# Lecture 1 Unconstrained Optimization

- Definitions
- Necessary first/second order optimality condition variational approach
- Sufficient optimality condition
- Existence of optimal solutions
- Quadratic minimization characterization/existence of optimal solutions
- Convexity

#### **Definitions**

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & f(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ \text{subject to} & \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{array}$ 

- local minimum  $x^*$ :  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  s.t.  $f(x) \ge f(x^*)$ , for all  $||x x^*|| \le \epsilon$ .
- Strict local minimum:  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  s.t.  $f(x) > f(x^*)$ , for all  $||x x^*|| \le \epsilon$ ,  $x \ne x^*$ .
- Global minimum:  $f(x) \ge f(x^*)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .
- Strict global min:  $f(x) > f(x^*)$ , for all  $x \neq x^*$ .
- Geometrically ...

#### **Checkable Conditions for Local Min**

• Given a point x, how do we know if it is a (strict) local/global min of a (twice) continuously differentiable function f?

Need easily checkable necessary optimality conditions – variational approach

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) \succeq \mathbf{0}.$$
 (1)

• One dimensional case: suppose  $x^*$  is a local min of a differentiable function  $f:\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathbb{R}$ 

$$0 \le \lim_{x^r \downarrow x^*} \frac{f(x^r) - f(x^*)}{x^r - x^*} = f'(x^*) = \lim_{x^r \uparrow x^*} \frac{f(x^r) - f(x^*)}{x^r - x^*} \le 0$$

$$0 \le \lim_{x^r \to x^*} \frac{f(x^r) - f(x^*) - f'(x^*)(x^r - x^*)}{(x^r - x^*)^2} = \frac{1}{2} f''(x^*)$$

• For higher dimensions: fix any  $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Consider the one dimensional function  $g(\alpha) = f(\mathbf{x}^* + \alpha \mathbf{d})$ , which is minimized at  $\alpha = 0$ 

$$\implies g'(0) = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)'\mathbf{d} = 0, \quad g''(0) = \mathbf{d}'\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^*)\mathbf{d} \ge 0, \quad \forall \ \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

implying (1).

- Example:  $f(x) = |x|^3$ ,  $x^3$ ,  $-|x|^3$ . Check the necessary conditions at x = 0. Plot f.
- Sufficient condition for local optimality:

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{x}^*) \succ \mathbf{0}.$$
 (2)

since

$$f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*)'\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}^* + \alpha(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*))(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*) \ge 0, \quad 0 \le \alpha \le 1.$$

## Why Optimality Conditions are Important?

- Optimality conditions are useful because:
  - \* they provide a means of guaranteeing that a candidate solution is indeed optimal (sufficient conditions), and
  - \* they indicate when a point is not optimal (necessary conditions)
  - \* they help narrow down the list of potential solution candidates
- Furthermore they
  - ★ guide in the design of algorithms, since lack of optimality
    ★ indication of improvement

## **Use of Optimality Conditions**

minimize 
$$f(\mathbf{y}) = e^{y_1} + e^{y_2} + \dots + e^{y_n}$$
  
subject to  $y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_n = s$ .

• First we eliminate  $y_n$  by substituting  $y_n = s - y_1 - y_2 - \cdots - y_{n-1}$  in the objective function. The new objective function is

$$g(\mathbf{y}) = e^{y_1} + e^{y_2} + \dots + e^{y_{n-1}} + e^{s-y_1-y_2-\dots-y_{n-1}}$$

• The first order optimality condition  $\nabla g(y^*) = 0$  implies, for i = 1, 2, ..., n - 1,

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial y_i} = e^{y_i^*} - e^{s - y_1^* - y_2^* - \dots - y_{n-1}^*} = 0, \text{ or } y_i^* = s - y_1^* - y_2^* - \dots - y_{n-1}^*.$$

with the minimum  $f^* = ne^{s/n}$ . The 2nd order sufficient condition holds, so

$$e^{y_1} + e^{y_2} + \dots + e^{y_n} \ge ne^{(y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_n)/n}$$
.

• Using  $x = e^y$ , we obtain the well-known arithmetic-geometric inequality.

## **Use of Optimality Conditions**

• **Example:** find the local/global mins of  $f(x) = x^2 - x^4$ .

$$\begin{split} \nabla f(x) &= f'(x) = 2x - 4x^3 = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad x = 0, \ x = \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \quad \text{candidates} \\ f''(x) &= 2 - 12x^2 \\ \Rightarrow \quad f''(0) &= 2 > 0, \quad f''\left(\pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right) = 2 - 12 \times \frac{1}{2} < 0. \\ \Rightarrow \quad x = 0 \text{ is a strict local min; } \pm \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \text{ are strict local max.} \end{split}$$

Given there is a unique local min x = 0, can we then conclude that x = 0 is also the unique global min?

