

Convex Optimization

Problem 1.

Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers

$$\min \frac{1}{2} x^T H x + h^T x$$

$$\text{s.t. } Ax = b$$

$$l \leq Cx \leq u$$

a)

reformulate as $\min f(x) + g(Lx)$

$$\text{where } f(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T H x + h^T x + I_{Ax=b}(x).$$

$$\text{i) } L = C, \text{ then } g(Lx) = I_{[l, u]}(Cx), \quad g(x) = I_{[l, u]}(x)$$

$$\text{ii) } L = I, \text{ then } g(Lx) = I_{l \leq Cx \leq u}(x), \quad g(x) = I_{l \leq x \leq u}(x).$$

Dual Problem:

$$\min f^*(-L^T \mu) + g^*(\mu)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(y) &= \sup_x y^T x - f(x) = \sup_x y^T x - \left[\frac{1}{2} x^T H x + h^T x + I_{Ax=b}(x) \right] \\ &= - \inf_x \frac{1}{2} x^T H x + (h-y)^T x + I_{Ax=b}(x). \end{aligned}$$



Solution to
 $\frac{1}{2} x^T H x + (h-y)^T x$.

this is actually another QP problem with equation constraints.

Just the same as primal problem.

$$g^*(y) = \sup_x y^T x - g(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } L = C: \quad g^*(y) &= \sup_x y^T x - I_{[l, u]}(x) \\ &= \sup_x y^T x \\ &\text{s.t. } x \in [l, u]^n. \end{aligned}$$

this is a linear programming problem, the optimal
 is chosen at its vertices: for $[l, u]^n$, there are 2^n vertices.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } L = I: \quad g^*(y) &= \sup_x y^T x \\ &\text{s.t. } l \leq Cx \leq u \end{aligned}$$

If C is sparse, then the polytope $\{x \mid l \leq Cx \leq u\}$ has
 possibly smaller number of vertices, therefore easier to
 find the solution.

$$\text{for } L=C, \quad f^*(-L^T\mu) = -\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x} + (\mathbf{h} + L^T\mu)^T \mathbf{x}$$

$$\text{for } L=I, \quad f^*(-I\mu) = -\inf_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x} + (\mathbf{h} + \mu)^T \mathbf{x}$$

s.t. $A\mathbf{x} = b$

b)

Because both primal and dual problems are convex, with Both $L=I, C$.
Hence the primal and dual problems can both be solved by DR splitting.

For primal problem,

$$\mathbf{x}^k = \text{prox}_{\partial f}(z^k)$$

$$y^k = \text{prox}_{\partial g(L)}(2x^k - z^k)$$

$$z^{k+1} = z^k + 2\lambda(y^k - x^k)$$

While for the dual problem

$$\mu^k = \text{prox}_{\partial g^*}(v^k)$$

$$y^k = \text{prox}_{\partial(f_0^*(L^T))}(2\mu^k - v^k)$$

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + 2\lambda(\eta^k - \mu^k)$$

By Moreau's identity:

$$\text{prox}_{\partial g^*} = I_d - \text{prox}_{\partial g}$$

$$\text{prox}_{\partial(f_0^*(L^T))}(2\mu^k - v^k) = 2\mu^k v^k + \gamma L^T \mathbf{x}^*$$

$$\mathbf{x}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ f(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\gamma}{2} \| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* - \gamma^{-1}(2\mu^k v^k) \|_2^2 \right\} \quad (1)$$

first compare D₁ and D₂.

then μ^k update is dependent on g .

$$\text{prox}_{\partial g(I)} \rightarrow \Pi_I \quad \text{prox}_{\partial g(C)} \rightarrow \Pi_C$$

Normally, projection onto a polyhedron is difficult.

but if C is very sparse, for example $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

the projection onto this polyhedron might be easier.

the η^k update. If L is sparse, from (1) we know this computation would be easier. again imagine $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$

therefore, between D_1 and D_2 , I would choose $L = C$.

- Compare primal and dual

for the update regarding $\nabla f(x)$, again the dual with $L = C$ wins.

for the update regarding $\nabla g(x)$, we will always use.

Moreau's Identity.

$$\text{prox}_{\lambda g^*} = \lambda d - \text{prox}_{\lambda g}$$

And with $\text{prox}_{\lambda g(C)} = \text{prox}_{\lambda \cdot I_{\{l \in C\}}}$

$$\text{prox}_{\lambda(g \circ L)} = \text{prox}_{\lambda \cdot I_{\{l \in C\}}}$$

This $g(x)$ related update is essentially the same, and are both better when $L = C$ is sparse.

Therefore, I would choose dual with $L = C$.

Problem 2.

Consider

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}} -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T P \mathbf{x} - s_c(\mathbf{y})$$

$$\text{s.t. } -P\mathbf{x} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q$$

$$\mathbf{y} \in (C^\infty)^\circ.$$

$$P \in S_+^n$$

C closed convex set

If there exists some $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, such that.

$$P\bar{\mathbf{x}} = 0, A\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C^\infty, \text{ and } q^T \bar{\mathbf{x}} < 0.$$

then the dual problem is infeasible.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_y \{ \mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid -P\bar{\mathbf{x}} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q \} \\ &= \inf_y \{ (-q^T + \bar{\mathbf{x}}^T P) \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid -P\bar{\mathbf{x}} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q \} \\ &= \inf_y \{ -q^T \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid -P\bar{\mathbf{x}} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q \} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\sup_y \{ \mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{y} \in (C^\infty)^\circ \} \leftarrow 0.$$

By definition of polar cone, $\mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{y}^T (A \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 0$. Because $A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \in C^\infty$.

$$\text{Therefore, } \sup_y \{ \mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{y} \in (C^\infty)^\circ \} \leq 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow \inf_y \{ \mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid -P\bar{\mathbf{x}} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q \} \geq \sup_y \{ \mathbf{y}^T A \bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{y} \in (C^\infty)^\circ \}.$$

$$\text{Therefore, } \{ \mathbf{y} \mid -P\bar{\mathbf{x}} + A^T \mathbf{y} = -q \} \cap \{ \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{y} \in (C^\infty)^\circ \} = \emptyset.$$

Problem 3

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & \|x\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax = b \end{array}$$

$A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, full row rank.
 $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$

the equivalent way using indicator function

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & \|x\|_1 + I_C(z) \end{array}$$

$$\text{s.t. } Ax = z$$

$$z \in \{by = c\}$$

Therefore, the ADMM update.

$$x^{k+1} \in \underset{x}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(\|x\|_1 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ax - z^k + \frac{1}{\rho} y^k\|_2^2 \right)$$

this is a Lasso problem; and has a closed form for x^{k+1}

$$\cancel{\rho A^T(Ax - z^k + \frac{1}{\rho} y^k) + \operatorname{sgn}(x)}$$

$$z^{k+1} = \Pi_C(Ax^{k+1} - z + \frac{1}{\rho} y^k) = b.$$

$$y^{k+1} = y^k + f.(A x^{k+1} - z^{k+1}).$$