Optimization HW1

Adi Amuzig 205928211

Grimovitch Ekaterina 314092826

27 November 2019

Question 1

Prove or disprove the following claims.

Note that for this questions we assume $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- 1. The expression $\langle x, y \rangle_M = x^T M y$ is an inner product if $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. By definition, an inner product maps $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ upholds:
 - (a) Symmetry: $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$
 - (b) Additivity: $\langle x + y, z \rangle = \langle x, z \rangle + \langle y, z \rangle$
 - (c) Homogeneity: $\langle \lambda x, y \rangle = \lambda \langle x, y \rangle$
 - (d) Positive-definite: $\langle x, x \rangle \ge 0$ and $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$ iff x = 0.

We can easily show that the given product does not answer (d), meaning it is not positive definite. If M is the zero matrix (it contains only zeros) then: $\langle x, x \rangle_M = x^T M x = 0$ even though $x \neq 0$. We got/a contradiction, therefore the given expression is not an inner product.

2. The expression $\langle x, y \rangle_Q = x^T Q y$ is an inner product if $0 \prec Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

The definition of a positive definite matrix is that for a symmetrical matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and for every $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we get $x^T Q x > 0$. Marking $0 \prec Q$. Lets go over all 4 requirements for an inner product:

- (a) Symmetry: Q is symmetrical, therefore $Q = Q^T$. $\langle x, y \rangle = x^T Q y = (y^T Q x)^T$ The product of this equation is a single value (not a matrix) therefore it is equal to its transpose. $(y^T Q x)^T = y^T Q x = \langle y, x \rangle$
- (b) Additivity: $\langle x+y,z\rangle=(x+y)^TQz=(x^T+y^T)Qz=x^TQz+y^TQz=\langle x,z\rangle+\langle y,z\rangle$
- (c) Homogeneity: $\langle \lambda x, y \rangle = (\lambda x)^T Q y = \lambda x^T Q y = \lambda \langle x, y \rangle$
- (d) Positive-definite: According to the positive definite matrix definition, the positive-definite requirement is met.

The expression answers all requirements, therefore it is an inner product.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$

1. Prove that if $0 \prec A$ then it is invertible, and $0 \prec A^{-1}$

By definition, a positive definite matrix is a symmetrical matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that for every $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we get $x^T Ax > 0$. Marking it $0 \prec A$.

According to tutorial 1, $x \prec A$ iff all of its eigenvalues are positive definite. It is known that 0 is not an eigenvalue of a square matrix iff it is invertible.

For eigenvector $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and its corresponding eigenvalue λ

$$Av = \lambda v$$

$$A^{-1}Av = A^{-1}\lambda v$$

$$A^{-1}v = \frac{1}{\lambda}v$$

Since $v \neq 0$ it implies that it is the eigenvector for A^{-1} with the corresponding eigenvalue $\frac{1}{\lambda}$. Given that, $\lambda > 0 \implies \frac{1}{\lambda} > 0 \implies 0 \prec A^{-1}$.

2. Prove that if $0 \leq A$ and it is inevitable then $0 \leq A$

As seen in tutorial 1, $x \leq A$ iff all of its eigenvalues are positive semidefinite. Because it is also invertible that means that $\lambda \neq 0 \implies \lambda > 0$. This means that $x \prec A$ because all of its eigenvalues are positive definite.

3. $A = B^T B$ for some $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We will prove that $0 \leq A$.

$$x^{T}Ax = x^{T}B^{T}Bx = (Bx)^{T}(Bx)$$

$$Bx \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$$

$$Bx = y$$

$$(Bx)^{T}(Bx) = y^{T}y = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_{i}^{2} \ge 0$$

 $0 \leq A$ by definition.

Note that $0 \not\prec A$. For example

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$A = B^T B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$x^T A x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

4. Prove that if $A_{i,i} < 0$ for any $1 \le i \le n$ then $0 \npreceq A$.

$$x^{T}Ax = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i}x_{i}A_{i,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j\neq i}^{n} x_{i}x_{i}A_{i,j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{2}A_{i,i}$$

2

If there exists $A_{i,i} < 0$ then $x_i^2 A_{i,i} < 0$ for $x_i \neq 0$. By choosing a vector x containing only zeros except x_i that corresponds to $A_{i,i} < 0$ we get $x^T A x < 0$ meaning $0 \nleq A$.

