
 **Yen-Huan Li** · Follow

Last edited by Yen-Huan Li on Mar 7, 2025

Contributed by 

 0

CSIE5410 Optimization Algorithms: HWO
Yen-Huan Li @ CSIE, National Taiwan University

Expand all
Back to top
Go to bottom

CSIE5410 Optimization Algorithms: HWO

Yen-Huan Li @ CSIE, National Taiwan University

There are a total of 12 problems, each worth 10 points. However, your grades will be capped at 100.

We say a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is *convex* if

$$x, y \in \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

We say a differentiable function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ is *convex* on a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ if

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

for any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}^d$ such that $\varphi(x) < +\infty$ and $\nabla \varphi(x)$ exists, where $\nabla \varphi(x)$ denotes the gradient of φ at x and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the dot product. We say an optimization problem of the form

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(x)$$

is *convex* if both the *objective function* φ and the *constraint set* \mathcal{X} are convex. The first characterizes the minimum value of φ on \mathcal{X} , while the second characterizes the set of minimizers of φ on \mathcal{X} .

- Let $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ be the *data points*. We seek a parameter w^b such that y_i is close to $\langle x_i, w^b \rangle$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The *least squares approach* yields:

$$w^b \in \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} g(w), \quad g(w) := \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \langle x_i, w \rangle)^2,$$

where the factor $1/(2n)$ is introduced for convenience. Suppose that $n > d$ and that the matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, whose i -th row is given by the transpose of x_i , has full column rank.

- (10 points) Show that the optimization problem defining w^b is convex.
- (10 points) Consider solving the optimization problem by Newton's method, which is given by:
 - Let $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
 - For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, compute

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \left(\nabla^2 g(w_t) \right)^{-1} \nabla g(w_t),$$

where $\nabla^2 g(w)$ denotes the Hessian matrix of g at w .

Show that if we choose $w_1 = 0$, the all-zeros vector, then Newton's method solves the optimization problem in one iteration (i.e., $w_2 = w^b$).

Hint. You can freely cite the results in the Wikipedia page on the [Moore-Penrose inverse](#).

- Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Let y_1, \dots, y_n be independent $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}(y_i = 1) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(y_i = 0) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(x_i, \theta^b)}},$$

for some unknown parameter $\theta^b \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

- (10 points) Given $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$, show that the *maximum-likelihood estimator* for θ^b is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_n \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} L(\theta), \quad L(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(1 + e^{-2(y_i - 1/2)(x_i, \theta)} \right).$$

Google and find the definition of maximum-likelihood estimator if you are unfamiliar with this concept.

- (10 points) Show that the optimization problem defining the maximum-likelihood estimator is convex.
- (10 points) Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ whose i -th row is given by the transpose of x_i . Let y be an n -dimensional random vector whose i -th entry is y_i . Show that

$$\nabla L(\theta^b) = -\frac{1}{n} X^\top (y - \mathbb{E}[y]),$$

where $\mathbb{E}[y]$ denotes the expectation of y .

- (10 points) Let X be as defined in the previous problem. Show that

$$\nabla^2 L(\theta^b) = \frac{1}{n} X^\top D X,$$

where $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix whose (i, i) -th entry is given by the variance of y_i and X^\top denotes the transpose of the matrix X .

- (10 points) For any matrices A and B , we write $A \leq B$ if the matrix $B - A$ is positive semi-definite. Show that

$$0 \leq \nabla^2 L(\theta) \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X)}{4n} I, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p,$$

where 0 denotes the all-zeros matrix, $\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X)$ the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $X^\top X$, and I the identity matrix.

- The *growth-optimal portfolio* in mathematical finance is formulated as

$$x_* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \Delta_d} f(x), \quad f(x) := -\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log(a_i, x), \tag{P}$$

where Δ_d denotes the probability simplex in \mathbb{R}^d , i.e.,

$$\Delta_d := \left\{ x = (x[1], \dots, x[d]) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x[i] \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^d x[i] = 1 \right\},$$

\log denotes the natural log, and w_i are given non-negative numbers satisfying $\sum_i w_i = 1$ and entrywise-nonnegative vectors $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $a_i \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $a_i \in [0, 1]^d$ for all i .

For convenience, let us write the optimization problem (P) equivalently as:

$$u_* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{f}(u), \tag{P'}$$

$$\tilde{f}(u) := -\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \log \left\langle a_i, \left(u[1], \dots, u[d-1], 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} u[i] \right) \right\rangle,$$

$$\mathcal{U} := \left\{ (u[1], \dots, u[d-1]) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \mid u[i] \geq 0 \ \forall i, \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} u[i] \leq 1 \right\}.$$


Find the book draft "Techniques in Optimization and Sampling" at <https://github.com/YinTat/optimizationbook/>. Consider solving the optimization problem (P) (P') using Algorithm 5 in the book draft, which we will refer to as the *ellipsoid method*.

- (10 points) Show that the optimization problem (P) (P') is convex.
- (10 points) Show how the mapping $g(\cdot)$ in the ellipsoid method can be chosen for solving (P') .
- (10 points) In the proof of Lemma 3.3 in the book draft, it is claimed that "we can do a transformation so that $A^{(k)} = I$, $x^{(k)} = 0$ and $v(x^{(k)}) = e_1$." Please specify the associated affine transformation: Please find an affine transformation such that " $A^{(k)} = I$, $x^{(k)} = 0$ "; then, argue that it suffices to consider the case where " $v(x^{(k)}) = e_1$ ". Moreover, this the quoted sentence contains a typo. Please correct the typo.

Note that then, Lemma 3.3 implies that the ellipsoid method identifies a set of volume ε that contains the minimizer x_* in $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ iterations.

- (10 points) Argue that the convergence guarantee offered by Lemma 3.3 may not be meaningful.
- (10 points) Show that the proof of Theorem 3.7 does not apply to the optimization problem (P) (P'); hence, Theorem 3.9 that provides a more meaningful convergence guarantee does not apply. Please clearly point out which sentences in the proof of Theorem 3.7 do not hold and explain the reason.

Last changed by 

 **Yen-Huan Li** · Follow

Associate Professor at the Computer Science Dept., National Taiwan University. Machine learning, convex opt., high-dim. stat., quantum information.

 0



 863

