Labs
Optimization for Machine Learning
Spring 2019

EPFL
School of Computer and Communication Sciences
Martin Jaggi
github.com/epfml/OptML_course

Problem Set 4 — Solutions (Proximal Gradient and Subgradient Descent)

Proximal Gradient and Subgradient Descent

Solve Exercises 21, 22, 23, 24 from the lecture notes.

Exercise 21. *Prove Lemma 3.12!*

Hint: *It is useful to prove that with* $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ *as in (3.12) and satisfying (3.13),*

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}.$$

Solution: We claim that

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}.$$

Assume for the moment that this claim is true. By Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11 we know that there exists $1 \le p \le d$ such that $\Pi_X(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{x}^\star(p)$. Which means that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x}\in X} \|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\|^2$. Now suppose Lemma 3.12 is wrong, which means that we can find $p' > p$, $(p' \ge p+1)$ with $\mathbf{x}^\star(p')$ as in (3.12) and satisfying (3.13), which means that we also get

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p') = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1, x_{p'+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}.$$

Here we are minimizing $\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\|$ with less constraint than in the previous case with $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ (components $p+1$ to p' do not have to be equal to 0), which implies that $\|\mathbf{x}^\star(p')-\mathbf{v}\| \le \|\mathbf{x}^\star(p)-\mathbf{v}\|$. Combining this with the previous assumption of $\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \Pi_X(\mathbf{v})$ we get $\|\mathbf{x}^\star(p')-\mathbf{v}\| = \|\mathbf{x}^\star(p)-\mathbf{v}\|$. And since we are projecting on a convex set we know that the projection is unique, and thus $\mathbf{x}^\star(p') = \mathbf{x}^\star(p)$. However, from the way $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ and $\mathbf{x}^\star(p')$ are defined using (3.12), we know that the $p+1$ component of $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ is equal to 0, and that of $\mathbf{x}^\star(p')$ is strictly positive which leads to a contradiction.

It remains only to prove our claim. That is, to show that for a given $1 \le p \le d$ indeed

$$\mathbf{x}^\star(p) = \operatorname{argmin}\{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{v}\| : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\},$$

provided that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ satisfies conditions (3.12) and (3.13).

Let $Y = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 1, x_{p+1} = \cdots = x_d = 0\}$, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as $f(x) = \|\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}\|^2$. To prove our claim, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p) \in Y$ is a minimizer of f over Y. By the optimality condition of Lemma 1.22, it suffices to show that $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*(p)) \ge 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Y$. Because $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x})$, we want to show that

$$-2(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*(p)) \ge 0. \tag{1}$$

Notice that the first p coordinates of $(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))$ are all equal to Θ_p. Moreover, the last $(d-p)$ coordinates of both $\mathbf{x} \in Y$ and $\mathbf{x}^*(p)$ are all equal to 0. Therefore, we get that $(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))$ equals

$$(\Theta_p, \dots, \Theta_p, v_{p+1}, \dots, v_d)^\top (x_1 - v_1 + \Theta_p, \dots, x_p - v_p + \Theta_p, 0, \dots, 0)$$

Expanding this product, we get

$$(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*(p)) = \Theta_p \sum_{i=1}^{p}(x_i - v_i + \Theta_p) = \Theta_p\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} x_i - \sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i + p\Theta_p\right).$$

Because $\mathbf{x} \in Y$, we know that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} x_i = 1$, and since $\Theta_p = \frac{1}{p}(\sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i - 1)$, we get that

$$(\mathbf{v}-\mathbf{x}^*(p))^\top(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*(p)) = \Theta_p\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i + p\frac{1}{p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i - 1\right)\right) = 0.$$

That is, equation (1) holds, and by Lemma 1.22 we conclude that $\mathbf{x}^\star(p)$ is a minimizer of f over Y proving our claim.