It is not a sufficient condition. For example

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$x^T A x = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

Function $f: U \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differential while $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Direction $0 \neq d$ is called the downhill direction of the function at point x if there exists 0 < T so that for every 0 < t < T

$$f(x+td) < f(x)$$

1. Prove that if direction d uphold f'(x,d) < 0 for a certain x, then it is a downhill direction of f at x. By definition:

$$f'(x,d) = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(x+td) - f(x)}{t}$$

We assume 0 < t < T.

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(x+td) - f(x)}{t} < 0$$

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(x+td) - f(x)}{t} < 0$$

$$f(x+td) - f(x) < 0$$

$$f(x+td) < f(x)$$

If direction d uphold f'(x,d) < 0 then f(x+td) < f(x) which means it is a downhill direction.

2. Prove that if $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$ then the direction $d = -\nabla f(x)$ is a downhill direction of f at x. By definition:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x) = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(x + te_i) - f(x)}{t}$$

$$\nabla f(x) = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x) \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(x) \quad \dots \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(x) \right]^T$$

As seen in tutorial 1, if f is continuously differential then

$$f'(x,d) = \nabla f(x)^T d, \ \forall d \in \mathbb{R}^n$$
$$d = -\nabla f(x) \to \nabla f(x) = -d$$
$$\implies f'(x,d) = \nabla f(x)^T d = -d^T \times d = -\sum d_i^2 < 0$$

As seen in part 1, if f'(x,d) < 0 for a certain x then it is a downhill direction of f at x.

3. Function $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ is continuously differential. Given point $x^{(0)} = [x_1^{(0)} \ x_2^{(0)}]^T = [1 \ 1]^T$:

$$\nabla f(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x) & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(x) \end{bmatrix}^T = \begin{bmatrix} 2x_1^{(0)} & 2x_2^{(0)} \end{bmatrix}^T = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

According to part 2, if $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$ then the direction $d = -\nabla f(x)$ is a downhill direction of f at x. In our example $d_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & -2 \end{bmatrix}^T$. Because $x^{(0)}$ is not a maximum or a minimum of the function $f(x_1, x_2)$ the opposite from the downhill direction will not be a downhill direction as well. Meaning $d_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

 $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a convex domain and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

$$B_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x = A^T z, z \in C\}$$

$$B_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | Ax \in C\}$$

By definition, domain $C \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex if for all $x, y \in C$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1] \to \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in C$.

$$\begin{split} \lambda \in [0,1] \\ x,y \in B_1 \\ x = A^T z_x \\ y = A^T z_y \\ z_x, z_y \in C \\ q = \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y = \lambda A^T z_x + (1-\lambda)A^T z_y = A^T (\lambda z_x + (1-\lambda)z_y) = A^T z_q, \ z_q \in C \end{split}$$

 $\implies B_1$ is a convex domain by definition.

$$x, y \in B_2$$

$$Ax \in C$$

$$Ay \in C$$

$$Aq = A(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) = \lambda(Ax) + (1 - \lambda)(Ay) \in C$$

 $\implies B_2$ is a convex domain by definition.

Definition 1 let there be a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$

- 1. Point $a \in S$ is called an inner point of S if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ for which $B(a, \varepsilon) \subseteq S$.
- 2. Point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (not necessarily in S) are called condensation point if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the open ball $B(x, \varepsilon)$ contains at least one point $y \in S$, $y \neq x$.

Definition 2 let there be a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$

- 1. Set S is called open if every point in S is an inner point.
- 2. Set S is called closed if its complimentary set, S^c , is an open set.

We will prove the following claims:

1. Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be some set and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ its condensation point. Therefore for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the open ball $B(x,\varepsilon)$ contains an infinite amount of points from S.

