

MECH 6327 - Homework 4

Jonas Wagner

2021, April 12

Contents

0.1	Problem 5.43	3
0.1.1	Part a	4
0.1.2	Part b	5
1	Problem 1: Robust control design	6
2	Problem 2: Nonnegative and sum of squares polynomials	7
A	MATLAB Code:	8

BV Textobook Problems

0.1 Problem 5.43

The dual a SOCP defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f^T x \\ & \text{subject to} && \|A_i x + b_i\|_2 \leq c_i^T x + d_i, \ i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with $x \in \Re^n$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^m (b_i^T u_i - d_i v_i) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T u_i - c_i v_i) + f = 0 \\ & && \|u_i\|_2 \leq v_i, \ i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with variables $u_i \in \Re^n$, $v_i \in \Re$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ and problem data $f \in \Re^n$, $A_i \in \Re^{n_i \times n}$, $b_i \in \Re^{n_i}$, $c_i \in \Re$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

0.1.1 Part a

Problem: Derive the dual by defining $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and the equalities $y_i = A_i x + b_i$, $t_i = c_i^T x + d_i$ then deriving the Lagrange dual.

Solution: The problem can first be written in a standard form as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f^T \\ & \text{subject to} && y_i = A_i x + b_i \\ & && t_i = c_i^T x + d_i \\ & && \|y_i\|_2 \leq t_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The lagrange can then be defined with

$$L(x, y, t, \lambda_i, \nu_i, \mu_i) = f^T + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (\|y_i\|_2 - t_i) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^T (t_i - C_i x + d_i) \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(f + \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T \mu_i - c_i \nu_i) \right)^T x + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \|y_i\|_2 + \mu_i^T y_i \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m (-\lambda_i + \nu_i) t_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^m b_i^T \mu_i - d_i \nu_i \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Since the definition of the dual optimization problem is to maximize

$$g(\lambda_i, \nu_i, \mu_i) = \inf_{x, y_i, t_i} L(x, y, t, \lambda_i, \nu_i, \mu_i)$$

the inf can be found by determining when a min/max would occur for each of the variables.

For the critical point on x the direvative can be set to zero and thus the following equality must hold:

$$f + \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T \mu_i - c_i \nu_i) = 0 \tag{6}$$

For the y_i related term, it is known

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \|y_i\|_2 + \mu_i^T y_i$$

will be bounded below if it is within the cone defined by $\lambda_i \|y_i\|_2 \geq \|\mu_i\|_2 y_i$ which can be rewritten as:

$$\|\mu_i\|_2 \leq \lambda_i$$

For the critical point over t_i the equality $\nu_i = \lambda_i$.

From this the dual problem can be obtained when the quantity $(\sum_{i=1}^m b_i^T \mu_i - d_i \nu_i)$ is maximized.

Thus the dual problem is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^m (b_i^T u_i - d_i v_i) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T u_i - c_i v_i) + f = 0 \\ & && \|u_i\|_2 \leq v_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

0.1.2 Part b

Problem: Start with the conic formulation of the SOCP and use the conic dual to prove the equivalence. Use the fact that the second-order dual is self-dual.

Solution: Starting with the SOCP given as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f^T x \\ & \text{subject to} && \|A_i x + b_i\|_2 \leq c_i^T x + d_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

a standard form can be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f^T x \\ & \text{subject to} && (A_i x + b_i, c_i^T x + d_i) \preceq_2 0 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Since the conic dual transformation is known to transform

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f^T x \\ & \text{subject to} && -(A^T x + b, c^T x + d) \preceq_K 0 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

into its dual according to its dual cone definition

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && b^T u + d^T v \\ & \text{subject to} && A^T u + v c = f \\ & && (u, v) \succeq_{K^*} 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and from the fact that the 2-norm is self-dual, the dual program is given as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^m (b_i^T u_i - d_i v_i) \\ & \text{subject to} && - \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T u_i - c_i v_i) = f \\ & && (u_i, v_i) \succeq_2 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^m (b_i^T u_i - d_i v_i) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^T u_i - c_i v_i) + f = 0 \\ & && \|u_i\|_2 \leq v_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

1 Problem 1: Robust control design

For the standard DT dynamical system defined as:

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t \quad (14)$$

with dynamic matrix A unknown but assumed to belong to a set:

$$A \in \mathcal{A} = \text{conv}(A_1, \dots, A_m) \quad (15)$$

with A_i and B known.

