

Continuous optimization

ENT305A

Laurent Pfeiffer

Inria and CentraleSupélec, Université Paris-Saclay

Ensta-Paris
Institut Polytechnique de Paris
December 2023

Inria



CentraleSupélec

université
PARIS-SACLAY

Organisation

Organization:

- Class 1: lecture
- Class 2: lecture (1h 30) + programming exercises (2h)
- Class 3: lecture (1h 30) + programming exercises (2h)
- Class 4: programming exercises
- Class 5: programming exercise (1h 30) + exam (2h).

Contact me:

laurent.pfeiffer@inria.fr

100

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

What is an optimization problem?

Definition 1

An **optimization problem** is a mathematical expression of the form:

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x), \quad \text{subject to: } x \in K, \quad (P)$$

where:

- \mathcal{D} is a set, called **domain** of f
- $f: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called **cost function** (or **objective function**)
- $K \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is called **feasible set**.

In this class: $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{R}^n$. **Unconstrained** optimization: $\mathcal{D} = K = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Straightforward adaptation of all results of the class to **maximization** problems, replacing f by $-f$.

Abbreviation: “subject to” \rightsquigarrow “s.t.”.

What is an optimization problem?

Definition 2

- A point x is called **feasible** if $x \in K$.
- A feasible point \bar{x} is called **(global) solution** (to problem P) if

$$f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}), \quad \text{for all } x \in K.$$

- If \bar{x} is a global solution, then the real number $f(\bar{x})$ is called **value** of the problem, it is denoted $\text{val}(P)$.

Example. The point $x = \pi$ is the solution of the problem

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \cos(x), \quad x \in [0, 2\pi].$$

What is an optimization problem?

Remarks.

- An optimization problem may **not** have a solution. *Examples:*

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} e^x, \quad (P_1)$$

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x^3. \quad (P_2)$$

- The concept of **value** of an optimization can also be defined whether the problem has a solution or not, as an element of $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. In particular:

$$\text{val}(P_1) = 0, \quad \text{val}(P_2) = -\infty.$$

What is an optimization problem?

Definition 3

Let $\bar{x} \in K$. We call \bar{x} a **local solution** to (P) if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds true: for all $x \in K$,

$$\|x - \bar{x}\| \leq \varepsilon \implies f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}).$$

Example: $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} -x^2$, s.t. $x \in [-1, 2]$. Local solutions: -1 and 2 .

Remarks.

- A global solution is also a local solution.
- The notion of local optimality does not depend on the norm, if K is a subset of a finite dimensional vector space.

1. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1990, 27, 1, 1-13.

—

1. *Chlorophyll a* and *Chlorophyll b* were determined by the method of Lichtenthaler and Whistler (1973).

[illegible]

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad x \in K \cap \bar{B}(\bar{x}, \varepsilon).$$

What is an optimization problem?

Constraints.

Most of the time, the feasible set K is described by

$$K = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \begin{array}{l} g_i(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \\ g_i(x) = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{E} \end{array} \right\},$$

where $g: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E})$ is a partition of $\{1, \dots, m\}$.

We call the expressions

- $g_i(x) \geq 0$: **inequality constraint**
- $g_i(x) = 0$: **equality constraint.**

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- **Classes of problems**
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 283: 2689-2696.

- 1 Economical problems
- 2 Physical problems
- 3 Inverse problems
- 4 Learning problems.

Any practical situation involving

1. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1996, 33, 1, 1-15.

1. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1997, 34(1), 1-14.

- Mechanical structures
- Electricity networks
- Gas networks

- Cournot models with competing firms
- Traffic models on road networks.

1. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1990, 27, 1, 1-14.

- the epicenter x of an earthquake, given seismic measurements y .
- localization x of a crack in a mechanical structure, given displacements measurements y provided by captors
- temperature in the core of nuclear plant, given external temperature measurements

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 283: 2639-2645.

- may not have a solution (because of inaccurate measurements)
- may have several solutions (too few measurements).

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \|y - F(x)\|^2, \quad \text{subject to: } x \in K,$$

(5)

Classes of optimization problems

Approach by least-square.

