

# Optimization for Data Science: Special Assignment 1

Gabriel Hayat

April 28, 2019

**Assignment 1.** Given  $i \in [n]$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{0} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in B_i \\ \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Show that  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  is a subgradient of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$ , i.e.,  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial h_i(\mathbf{x})$ . Is  $h_i$  differentiable?

*Solution:*

According to definition 4.1,  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial h_i(\mathbf{x})$  if

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) \geq h_i(\mathbf{x}) + g_i(\mathbf{x})^T(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \text{dom}(h_i) \quad (1)$$

We consider two cases:

*Case 1 :*  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i$

Since both  $h_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  and  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ , the right hand side of inequality (1) is 0.

As

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2)$$

inequality (1) holds.

*Case 2 :*  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i$

As  $h_i(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i$  and  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}$ , we can write inequality (1) as:

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) \stackrel{?}{\geq} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i + \left[ \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right]^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

Consider the right handside of inequality (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i + \left[ \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right]^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \left[ \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|^2 - r_i \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| + (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \left[ (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i) - r_i \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \left[ \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \right] \quad (5)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i \quad (6)$$

where in (4), we used the result  $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}$  and in (5), we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Note that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \neq 0$  as  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i$ .

We can now examine the inequality:

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) \stackrel{?}{\geq} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i \quad (7)$$

If  $\mathbf{y} \in B_i$ , then by definition the right hand side of inequality (7) will be negative. By inequality (2), (7) holds.

If  $\mathbf{y} \notin B_i$ , then by definition of  $h_i$ :

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i$$

and inequality (7) holds. We conclude that equation (1) holds  $\forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  is a subgradient of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$ .

Assume  $h_i$  differentiable. From Definition 1.7, we know there exists a unique  $(1 \times d)$ -matrix  $A$  and an error function  $r : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined around  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that for all  $\mathbf{y}$  in some neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}$ ,

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) = h_i(\mathbf{x}) + A(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) + r(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \quad (8)$$

where  $\lim_{v \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r(\mathbf{v})|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} = 0$

Consider the points  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}_i + r_i \mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}_i + (r_i + \beta) \mathbf{e}_1$  for some small  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbf{e}_1$  is the first vector of the natural basis. We then consider two cases:

*Case 1:*  $\beta < 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_i$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 0 + \beta A(\mathbf{e}_1) + r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1) \\ |A(\beta \mathbf{e}_1)| &= \frac{|r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1)|}{|\beta|} \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow 0} 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we used the fact that  $\|\beta \mathbf{e}_1\| = |\beta|$

*Case 2:*  $\beta > 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{x} \in B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$

$$\|(r_i + \beta) \mathbf{e}_1\| - r_i = 0 + \beta A(\mathbf{e}_1) + r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1)$$

$$\beta = \beta A(\mathbf{e}_1) + r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1) \quad (10)$$

$$\beta(A(\mathbf{e}_1) - 1) = -r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1) \quad (11)$$

$$|A(\mathbf{e}_1)| = \left| 1 - \frac{r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1)}{\beta} \right| \geq 1 - \frac{|r(\beta \mathbf{e}_1)|}{\beta} \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow 0} 1 \quad (12)$$

where we used the reverse triangle inequality and the fact that  $\|\beta \mathbf{e}_1\| = \beta$

We see that the two cases contradicts. We conclude that the original assumption is wrong and  $h_i$  is not differentiable.  $\square$

**Assignment 2.** For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , show that there is  $j \in [n]$  such that  $g_j(\mathbf{x})$  is a subgradient of  $h(\mathbf{x})$ , i.e,  $g_j(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial h(\mathbf{x})$ . Describe how to compute such subgradient and provide the running time of this procedure.

*Solution:*

Take  $j = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [n]} h_i(x)$ . Then,  $h(\mathbf{x}) = h_j(\mathbf{x})$ .

We showed in the previous question that for any  $i \in [n]$ ,  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial h_i(\mathbf{x})$ . In particular, take  $i = j$  and  $g_j(\mathbf{x}) \in \partial h_j(\mathbf{x}) = \partial h(\mathbf{x})$ .

To compute such gradients:

1. For each  $i \in [n]$ , compute  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$ :

(a) Compute  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| = D_i$

(b) If  $D_i \leq r_i$ , then  $h_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  else  $h_i(\mathbf{x}) = D_i - r_i$

2. Compute  $j = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [n]} h_i(x)$

3. If  $h_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , then  $g_j(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  else  $g_j(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_j}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_j\|}$

Step 1 is done in  $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ , step 2 in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  and step 3 in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  (as all calculations have been previously done and can be reused). As  $d$  is assumed to be constant, the gradient is computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ .  $\square$

**Assignment 3.** Show that each  $h_i$  is convex and 1-Lipschitz. Then use this to show that  $h$  is convex and 1-Lipschitz.

