5004 Homework 2

RONG Shuo

November 14, 2024

Question 1:

1. For each of the following functions $f(x_1, x_2)$, find all critical points (i.e, all x_1, x_2 such that $\nabla f(x_1, x_2) = \mathbf{0}).$

(a)
$$f(x_1, x_2) = (4x_1^2 - x_2)^2$$

(b)
$$f(x_1, x_2) = 2x_2^3 - 6x_2^2 + 3x_1^2x_2$$

(c)
$$f(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - 2x_2)^4 + 64x_1x_2$$

(a)
$$f(x_1, x_2) = (4x_1 - x_2)$$

(b) $f(x_1, x_2) = 2x_2^3 - 6x_2^2 + 3x_1^2x_2$
(c) $f(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - 2x_2)^4 + 64x_1x_2$
(d) $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + 4x_1x_2 + x_2^2 + x_1 - x_2$

Answer:

(a)

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = 2(4x_1^2 - x_2)(8x_1) = 16x_1(4x_1^2 - x_2)$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} = 2(4x_1^2 - x_2)(-1) = -2(4x_1^2 - x_2)$$

set the gradient to 0:

$$16x_1(4x_1^2 - x_2) = 0 (1)$$

$$-2(4x_1^2 - x_2) = 0 (2)$$

if $x_1 = 0$, from (2) we can get that $x_2 = 0$ if $x_1 \neq 0$, from equation (1), we know:

$$4x_1^2 = x_2$$

this satisfied $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0)$ Thus, we can conclude that the critical points are:

$$(x_1, x_2) = (x_1, 4x_1^2), \forall x_1 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(b)

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = 6x_1x_2$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} = 6x_2^2 - 12x_2 + 3x_1^2$$

set the gradient to 0:

$$6x_1x_2 = 0$$
$$6x_2^2 - 12x_2 + 3x_1^2 = 0$$

if $x_1 = 0$,

$$6x_2^2 - 12x_2 = 0$$
$$6x_2(x_2 - 2) = 0$$

we can conclude that $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0)$, or $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 2)$. if $x_2 = 0$,

$$3x_1^2 = 0$$
$$x_1 = 0$$

This gives $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0)$ In conclusion, the critical points is (0, 0) and (0, 2)(c)

$$\frac{f}{\partial x_1} = 4(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 + 64x_2$$
$$\frac{f}{\partial x_2} = -8(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 + 64x_1$$

set the gradient to 0:

$$4(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 + 64x_2 = 0$$
i.e. $(x_1 - 2x_2)^2 = -16x_2$

$$-8(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 + 64x_1 = 0$$
i.e. $(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 = 8x_1$

$$(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 = -16x_2$$
$$(x_1 - 2x_2)^3 = 8x_1$$
$$-16x_2 = 8x_1$$
$$-2x_2 = x_1$$

Substituting $-2x_2 = x_1$ to $(x_1 - 2x_2)^2 = -16x_2$, we can get:

$$64x_2^3 + 16x_2 = 0$$
$$x_2^2 = \frac{1}{4}$$

Thus, the result is

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

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

(d)

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = 2x_1 + 4x_2 + 1$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} = 4x_1 + 2x_2 - 1$$

set the gradient to 0:

$$2x_1 + 4x_2 + 1 = 0$$
$$4x_1 + 2x_2 - 1 = 0$$

$$x_1 = -\frac{1}{2} - 2x_2$$

Substituting this to second equation.

$$4(-\frac{1}{2} - 2x_2) + 2x_2 - 1 = 0$$

$$-2 - 8x_2 + 2x_2 - 1 = 0$$

$$x_2 = -\frac{1}{2}$$

$$x_1 = -\frac{1}{2} + 1 = \frac{1}{2}$$

Thus, the critical point is $(\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})$

Question 2:

2. Find the gradient of the following functions, where the space \mathbb{R} and $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are equipped with the standard inner product.

