

Research Notes

Nonparametric Estimation using SOS-Convexity

Prof. John Lafferty

Students: YJ Choe, Max Cytrynbaum, Wei Hu

1 Introduction

(YJ will write out this section summerizing our first-day discussion when he has time.)

2 SOS-Convex Regression

Given $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, recall that we have the equivalence between the following optimization problems:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} && f \text{ is convex.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\beta}} && \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} && z_j \geq z_i + \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In particular, we can reduce the infinite-dimensional problem (1) into a finite-dimensional quadratic program (QP) (2), which can be efficiently solved. The solution to (2) can be viewed as a piecewise-linear convex function.

Here, we attempt to derive the analogous equivalence, i.e. find an equivalent convex optimization problem to the following infinite-dimensional problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} && f \text{ is an SOS-convex polynomial of degree } 2d. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Denote the vector of basis monomials up to degree d by $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = (1, x_1, \dots, x_p, x_1 x_2, \dots, x_p^d)$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$. Also, let $s = \binom{2d+p}{p}$ denote the length of this vector for degree $2d$. Then, we may replace f with a coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^s$, such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{v}_{2d}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Note the one-to-one correspondence between f and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Further, as done with the convex program, we introduce the auxiliary variable $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ so that

$$f(\mathbf{x}_i) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{v}_{2d}(\mathbf{x}_i) = z_i \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{4}$$

We can write this more concisely by introducing the matrix

$$V = V(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}_n) \end{bmatrix}_{n \times s}$$

so that (4) simply becomes

$$V\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{z}. \tag{5}$$

So we have a linear constraint on the coefficient θ that is equivalent to saying that the polynomial interpolates the points $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. Analogously, we can rewrite the objective to be

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2 = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$.

Now we want to rewrite the constraint that $f(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ is SOS-convex. Recall that p is SOS-convex if and only if

$$\mathbf{u}^T H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^T Q \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \quad (7)$$

and

$$Q \succeq 0 \quad (8)$$

where Q is a symmetric $r \times r$ matrix with $r = \binom{d+2p}{2p}$, $H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the Hessian polynomial matrix of $p(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$.

Note first that (7) is an equality in the space of *polynomials* on $2p$ variables: \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} . Also, (8) **suggests that the convex optimization program that we attempt to build is a semidefinite program (SDP).**

It is important to note that, **in this case where f is a polynomial, the Hessian $H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ is easy to compute – in fact, the coefficients of each entry of the Hessian are a linear function of the coefficient θ of the original polynomial f .** For a multinomial index $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p$ on \mathbf{x} such that $\sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \leq d$, recall that the Hessian of $\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ with respect to x_i and x_j is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \alpha_i \alpha_j \mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}'_{i,j}}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'_{i,j} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i - 1, \dots, \alpha_j - 1, \dots, \alpha_p)$ for $i \neq j$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'_{i,i} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i - 2, \dots, \alpha_p)$. Note that if $\alpha_i = 0$ for any i then the Hessian is zero anyway.

(7) is not a valid semidefinite constraint yet, because it is an equality between two polynomials. This means we want to equate the *coefficients* of the two polynomials on (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) . Note first that

$$\mathbf{u}^T H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u} = \sum_{i,j=1}^p \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} f(\mathbf{x}) \right) u_i u_j. \quad (9)$$

Then, there is at most one term (zero iff the partial derivative is zero) for each $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k \leq d$, and for each $i, j = 1, \dots, p$. For each of these cases, we give a multinomial index $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j} \in \mathbb{N}^{2p}$ on (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) , and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j}$ will have a few specific properties: the first p coordinates are precisely $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'_{i,j}$, which sum up to at most $d - 2$, and the last p coordinates are all zero except at the $(p + i)$ th and the $(p + j)$ th coordinate (only at the $(p + i)$ th if $i = j$). The first corresponds to the fact that the Hessian can have at most degree $d - 2$, and the second to the fact that each term has exactly one degree on u_i and u_j . Thus, we have

$$\mathbf{u}^T H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i,j} H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j} \quad (10)$$

where $H_{\theta}(\alpha, i, j)$ represents the scalar coefficient for the term $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^{\gamma_{\alpha, i, j}}$.