Global min does not exist. Plot.

### **Existence of Optimal Solution**

#### • Example:

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} e^{-|x|} = ?$$

is the infimum attained?

• **Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem**: every continuous function f attains its infimum over compact set X. That is, there exists an  $x^* \in X$  such that  $f(x^*) = \inf_{x \in X} f(x)$ .

Consequently, if the level set

$$f(x) \le f(x^0)$$

of continuous function f is compact for some  $oldsymbol{x}^0$ , then the global min of

minimize 
$$f(oldsymbol{x})$$
 subject to  $oldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 

is attained. Check the level sets of  $e^{-|x|}$ .

• Another sufficient condition (coercivity):  $f(x) \to \infty$  as  $|x| \to \infty$ .

### **Unconstrained Quadratic Optimization**

minimize 
$$rac{1}{2}m{x}'m{Q}m{x}+m{b}'m{x}$$
 subject to  $m{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ 

Necessary condition for optimality:

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{0}, \quad \nabla^2 f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{Q} \succeq \boldsymbol{0}.$$
 (3)

- What if the linear system Qx + b = 0 is infeasible? What if  $Q \not\succeq 0$ ?
- Sufficient condition requires  $Q \succ 0$ .
- Claim: the necessary condition (3) is also sufficient; any local optimal solution is also globally optimal.

### A 2-dimensional Example

minimize 
$$f(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha x^2 + \beta y^2) - x$$
 subject to 
$$(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

- $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$  (strongly convex):  $(1/\alpha, 0)$  is the unique global minimum.
- $\alpha = 0$  (convex): There is no global minimum
- $\alpha > 0, \ \beta = 0$  (convex):  $\{(1/\alpha, \xi) \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is the set of global minima
- $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta < 0$  or  $\alpha < 0$  (non-convex case): There is no global minimum
- Plot the level sets of all four cases

### **Linear Least Squares**

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{c}\|^2 \\ \text{subject to} & \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n \end{array}$ 

- A may be fat (under-determined), tall (over-determined), or rank-deficient.
- Note that Q = A'A, b = A'c.
- Necessary & sufficient optimality condition:

$$A'Ax^* - A'c = 0$$

which always has a solution.

 Linear least squares problem may have unbounded levels, but always admits a solution.

## **Role of Convexity**

Suppose  $f: \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  satisfies

$$f(\alpha \boldsymbol{x} + (1 - \alpha)\boldsymbol{y}) \le \alpha f(\boldsymbol{x}) + (1 - \alpha)f(\boldsymbol{y}), \quad \forall \ \alpha \in [0, 1], \ \boldsymbol{x}, \ \boldsymbol{y}.$$

then f is called a convex function. [or -f is called a concave function.]

- A set X is convex iff  $\iota_X$  (the indicator function) is convex.
- If f is continuously differentiable, f is (strongly) convex iff

$$f(\boldsymbol{y}) \ge f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})'(\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}) + \sigma \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\|^2$$

(and  $\sigma > 0$ ). If f is twice continuously differentiable, then

$$f$$
 is (strongly) convex  $\iff \nabla^2 f(x) \succeq \mathbf{0}(\succ \mathbf{0})$  for all  $x$ .

- Examples of convex functions: a'x + b,  $e^x$ ,  $-\ln x$ ,  $x^2$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}x'Qx + b'x$ ,  $Q \succeq 0$ .
- For convex differentiable f, each local min is also a global min (why?), so the necessary and sufficient optimality condition is

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0.$$

**Claim:** the set of minimizers of f is a convex set.

## **Applications of Convex Functions**

The arithmetic-geometric inequality

$$(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n)^{1/n} \le \frac{1}{n} (x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n), \quad \forall \ x_i \ge 0$$

can be derived from the convexity of  $-\ln x$  function.

First, the convexity of f is equivalent to

$$f(\alpha_1 \boldsymbol{x}^1 + \alpha_2 \boldsymbol{x}^2 + \dots + \alpha_r \boldsymbol{x}^r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i f(\boldsymbol{x}^i), \quad \forall \ \boldsymbol{x}^i \text{ and } \alpha_i \geq 0, \ \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1.$$

• Thus, the convexity of  $f(x) = -\ln x$  implies

$$-\ln\left(\frac{1}{n}x_1 + \frac{1}{n}x_2 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}x_n\right) \le -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ln x_i.$$

implying the arithmetic-geometric inequality.