(a)
$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2$$
, where $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $(\lambda > 0)$ are given.
(b) $f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{c}$, where $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

(c)
$$f(X) = \boldsymbol{b}^T X^T X \boldsymbol{c}$$
, where $X \in \boldsymbol{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

Answer:

(a)

$$\begin{split} f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{y}\|_{2}^{2} \\ f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} \\ f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} \\ f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})\|_{2}^{2} + \langle \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} \\ f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})\|_{2}^{2} + \langle (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{A}^{T}(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b})\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} \\ f(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})\|_{2}^{2} + \langle (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{A}^{T}(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b})\rangle + f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} + 2\lambda \langle \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle \end{split}$$

$$\lim_{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2} \to 0} \frac{|f(\mathbf{y}) - (f(\mathbf{x}) + \langle \mathbf{A}^{T}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle + 2\lambda \langle \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle)|}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}}$$

$$= \lim_{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2} \to 0} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\|_{2}^{2} + 2\lambda \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2}}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}}$$

$$\leq \lim_{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2} \to 0} \frac{\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2}^{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2} + 2\lambda \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}^{2}}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}}$$

$$= \lim_{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2} \to 0} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2}^{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2} + 2\lambda \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{2}$$

$$= 0$$

According

$$f(y) - (f(x) + \langle A^T(Ax - b), y - x \rangle + 2\lambda \langle y - x, x \rangle)$$

In conclusion, the gradient for(a) is $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}^T (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}) + 2\lambda \mathbf{x}$

(b) We know the definition of the $(\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{X}))_{ij} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{X}_{ij}}$ And we know that $f(\mathbf{X})$

$$f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_i X_{ij} c_j$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{ij}} = b_i c_j$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{X}} f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 c_1 & b_1 c_2 & \cdots & b_1 c_n \\ b_2 c_1 & b_2 c_2 & \cdots & b_2 c_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_n c_1 & b_n c_2 & \cdots & b_n c_n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{X}} f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{b} \boldsymbol{c}^T$$

In conclusion, the gradient of $f(X) = b^T X c$ is $\nabla_X f(X) = b c^T$

(c) We consider

$$f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{i} X_{ji} X_{ij} c_{j}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{ij}} = b_{i} X_{ji} c_{j} + b_{j} X_{ji} c_{i}$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{X}} f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{11} c_{1} & b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{21} c_{2} & \cdots & b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{n1} c_{n} \\ b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{12} c_{1} & b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{22} c_{2} & \cdots & b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{n2} c_{n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{1n} c_{1} & b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{2n} c_{2} & \cdots & b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{nn} c_{n} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{11} c_{1} & b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{21} c_{1} & \cdots & b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{n1} c_{1} \\ b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{12} c_{2} & b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{22} c_{2} & \cdots & b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{n2} c_{2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b_{1} \boldsymbol{X}_{1n} c_{n} & b_{2} \boldsymbol{X}_{2n} c_{n} & \cdots & b_{n} \boldsymbol{X}_{nn} c_{n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{X}} f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{X} (\boldsymbol{c} \boldsymbol{b}^{T} + \boldsymbol{b} \boldsymbol{c}^{T})$$

Question 3:

3. Let $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be given with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume N < n. Consider the ridge regression

$$\text{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\langle \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{x}_i \rangle - y_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2,$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a regularization parameter, and we set the bias b = 0 for simplicity.

(a) Prove that the solution must be in the form of $\boldsymbol{a} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i \boldsymbol{x}_i$ for some $\boldsymbol{c} = [c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

(hint: similar to the proof of the representer theorem.)

(b) Re-express the minimization in terms of $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which has fewer unknowns than the original formulation as N < n.

Answer:

(a) We can denote $\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{a}_s + \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \boldsymbol{x}_i$, where $\boldsymbol{c} = [c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\langle \boldsymbol{a}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_i \rangle = 0$.

