

1. Simple Constrained Optimization Problem with Duality

Consider the optimization problem

$$\min_{x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}} f(x_1, x_2) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t. } 2x_1 + x_2 \geq 1 \quad (2)$$

$$x_1 + 3x_2 \geq 1 \quad (3)$$

$$x_1 \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

$$x_2 \geq 0 \quad (5)$$

- (a) Express the Lagrangian of the problem $\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$.

Solution: The Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = f(x_1, x_2) + \lambda_1(-2x_1 - x_2 + 1) + \lambda_2(1 - x_1 - 3x_2) - \lambda_3x_1 - \lambda_4x_2. \quad (6)$$

Note that the domain of the Lagrangian is considered to be $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ here.

- (b) Show that \mathcal{L} is concave in $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ for each fixed (x_1, x_2) .

Solution: For each fixed (x_1, x_2) , $-\mathcal{L}$ is convex in $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ as a affine function of $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$. So \mathcal{L} is concave in $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$.

- (c) Express the dual function of the problem, and show that it is concave.

Solution: The dual function is $g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \min_{x_1, x_2} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$.

We can show that by showing that $-g$ is convex.

$$-g(\vec{\lambda}) = -\min_{x_1, x_2} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \quad (7)$$

$$= \max_{x_1, x_2} -\mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4). \quad (8)$$

When (x_1, x_2) is fixed, the function $-\mathcal{L}$ is affine in $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$.

Because the max of convex functions is convex, $-g$ is convex. Therefore g is concave.

- (d) Assume f is convex. Show that \mathcal{L} is convex in (x_1, x_2) for each fixed $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$.

Solution: For each fixed $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$, \mathcal{L} is convex in (x_1, x_2) because it is a linear combination of functions that are convex in (x_1, x_2) , with non-negative coefficients.

(e) Denoting $\mathcal{X} = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid 2x_1 + x_2 \geq 1, x_1 + 3x_2 \geq 1, x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0\}$, show that

$$\max_{\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \begin{cases} f(x_1, x_2) & \text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Solution: Let's just do it for λ_4 :

$$\max_{\lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \max_{\lambda_4 \geq 0} (f(x_1, x_2) + \lambda_1(-2x_1 - x_2 + 1) + \lambda_2(1 - x_1 - 3x_2) - \lambda_3x_1 - \lambda_4x_2) \quad (10)$$

$$= f(x_1, x_2) + \lambda_1(-2x_1 - x_2 + 1) + \lambda_2(1 - x_1 - 3x_2) - \lambda_3x_1 + \max_{\lambda_4 \geq 0} -\lambda_4x_2 \quad (11)$$

$$\max_{\lambda_4 \geq 0} -\lambda_4x_2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_2 \geq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

One can show the same results for λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 , resulting in:

$$\max_{\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \begin{cases} f(x_1, x_2) & \text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

(f) Conclude that $\min_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \min_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}} f(x_1, x_2)$.

Solution: From part (e):

$$\max_{\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \begin{cases} f(x_1, x_2) & \text{if } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Thus:

$$\min_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \lambda_4 \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \min_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}} f(x_1, x_2). \quad (15)$$

(g) Assuming f is convex, formulate the first order condition on \mathcal{L} as a function of ∇f and $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$ to solve:

$$\min_{x_1, x_2} \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \quad (16)$$

Solution: Defining $\vec{\lambda} := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ as the vector of dual variables, the first order condition is

$$0 = \nabla_{x_1, x_2} \mathcal{L}(x_1^*(\vec{\lambda}), x_2^*(\vec{\lambda}), \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \nabla_{x_1, x_2} f(x_1^*(\vec{\lambda}), x_2^*(\vec{\lambda})) + \begin{bmatrix} -2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 \\ -\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 - \lambda_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

NOTE: Note here that $x_1^*(\vec{\lambda})$ and $x_2^*(\vec{\lambda})$ are functions of $\vec{\lambda}$. Also, because the inequalities are defined by affine functions in this problem, the role of the nonnegativity of the $\lambda_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4$ is obscured. However, in general, it is important.

2. Lagrangian Dual of a QP

Consider the general form of a convex quadratic program, where $Q \succ 0$ is a positive definite $n \times n$ matrix, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\vec{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\min_{\vec{x}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \vec{x}^\top Q \vec{x} \quad (17)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad A\vec{x} \leq \vec{b} \quad (18)$$

- (a) Write the Lagrangian function $\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda})$.

Solution:

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{x}^\top Q \vec{x} + \vec{\lambda}^\top (A\vec{x} - \vec{b}), \quad (19)$$

where $\vec{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The domain of the Lagrangian is $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

- (b) Write the Lagrangian dual function, $g(\vec{\lambda})$.

Solution: The dual function is

$$g(\vec{\lambda}) = \inf_{\vec{x}} \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda}). \quad (20)$$

Since here also the inequality constraints are defined by affine functions, it turns out that $\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda})$ is convex in \vec{x} for each $\vec{\lambda}$, so we can find this infimum by setting $\nabla_{\vec{x}} \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}^*, \vec{\lambda}) = 0$:

$$Q\vec{x}^* + A^\top \vec{\lambda} = 0 \implies \vec{x}^* = -Q^{-1} A^\top \vec{\lambda}. \quad (21)$$

Substituting, we get

$$g(\vec{\lambda}) = \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}^*, \vec{\lambda}) \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \vec{\lambda}^\top A Q^{-1} A^\top \vec{\lambda} - \vec{\lambda}^\top A Q^{-1} A^\top \vec{\lambda} - \vec{\lambda}^\top \vec{b} \quad (23)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \vec{\lambda}^\top A Q^{-1} A^\top \vec{\lambda} - \vec{\lambda}^\top \vec{b}. \quad (24)$$

- (c) Show that the Lagrangian dual problem is convex by writing it in standard QP form. Is the Lagrangian dual problem convex in general?

Solution: The Lagrangian dual problem can be written as

$$\max_{\vec{\lambda} \geq 0} g(\vec{\lambda}) = \max_{\vec{\lambda} \geq 0} -\frac{1}{2} \vec{\lambda}^\top A Q^{-1} A^\top \vec{\lambda} - \vec{\lambda}^\top \vec{b}, \quad (25)$$

which is the maximization of a concave function of $\vec{\lambda}$ over the convex region given by the non-negative orthant $\vec{\lambda} \geq 0$. The dual problem is therefore convex.

While in this problem, the primal problem was convex, it turns out that the Lagrangian dual problem is a convex problem even when the primal is not. To see this, examine its general form:

$$\max_{\vec{\lambda} \geq 0} \min_{\vec{x}} \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \vec{\lambda}) = \max_{\vec{\lambda} \geq 0} \min_{\vec{x}} \left[f_0(\vec{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f_i(\vec{x}) \right]. \quad (26)$$

The inner minimum represents the pointwise minimum of affine functions of \vec{x} , which we know to be concave in \vec{x} . The resulting maximization problem of a concave objective in $\vec{\lambda}$ over the convex region $\vec{\lambda} \geq 0$ is then a convex optimization problem!

Note, however, that for fixed \vec{x} the function $f_0(\vec{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f_i(\vec{x})$, as a function of \vec{x} , will not in general be convex unless $\vec{\lambda}$ has nonnegative entries. This feature is obscured in both of the examples covered in this discussion set.