- Fix an explicit function $F: X \times R \rightarrow Y$, for some parameter set R .
- “Tune the parameter r ”, that is, solve the least-squares problem

$$\inf_{r \in R} \sum_{k=1}^K \|y_k - F(x_k, r)\|^2.$$

- Heuristical relation $y \approx F(x, \bar{r})$ for the optimal \bar{r} .

Example: linear regression. For $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $Y = \mathbb{R}$, take $R = \mathbb{R}^2$ and

$$F(x, r) = r_1 + r_2 x.$$

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- **Existence of a solution**
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

Existence of a solution

Lemma 4

Assume the following:

- K is non-empty and compact (i.e. closed and bounded)
- f is continuous on K .

Then the optimization problem (P) has (at least) one solution.

Remarks. If $K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g_i(x) \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, g_i(x) = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{E}\}$, where g is continuous, then K is closed. In practical exercises, it is not necessary to justify the continuity of g .

Existence of a solution

Definition 5

We say that f is **coercive** on the set K if the following holds: for any sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in K ,

$$\|x_k\| \rightarrow \infty \implies f(x_k) \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Remark. The definition is independent of the norm.

Exercise. Consider

$$f: (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto x^4 - 2xy + 2y^2.$$

Prove that f is coercive on \mathbb{R}^2 .

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &\geq 2x^2 - 1 - 2xy + 2y^2 \\ &= (x^2 + y^2) - 1 + (x - y)^2 \\ &\geq \|(x, y)\|^2 - 1 \xrightarrow{\|(x, y)\| \rightarrow \infty} \infty, \end{aligned}$$

- K is non-empty and closed
- f is continuous on K
- f is coercive on K .

Existence of a solution

Elements of proof. Fix $x_0 \in K$ and define:

$$K' = \{x \in K \mid f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}.$$

- K' is **closed**, since f is continuous and K is closed
- K' is **bounded**, since f is coercive (proof by contradiction)
- The problem $\inf f(x)$, s.t. $x \in K'$ is known to have a **global solution** \bar{x} since f is continuous and K' compact.
- Show that \bar{x} is a global solution to the original problem.

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- **Derivatives**

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

Derivatives

Definition 7

A function $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is called **differentiable** at \bar{x} if for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, for all $j = 1, \dots, n$, the function

$$x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto F_i(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{j-1}, x, \bar{x}_{j+1}, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is differentiable. Its derivative at \bar{x}_j is called **partial derivative** of F , it is denoted $\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(\bar{x})$.

The matrix

$$DF(\bar{x}) = \left(\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(\bar{x}) \right)_{\substack{i=1, \dots, m \\ j=1, \dots, n}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$$

is called **Jacobian** matrix.

- $$F(x + \delta x) = F(x) + DF(x)\delta x + o(\|\delta x\|).$$

(1) \mathcal{C}_1 is a \mathbb{C}^* -extension of \mathcal{C}_0 if and only if \mathcal{C}_1 is a \mathbb{C}^* -extension of \mathcal{C}_0 .

- $$DH(x) = DF(G(x))DG(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

() () () ()

10. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 284: 1039-1044.

Derivatives

Definition 9

The function $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be **twice differentiable** if it is differentiable and DF is differentiable.

We denote: $\frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_k} \right)(x)$.

If $m = 1$, the matrix

$$D^2 F(x) = \left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(x) \right)_{\substack{j=1,\dots,n \\ k=1,\dots,n}}$$

is called **Hessian** matrix. It is symmetric.

Derivatives

Exercise.

Calculate the gradient and the Hessian of the function

$$f: x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle x, Ax \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Derivatives

Solution. We have

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kj} x_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n A_{ik} x_i + b_k \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (Ax)_k + \frac{1}{2} (A^\top x)_k + b_k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla f(x) = \frac{1}{2} (A + A^\top) x + b.$$

Hessian: $D^2 f(x) = \frac{1}{2} (A + A^\top).$

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

Optimality conditions

Let us fix a continuously differentiable function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the whole section. Let us consider

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \quad (P)$$

The function f is said to be **stationary** at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if $\nabla f(x) = 0$.

Theorem 10 (Necessary optimality condition)

Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a local solution of (P). Then, f is stationary at \bar{x} .

Remark. Stationarity is only a necessary condition!

Optimality conditions

Theorem 11

Assume that f is twice continuously differentiable. Let \bar{x} be a stationary point.

