ME598/494 Homework 2 Solution

1. (20 points) Show that the stationary point of the function

$$f = 2x_1^2 - 4x_1x_2 + 1.5x_2^2 + x_2$$

is a saddle. Find the directions of downslopes away from the saddle. Hint: Use Taylor's expansion at the saddle point. Find directions that reduce f.

Solution

(a) Find a stationary point

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = 4x_1 - 4x_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} = -4x_1 + 3x_2 + 1 = 0$$
(1)

Solve these to get the stationary point $x^* = [1, 1]^T$.

- (b) Calculate the Hessian to get H = [4, -4; -4, 3]. It is indefinite since one eigenvalue is positive and the other is negative. So the stationary point is a saddle point.
- (c) To find the direction of downslope, denote $\partial \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^*$ and $\partial f^* = f(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}^*)$:

$$\partial f^* = \nabla f^* \partial \mathbf{x}^* + \frac{1}{2} \partial \mathbf{x}^{*T} \mathbf{H} \partial \mathbf{x}^*$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (2\partial x_1 - \partial x_2)(2\partial x_1 - 3\partial x_2)$$
(2)

Set $\partial f^* < 0$ to get the downslopes $2\partial x_1 - \partial x_2 < 0$ and $2\partial x_1 - 3\partial x_2 > 0$ or $2\partial x_1 - \partial x_2 > 0$ and $2\partial x_1 - 3\partial x_2 < 0$.

- 2. (a) (10 points) Find the point in the plane $x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = 1$ in \mathbb{R}^3 that is nearest to the point $(-1,0,1)^T$. Hint: Convert the problem into an unconstrained problem using $x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = 1$.
 - (b) (40 points) Implement the gradient descent and Newton's algorithm for solving the problem. Attach your codes in the report, along with a short summary of your findings. The summary should

include: (1) The initial points tested; (2) corresponding solutions; (3) A log-linear convergence plot. Based on your results, which algorithm do you think is better? Why? Hint: A template can be found here.

Solution

(a) Solve the following problem

$$\min_{\substack{x_1, x_2, x_3 \\ \text{subject to:}}} (x_1 + 1)^2 + x_2^2 + (x_3 - 1)^2$$
subject to: $x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = 1$ (3)

Substituting $x_1 = 1 - 2x_2 - 3x_3$, the problem reduces to an unconstrained optimization problem. The solution is $x_1 = -15/14$, $x_2 = -1/7$, $x_3 = 11/14$.

- (b) See code.
- 3. (5 points) Prove that a hyperplane is a convex set. Hint: A hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n can be expressed as: $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = c$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where \mathbf{a} is the normal direction of the hyperplane and c is some constant.

Solution: Let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = c\}$ be the hyperplane. Let \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 be any two points in \mathcal{H} . Then $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_1 = c$ and $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_2 = c$. Then $\mathbf{a}^T (\lambda \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{x}_2) = \lambda \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x}_2 = c$. Therefore $\lambda \mathbf{x}_1 + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{x}_2$ belongs to \mathcal{H} . So \mathcal{H} is convex.

- 4. Let f(x) and g(x) be two convex functions defined on the convex set \mathcal{X} .
 - (a) (5 points) Prove that af(x) + bg(x) is convex for a > 0 and b > 0.
 - (b) (5 points) In what conditions will f(g(x)) be convex?

Solution

(a) For any two points x_1 and x_2 , we have

$$f(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) \le \lambda f(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(x_2) \tag{4}$$

and

$$g(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) \le \lambda g(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)g(x_2).$$
 (5)

Then

$$af(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) + bg(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2)$$

$$\leq a(\lambda f(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(x_2)) + b(\lambda g(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)g(x_2))$$

$$= \lambda (af(x_1) + bg(x_1)) + (1 - \lambda)(af(x_2) + bg(x_2)).$$
(6)

Therefore by definition af(x) + bg(x) is convex.

- (b) The second-order derivative is $f''(g')^2 + g''f'$. If $f''(g')^2 + g''f' > 0$ then f(g) is convex. One special case will be when f is monotonically increasing, i.e., f' > 0.
- 5. (15 points, optional for MAE494) Show that $f(\mathbf{x}_1) \geq f(\mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{g}_{\mathbf{x}_0}^T(\mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{x}_0)$ for a convex function $f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ and for $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathcal{X}$.

Solution: The following is a proof for a 1D case. Necessity: If f is convex, we have

$$f(x + \lambda(y - x)) \le (1 - \lambda)f(x) + (y),\tag{7}$$

for $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Divide both sides by λ to have:

$$f(y) \ge f(x) + \frac{f(x + \lambda(y - x)) - f(x)}{\lambda}.$$
 (8)

Take $t \to 0$ to get $f(y) \ge f(x) + f'(x)(y - x)$.

Sufficiency: Let $z = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We have $f(x) \ge f(z) + f'(z)(x - z)$, $f(y) \ge f(z) + f'(z)(y - z)$. Multiplying the first inequality by λ , the second by $1 - \lambda$, add the two together to have $\lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y) \ge f(z)$. Thus f is convex.

For a general case in \mathbb{R}^n , please see Page 70 "Proof of first-order convexity condition" in *Convex Optimization* by Stephen Boyd.