

HomeWork 1

Convex Optimization

2023

Gabriel Singer

Exercise 1

1. Let $(u, v, \lambda) \in \Omega^2 \times [0, 1]$ where $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i \in [\alpha_i, \beta_i] \quad \forall i \in [1, n]\}$.

Let $i \in [1, n]$, we have

$$(\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v)_i = \lambda u_i + (1 - \lambda)v_i \in [\lambda \alpha_i + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_i, \lambda \beta_i + (1 - \lambda)\beta_i] = [\alpha_i, \beta_i].$$

This show that Ω is convex.

2. Let $(u, v, \lambda) \in \Omega^2 \times [0, 1]$ where $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid x_1 x_2 \geq 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v)_1 (\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v)_2 &= (\lambda u_1 + (1 - \lambda)v_1)(\lambda u_2 + (1 - \lambda)v_2) \\ &= \lambda^2 u_1 u_2 + \lambda(1 - \lambda)u_1 v_2 + \lambda(1 - \lambda)u_2 v_1 + (1 - \lambda)^2 v_1 v_2 \\ &\geq \lambda^2 + (1 - \lambda)^2 + \lambda(1 - \lambda)(u_1 v_2 + u_2 v_1) \end{aligned}$$

Since $u, v \in \Omega$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we have that

$$\lambda(1 - \lambda)(u_1 v_2 + u_2 v_1) \geq \lambda(1 - \lambda)\left(\frac{v_2}{v_1} + \frac{v_1}{v_2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{v_2}{v_1} + \frac{v_1}{v_2}\right). \quad (1)$$

Let $g : x \mapsto x + \frac{1}{x}$ define on $]0, \infty[$ $g \in C^\infty(]0, \infty[, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\forall x > 0 \quad g''(x) = 2x^{-3} > 0$$

which implies that g is convex and since $g'(x) = 0 \implies x = 1$ by convexity of g we have that $g(x) \geq g(1) = 2$. This mean that from (1) we have

$$\lambda(1 - \lambda)(u_1 v_2 + u_2 v_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

Thus

$$(\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v)_1 (\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v)_2 \geq \lambda^2 + (1 - \lambda)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \geq 1$$

Where we have used that

$$\lambda^2 + (1 - \lambda)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We have shown that Ω is convex.

3. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denote the usual scalar product on \mathbb{R}^n and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ fixed. Let $y \in S$,

$$\|x - x_0\|_2 \leq \|x - y\|_2 \iff 2 \langle x, y - x_0 \rangle \leq \|y\|^2 - \|x_0\|^2$$

which shows that

$$\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{abs}|x - x_0|_2 \leq \|x - y\|_2 \quad \forall y \in S\} = \bigcap_{y \in S} \phi^{-1} \left(] - \infty; \frac{\|y\|^2 - |x_0|^2}{2}] \right)$$

With

$$\phi : x \mapsto \langle x, y - x_0 \rangle$$

since ϕ is linear, ϕ is convex and $] - \infty; \frac{\|y\|^2 - |x_0|^2}{2}]$ is convex, thus Ω is convex.

4. Let

$$\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{dist}(x, S) \leq \text{dist}(x, T)\}.$$

Here the goal is to show that the set is not convex. Let $T := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ and $S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 1 \leq \|x\| \leq 2\}$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(T)$ we have that

$$\text{dist}(x, T) = \text{dist}(x, \partial T) \quad (2)$$

and since $\partial T = \mathbb{S}_n(0, 1) \subset S$ we have that

$$\text{dist}(x, S) \leq \text{dist}(x, \partial T) \quad (3)$$

Combining (2) and (3) we have that

$$\text{dist}(x, S) \leq \text{dist}(x, T).$$

So we have shown that:

$$\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus T.$$

But $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus T$ is not convex because one can take :

$$x = e_1 \quad y = -e_1 \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \implies \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y = 0 \notin \Omega.$$

Where e_1 is the first vector of the canonical base of \mathbb{R}^n .