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\langle \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \rangle - y_{i})^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_{2}^{2} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\langle \boldsymbol{a}_{s} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_{j} \boldsymbol{x}_{j}, \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \rangle - y_{i})^{2} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_{s} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_{j} \boldsymbol{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_{j} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{j}, \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \rangle - y_{i})^{2} + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_{j_{1}} c_{j_{2}} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{j_{1}}, \boldsymbol{x}_{j_{2}} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_{s}\|_{2}^{2} \end{split}$$

Introduce $\boldsymbol{K} = [\langle \boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j \rangle]_{i,j=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_{j} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{j}, \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \rangle - y_{i})^{2} + \lambda \sum_{j_{1}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_{2}=1}^{N} c_{j_{1}} c_{j_{2}} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{j_{1}}, \boldsymbol{x}_{j_{2}} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_{s}\|_{2}^{2}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} ((\boldsymbol{K}^{T} \boldsymbol{c})_{i} - y_{i})^{2} + \lambda \boldsymbol{c}^{T} \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{c} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_{s}\|_{2}^{2}$$

We know:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\boldsymbol{K}^T \boldsymbol{c})_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{c} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_s\|^2 \\ & \iff & \text{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\boldsymbol{K}^T \boldsymbol{c})_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{c} \\ & \text{and minimize}_{\boldsymbol{a}_s \in \mathbb{R}^n, \langle \boldsymbol{a}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_i \rangle = 0} \lambda \|\boldsymbol{a}_s\|^2 \\ & \iff \boldsymbol{a}_s^* = \mathbf{0} \\ & \text{and } \boldsymbol{c}^* = & \text{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\boldsymbol{K}^T \boldsymbol{c})_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{c} \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, the optimal $a^* = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i^* x_i$

(b) The re-express formulation show below:

$$\text{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i=1}^N ((\boldsymbol{K}^T \boldsymbol{c})_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{c}$$

Question 4:

4. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + 2\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{x} + c$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

- (a) Prove that x is a global minimizer of f if and only if Ax = -b.
- (b) Prove that f is bounded below over \mathbb{R}^n if and only if $\mathbf{b} \in \{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$.

Answer:

(a) We know that:

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n x_i A_{ij} x_j$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k} = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kj} x_j + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i A_{ik}$$
$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{A}^T \boldsymbol{x}$$
$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 2 \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}$$

So we can get the gradient of f(x):

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 2\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + 2\boldsymbol{b}$$

To prove that f(x) is convex, we have:

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \langle \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x} \rangle =$$

$$= \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{x} + c + 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x})$$

$$= \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{x} + c + 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y} - 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{y} - 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{x}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + c + 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y} - 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{y}$$

$$= c + 2 \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} + 2 \boldsymbol{b}^T \boldsymbol{y}$$

$$egin{aligned} f(oldsymbol{y}) - (f(oldsymbol{x}) + \langle
abla f(oldsymbol{x}), oldsymbol{y} - oldsymbol{x}
angle = oldsymbol{y}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + 2 b^T oldsymbol{y} + c - c - 2 oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} oldsymbol{x} + oldsymbol{y}^T oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{x}^T oldsymbol{A} oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} - oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} - oldsymbol{y} + oldsymbol{y} - oldsymbol{y} -$$

We know:

$$(\boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y})^T = \boldsymbol{y}^T (\boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A})^T = \boldsymbol{y}^T (\boldsymbol{A}^T \boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{y}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}$$

$$\boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y} = \langle \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \rangle$$

$$\boldsymbol{y}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} = \langle \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x} \rangle$$

We know the transpose of a scalar is itself, so

$$\boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{y}^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}$$

Continue, we have

$$= \mathbf{y}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} - 2\mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}$$

$$= \mathbf{y}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}$$

$$= \langle \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle$$

$$= \langle \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \rangle \ge 0$$