Exercise 22. *Prove Theorem 3.14!*

Solution: From (3.17), the proximal step could be written as

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \underset{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmin}}\{g(\mathbf{x}_t) + \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y})\},$$

The function $\psi(\mathbf{y}) = g(\mathbf{x}_t) + \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y})$ is strongly convex with the parameter L. This means that $\psi(\mathbf{y}) \geq \psi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2$. This is equivalent to

$$\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y}) \geq \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2,$$

Rearranging terms and subtracting $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$ from both sides,

$$\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2 + h(\mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x}_t) \geq \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 + h(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - h(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

As the function g is L-smooth, we can estimate the right side as $g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \geq g(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - g(\mathbf{x}_t)$, and because g is convex, on the left side we estimate $\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t)^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t) \leq g(\mathbf{y}) - g(\mathbf{x}_t)$. Putting this together

$$f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}_t) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{t+1}\|^2 \geq f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)$$

This holds for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Lets take $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^*$ and sum up the inequation above from $t = 0$ to $t = T-1$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1}(f(\mathbf{x}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}_t)) + \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_T\|^2 \geq f(\mathbf{x}_T) - f(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T}(f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 - \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_T\|^2 \leq \frac{L}{2}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_0\|^2$$

Because $f(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_t)$ for each $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(f(\mathbf{x}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \frac{L}{2T}\|\mathbf{x}^*-\mathbf{x}_0\|^2.$$

Exercise 23. *Prove Lemma 4.2, meaning that a function that is differentiable at $\mathbf{x}$ has at most one subgradient there, namely $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$.*

Solution: Let $\mathbf{g}$ be a subgradient at $\mathbf{x}$. Together with differentiabilty at $\mathbf{x}$ (Definition 1.7), we derive the inequality

$$(\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}))^\top(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}) \leq r_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})$$

for all $\mathbf{y}$ in some neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}$, where $r_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a sublinear error function ($r_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{v})/\|\mathbf{v}\| \to 0$ as $\mathbf{v} \to 0$). But the only linear function that is majorized by a sublinear function in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero function, so $\mathbf{g} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x})$.

Exercise 24. *Prove the easy direction of Lemma 4.3, meaning that the existence of subgradients everywhere implies convexity!*

Solution: Let's assume that we have subgradients everywhere. With $\mathbf{g} \in \partial f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y})$, (4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &\geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{g}^\top((1-\lambda)(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})), \\ f(\mathbf{y}) &\geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{g}^\top(\lambda(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$

Adding up these two inequalities with multiples λ and $1-\lambda$ cancels the subgradient terms and yields

$$\lambda f(\mathbf{x}) + (1-\lambda) f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\lambda \mathbf{x} + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{y}),$$

which is convexity.

Random Walks

Gradient descent turns up in a surprising number of situations which apriori have nothing to do with optimization. In this exercise, we will see how performing a random walk on a graph can be seen as a special case of gradient descent.

We are given an *undirected* graph $G(V, E)$ with vertices $V = [n]$ labelled 1 through n, and edges $E \subseteq [n]^2$ such that if $(i, j) \in E$, then $(j, i) \in E$. Further, we assume that the graph is *regular* in the sense that every edge has the same degree. Let d be the degree of each node such that if we denote $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{j : (i, j) \in E\}$ to be the neighbors of i, then $|\mathcal{N}(i)| = d$. We assume that every node is connected to itself and so $(i, i) \in \mathcal{N}(i)$.

Now we start our random walk from node 1, jumping randomly from a node to its neighbor. More precisely, suppose at time step t we are at node i_t. Then i_{t+1} is picked uniformly at random from $\mathcal{N}(i)$. If we run this random walk for a large enough T steps, we expect that $\Pr(i_T = j) = 1/n$ for any $j \in [n]$. This is called the stationary distribution.

Problem A. Let us represent the position at time step t in the graph with $\mathbf{e}_{i_t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where the i_tth coordinate is 1 and all others are 0. Then, the vector $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]$ denotes the probability distribtion over the n nodes of the graph. Further, let us denote $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the transition probability matrix such that

$$\mathbf{G}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d} & \text{if } (i,j) \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Show that

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t \tag{2}$$

Solution: Let look at one coordinate j of random vector $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]$. Then by the low of total probability, the expectation of this coordinate would be

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_j = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]_j = \Pr\left([\mathbf{e}_{i_{t+1}}]_j = 1\right) &= \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \Pr(i_t = k) = \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \Pr\left([\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]_k = 1\right) \\ &= \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_{i_t}]_k = \sum_k \Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k)[\mathbf{x}_t]_j \end{aligned}$$

Note, that for $k : \ (j,k) \notin E$, $\Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) = 0 = \mathbf{G}_{j,k}$ and for $k : \ (j,k) \in E$, $\Pr(i_{t+1} = j | i_t = k) = \frac{1}{d} = \mathbf{G}_{j,k}$. This means that

$$[\mathbf{x}_{t+1}]_j = \sum_k \mathbf{G}_{jk}[\mathbf{x}_t]_k,$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t \tag{3}$$

Problem B. Simulate the random walk above over a torus and confirm that we indeed converge to a uniform distribution over the nodes. What is the *rate* at which this convergence occurs?

