/tree/master/labs/ex04/

Problem C. Define $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n$ be a vector of all $1/n$, and a objective function $f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x} - \mu)^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})(\mathbf{x} - \mu) ,$$

defined over the probability simplex $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{v} = 1, v_i \geq 0\}$.

1. Show that f defined above is convex and compute its smoothness constant.
2. Show that running gradient descent on f with the correct step-size is equivalent to the random walk step (2).
3. Prove that $\mathbf{x}_t$ converges to the distribution μ at a linear rate i.e. for the random walk on a torus with n nodes,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mu\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mu\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t .$$

   Hint: Use that the two largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{G}$ are 1 and $1 - \frac{1}{n}$. Also $\mathbf{G}\mu = \mu$ and so μ is the eigenvector corresponding to eigenvalue 1.

Solution:

1. By the second order characterization of convexity (Lemma 1.17) the function is convex if its hessian is positive semidefinite. Lets show that

$$\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G}) \succeq 0$$

   which is equivalent to show $\mathbf{z}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{z} \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is symmetric and $\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} = 1$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} z_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} z_j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij}(z_i^2 + z_j^2)/2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{z}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{z} &= \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} z_i z_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} \frac{1}{2}(z_i^2 + z_j^2) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} z_i z_j \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij}(z_i - z_j)^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

   In Exercise 13 we know that $L = 2\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G}\|$. $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G}\| \leq 1$ (TBD).

2. The gradient of f is

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})(\mathbf{x}_t - \mu) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t - 2(\mu - \mathbf{G}\mu) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t .$$

   The last equality followed since $\mathbf{G}\mu = \mu$. With the stepsize $\gamma = \frac{1}{L} = \frac{1}{2}$ gradient descent will take form

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1}{2}\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1}{2} 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t .$$

   Since our problem is constrained to the set $\mathcal{S}$, we have to make sure $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ also lies in $\mathcal{S}$. This is easy to verify.

3. To show the linear convergence rate, we first will prove that function f restricted to the set $\mathcal{S}$ is strongly convex with parameter $\frac{2}{n}$. Then, the convergence rate would follow from the Theorem 2.11.

   To find strong convexity coefficient we need to show a lower bound on $(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top 2(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$. For that we will find the minimum

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\|^2}$$

   First, let's show that $\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x} \perp \mu\ \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$. Indeed,

$$(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top \mu = \mathbf{y}^\top \mu - \mathbf{x}^\top \mu = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n} = 0\,.$$

   Here we used that $\sum_i y_i = 1$ and $\sum_i x_i = 1$.

   Then

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\|^2} \geq \min_{\mathbf{z}\perp\mu} \frac{\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|^2}\,.$$

   Recall that μ is the principal eigenvector. Then, the right hand side of the above equation characterizes the second largest eigenvalue. In the basis of orthonormal eigenvectors $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G}$ vector $\mathbf{z}$ is represented as $\mathbf{z} = \sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{v}_i$, because it is orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mu$. Then

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}\perp\mu} \frac{\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|^2} = \min_{\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_n} \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i^2 \lambda_i}{\sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i^2} = \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{n}.$$

   This shows that f is $\frac{2}{n}$ strongly convex when restricted to $\mathcal{S}$.