*Solution:*

By Lemma 4.3,  $h_i$  is convex if  $\partial h_i(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{dom}(h_i)$  and  $\mathbf{dom}(h_i)$  is convex. In Assignment 1, we have shown that:

$$h_i(\mathbf{y}) \geq h_i(\mathbf{x}) + g_i(\mathbf{x})^T(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{dom}(h_i) \quad (13)$$

Since  $\mathbf{dom}(h_i)$  is convex, we conclude that  $h_i$  is also convex.

To show that  $h_i$  is 1-Lipschitz, we must show:

$$|h_i(\mathbf{x}) - h_i(\mathbf{y})| \leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{dom}(h_i) \quad (14)$$

*Case 1:*  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_i$

The left hand-side of inequality (11) is 0 and thus holds by the definition of a norm.

*Case 2:*  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$  (resp.  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i, \mathbf{y} \in B_i$ )

$$|h_i(\mathbf{y}) - h_i(\mathbf{x})| = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i \quad (15)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \|(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i) - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)\| = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \quad (17)$$

where in (13), we used the fact that  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i$  and in (14), we used the reverse triangle inequality.

*Case 3:*  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$

$$|h_i(\mathbf{y}) - h_i(\mathbf{x})| = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| + r_i \quad (18)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \quad (19)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \quad (20)$$

where in (17), the reverse triangle inequality was used again.

We conclude that  $h_i$  is 1-Lipschitz.

For  $j = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [n]} h_i(x)$ , we have  $h(\mathbf{x}) = h_j(\mathbf{x})$ . In particular,  $h$  is also convex and 1-Lipschitz. □

**Assignment 4.** Assume that you are given  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq R$  for some constant  $R \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a global minimum of  $h$ . Show that there exists  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that after  $T$  iterations of subgradient descent on  $h(\mathbf{x})$  we get:

$$\min_{t \in 0, \dots, T-1} (h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*)) \leq \frac{R}{\sqrt{T}} \quad (21)$$

*Solution:*

We use the Vanilla analysis (Eq. 2.6 from notes):

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\mathbf{g}_t\| + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|^2 \quad (22)$$

From assignment 4, we know that  $h$  is 1-Lipschitz. According to Lemma 4.4, this is equivalent to  $\|\mathbf{g}\| \leq 1$ . In addition,  $\|\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\| \leq R$  allows us to write:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} T + \frac{1}{2\gamma} R^2 \quad (23)$$

We want to minimize the bound, *i.e* minimize the function  $g(\gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{2}T + \frac{1}{2\gamma}R^2$ . By setting its gradient to 0:

$$g'(\gamma) = \frac{T}{2} - \frac{R^2}{2\gamma^2} = 0$$

$$\gamma = \frac{R}{\sqrt{T}}$$

Inequality (20) now becomes:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{R\sqrt{T}}{2} + \frac{R\sqrt{T}}{2} = R\sqrt{T} \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{R}{\sqrt{T}} \quad (25)$$

where inequality (22) is obtained by dividing by  $T$ .

We have obtained the result that the average error is bounded by the factor  $\frac{R}{\sqrt{T}}$ . This is only possible when at least one error in the sequence  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  is bounded by  $\frac{R}{\sqrt{T}}$ . In particular, the minimum error in the sequence will be bounded by this factor. Hence the result.  $\square$

**Assignment 5.** Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , show that  $\mathcal{O}(n/\epsilon^2)$  time suffices to solve the  $\epsilon$ -intersection problem for the set of  $B_i$ 's.

*Solution:*

Using the result from assignment 4, we know that the minimum error after running subgradient descent for  $T$  steps can be bounded.

Choose  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\frac{R}{\sqrt{T}} < \epsilon$  and let  $\min_{t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}} (h(\mathbf{x}_t) - h(\mathbf{x}^*)) = h(\mathbf{x}_m) - h(\mathbf{x}^*)$ . Then,

$$h(\mathbf{x}_m) - h(\mathbf{x}^*) < \epsilon$$

$$h(\mathbf{x}^*) > h(\mathbf{x}_m) - \epsilon$$

We now have two cases to consider:

*Case 1:*  $h(\mathbf{x}_m) - \epsilon \geq 0$

Since  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is the global minimum of  $h$ , we conclude that  $h(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Case 2:*  $h(\mathbf{x}_m) - \epsilon < 0$

Then choose  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_m$  such that  $h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) < \epsilon$

Therefore, running subgradient descent for  $T > \frac{R^2}{\epsilon^2}$  steps suffices to solve the  $\epsilon$ -intersection problem.

