# **HOMEWORK 3**

### QUESTION 1

According to the result in Problem 5(a) of Hw2, int  ${\cal C}_1$  is convex since  ${\cal C}_1$  is a convex set.

ullet First, we know there exists a  $w^T\in\mathbb{R}^nackslash\{oldsymbol{0}\}$  and  $b\in\mathbb{R}$  which satisfies:

$$w^T x \le b, \forall x \in intC_1 \ w^T x \ge b, \forall x \in C_2$$
 (1)

- ullet We also know the fact that a point of  $C_1$  is the limit of points in int  $C_1$  (by the lemma on slide 34 of  $\S$  3).
- ullet  $f(x)=w^Tx$  is continuous on the closure of  $C_1$  .
- Then  $\forall x' \in C_1$ , we could find a series  $\{x_k\}$  which converges to x'. And  $\forall \epsilon>0$ , we could find a  $\delta>0$  s.t. if  $|x'-x_k|<\delta$ , then  $|w^Tx'-w^Tx_k|<\epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon$  can be arbitrarily small and  $\{x_k\}$  converges to x', we could say

$$w^T x' \le b \tag{2}$$

Therefore the conclusion holds.

### **QUESTION 2**

(a.)

if  $\theta=1$  or  $\theta=0$  , it's a trivial case. Else:

 $orall x,y\in S_lpha,x
eq y$  and  $orall heta\in (0,1)$  we have:

$$f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) \le \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) < \alpha \tag{3}$$

$$\therefore heta x + ar{ heta} y \in S_lpha$$

by definition,  $S_{lpha}$  is convex.

Similarly, if  $\theta=1$  or  $\theta=0$ , it's a trivial case. Else:

 $orall x,y\in C_lpha,x
eq y$  and  $orall heta\in(0,1)$  we have:

$$f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) \le \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) \le \alpha$$
 (4)

$$\therefore \theta x + \overline{\theta} y \in C_{\alpha}$$

by definition,  $C_{lpha}$  is convex.

### (b.)

The effective domain of f is  $S=\{x:f(x)<+\infty\}$ 

if heta=1 or heta=0 , it's a trivial case. Else:

 $\forall x,y \in S, x 
eq y ext{ and } orall heta \in (0,1) ext{ we have:}$ 

$$f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) \le \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) < +\infty$$
 (5)

$$\therefore \theta x + \bar{\theta} y \in S$$

by definition, the effective domain of f is convex.

#### (C.)

For a certain X we set  $lpha=f(x^*)$  , then we have  $M=C_lpha\cap X$  . Let's prove this:

In one side, $orall x^* \in M$  , we have  $x^* \in X$  and  $f(x^*) \leq lpha$ 

$$\therefore x^* \in C_lpha \cap X$$

On the other side,  $\forall x' \in C_{\alpha} \cap X$ , we have  $x' \in X$  and  $f(x') \leq \alpha \leq f(x)$   $\forall x \in X$ .

$$\therefore x' \in M$$

$$\therefore M = C_{\alpha} \cap X$$

since we have proven that  $C_{\alpha}$  is convex in 2. (a), and we know the fact that the intersect of two convex sets is convex, we can derive that M is also convex.

# **QUESTION 3**

 $\therefore f$  is convex

 $\therefore$  its domain  $\mathrm{dom} f=S$  is convex and  $orall x,y\in S$  and  $heta\in[0,1]$  , Jensen's inequality holds:

$$f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) \le \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) \tag{6}$$

First, we choose a line segment  $\,l_{xy}$ 

Suppose  $f(\theta_0x+\bar{\theta}_0y)<\theta_0f(x)+\bar{\theta}_0f(y)$  for some  $\theta_0\in(0,1)$ , we consider the case where  $\theta\in(0,\theta_0)$ .

Assume that there exists a series  $\{ heta_k\}\ s.\ t.f( heta_kx+ar{ heta}_ky)= heta_kf(x)+ar{ heta}_kf(y)$ 

In  $\{\theta_k\}$  we choose  $\theta$  as the nearest one to  $\theta_0$ , then we could find a small enough  $\epsilon$  s.t.

$$f(\theta_1 x + \overline{\theta}_1 y) < \theta_1 f(x) + \overline{\theta}_1 f(y) f(\theta_2 x + \overline{\theta}_2 y) < \theta_2 f(x) + \overline{\theta}_2 f(y)$$

$$(7)$$

Where  $\theta_1 = \theta - \epsilon, \theta_2 = \theta + \epsilon$ .

 $\because f$  is convex,  $u_1= heta_1x+ar{ heta}_1y$  and  $u_2= heta_2x+ar{ heta}_2y$  are all in S.

However,

$$f(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + \frac{1}{2}u_2) = f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) = \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) > \frac{1}{2}[f(u_1) + f(u_2)] \quad (8)$$

Which contradicts condition (5)

 $\therefore$   $heta 
otin \{ heta_k\}$ , and we can keep repeating the same operation through  $\{ heta_k\}$  and find that  $orall heta \in (0, heta_0)$  s.t.

$$f(\theta x + \bar{\theta}y) < \theta f(x) + \bar{\theta}f(y) \tag{9}$$

And when  $\theta \in (\theta_0, 1)$ , the proof method is the same.

Therefore the conclusion holds.

#### **QUESTION 4**

According to the First-order condition for convexity,  $orall x,y\in \mathrm{dom}\, f$  , f should satisfy:

$$f(y) \ge f(x) + \nabla f(x)^T (y - x) \tag{10}$$

$$f(y) - \nabla f(y)^T (y - x) \le f(x) \tag{11}$$

From equations (9) and (10), we can immediately derive that:

$$0 \ge (\nabla f(x)^T - \nabla f(y)^T)(y - x) \tag{12}$$

Which means:

$$\langle \nabla f(\boldsymbol{x}) - \nabla f(\boldsymbol{y}), \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y} \rangle \ge 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \text{dom } f$$
 (13)