■ *Necessary condition.*

If \bar{x} is a local solution of (P) , then $D^2f(\bar{x})$ is positive semi-definite, that is to say,

$$\langle h, D^2f(\bar{x})h \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

■ *Sufficient condition.*

If $D^2f(\bar{x})$ is positive definite, that is to say if

$$\langle h, D^2f(\bar{x})h \rangle > 0, \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\},$$

then \bar{x} is a local solution of (P) .

Optimality conditions

Definition 12

The function f is said to be convex if

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y),$$

for all x and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 13


- *The function f is convex if and only if*

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle,$$


for all x and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- *If f is twice differentiable, then f is convex if and only if $D^2 f(x)$ is symmetric positive semi-definite for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Optimality conditions



Optimality conditions



Optimality conditions

Theorem 14

Assume that f is convex. Let \bar{x} be a stationary point of f . Then it is a global solution of (P) .

Proof. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) + \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle = f(\bar{x}).$$

Optimality conditions

Exercise.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric positive definite and let $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$f : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle x, Ax \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle.$$

Prove that

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$$

has a unique solution. *Hint:* A is regular.

Optimality conditions

Solution.

- We have

$$\nabla f(x) = Ax + b.$$

Since A is regular, there exists a unique solution \bar{x} to the equation $Ax + b = 0$ (that is, $\bar{x} = -A^{-1}b$).

- We also have $D^2f(x) = A$. Therefore, f is convex and \bar{x} is a global solution.
- Any solution is stationary. Since \bar{x} is the unique stationary point, it is also the unique solution.

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- **Gradient methods**
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

0 0 0 0

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x). \quad (P)$$

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

0 0 0 0

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x). \quad (P)$$

$$f(x_{k+1}) \leq f(x_k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

Gradient methods

Definition 15

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The vector d is called **descent direction** if

$$\langle \nabla f(x), d \rangle < 0.$$

Remark. If $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$, then $d = -\nabla f(x)$ is a descent direction. Indeed,

$$\langle \nabla f(x), d \rangle = -\langle \nabla f(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle = -\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 < 0.$$

Gradient methods

Main idea of gradient methods.

Let $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let d_k be a descent direction at x_k . Let $\alpha > 0$. Then

$$f(x_k + \alpha d_k) = f(x_k) + \underbrace{\alpha \langle \nabla f(x_k), d_k \rangle}_{<0} + o(\alpha).$$

Therefore, if α is small enough,

$$f(x_k + \alpha d_k) < f(x_k).$$

We can set

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha d_k.$$

Gradient methods

On the choice of α_k .

Let us fix $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let us define

$$\phi_k: \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto f(x_k + \alpha d_k).$$

The condition $f(x_k + \alpha_k d_k) < f(x_k)$ is equivalent to

$$\phi_k(\alpha_k) < \phi_k(0).$$

A natural idea: define α_k as a solution to

$$\inf_{\alpha \geq 0} \phi_k(\alpha).$$

Minimizing ϕ_k would take too much time! A **compromise** must be found between simplicity of computation and quality of α .


1. $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

1. $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

100

Case	Time (h)	Temperature (°C)	Pressure (MPa)	Strain (%)	Stress (MPa)	Modulus (GPa)	Yield Strength (MPa)	Ultimate Tensile Strength (MPa)	Elongation (%)
1	0	25	0.1	0	0	100	100	100	100
	1	25	0.1	10	10	100	100	100	100
	2	25	0.1	20	20	100	100	100	100
2	0	25	0.1	0	0	100	100	100	100
	1	25	0.1	10	10	100	100	100	100
	2	25	0.1	20	20	100	100	100	100
3	0	25	0.1	0	0	100	100	100	100
	1	25	0.1	10	10	100	100	100	100
	2	25	0.1	20	20	100	100	100	100

Gradient methods



Gradient methods

Backstepping algorithm for Armijo's rule


- 1 Input: $c_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\beta > 0$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.
- 2 Set $\alpha = \beta$.
- 3 While α does not satisfy Armijo's rule,
 - Set $\alpha = \gamma\alpha$.
- 4 Output α .