Further, we can express the right-hand side in terms of their coordinates in the following way. First define the coordinate matrix B_{γ} for each multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{2p}$ up to degree $2d$ such that

$$\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^T = \sum_{\gamma} B_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^{\gamma}.$$

Note that the matrices B_{γ} are simply “constants”, i.e. they do not depend on the data or the program variables. With this, the right-hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^T Q \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= \text{tr}(Q \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^T) \\ &= \langle Q, \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^T \rangle \\ &= \left\langle Q, \sum_{\gamma} B_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^{\gamma} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma} \langle Q, B_{\gamma} \rangle (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})^{\gamma} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(A^T B) = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij} B_{ij}$ is the matrix inner product. Note that Q is symmetric.

Then, we can equate the coefficients of (10) and (11) to obtain:

$$\langle Q, B_{\gamma_{\alpha, i, j}} \rangle = H_{\theta}(\alpha, i, j) \quad \forall \alpha, i, j \tag{12}$$

$$\langle Q, B_{\gamma} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all other } \gamma \tag{13}$$

Putting (5), (6), (8), (12), and (13) together, (3) can be restated as the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{z}, \theta, Q}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & V\theta = \mathbf{z} \\ & \langle Q, B_{\gamma_{\alpha, i, j}} \rangle = H_{\theta}(\alpha, i, j) \quad \forall \alpha, i, j \\ & \langle Q, B_{\gamma} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all other } \gamma \\ & Q \succeq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

(14) is almost an SDP, except that the objective is quadratic. But in general, we can introduce another auxiliary variable t to restate the problem as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{t, \mathbf{z}, \theta, Q}{\text{minimize}} \quad & t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 \leq t \\ & V\theta = \mathbf{z} \\ & \langle Q, B_{\gamma_{\alpha, i, j}} \rangle = H_{\theta}(\alpha, i, j) \quad \forall \alpha, i, j \\ & \langle Q, B_{\gamma} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all other } \gamma \\ & Q \succeq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Then, we are left with a quadratic inequality constraint. Fortunately, the following allows us to convert this into a semidefinite constraint.

Fact 2.1 For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} + r \leq 0$ if and only if $\begin{bmatrix} I & -\mathbf{x} \\ -\mathbf{x}^T & -\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} - r \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$.

Proof: For any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}^T & z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -\mathbf{x} \\ -\mathbf{x}^T & -\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} - r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ z \end{bmatrix} &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - 2z\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y} - z^2(\mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} + r) \\ &= \|\mathbf{y} - z\mathbf{x}\|^2 - z^2(\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} + r). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x} + r \leq 0$, then this is nonnegative for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, one can find $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that this is strictly negative. ■

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|^2 \leq t &\iff \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{z} - 2\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{z} + (\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - t) \leq 0 \\ &\iff \begin{bmatrix} I & -\mathbf{z} \\ -\mathbf{z}^T & 2\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} + t \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last relation is a linear matrix inequality (LMI), i.e. it says that a linear combination of symmetric matrices is positive semidefinite.

Thus, we can now write (15) into a semidefinite program:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{t, \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, Q}{\text{minimize}} && t \\ &\text{s.t.} && \begin{bmatrix} I & -\mathbf{z} \\ -\mathbf{z}^T & 2\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} + t \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \\ & && V\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{z} \\ & && \langle Q, B_{\gamma_{\alpha, i, j}} \rangle = H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j) \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\alpha}, i, j \\ & && \langle Q, B_{\gamma} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all other } \gamma \\ & && Q \succeq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the two semidefinite constraints can be restated – if necessary – into one semidefinite constraint

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -\mathbf{z} \\ -\mathbf{z}^T & 2\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} + t \\ & & Q \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

Finally, note that the entire program depends on the degree of the SOS-convex polynomial that we started off with: $2d$.

Further Questions

1. What is the program size? Is it tractable?
2. Can the zero constraints be simplified?
3. For any given d , is the program feasible? What is the behavior of the objective t_d ?
4. How can SDP hierarchy (e.g. by Lasserre) help choosing/removing d ?

References

- [BV] BOYD, S. and VANDENBERGHE, L. (2009). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Lasserre] LASSERRE, J. B. (2009). *Moments, Positive Polynomials and Their Applications*. Vol. 1. World Scientific.