Follow the Python notebook provided here:

github.com/epfml/OptML_course/tree/master/labs/ex03/

Problem C. Define $\mu = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n$ be a vector of all $1/n$, and a objective function $f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x} - \mu)^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})(\mathbf{x} - \mu)\,,$$

defined over the probability simplex $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{1}_n^\top \mathbf{v} = 1, v_i \geq 0\}$.

1. Show that f defined above is convex and compute its smoothness constant.
2. Show that running gradient descent on f with the correct step-size is equivalent to the random walk step (2).
3. Prove that $\mathbf{x}_t$ converges to the distribution μ at a linear rate i.e. for the random walk on a torus with n nodes,

$$\|\mathbf{x}_t - \mu\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mu\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t.$$

Hint: Use that the two largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{G}$ are 1 and $1 - \frac{1}{n}$. Also $\mathbf{G}\mu = \mu$ and so μ is the eigenvector corresponding to eigenvalue 1.

Solution:

1. By the second order characterization of convexity (Lemma 1.12) the function is convex if its hessian is positive semidefinite. Lets show that

$$\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G}) \succeq 0$$

For any vector $\mathbf{z}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{z} &= \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{G}_{ij} z_i z_j = d\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} z_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j:(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d} 2 z_i z_j = d\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} z_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j:(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d} z_i z_j = \\ &= (d-1)\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} z_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j<i:(i,j)\in E} \frac{2}{d} z_i z_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j<i:(i,j)\in E} z_i^2 + z_j^2 - 2 z_i z_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j<i:(i,j)\in E} (z_i - z_j)^2 \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

where we used that the $\mathbf{G}$ is symmetric because the graph is undirected and that every row of $\mathbf{G}$ had exactly d non-zero elements.

Let us prove now that the function f is L-smooth with smoothness constant $L = 2$. From Ex. 11 we know that $L = 2\|I - G\|$, and we claim that $\|I - G\|$ is less than 1. As we already showed above,

$$\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{z} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j<i:(i,j)\in E} (z_i - z_j)^2.$$

Using that $z_i > 0\ \forall i$,

$$\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{z} \leq \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j<i:(i,j)\in E} z_i^2 + z_j^2 = \frac{d-1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2 < \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2$$

This means that $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G}\| < 1$.

2. The gradient of f is

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})(\mathbf{x}_t - \mu) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t - 2(\mu - \mathbf{G}\mu) = 2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t\,.$$

The last equality followed since $\mathbf{G}\mu = \mu$. With the stepsize $\gamma = \frac{1}{L} = \frac{1}{2}$ gradient descent will take form

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1}{2}\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_t) = \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1}{2}2(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{G})\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t\,.$$

Since our problem is constrained to the set $\mathcal{S}$, we have to make sure $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ also lies in $\mathcal{S}$. This is easy to verify.

3. To show the linear convergence rate, we first will prove that function f restricted to the set $\mathcal{S}$ is strongly convex with parameter $\frac{2}{n}$. Then, the convergence rate would follow from the Theorem 2.11.

   To find strong convexity coefficient we need to show a lower bound on $(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top 2(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{S}$. For that we will find the minimum

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\|^2}$$

   First, let's show that $\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\perp\mu\ \forall \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{S}$. Indeed,

$$(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top\mu = \mathbf{y}^\top\mu - \mathbf{x}^\top\mu = \frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{n} = 0\,.$$

   Here we used that $\sum_i y_i = 1$ and $\sum_i x_i = 1$.

   Then

$$\min_{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}\|^2} \geq \min_{\mathbf{z}\perp\mu} \frac{\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|^2}\,.$$

   Recall that μ is the principal eigenvector. Then, the right hand side of the above equation characterizes the second largest eigenvalue. In the basis of orthonormal eigenvectors $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G}$ vector $\mathbf{z}$ is represented as $\mathbf{z}=\sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i\mathbf{v}_i$, because it is orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}_1=\mu$. Then

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}\perp\mu} \frac{\mathbf{z}^\top(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{G})\mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{z}\|^2} = \min_{\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_n} \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i^2\lambda_i}{\sum_{i=2}^n \alpha_i^2} = \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{n}.$$

   This shows that f is $\frac{2}{n}$ strongly convex when restricted to $\mathcal{S}$.