However, each step of the algorithm requires taking a maximum over  $n$  elements to compute  $h(\mathbf{x}_t)$ , causing an additional factor of  $n$ . Thus, the  $\epsilon$ -intersection problem can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(n/\epsilon^2)$  time.  $\square$

**Assignment 6.** Using elementary calculus (e.g. partial derivatives) show that:

$$\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{0} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in B_i \\ (1 - \frac{r_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|})(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Show how to compute the gradient  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ . How much time is needed to compute this gradient?

*Solution:*

We use the definition:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_i + h, \dots, x_d) - f(x_1, \dots, x_d)}{h} \quad (26)$$

*Case 1:*  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{0 - 0}{h} = 0$$

Thus, we conclude that  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  if  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i$ .

*Case 2:*  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i$

Consider the function:

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}d(\mathbf{x}, B_i)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|^2 - r_i\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| + \frac{1}{2}r_i$$

Consider  $p_1(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|^2$ ,  $p_2(\mathbf{x}) = r_i\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|$ ,  $p_3(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}r_i$  such that  $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = p_1(\mathbf{x}) - p_2(\mathbf{x}) + p_3(\mathbf{x})$

We then apply definition (23) to each part  $p_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x_j} &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2 - \left( (x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2 \right)}{h} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 - (x_j - c_{ij})^2}{h} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{x_j^2 + 2hx_j + h^2 - 2(x_j + h)c_{ij} + c_{ij}^2 - (x_j^2 - 2x_jc_{ij} + c_{ij}^2)}{h} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{2hx_j + h^2 - 2hc_{ij}}{h} \\ &= x_j - c_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\nabla p_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x_j} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} r_i \frac{\sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2} - \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2}}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} r_i \frac{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2 - (x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2}{h \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2} + \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2}} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} r_i \frac{(x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 - (x_j - c_{ij})^2}{h \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2} + \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2}} \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} 2r_i \frac{x_j - c_{ij} + h}{\sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_j + h - c_{ij})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2} + \sqrt{(x_1 - c_{i1})^2 + \dots + (x_d - c_{id})^2}} \\
&= 2r_i \frac{x_j - c_{ij}}{2\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} = r_i \frac{x_j - c_{ij}}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\nabla p_2(\mathbf{x}) = r_i \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}$

Since  $p_3(\mathbf{x})$  is constant with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\nabla p_3(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$

By linearity of operator  $\nabla$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \nabla p_1(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla p_2(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla p_3(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i - r_i \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} + \mathbf{0} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{r_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}\right)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)
\end{aligned}$$

Computing  $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x})$  requires  $\mathcal{O}(d)$ . Again, we use the linearity property of operator  $\nabla$  to write:

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x})$$

Since computing  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x})$  requires summing over  $n$  elements, the total running time is  $\mathcal{O}(nd)$   $= \mathcal{O}(n)$  ( $d$  is assumed constant).  $\square$

**Assignment 7.** For  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\|$  and for real numbers  $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| \leq \|\alpha\mathbf{u} - \beta\mathbf{v}\|$$

*Solution:*

Assume  $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\| = a$ . Notice that showing this inequality is equivalent to showing:

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq \|\alpha\mathbf{u} - \beta\mathbf{v}\|^2$$

Consider:

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 - 2\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} = 2a^2 - 2\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v}$$

$$\|\alpha \mathbf{u} - \beta \mathbf{v}\|^2 = \alpha^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \beta^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 - 2\alpha\beta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} = a^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2) - 2\alpha\beta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v}$$

We thus need to show:

$$2a^2 - 2\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} \stackrel{?}{\leq} a^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2) - 2\alpha\beta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} \quad (27)$$

$$0 \stackrel{?}{\leq} a^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 2) + 2(1 - \alpha\beta) \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} \quad (28)$$

We use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality  $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{v} \geq -\|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\| = -a^2$  to show instead:

$$0 \stackrel{?}{\leq} a^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 2) - 2a^2(1 - \alpha\beta) \quad (29)$$

$$0 \stackrel{?}{\leq} a^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 2\alpha\beta - 4) \quad (30)$$

$$0 \stackrel{?}{\leq} (\alpha + \beta)^2 - 4 \quad (31)$$

$$(\alpha + \beta)^2 \stackrel{?}{\geq} 4 \quad (32)$$

As  $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$  by hypothesis, inequality 29 holds. Note that step (28) used the fact that  $a^2 \geq 0$   $\square$

**Assignment 8.** Using Assignment 7, show that for each  $f_i$ , it holds that

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y})\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \quad (33)$$

That is,  $f_i$  is smooth with parameter 2 (Lemma 2.4). Using this fact and Lemma 2.5 we also get that  $f$  is smooth with parameter  $2n$ . Is  $f$  always strongly convex?