Problem: For a state-feedback controller $u_t = Kx_t$ use Lyapunov techniques to design it so the system is globally asymptotically stable (GAS) by solving a semi-definite program (SDP).

Solution: The closed-loop system for the DT dynamical system can be defined by the dynamics

$$x_{t+1} = \hat{A}x = (A + BK)x \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{A} = A + BK$.

In order for the closed-loop system to be Globally Asymptotically Stable, a quadratic Lyapunov Function could be used to prove that if the following inequality is true then the system is GAS:

$$\hat{A}^T P \hat{A} - P \prec 0 \quad (17)$$

Since the system dynamics themselves are uncertain, this inequality will not be enough to prove GAS. This can be address, however, by considering all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ to be a linear combination of the individual corner matrices. Since this is a convex hull, it is known that following this to its conclusion, GAS can be guaranteed for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ if A_i is GAS $\forall i = 1, \dots, m$.

Following this, a stabilizing gain can then be found as follows:

$$\hat{A}_i^T P \hat{A}_i - P \prec 0 \quad (18)$$

recognizing the Schur's compliment form, the following is true

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \hat{A}_i^T \\ \hat{A}_i P^{-1} & \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & (A_i + BK)^T \\ (A_i + BK) & P^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \quad (20)$$

A SDP feasibility problem can then be done to solve the problem such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \hat{A}_i^T \\ \hat{A}_i P^{-1} & \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \quad (21)$$

$$B^{-1}(\hat{A}_i - A_i) - K = 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, m$$

with variables P , \hat{A}_i , and K , along with problem data A_i and B . This is a problem that can now be easily implemented using CVX or YALMIP in MATLAB for given problem data.

2 Problem 2: Nonnegative and sum of squares polynomials

The Motzkin polynomial is defined as:

$$M(x, y) = x^2y^4 + x^4y^2 + 1 - 3x^2y^2 \quad (22)$$

Problem: Show that the Motzkin polynomial is nonnegative but can be expressed as sum of squares. It is sufficient to show this using numerical and/or symbolic solvers.

Solution: Nonnegativity of the Motzkin polynomial can be proven using the AM-GM inequality using $n = 3$ with $x^4y^2, x^2y^4, 1$.

$$\sqrt[n]{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \quad (23)$$

$$\sqrt[3]{(x^4y^2)(x^2y^4)(1)} \leq \frac{1}{3}(x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + 1) \quad (24)$$

$$x^2y^2 \leq \frac{1}{3}(x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + 1) \quad (25)$$

$$3x^2y^2 \leq x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + 1 \quad (26)$$

$$x^4y^2 + x^2y^4 + 1 - 3x^2y^2 \geq 0 \quad (27)$$

Therefore the Motzkin polynomial is non-negative.

However, it is not possible to put this into sum of square form using the standard solver as demonstrated by the infeasability result from the solvesos() command in yalmip (shown in AppendixA)

A MATLAB Code:

All code I write in this course can be found on my GitHub repository:

<https://github.com/jonaswagner2826/MECH6327>

Script 1: MECH6327_HW4

```
1  % MECH 6327 - HW 4
2
3  x = sdpvar(1,1);
4  y = sdpvar(1,1);
5  p = x^2 * y^4 + x^4 * y^2 + 1 - 3 * x^2 * y^2;
6  F = sos(p);
7  solvesos(F);
8  sdisplay(sosd(F))
9
10
11 % Results:
12 % -----
13 % -----
14 % YALMIP SOS module started...
15 % -----
16 % Detected 0 parametric variables and 2 independent variables.
17 % Detected 0 linear inequalities, 0 equality constraints and 0 LMIs.
18 % Using kernel representation (options.sos.model=1).
19 % Initially 8 monomials in R^2
20 % Newton polytope (2 LPs).....Keeping 4 monomials (0.20313sec)
21 % Finding symmetries.....Found 3 symmetries (0sec)
22 % Partitioning using symmetry.....1x1(4)
23 %
24 %
25 % Problem is unbounded.
26 %
27 %
28 % -> Solver reported unboundness of the dual problem.
29 % -> Your SOS problem is probably infeasible (SOS is dualized).
```


References: * not bibtex because of time...

<https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~elghaoui/Teaching/EE227A/lecture10.pdf>

<https://people.orie.cornell.edu/miketodd/iccopt.pdf>