Problem 1.1.4

use optimality conditions to show that

for all x > 0 we have 1/x + x >= 2

Let
$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} + x$$
 and domain of $f = \{x \mid x \in R, x > 0\}$

The necessary optimality conditions are below.

$$\nabla f(x) = 0 \text{ and } \nabla^2 f(x) \ge 0$$

+ First,
$$\nabla f(x) = 0$$

$$-1x^{-2} + 1 = 0$$

$$-1 + x^2 = 0$$

$$x = \pm 1$$

x = 1 because x > 0

+ Second,
$$\nabla^2 f(x) \ge 0$$

$$2x^{-3} \ge 0$$

And plug in x = 1.

$$2 \ge 0$$

+ Afterall, global min of f(x) is at x = 1 and f(1) = 2.

Therefore, $\forall x > 0$, $f(x) \ge 2$

Problem 1.2.1

```
1.2.1 minimizing fox, y) = 301+ y+
  Applying one iteration of steepest descent method
           with Armijo rule 5=1, 0=0.1, 3=0.5
· Armija Rule
      F(dx) - +(dx+Bm. J. dx) I - 5 Bm 5 x+(Nx) /dx
      +(11x) +0Bm2x+(1x),9x = +(1x+Bm29x) .... (X)
(a) solution)
· Applying one iteration k=0 and we're going to find
     m until the above & inequality is satisfied.
  f(d°) + 0.1(0,5) m vf(d°) d° 7 f(d°+(0,5) md°). (0,5)
   F(10.40)=3.12+(-2)4=3+16=19
· Now for m=0, the above & is
    = 19 + 0.1 x (-36-1024) = 19-106=-An
       = 3(1-6(0.5)^{n})^{2} + (-2+32(0.5)^{n})^{4} = 3(-5)^{2} + (-2+32)^{4}
= 3(000)5
```

```
so, -87 $ $100 ht
         Armija condition isn't met.
      · For M=1, the above (xx) is
        TH2=10 +0.1 (0.4), [9 -35] [-9]
3
            = 19 + 0.0 + (-1060) = 19-53=-34
        ZHS=3(1-6(0.5))2+(-2+32(0.5))4
            = 3(1-3)+(-2+16)4
             = 12 + 38416 = 38428
        20, -34 $ 36428
             Armijo condition isn't met.
      - For m=2, the above ( is
       for m=2, the many

[HS = 19 + 0.1 (0.5) = [6 -32] [-6]

[32]
            = -7.5
       PHS= 3(1-6(0.4)))2+(-2+32(0.4))4
          = 1296-75
        50, -1.5 $ 1296.75 . Armija condition is not met.
      · For m=3, the above (+) is
        LHS = 19 + 0.1(0.5)? [6 -32][-6] = 5.75
        RHS= 3(1-6(0.5)3)2+(-2+52(0.5)3)4
        so, 5.75 $ 16.1875. Armijo condition isn't met
        = 16.1275
```

· For m>+ LHS= 19+0.1(0.5)+[6-32][-6]= 12.375 RHS=3(1-6(0.5)4)+(-2+32(0.5)4)4 =3.(0.624)2+0 = 1.171Ans 50, 12.375 = 1.171875 Armijo condition is met. Therefore m= 4 and we have (0.625,0) for the next iteration. ((b solution)) S=1, 0=0.1, B=0.1 Everything is the same, except the radiction factor For m=0, Armijo andition isn't met because it's the same result like previous one For M=1. THS=19+0.1(0.1), [9-35][-9]=4.4 PHS = 3(1-6(0.1)') + (-2+32(0.1)') + =3(0.4) + (1.2) + = 2.5536 50, 8.4 2 2.5536 Armijo rondition is met. Therefore, m=1 and we have (0,4,1,2) I think the cost of the new iteraction is low because of lower B, reduction factor. We can reach the proper m fast.

(coolution) · newton's method when steprize = 1.2 starting point 2K+1 = 2K - F(2K) P'(7K) · f(a,y)=39°+4+ · da fory) = 691 d f(a,y) = 4y3 . I iteration of d n' = d° - f(a°) f(9)=f(1)=3.12=3 f'(a)=f'(1)=6.1=6 7'=1-3-0.5 - 1st iteration of y y'= yo - fry.) $f'(y^{\circ}) = f'(-2) = (-2)^4 = 16$ $f'(y^{\circ}) = f'(-2) = 4 \cdot (-2)^3 = -32$ $y' = -2 - \frac{16}{2} = -2 + 0.5 = -1.5$ (a) Newton's method only took a step getting a result compare to part (a) which took five steps (m=4.) ibi And amount of work of Newton's method is quite simple and fast.

3.1.b.1

L-BFGS-B is an optimization algorithm using quasi-Newton methods based on a limited amount of computer memory. The goal problem of the algorithm is to minimize the unconstrained values of a real vector x, where f(x) is a differentiable scalar function. It is a widely used algorithm for parameter estimation in machine learning.

3.1.b.2

filename	_total_solve_time	Optimal value
dqrtic.mod	0.087309	1.99817e-14
eigenbls.mod	0.076656	3.52907e-08
freuroth.mod	0.161427	608159

3.2.b

n value	_total_solve_time	Optimal value
10	0.001721	80.5912
20	0.001787	173.122
50	0.001507	396.986
100	0.00195	777.058
1000	0.010822	8644.15
10000	0.095459	87993.6

- + Compare their performance and discuss your observation.
- In terms of time, I think the time grows as n value grows and it's not exactly linear, but I can say it's not like exponential. The time complexity is in between linear and exponential and I looked up internet and I found out that Rastrigin follows nln(n).
- In terms of optimal value, the values are almost 80 times with n values. The results are consistent.