

- First let's do some analysis of the problem. Is it convex? Yes, it is.
 - = We know from problem #1 that $f(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ is convex.
 - = $g_1(x) = x_1 - 10$ is linear and thus convex, $g_2(x) = -x_1 + x_2^2 + 4$ has $\nabla^2 g_2(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ which is PSD making $g_2(x)$ convex also. So the inequality constraints are convex.
 - = $h(x) = 0$ is trivially affine.
 - = Thus, if \exists a candidate that satisfies optimality conditions it is a guaranteed global min.

- $L(x) = \lambda_0 x_1^2 + \lambda_0 x_2^2 + \lambda_1(x_1 - 10) + \lambda_2(-x_1 + x_2^2 + 4)$

- $\partial L / \partial x_1 = 2\lambda_0 x_1 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \stackrel{\text{set}}{=} 0$ eq 1

- $\partial L / \partial x_2 = 2\lambda_0 x_2 + 2\lambda_2 x_2 \stackrel{\text{set}}{=} 0$ eq 2

- Complementarity: $\lambda_1(x_1 - 10) = 0$ and $\lambda_2(-x_1 + x_2^2 + 4) = 0$

- CASE 1: $\lambda_0 = 0$

- eq 1 becomes $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, eq 2 becomes $2\lambda_2 x_2 = 0 \Rightarrow$ either $\lambda_2 = 0$ or $x_2 = 0$. We can't let $\lambda_2 = 0$ since that makes $\lambda_1 = 0$ which gives $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ which is trivial. Thus let $x_2 = 0$.

- With $x_2 = 0$ let's look at complementarity: $\lambda_1(x_1 - 10) = 0$ and $\lambda_2(-x_1 + 4) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_1(x_1 - 10) = 0$ and $\lambda_2(-x_1 + 4) = 0$. Since λ_1 and λ_2 cannot $= 0$ this means that $x_1 - 10 = 0 \Rightarrow x_1 = 10$ and $-x_1 + 4 = 0 \Rightarrow x_1 = 4$. Since x_1 cannot $= 4$ and 10 we know that $\lambda_0 = 0$ won't work, and any feasible candidates must be normal ($\lambda_0 = 1$).

- CASE 2: $\lambda_0 = 1$

- eq 1 becomes: $2x_1 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0$, eq 2 becomes: $2x_2 + 2\lambda_2 x_2 = 0 \rightarrow 2x_2(1 + \lambda_2) = 0$ means either $x_2 = 0$ or $\lambda_2 = -1$, but $\lambda \geq 0$ is required, so we must let $x_2 = 0$.

- Now the complementarity conditions: $\lambda_2(-x_1 + 0^2 + 4) = 0$ and $\lambda_1(x_1 - 10) = 0$

These conditions will give us 4 sub-cases to check when $\lambda_0 = 1$:

- (A) $x_1 = 4$, (B) $x_1 = 10$, (C) $\lambda_1 = 0$, (D) $\lambda_2 = 0$

• CASE 2A: ($\lambda_0=1$), $x_1=4$

• If $x_1=4 \Rightarrow x_1 \neq 10 \Rightarrow \lambda_1=0$ (from complementarity)

• Using eq1: $2x_1 + \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0 \rightarrow 2(4) + 0 = \lambda_2 \rightarrow \lambda_2=8$

• This candidate, $(x_1=4, x_2=0, \lambda_0=1, \lambda_1=0, \lambda_2=8)$ satisfies all conditions. Since the problem is convex, we know $\begin{bmatrix} x_1^* = 4 \\ x_2^* = 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is a global optimizer of f in this case. We'll check the remaining 3 cases to see if \exists any other optima that achieve $f([4,0])=16$ optimum given the constraints.

• CASE 2B: ($\lambda_0=1$), $x_1=10$

• If $x_1=10 \Rightarrow x_1 \neq 4 \Rightarrow \lambda_2=0$ (from complementarity). Using eq1: $2x_1 + \lambda_1 = 0 \Rightarrow 20 = -\lambda_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_1 = -20$ which violates $\lambda \geq 0 \Rightarrow x_1 \neq 10$.

• CASE 2C: ($\lambda_0=1$), $\lambda_1=0$

• If $\lambda_1=0$, eq1 says $2x_1 = \lambda_2 \rightarrow$ plugged into compl. cond gives $2x_1(-x_1+4) \Rightarrow x_1$ is either 0 or 4. We've already looked at $x_1=4$ (see CASE 2A), so let $x_1=0$.

• If $x_1=0$, in the other compl. cond we have $\lambda_2(0+4)=0 \Rightarrow \lambda_2=0$. But is $x_1=x_2=0$ feasible? No. Consider $g_2(x) = x_1 - x_2^2 - 4 \geq 0 \rightarrow g_2([0,0]) = -4 \neq 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_1=0$ isn't feasible here.

• CASE 2D: ($\lambda_0=1$), $\lambda_2=0$

• If $\lambda_2=0$, eq1 gives $2x + \lambda_1 = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_1 = -2x_1$. Plugging into compl. cond 1 gives: $-2x_1(x_1-10)=0$. From CASE 2C we know $x_1=x_2=0$ isn't feasible, so let $x_1=10$ to satisfy this. As above in CASE 2B, if $x_1=10$ we have $\lambda_1 = -2(10) = -20$, and $\lambda_1 = -20$ violates $\lambda \geq 0$.

• FINAL: based on all of these cases, and the fact that our problem is convex, we can guarantee that the point $\begin{bmatrix} x_1^* = 4 \\ x_2^* = 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is a global optimizer of $f(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ for given constraints. This x^* gives $f(x^*)=16$ as the global optimum, and satisfies optimality conditions with $\lambda_0=1, \lambda^T = [\lambda_1=0, \lambda_2=8]$.