*Solution:*

*Case 1:*  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_i$

We have that  $\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{0}$  and thus by definition of a norm, inequality (30) holds.

*Case 2:*  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$  (resp.  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i, \mathbf{y} \in B_i$ )

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y})\| = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - r_i \quad (34)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\| - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| \quad (36)$$

where inequality (32) used the fact that  $\mathbf{x} \in B_i$  and inequality (33) used the reverse triangle inequality.

*Case 3:*  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$

$$\|\nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f_i(\mathbf{y})\| = \left\| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i - r_i \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} - \left( \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i - r_i \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right) \right\| \quad (37)$$

$$= \left\| \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} + r_i \left( \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} - \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right) \right\| \quad (38)$$



$$\leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + r_i \left\| \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} - \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right\| \quad (39)$$

We now apply assignment 7 with  $\mathbf{u} = \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}$ ,  $\mathbf{v} = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}{r_i}$ ,  $\beta = \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}{r_i}$ , where  $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$  as  $\mathbf{x} \notin B_i, \mathbf{y} \notin B_i$  :

$$\leq \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + r_i \left\| \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}{r_i} \frac{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} - \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|}{r_i} \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i\|} \right\| \quad (40)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}_i - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)\| \quad (41)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| = 2\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \quad (42)$$

where the triangle inequality was used in equation (36).

In order for  $f$  to be strongly convex, we need to find  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\mu > 0$  such that

$$f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x})^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{dom}(f) \quad (43)$$

Consider the case where  $\exists \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{y}) = 0$  ( $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = f_i(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \forall i \in [n]$ ). Then:

$$0 \stackrel{?}{\geq} \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 \quad (44)$$

which is false  $\forall \mu \in \mathbb{R}_+, \mu > 0$ .

Thus  $f$  is not always strongly convex.  $\square$

**Assignment 9.** Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , show that  $\mathcal{O}(n^{3/2}/\epsilon)$  time suffices to solve the  $\epsilon$ -intersection problem for the set of  $B_i$ 's. Use accelerated gradient descent to show this bound.

*Solution:*

Using accelerated gradient descent, we have that:

$$f(\mathbf{y}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{2L\|\mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{x}^*\|}{T(T+1)} = \frac{4nR^2}{T(T+1)} \leq \frac{2nR^2}{T^2} \quad (45)$$

Choose  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\frac{2nR^2}{T^2} < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$ . Then,

$$f(\mathbf{y}_t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*) < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$$

$$f(\mathbf{x}^*) > f(\mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$$

We now have two cases to consider:

*Case 1:*  $f(\mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \geq 0$

Let  $\mathbf{z}^*$  be the global minimum of the function  $h$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a global minimum of function  $f$

$$f(\mathbf{x}^*) > 0 \Rightarrow f(\mathbf{z}^*) > 0 \quad (46)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{z}^*) > 0 \quad (47)$$

As  $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}h_i(\mathbf{x})^2$ , we can write:

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(\mathbf{z}^*)^2 > 0 \quad (48)$$

Since  $h(\mathbf{x})$  represents the maximum value over all  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$ , we conclude that:

$$h(\mathbf{z}^*)^2 > 0 \Rightarrow h(\mathbf{z}^*) > 0 \quad (49)$$

as  $h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

Since  $\mathbf{z}^*$  is the global minimum of  $h$ , we conclude that  $h(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Case 2:*  $f(\mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} < 0$ . Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{y}_t) - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} < 0 \quad (50)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(\mathbf{y}_t)^2 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} < 0 \quad (51)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n h_i(\mathbf{y}_t)^2 - \epsilon^2 < 0 \quad (52)$$

$$h(\mathbf{y}_t)^2 - \epsilon^2 < 0 \quad (53)$$

$$h(\mathbf{y}_t) < \epsilon \quad (54)$$

where the same arguments as in the first case are used.

Then choose  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{y}_t$  such that  $h(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) < \epsilon$ .

Therefore, running accelerated gradient descent for  $T > \frac{2n^{1/2}R}{\epsilon}$  steps suffices to solve the  $\epsilon$  – *intersection* problem.

As each step of the algorithm requires taking a sum over  $n$  elements, the complexity is increased by an additional factor of  $n$ . Thus, the  $\epsilon$  – *intersection* problem can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{3/2}/\epsilon)$ .

□