5. Let $\{x \mid x + S_2 \subset S_1\}$, with S_1 which is convex.

We have that

$$\Omega = \{x, \quad \forall y \in S_2 \quad x + y \subset S_1\} = \bigcap_{y \in S_2} \{x, \quad x + y \in S_1\}$$

Let's show that, since S_1 is convex then $S_y := \{x, \quad x + y \in S_1\}$ is convex and thus Ω is convex.

Let $y \in S_2$ and $(u, v, \lambda) \in S_y^2 \times [0, 1]$ we have that $u + y \in S_1$ and $v + y \in S_1$

$$\lambda u + (1 - \lambda)v + y = \lambda \underbrace{(u + y)}_{\in S_1} + (1 - \lambda) \underbrace{(v + y)}_{\in S_1} \underbrace{\quad}_{S_1 \text{ is convex}} \in S_1$$

Thus S_y is convex.

Exercice 2 First, all the function in this exercices are C^∞ so their Hessian matrix exists. Moreover, to prove that the functions f are convex I use the following characterisation of $S_n^+(\mathbb{R})$:

Lemma 1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $A \in S_n(\mathbb{R})$ is semi-definite positive if and only if all the eigenvalues of A are positive.

Let $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $Sp(A) = (\lambda_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ we have that

$$X^T A X = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i x_i^2$$

which is positive (for any X) if and only if for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ $\lambda_i \geq 0$.

1. Since f is a polynomial function of degrees 1 it is clear that

$$Hess f = 0$$

and if $X \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ we have that

$$X^T Hess(f)(x_1, x_2) X = 0 \geq 0$$

By the second order condition, f is convex on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 .

2. For any $(x_1, x_2) \in dom(f)$ we have

$$Hess(f)(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{x_1^3 x_2} & \frac{1}{x_2^2 x_1^2} \\ \frac{1}{x_2^2 x_1^2} & \frac{2}{x_2^3 x_1} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{x_1^2 x_2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{x_1} & \frac{1}{x_2} \\ \frac{1}{x_2} & \frac{2}{x_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Its characteristic polynomial is equal to

$$\Lambda^2 - (2\Lambda)/(x_1^3 x_2) - (2\Lambda)/(x_1 x_2^3) + 3/(x_1^4 x_2^4) = (\Lambda - \mu_1(x_1, x_2))(\Lambda - \mu_2(x_1, x_2))$$

with

$$\mu_{1,2} = \frac{x_1^2 + x_2^2 \pm \sqrt{x_1^4 - x_2^2 x_1^2 + x_2^4}}{x_1^3 x_2^3}.$$

μ_2 is clearly positive and for m_1 we have,

$$-x_1^2 x_2^2 \geq -2x_1^2 x_2^2 \implies x_1^4 - x_2^2 x_1^2 + x_2^4 \geq (x_1^2 - x_2^2)^2,$$

it follows that :

$$\mu_1 \geq \frac{x_1^2 + x_2^2 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2|}{x_1^3 x_2^3}.$$

But, $x_1^2 + x_2^2 - |x_1^2 - x_2^2| = 2x_2^2 \geq 0$ or $2x_1^2 \geq 0$.

So

$$\mu_1 \geq 0.$$

Thus, by lemma (3) the hessian of f is semi-definite positive this implies (by the second order theorem) that f is convex on its domain.

3. Let $f : (x_1, x_2) \mapsto \frac{x_1}{x_2}$ defined on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 . To prove that f is not convex I use the lemma (3)

Let's $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ we have that

$$Hess(f)(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{-1}{x_2^2} \\ \frac{-1}{x_2^2} & \frac{2x_1}{x_2^3} \end{pmatrix}$$

If we denote by $\lambda(x_1, x_2)$ an eigenvalue of

$$Hess(f)(x_1, x_2)$$

since,

$$\det(Hess(f)(x_1, x_2)) = \frac{-1}{x_2^2} < 0$$

so there exists $(x_1^*, x_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ such that $\lambda(x_1^*, x_2^*) < 0$. By lemma we get that $Hess(f)(x_1^*, x_2^*)$ is not semi definite positive so by the second order condition we conclude that f is not convex.