Definition 17

Let $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$. We say that $\alpha > 0$ satisfies **Wolfe's rule** if

$$\phi_k(\alpha) < \phi_k(0) + c_1 \phi'_k(0) \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \phi'_k(\alpha) \geq c_2 \phi'(0).$$

Gradient methods



Gradient methods

Bisection method for Wolfe's rule

- 1 Input: $c_1 \in (0, 1)$, $c_2 \in (c_1, 1)$, $\beta > 0$, $\eta > 1$.
- 2 Set $\alpha = \beta$.
- 3 While α satisfies Armijo's rule, do
 - Set $\alpha = \eta\alpha$.
- 4 Set $\alpha_{\min} = 0$, α_{\max} , $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_{\min} + \alpha_{\max})$.
- 5 While α does not satisfy Wolfe's rule, do
 - If α does not satisfy Armijo's rule, then set $\alpha_{\max} = \alpha$.
Else set $\alpha_{\min} = \alpha$.
 - Set $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_{\min} + \alpha_{\max})$.
- 6 Output: α .

- Figure 1.**

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- **Newton's method**

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

Originally, Newton's method aims at solving non-linear equations of the form

where $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a given continuously differentiable function. It is an iterative method, generating a sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Given x_k , we have

Thus we look x_{k+1} as the solution to the linear equation

that is, $x_{k+1} = x_k - DF(x_k)^{-1}F(x_k)$.

- 0 0 0

Newton's method

Globalization of Newton's method.

- Newton's formula can be written in the form:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k,$$

where

$$\alpha_k = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_k = -D^2f(x_k)^{-1}\nabla f(x_k).$$

- If $D^2f(x_k)$ is positive definite (and $\nabla f(x_k) \neq 0$), then $D^2f(x_k)^{-1}$ is also positive definite, and therefore d_k is descent direction:

$$\langle \nabla f(x_k), d_k \rangle = -\langle \nabla f(x_k), D^2f(x_k)^{-1}\nabla f(x_k) \rangle < 0.$$

Newton's method

Globalised Newton's method.

- 1 Input: $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\varepsilon > 0$, a linesearch rule (Armijo, Wolfe,...).
- 2 Set $k = 0$.
- 3 While $\|\nabla f(x_k)\| \geq \varepsilon$, do
 - (a) If $-D^2f(x_k)^{-1}\nabla f(x_k)$ is computable and is a descent direction, set $d_k = -D^2f(x_k)^{-1}\nabla f(x_k)$, otherwise set $d_k = -\nabla f(x_k)$.
 - (b) If $\alpha = 1$ satisfies the linesearch rule, then set $\alpha_k = 1$. Otherwise, find α_k with an appropriate method.
 - (c) Set $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k d_k$.
 - (d) Set $k = k + 1$.
- 4 Output: x_k .

- Under non-restrictive assumptions, the globalized method converges, whatever the initial condition. Convergence is fast.
- The numerical computation of $D^2f(x_k)$ may be **very time consuming** and may generate storage issues (n^2 figures in general).
- **Quasi-Newton** methods construct a sequence of positive definite matrices H_k such that $H_k \approx D^2f(x_k)^{-1}$. The matrix H_k can be stored efficiently (with $O(n)$ figures). Then $d_k = -H_k \nabla f(x_k)$ is a descent direction. Good speed of convergence is achieved. → **The ideal compromise!**

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- Sensitivity analysis

Linear equality constraints

- We investigate in this section the problem

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} g_i(x) = 0, & \forall i \in \mathcal{E} \\ g_i(x) \geq 0, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases} \quad (P)$$

- Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be feasible. Let $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We say that
 - the inequality constraint i is **active** if $g_i(x) = 0$
 - the inequality constraint i is **inactive** if $g_i(x) > 0$.
- *Remark.* All results of the section are true if $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$.

Linear equality constraints

Theorem 18

Assume that g is affine, that is to say, there exists $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$g(x) = Ax + b.$$

Let \bar{x} be a local solution to (P) .

Then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the following three conditions, referred to as Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, are satisfied:

- 1 Stationarity condition: $\nabla_x L(\bar{x}, \lambda) = 0$.
- 2 Sign condition: for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\lambda_i \geq 0$.
- 3 Complementarity condition: for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$,
 $g_i(\bar{x}) > 0 \implies \lambda_i = 0$.

1. 9

Linear constraints

Exercise.


