

# MTH 377/577 Convex Optimization

## Problem set 2: Indicative solutions

1. Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$  and let  $b = (1, 0)$ . Does the system  $Ax = b$  have a solution where  $x \geq 0$ ? [Use Farkas Lemma]

Ans. Farkas alternative:

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

Writing the above as a system of linear inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 2y_1 + y_2 &\geq 0 \\ 0y_1 + 1y_2 &\geq 0 \\ -1y_1 + 2y_2 &\geq 0 \\ 1y_1 + 0y_2 &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

The above system has a solution:  $y = (-1, 10)$ . Therefore by Farkas Lemma,  $Ax = b$  does not have a non-negative solution.

2. Use Farkas Lemma to decide whether the following system has a non-negative solution:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 & -2 \\ 1 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

Ans. Follow steps similar to Ans 1. In this case  $y = (1, \frac{1}{2})$  is a solution to the Farkas alternative. Therefore,  $Ax = b$  does not have a non-negative solution.

3. Let  $A, B$  be non-empty, disjoint, convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Can you claim that there will exist a strict separating hyperplane that separates  $A$  and  $B$ ? If yes, provide an explanation. If no, provide a counterexample.  
 Ans. No. At least one of the sets  $A, B$  should be bounded to ensure that a strict separating hyperplane exists. See counterexample in Lecture 7 slides.

4. Consider a non-empty, closed, bounded set  $C$ . Suppose I can construct a weak separating hyperplane at every  $x \in C$  that is on its boundary and not a point in the interior of  $C$ . Is  $C$  convex?

Ans. Yes. Here is a simplified indicative proof by contradiction. For the purpose of this question, you can also show the explanation diagrammatically with the correct expressions for the separating hyperplane and the point  $b$ .

Proof: Let  $C$  be a non-convex, non-empty, closed bounded set that has a weak separating hyperplane at every boundary point. Let  $x_1, x_2 \in C$  such that  $b = \theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2 \notin C$  for some  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  and  $x_0$  is a boundary point closest to  $b$ . By assumption,  $\exists$  weak separating hyperplane  $(h, \beta)$  such that  $h^T x \geq \beta \geq h^T b$  for all  $x \in C$  and  $h^T x_0 = \beta$ . Note that for  $\theta \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} h^T \theta x_1 &\geq \theta \beta \geq h^T \theta b \\ h^T (1 - \theta)x_2 &\geq (1 - \theta)\beta \geq h^T (1 - \theta)b \end{aligned}$$

Adding the above two, we get

$$h^T [\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2] \geq \beta \geq h^T b$$

Since  $b = \theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2$ , the above holds with equality. Note that the above argument holds for all boundary points of  $C$ . Therefore,  $b$  lies on every weak separating hyperplane for  $C$  i.e. is a point of intersection for all weak separating hyperplanes. This is not possible: Case 1: if  $C$  is a line passing through  $b$  then  $b \in C$  and  $C$  is convex. Case 2: if the hyperplanes form a cone with origin at  $b$  then  $C$  is either not bounded above or below.

5. Suppose  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are convex sets. Let  $C = \{x_1 + x_2 | x_1 \in C_1, x_2 \in C_2\}$ . Is  $C$  convex?

Ans. Yes. Let  $x = x_1 + x_2$  where  $x_1 \in C_1$  and  $x_2 \in C_2$ . By definition,  $x \in C$ . Similarly let  $y = y_1 + y_2$  where  $y_1 \in C_1$ ,  $y_2 \in C_2$  and  $y \in C$ . Pick any  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ . Note that  $\theta x + (1 - \theta)y = \theta(x_1 + x_2) + (1 - \theta)(y_1 + y_2)$ . Re-arranging the terms, we get:

$$[\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)y_1] + [\theta x_2 + (1 - \theta)y_2]$$

Since  $C_1, C_2$  are convex,  $\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)y_1 \in C_1$  and  $\theta x_2 + (1 - \theta)y_2 \in C_2$ . Therefore  $[\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)y_1] + [\theta x_2 + (1 - \theta)y_2] = \theta x + (1 - \theta)y \in C$  for all  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ .

6. “A polyhedron is the intersection of a finite number of half spaces and hyperplanes.” Let  $P$  be a polyhedron. Show that  $P$  is **necessarily convex**.

Ans. All polyhedra are convex sets. The intersection of a finite number of halfspaces and hyperplanes can be written as a system of weak inequalities: Let  $P = \{x \in R^n | Ax \leq b\}$  be a polyhedron. If  $x, y \in P$ , then  $Ax \leq b$  and  $Ay \leq b$ . Therefore,  $A(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y) = \theta Ax + (1 - \theta)Ay \leq \theta b + (1 - \theta)b = b$ . Thus  $\theta x + (1 - \theta)y \in P$ .

7. Provide an example of a set for each of the following:

- (a) Closed but not bounded: see example in lecture 7 slide
- (b) Bounded but not convex:  $A = \{(x, y) \in R^2 | x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$ .
- (c) Convex but not compact:  $C = (-5, 5)$  is not compact because it is not closed. It is bounded.

For which of the above three sets will a separating hyperplane always exist that separates it from a point  $x$  that is not in the set?

Ans. For (c) Convex but not compact: convexity suffices for a weak separating hyperplane to exist between the set and a point not in the set. [Weak separating hyperplane theorem]

[Note that for two sets and/or for strict hyperplanes, only convexity is not sufficient.]