However, f is quasi-convex. In fact its domain is clearly convex. Let's show that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $S_\alpha := \{x \in dom(f) \mid f(x) \leq \alpha\}$ is convex.

For $\alpha < 0$ we have S_α is empty and if $\alpha \geq 0$

$$S_\alpha = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 \mid x_1 - \alpha x_2 \leq 0\}$$

which is clearly convex (half plane).

4. If $\alpha = 0$ $f = x_2$ which is convex and (thus) quasi-convex. Same thing for $\alpha = 1$ by replacing the role of x_1 and x_2 .

Let $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, a direct computation gives :

$$\forall (x_1, x_2) \in dom(f) \quad Hess f(x_1, x_2) = (1 - \alpha) \alpha x_1^\alpha x_2^{-\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} -x_1^{-2} x_2 & x_1^{-1} \\ x_1^{-1} & -x_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

here we remark that

$$\forall (x_1, x_2) \in dom(f) \quad det(hess(f))(x_1, x_2) = ((1 - \alpha) \alpha x_1^\alpha x_2^{-\alpha})^2 (x_1^{-2} - x_2^{-2})$$

so we can choose $x_1^*, x_2^* \in dom(f)$ such that

$$det(hess(f))(x_1^*, x_2^*) < 0$$

which implies that one of the two eigenvalue of

$$hess(f)(x_1^*, x_2^*)$$

is negative so by the lemma (3) and the second order condition we have that f is not convex. However f is quasi-convex. In fact, $dom(f)$ is clearly convex and for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$S_\beta = \{x \mid x_1^\alpha x_2^{1-\alpha} \leq \beta\} = \left\{x \mid x_2 \leq \beta^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} x_1^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}\right\}$$

if $\beta \leq 0$ then S_β is empty (and thus convex) and if $\beta > 0$ since the function

$$\omega_\alpha : t \mapsto \beta^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$$

is clearly convex ($\omega_\alpha''(t) \geq 0, \forall t > 0$) then

$$S_\beta = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 \mid x_2 \leq \omega_\alpha(x_1)\}$$

is convex. Thus f is quasi convex for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$.

Exercise 3

1. Let $V \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$ and $g : t \mapsto Tr((X + tV)^{-1})$ First we have that (since $X \in S_n^{++}$ there exists a base B such that

$$Mat_B(I_n + tX^{-\frac{1}{2}} V X^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = Diag(1 + t\lambda_i) \quad (4)$$

where (λ_i) are the eigenvalues of

$$X^{-\frac{1}{2}} V X^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

. This shows us first that

$$I_n + tX^{-\frac{1}{2}}VX^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in GL_n(\mathbb{R})$$

since,

$$\det(I_n + tX^{-\frac{1}{2}}VX^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + t\lambda_i) \neq 0$$

so thank's to (4) and using the fact that $(AB)^{-1} = B^{-1}A^{-1}$ and that $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)$ we find :

$$g(t) = \text{Tr} \left((\text{Diag}(1 + t\lambda_i))^{-1} X^{-1} \right) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{(X^{-1})_{i,i}}{1 + t\lambda_i}$$

Let $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $X \in S_n^{++}$ we

have that $X_{ii} > 0 \implies X_{ii}^{-1} = (X_{ii})^{-1} > 0$ and plus

$$\left(\frac{X_{ii}^{-1}}{1 + \lambda_i t} \right)'' = \frac{2X_{ii}^{-1}\lambda_i^2}{(1 + \lambda_i t)^3} \geq 0$$

Thus, g is convex as a finite sum of convex function.