Using proof by contradiction assuming for a certain $\varepsilon > 0$ the open ball $B(x, \varepsilon)$ contains a finite amount of points from S. Each one of the points from S in the ball have a different distance from point x. We will mark the closest point to x as a and the distance as ε_a where $\varepsilon_a \leq \varepsilon$. The open ball $B(x, \varepsilon_a/2)$ does not contain any points from S because the closest point to x which is a is outside of it. Therefore $B(x, \varepsilon_a/2)$ does not contains any points $y \in S$, $y \neq x$ meaning we got a contradiction with definition 1.2 of a condensation point.

2. Set S is closed iff it containers all its condensation points.

Using proof by contradiction given that set S is closed we assume it does not contain all of its condensation points. Meaning there is at least one condensation point $x \notin S$. $x \in S^c$ where S^c is the complimentary set of S and, according to definition 2.2, an open set. According to definition 1.2, because x is a condensation point then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the open ball $B(x, \varepsilon)$ contains at least one point $y \in S$, $y \neq x$ ($y \notin S^c$). Therefore it is not an inner point of S^c according to definition 1.1. Looking at definition 2.1 we get a contradiction where not all points in the open set S^c are inner points.

Using proof by contradiction given that S contains all of its condensation points we assume it is not a closed set. According to definition 2.2 if S is not closed then S^c is not open. According to definition 2.1 if S^c is not open then it has at least one point $x \in S^c$ that is not an inner point. According to definition 1.1 for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the open ball $B(x,\varepsilon) \nsubseteq S^c$ meaning it has at least one point $y \in B(x,\varepsilon), y \in S$. If $y \in S$ then point x is a condensation point according to definition 1.2 and we got a contradiction because $x \notin S$.

3. If S is a closed set and the series $i=1,2,...,\ x_i\in S$ converges to x (meaning $\lim_{i\to\infty}||x_i-x||=0$) then $x\in S$.

Using proof by contradiction assuming $x \notin S$. Given that S is closed it containers all its condensation points meaning x is not a condensation point. According to definition 1.2 there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ for which the open ball $B(x,\varepsilon) \nsubseteq S$. Meaning $B(x,\varepsilon)$ does not contain any point of the series x_i and we get a contradiction from a conclusion from the definition of a limit that says that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an i_0 such that for all $i > i_0$ we get $x_i \in B(x,\varepsilon)$.

 $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a convex and closed domain. $x_0 \notin C$. Given the optimization problem

$$\min_{y \in C} ||y - x_0||$$

Assume there is a solution $y_0 \in C$ for the optimization problem. We will prove that it is singular. Let us assume there are 2 solutions $y_0, z_0 \in C$ such that

$$||y_0 - x_0||^2 = ||z_0 - x_0||^2 = (\min_{u \in C} ||y - x_0||)^2 = \delta^2$$

By definition of a convex domain

$$y_{0}\lambda + z_{0}(1 - \lambda) \in C$$

$$\lambda = 0.5$$

$$\Rightarrow m_{0} = (y_{0} + z_{0})/2 \in C$$

$$||m_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} = ||(y_{0} + z_{0})/2 - x_{0}||^{2} = ||(y_{0} - x_{0} + z_{0} - x_{0})/2||^{2} = \langle (y_{0} - x_{0} + z_{0} - x_{0})/2, (y_{0} - x_{0} + z_{0} - x_{0})/2 \rangle =$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\langle y_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + \frac{1}{4}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, z_{0} - x_{0}\rangle =$$

$$\frac{1}{4}||y_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + \frac{1}{4}||z_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} =$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\delta^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + \frac{1}{4}\delta^{2} =$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\delta^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + \frac{1}{4}\delta^{2} =$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\delta^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle =$$

$$||m_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} \geq (\min_{y \in C} ||y - x_{0}||)^{2} = \delta^{2}$$

$$\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle \geq \delta^{2}$$

$$-2\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + 2\delta^{2} \leq 0$$

$$||y_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} - 2\langle z_{0} - x_{0}, y_{0} - x_{0}\rangle + ||z_{0} - x_{0}||^{2} \leq 0$$

$$||y_{0} - z_{0}||^{2} < 0$$

By definition $||\cdot|| \ge 0$ meaning

$$y_0 - z_0 = 0$$
$$y_0 = z_0$$