Consider the problem

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x,y) := y, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} g_1(x,y) := 2x + y \geq 0, \\ g_2(x,y) := -x + y \geq 0, \\ g_3(x,y) := -y + 3 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

- Draw the feasible set and find (geometrically) the solution.
- Verify that the KKT conditions are satisfied.

Linear constraints

Solution.



Linear constraints

- Solution to the problem: $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = 0$.
- Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be the associated Lagrange multiplier.
Necessarily $\lambda_3 = 0$, since $g_3(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) > 0$, by complementarity.
- Lagrangian:

$$L(x, y, \lambda) = y - \lambda_1(2x + y) - \lambda_2(-x + y).$$

- The stationarity condition yields:

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(0, 0) = -2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(0, 0) = 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2.$$

Linear constraints

Example 1. Case of **one equality constraint**:

$$m = 1, \quad \mathcal{E} = \{1\}, \quad \mathcal{I} = \emptyset.$$


The matrix A is a row vector, let $q = A^\top$.

Proof of KKT conditions.

- Geometrically, we understand that $\nabla f(x)$ and q are **colinear**.
- Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\nabla f(x) = \lambda q$.
- We have:


$$\nabla L(x, \lambda) = \nabla f(x) - \lambda \nabla g(x) = \nabla f(x) - \lambda q = 0.$$


Linear constraints



Linear constraints

Example 2(a). Case of **one (active) inequality equality constraint**:





Linear constraints

Example 3. Case of m equality constraints ($\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$).

Proof.

- Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given by the definition of a local solution.
Let $h \in \text{Ker}(A)$ (that is $Ah = 0$).
For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, let $x_\theta = \bar{x} + \theta h$.
- For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, x_θ is **feasible**:

$$g(x_\theta) = Ax_\theta + b = A\bar{x} + b + \theta Ah = 0.$$

- For all $\theta \in [0, \varepsilon/\|h\|]$, we have $\|x_\theta - \bar{x}\| \leq \varepsilon$ and thus

$$f(x_\theta) \geq f(\bar{x}).$$

Linear constraints

- We deduce that

$$0 \leq \lim_{\theta \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\bar{x} + \theta h) - f(\bar{x})}{\theta} = \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), h \rangle.$$

- Since $h \in \text{Ker}(A)$, we also have $-h \in \text{Ker}(A)$. Therefore,

$$0 \leq \langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), -h \rangle$$

and therefore $\langle \nabla f(\bar{x}), h \rangle = 0$.

- We deduce that

$$\nabla f(x) \in (\text{Ker}(A))^{\perp} = \text{Im}(A^{\top}),$$

that is, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\nabla f(x) = A^{\top} \lambda$.

- We have $\nabla_x L(x, \lambda) = \nabla f(x) - A^{\top} \lambda = 0$.

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- **Non-linear constraints**
- Sensitivity analysis

Non-linear constraints

Definition 19

Let \bar{x} be a feasible point. Let the set of **active inequality constraints** $\mathcal{I}_0(\bar{x})$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_0(\bar{x}) = \{i \in \mathcal{I} \mid g_i(\bar{x}) = 0\}.$$

We say that the **Linear Independence Qualification Condition (LICQ)** holds at \bar{x} , if the following set of vectors is linearly independent:

$$\{\nabla g_i(\bar{x})\}_{i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{I}_0(\bar{x})}.$$

Non-linear constraints

Theorem 20

Let \bar{x} be a local solution to (P) . Assume that the LICQ holds at \bar{x} . Then there exists a unique λ such that the KKT conditions are satisfied.

Remarks.

- Many available **variants** of this theorem in the literature, with different qualification conditions.
- At a numerical level, a solution that does not satisfy the LICQ is hard to compute.

Non-linear constraints

Example 4.

Consider the problem

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x, \quad \text{subject to: } -x^2 \geq 0.$$

Unique feasible point: $\bar{x} = 0$, thus the solution.

Lagrangian:

$$L(x, \lambda) = x + \lambda x^2.$$

At zero:

$$\nabla_x L(0, \lambda) = 1 + 2\lambda \bar{x} = 1 \neq 0.$$

The LICQ is not satisfied, since $\nabla g_1(0) = 0$.