2. I really can't find.
3. This follows from the min-max theorem for singular values. Let $i \in [1, n]$ by the min max theorem we have that

$$\sigma_i(X) = \max_{\dim(U)=i} \min_{c \in U, \|c\|=1} \|Xc\|_2.$$

It suffices to show that for any subspace U such that $\dim(U) = i$ the function

$$X \mapsto \min_{c \in U, \|c\|=1} \|Xc\|_2$$

is convex. To do so it suffices to show that for any $c \in U$ such that $\|c\| = 1$

$$X \mapsto \|Xc\|_2$$

is convex which is clearly the case since the norme is convex and $X \mapsto Xc$ is linear.

This shows that for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, σ_i is convex, it implies that

$$\phi = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sigma_i$$

is convex.

I have no idea of how to show that ϕ is a supremum...

Exercise 4 We have to show that :

1. That the interior of K_{m+} is not empty. Since

$$\text{Int}(K_{m+}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_n > \dots > x_0 > 0\}$$

we can choose

$$U := (e^k)_{1 \leq k \leq n} \in \text{Int}(K_{m+}).$$

2. K_{m+} is closed. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(x_p) \in K_{m+}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \|x_p - x\| = 0.$$

By definition of $(x_p)_p$ we have that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$x_{p,n} \geq x_{p,n-1} \geq \dots \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

The convergence in norm implies the convergence coordinate by coordinate by taking the limit in p in (5) we have

$$x_n \geq x_{n-1} \geq \dots \geq 0.$$

which is

$$x \in K_{m+}$$

K_{m+} is closed.

3. For any $u = (\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$ we define $D_u := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x = \lambda u, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Assume that there exists an $u = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_*^n$ such that

$$D_u \subset K_{m+} \quad (6)$$

it follows that

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \quad \lambda x_n \geq \dots \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

Choose $j := \min k \mid \alpha_k \neq 0$, such j exists because $u \neq 0$, by (6) it follows in particular that for $\lambda = -\alpha_j$ the equation (7) reads:

$$\alpha_j^2 = 0.$$

Which is not possible by the definition of j . So there is no line in K_{m+} .

K_{m+} is a proper cone.

Let determines the proper cone.

$$K_{m+}^* := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid y^T x \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in K_{m+} \right\} = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i x_i \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in K_{m+} \right\}.$$

What is clear is that $\mathbb{R}_+^n \subset K_{m+}^*$. However I am not able to say more, even if I take $n = 2$.

Exercise 5

1. Let's show that f^* is the indicator function of the set

$$\left\{ y \geq 0 \mid \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i = 1 \right\}.$$

First, if $y < 0$ then define :

$$\forall p \geq 0 \quad x_p = (-e^p, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$$

We have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = 0 \implies y^T x_p - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = -y_1 e^p \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Thus if $y < 0$

$$f^*(y) = \infty.$$

If $y \geq 0$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i = 1$ then there is l such that $y_l \neq 0$ by choosing $x_l = (0, 0, \underbrace{1}_l, \dots, 0)$ one has that $f^*(y) = 0$. If $y \geq 0$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i \neq 1$ we have two cases :

if $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i = 0 \implies y = 0$ then you choose $x_p = (-p, \dots, 0)$ so

$$y^T x_p - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = p \rightarrow \infty.$$

if $y \neq 0$ you have an $1 \leq l \leq n$ such that $y_l \neq 0$ so define

$$x_p = (0, \dots, \underbrace{e^p}_l, \dots, 0) \implies y^T x_p - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = e^p \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i - 1 \right) \rightarrow \infty.$$

2. Let $y > 1$ we notice that

$$y^T x - f(x) > \sum_{i=r+1}^n x_i$$

so we can construct a sequence $(x_p)_p$ such that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} y^T x_p - f(x_p) = \infty$$

Then, assume that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i = r$$

One has :

$$y^T x - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} x_{[i]} = r - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} x_{[i]} \quad (8)$$

define $x_r = (\underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_r, 0, \dots, 0)$ put it into (8) and you get

$$f^*(y) = 0.$$

We have show that f^* is the indicator function of the set

$$\Omega_r = \left\{ y \leq 1 \quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i = r \right\}$$