So we in conclusion, we have $f(y) \ge (f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle)$, which implies that f(x) is convex. So $\nabla f(x^*) = 0 \iff x^*$ is the global minimizer. i.e. x is a global minimizer $\iff Ax = -b$

- (b) Proof: f is bounded below $\implies b \in \{Ay, y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$.
- (i) If A is full rank, then $b \in Ay, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is easy to prove, since $Ay \equiv \mathbb{R}^n$
- (ii) If \boldsymbol{A} is not full rank, then there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{d} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$, s.t. $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{0}$ we can choose $\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{d}$

$$f(-\mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{d}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{d} - 2\mathbf{d}^{T} \mathbf{d} + c$$
$$f(-\mathbf{d}) = -2\mathbf{d}^{T} \mathbf{d} + c$$
$$f(-\mathbf{d}) = -2\|\mathbf{d}\|^{2} + c$$

We know that $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d} > 0$, since $\mathbf{d} \neq \mathbf{0}$

$$\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{d}\|^2 \to \infty} -2\|\boldsymbol{d}\|^2 + c = -\infty$$

s.t. if f is bounded below, then A must be full rank, which implies $b \in Ay$

Proof: $\mathbf{b} \in \{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \implies f$ is bounded below. According to (a), we know that $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0 \iff \mathbf{x}^*$ is the global minimizer.

$$abla f(oldsymbol{x}) = 2oldsymbol{A}oldsymbol{x} + 2oldsymbol{b}$$
 $oldsymbol{b} \in oldsymbol{A}oldsymbol{y}, oldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$
 $\exists oldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \, \text{s.t.} \, \, oldsymbol{A}oldsymbol{x} = -oldsymbol{b}$
i.e. $\exists oldsymbol{x} * \in \mathbb{R}^n, \, \nabla f(oldsymbol{x} *) = 0$

 $f(\mathbf{x}) \ge f(\mathbf{x}^*) \implies f$ is bounded below.

Question 5:

5. We consider the following optimization problem:

$$\operatorname{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_i^T \boldsymbol{x} + b_i) \right)$$
(3)

where $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \cdots \boldsymbol{a}_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b_1, \cdots b_m \in \mathbb{R}$ are given.

- (a) Find the gradient of f(x).
- (b) If we use gradient descent to solve Problem (1), will it converge to the global minimizer? Please justify your answer.

Answer

(a)

$$g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})$$

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{g(\boldsymbol{x})} \nabla g(\boldsymbol{x})$$

$$g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})$$

$$\nabla g(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x} + b_{i}) \boldsymbol{a}_{i}$$

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}^{T} \boldsymbol{x} + b_{i}) \boldsymbol{a}_{i}$$

(b) We can use Jensen's Inequality to prove this function is convex.

$$f(t\boldsymbol{x} + (1-t)\boldsymbol{y}) \le tf(\boldsymbol{x}) + (1-t)f(\boldsymbol{y})$$

take t = 1/2

$$f(t\boldsymbol{x} + (1-t)\boldsymbol{y}) = log\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i} + \boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i}))\right)$$

for the right hand side, we know:

RHS =
$$\frac{1}{2}log(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})) + \frac{1}{2}log(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i}))$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}log(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i}))$$

$$= log(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})^{1/2}) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i})^{1/2})$$

According to CS-inequality:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})) \exp(\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i})) \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{x} + b_{i})\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \exp(\boldsymbol{a}_{i}\boldsymbol{y} + b_{i})\right)^{1/2}$$
$$f(1/2\boldsymbol{x} + 1/2\boldsymbol{y}) \leq 1/2f(\boldsymbol{x}) + 1/2f(\boldsymbol{y})$$

In conclusion, f(x) is midpoint convex, which is equivalent to the convexity if the function is continuous.

Since f(x) is convex, any local minimizer is also a global minimum. Gradient descent is guaranteed to converge to a global minimizer.