1

 $\forall \boldsymbol{x}^*, \boldsymbol{y}^* \in M$, consider their convex combination $\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^*$. By definition of M, $\boldsymbol{x}^*, \boldsymbol{y}^* \in S$. S is convex, hence $\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^* \in S$. Now consider $f(\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^*)$. $\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in S, f(\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^*) \leq \theta f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) + \overline{\theta} f(\boldsymbol{y}^*)$ by convexity of f. Then $\theta f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) + \overline{\theta} f(\boldsymbol{y}^*) \leq \theta f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta} f(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}), \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in S$. So we know $\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in S, f(\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^*) \leq f(\boldsymbol{x})$, thus $\theta \boldsymbol{x}^* + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}^* \in M$. So M is convex.

2

Assume $f(\theta_1 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_1 \boldsymbol{y}) < \theta f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta}_1 f(\boldsymbol{y})$ for some θ_1 . Without loss of generality, assume $\theta_1 \in (\theta_0, 1]$.

 $\theta_0 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_0 \boldsymbol{y} = \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1} (\theta_1 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_1 \boldsymbol{y}) + (1 - \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1}) \boldsymbol{y}$, a convex combination of $\theta_0 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_0 \boldsymbol{y}$ and \boldsymbol{y} . Then by convexity of f we know $f(\theta_0 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_0 \boldsymbol{y}) \leq \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1} f(\theta_1 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_1 \boldsymbol{y}) + (1 - \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1}) f(\boldsymbol{y}) < \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1} (\theta_1 f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta}_1 f(\boldsymbol{y})) + (1 - \frac{\theta_0}{\theta_1}) f(\boldsymbol{y}) = \theta_0 f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta}_0 f(\boldsymbol{y})$. This contradicts with the fact that $f(\theta_0 \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta}_0 \boldsymbol{y}) = \theta_0 f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta}_0 f(\boldsymbol{y})$. Similarly, when $\theta_1 \in [0, \theta_0)$, we can also deduce a contradiction. Thus our assumption does not hold. So $f(\theta \boldsymbol{x} + \overline{\theta} \boldsymbol{y}) = \theta f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \overline{\theta} f(\boldsymbol{y})$ holds for the same $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}$ and any $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

3

We solve this problem by calculate the Hessian Matrix.

(a).

 $H = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, the eigenvalues are 3,2,0. Thus H is positive semidefinite, f is convex.

(b).

 $H = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{x_1^3 x_2} & \frac{1}{x_1^2 x_2^2} \\ \frac{1}{x_1^2 x_2^2} & \frac{2}{x_1 x_2^3} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ the leading principle minors are both positive, thus } H \text{ is positive definite,}$ f is convex.

(c).

 $H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2x_2 \\ 2x_2 & 2x_1 \end{pmatrix}$, the principle minors are $0, 2x_1, -4x_2^2$. So H is indefinite, f is neither convex nor concave.

(d).

 $H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}x_2^{-\frac{3}{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}x_2^{-\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{3}{4}x_1x_2^{-\frac{5}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ the principle minors are } 0, \frac{3}{4}x_1x_2^{-\frac{5}{2}}, -\frac{1}{4}x_2^{-3}. \text{ So } H \text{ is indefinite, } f \text{ is neither convex nor concave.}$

(e).

 $H = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(\alpha-1)x_1^{\alpha-2}x_2^{1-\alpha} & \alpha(1-\alpha)x_1^{\alpha-1}x_2^{-\alpha} \\ \alpha(1-\alpha)x_1^{\alpha-1}x_2^{-\alpha} & \alpha(\alpha-1)x_1^{\alpha}x_2^{-\alpha-1} \end{pmatrix}, \text{ the principle minors are } 0, \alpha(\alpha-1)x_1^{\alpha-2}x_2^{1-\alpha}, \alpha(\alpha-1)x_1^{\alpha}x_2^{-\alpha-1} \\ 1)x_1^{\alpha}x_2^{-\alpha-1}. \text{ So } H \text{ is negative semidefinite, } f \text{ is concave.}$

4

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2)$. Then $f(\theta \mathbf{x} + \overline{\theta} \mathbf{y}) = f(\theta x_1 + \overline{\theta} y_1, \theta x_2 + \overline{\theta} y_2) = f_1(\theta x_1 + \overline{\theta} y_1) + f_2(\theta x_2 + \overline{\theta} y_2) < \theta f_1(x_1) + \overline{\theta} f_1(y_1) + \theta f_2(x_2) + \overline{\theta} f_2(y_2) = \theta f(\mathbf{x}) + \overline{\theta} f(\mathbf{y})$, so f is strictly convex. When $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + x_2^4$, in this case f_1 and f_2 are both univariate functions, $f_1'' = 2 > 0$, $f_2'' = 12x_2^2 \ge 0$, but f_2 is always positive when $x_2 \ne 0$, so they are both strictly convex, thus f is strictly convex.

5

Necessity:

Since f is a differentiable function with an open convex domain C, $f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x})^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in C$, also $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{y})^T (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$, $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in C$. By adding these two inequalities together we get

$$0 \ge \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})^T (\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) + \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y})^T (\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}), \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in C$$

or equivalently

$$(\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})^T - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y})^T)(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) \le 0, \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in C$$

$$(\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y}))^T(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}) \ge 0, \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in C,$$

which is

$$\langle \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y}), \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} \rangle \ge 0, \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in C$$

Sufficiency:

We prove by showing that for any $x \in C$ and any direction d, g(t) = f(x + td) is convex on dom $g = \{ t : x + td \in C \}$

The hint tells us that the intersection of C with a straight line is an open interval when it is not empty, so by our definition dom g is an open interval. Thus to show g(t) is convex, we only need to show g'(t) is increasing.

$$g'(t) = \mathbf{d}^T \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}), \text{ so } \forall t, s \in \text{dom } g, (g'(t) - g'(s))(t - s)$$

$$= (\mathbf{d}^T \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}) - \mathbf{d}^T \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d}))(t - s)$$

$$= \mathbf{d}^T (\nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d}))(t - s))$$

$$= (t\mathbf{d}^T - s\mathbf{d}^T)(\nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d}))$$

$$= (\nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d}), (t - s)\mathbf{d})$$

But we already have

$$\langle \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y}), \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} \rangle \ge 0, \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in C$$

As both $\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}$, $\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d} \in C$, $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{d}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x} + s\mathbf{d}), (t - s)\mathbf{d} \rangle \geq 0$. Which means that $(g'(t) - g'(s))(t - s) \geq 0$. Thus g'(t) is increasing, thus g(t) is convex, by Proposition we have already proven in class, f is convex.