Non-linear constraints

Theorem 21

Assume that

- f is convex
- for all $i \in \mathcal{E}$, the map $x \mapsto g_i(x)$ is affine
- for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the map $x \mapsto -g_i(x)$ is convex.

Then any feasible point \bar{x} satisfying the KKT conditions is a global solution to the problem.

Remark. The result holds whether the LICQ holds or not at \bar{x} .

Exercise

Exercise. Consider the function $f: (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \exp(x + y^2) + y + x^2$.

- 1 Prove that f is coercive.
- 2 Calcule $\nabla f(x, y)$ and $\nabla^2 f(x, y)$.
- 3 We recall that a symmetric matrix of size 2 of the form $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{pmatrix}$ is positive semidefinite if and only if $a + c \geq 0$ and $ac - b^2 \geq 0$. Using this fact, prove that f is convex.
- 4 We consider the following problem:

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2} f(x, y), \quad \text{subject to: } \begin{cases} x + y \geq 0 \\ x + 2 \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (\mathcal{P})$$

Verify that $(0, 0)$ is feasible and satisfies the KKT conditions.

- 5 Is the point $(0, 0)$ a global solution to problem (\mathcal{P}) ?

Conclusion

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1039-1043.

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &\geq x + y^2 + y + x^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2) + \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + 2x + 1) + \frac{1}{2}(y^2 + 2y + 1) - 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|(x, y)\|^2 + (x + 1)^2 + (y + 1)^2 - 1 \xrightarrow{\|(x, y)\| \rightarrow \infty} \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Exercise

2. It holds:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \exp(x + y^2) + 2x, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = 2y \exp(x + y^2) + 1.$$

Therefore, $\nabla f(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(x + y^2) + 2x \\ 2y \exp(x + y^2) + 1 \end{pmatrix}.$

We also have

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} = \exp(x + y^2) + 2, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y \partial x} = 2y \exp(x + y^2),$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} = 2 \exp(x + y^2) + 4y^2 \exp(x + y^2).$$

Thus, $D^2 f(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(x + y^2) + 2 & 2y \exp(x + y^2) \\ 2y \exp(x + y^2) & (2 + 4y^2) \exp(x + y^2) \end{pmatrix}.$

Exercise

3. Proof of positive definiteness of D^2f . It holds:

$$a + c = (3 + 4y^2) \exp(x + y^2) + 2 \geq 0$$

and

$$ac - b^2 = 2 \exp(2x + 2y^2) + 4(1 + 2y^2) \exp(x + y^2) \geq 0.$$

It follows that $D^2f(x, y)$ is positive semidefinite, for all (x, y) .
Therefore f is a convex function.

Exercise

4. Feasibility of $(0, 0)$: we have $0 + 0 \geq 0$ and $0 + 2 > 0$.

KKT conditions. Lagrangian:

$$L(x, y, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \exp(x + y^2) + y + x^2 - \lambda_1(x + y) - \lambda_2(x + 2).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(0, 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \quad \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(0, 0) = 1 - \lambda_1.$$

Taking $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$, we have:

- 1 Stationarity: $\frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(0, 0, 1, 0) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(0, 0, 1, 0) = 0$.
- 2 Sign condition: $\lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0$.
- 3 Complementarity: the second constraint is inactive and the corresponding Lagrange multiplier is null.

5. We have the following:
- The cost function is convex.
 - The functions $-(x + y)$ and $-(x + 2)$ are convex.
 - The point $(0, 0)$ is feasible and satisfies the KKT conditions.

Therefore $(0, 0)$ is a global solution.

Exercise 1

-

Non-linear constraints

Verification of the LICQ.

$$\nabla g_1(\bar{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} -2\bar{x}_1 \\ -4\bar{x}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ -4 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla g_2(\bar{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have: $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{I}_0(\bar{x}) = \{1, 2\}$. The vectors $\nabla g_1(\bar{x})$ and $\nabla g_2(\bar{x})$ are linearly independent, since

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -4 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = -4 \neq 0.$$

Thus the LICQ is satisfied at \bar{x} .

Non-linear constraints

KKT conditions.

- Lagrangian:

$$L(x, \lambda) = (-x_1 - x_2) - \lambda_1(-x_1^2 - 2x_2^2 + 3) - \lambda_2(-x_1 + 1).$$

- Stationarity condition:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 2\bar{x}_1 \\ 4\bar{x}_2 \end{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \lambda_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is satisfied at \bar{x} with $\lambda_1 = 1/4 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 1/2 \geq 0$.

- The sign condition is satisfied.
- The complementarity condition is satisfied (all inequality constraints are active).

1 General introduction

- What is an optimization problem?
- Classes of problems
- Existence of a solution
- Derivatives

2 Methods for unconstrained optimization

- Optimality conditions
- Gradient methods
- Newton's method

3 Optimality conditions for constrained problems

- Linear constraints
- Non-linear constraints
- **Sensitivity analysis**

Sensitivity analysis

- Consider the family of optimization problems

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} g_i(x) = y_i, & \forall i \in \mathcal{E}, \\ g_i(x) \geq y_i, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \end{cases} \quad (P(y))$$

parametrized by the vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

- Let the **value function** V be defined by

$$V(y) = \text{val}(P(y)).$$

Sensitivity analysis

Theorem 22

Assume that for some \bar{y} , the problem $(P(\bar{y}))$ has a solution \bar{x} satisfying the KKT conditions. Let λ denote the corresponding Lagrange multiplier.

Then, under some technical assumptions, V is differentiable at \bar{y} and

$$\nabla V(\bar{y}) = \lambda.$$

Interpretation. A variation δy_i in the i -th constraint generates a variation of the optimal cost of $\lambda_i \delta y_i$ (in **first approximation**).

Sensitivity analysis

Exercise.

A company decides to rent an engine over d days. The engine can be used to produce two different objects. The two objects are not produced simultaneously. Let x_1 and x_2 denote the times dedicated to the production of each object. The resulting benefits (in k€) are given by:

$$\frac{x_1}{1 + x_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{x_2}{4 + x_2}.$$

Sensitivity analysis

- 1 Formulate the problem as a minimization problem.
- 2 Justify the existence of a solution.
- 3 Write the KKT conditions. What is the unit of the dual variable?
- 4 Verify that $\bar{x} = (4, 6)$ satisfies the KKT conditions for $d = 10$ days. Is it a global solution to the problem?
- 5 The renting cost of the engine is 70€/day. Is it of interest for the company to rent the engine for a longer time?

Sensitivity analysis

1. Problem:

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} -\frac{x_1}{1+x_1} - \frac{x_2}{4+x_2}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} x_1 + x_2 = d \\ x_1 \geq 0 \\ x_2 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

2. The feasible set is obviously compact and non-empty and the cost function is continuous. Therefore, there exists a solution.

Sensitivity analysis

3. Let \bar{x} be a solution. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^3$ be the associated Lagrange multiplier. Lagrangian:

$$L(x, \lambda) = -\frac{x_1}{1+x_1} - \frac{x_2}{4+x_2} - \lambda_1(x_1 + x_2 - d) - \lambda_2 x_1 - \lambda_3 x_2.$$

KKT conditions:

- Stationarity:

$$-\frac{1}{(1+\bar{x}_1)^2} - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0, \quad -\frac{4}{(4+\bar{x}_2)^2} - \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = 0.$$

- Sign condition: $\lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0$.
- Complementarity: $\bar{x}_1 > 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_2 = 0, \bar{x}_2 > 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_3 = 0$.

- Units: $[\lambda_1] = [\lambda_2] = [\lambda_3] = \text{k€}/\text{day}$.

Sensitivity analysis

4. Let λ be such that the KKT conditions hold true. By complementarity condition, we necessarily have $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$. The stationarity condition holds true with

$$\lambda_1 = -\frac{1}{(1 + \bar{x}_1)^2} = -\frac{4}{(4 + \bar{x}_2)^2} = -\frac{1}{25} = -0.04.$$

The sign condition trivially holds true since the inequality constraints are inactive.

The point \bar{x} is feasible and satisfies the KKT conditions. We have affine constraints and a convex cost function, therefore, the KKT conditions are sufficient. The point \bar{x} is a global solution.

Sensitivity analysis

5. Increasing the renting time of y days will generate a variation of cost of $\lambda_1 y$ (approximately), that is, an augmentation of the benefit of 40€/day (less the renting price). It would be of interest for the company to reduce the renting time.