goal: sofficient conditions for local optimality in NLP subject to constraints

refs:

OPTIMAL CONTROL AND ESTIMATION

Nonlinear Programming

SECOND EDITION

Robert F. Stengel

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

Section 2.1

Dimitri P. Bertsekas

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Chapter 3

o consider NLP with constraints: min c(w) $c: \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R}$ s.t. f(w) = 0 $f: \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R}^n$ \to assuming you can explicitly solve the constraint equation show how you can reduce to an equivalent unconstrained NLP - suppose $w \in \mathbb{R}^l$ can be "split" into two pieces, $w = (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ and explicitly solve f(x, u) = 0 for x in terms of u, i.e. $x: \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ \to then min c(x(u), u) is equivalent $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ $\to \infty$ then min c(x(u), u) is equivalent to original oxidential $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$

i.e. $X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) ($X: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ to original problem · con't solve f(w) =0 in general, so we'll consider another approach idea: consider augmented cost function $\mathcal{C}(x_i u_i \lambda) = \mathcal{C}(x_i u) + \lambda \cdot f(x_i u)$ C X E IRIXN termed "Legrouge multiplier" or " dual voilables' and find stationary points of Z i.e. wast (xo, uo, to) s.t. DE(xo, uo, to) =0 ER(n+m+n) ER(n+m+n)-> determine necessary condition for ho be stationary (assume Dxf(xo, uo) E IR "xn" invertible/non singular) - $D_x \tilde{c} = D_x c + \lambda \cdot D_x f$ so if $D_x f(x_0, u_0)$ invertible then its necessary that $\lambda_0 = -D_{x}c(x_0, u_0) \cdot [D_{x}f(x_0, u_0)]^{-1}$ def: (Xo, Uo) E IR " is a stationary point for min C(X, W) (X, W) EIR "+M" s.t. f(x,u)=0 ERn if $DuC(x_0, u_0) + \lambda_0 \cdot Duf(x_0, u_0) = 0$ and $f(x_0, u_0) = 0$

-> why is it reasonable to assume Dxf(xo, uo) invertible?
- otherwise constaints are redundant?

where $\lambda_0 = -D_X C(X_0, U_0) \cdot [D_X f(X_0, U_0)]^{-1}$

- otherwise constaints are redordants consider the linear case: $f(x,u) = L \cdot [x]$

-> why are stationary points of constrained NLP the same as those of E?

* fill answer regulars some work - cf whipedia article "lagrange multiplies"

~> when n=1 the geometry is easier to understand - cf pg 103 of
Folland's Advanced Calculus

ex: (Lews Syrmos 1.2-3) guadradic cost, linear constraint:

min $C(X_1u) = \frac{1}{2}X^TQX + \frac{1}{2}u^TRu - assume Q^T = Q > 0$ s.t. $f(X_1u) = X + Bu + b = 0$

-> write augmented cost & stationarity conditions

$$-2(x_1u_1x) = c(x_1u) + \lambda - f(x_1u)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}xTQx + \frac{1}{2}uTRu + \lambda \cdot (x+Bu+b)$$

 $-D_{x}\mathcal{E}=D_{x}C+\lambda\cdot D_{x}f=x^{T}Q+\lambda=0$

$$-D_{X}\mathcal{E} = f(x_{1}\mathcal{U}) = x + B\mathcal{U} + b = 0$$

 \rightarrow solve for stationary u (ξ χ)

- from
$$D_X = 0$$
 we find $\lambda = -X^TQ \implies X^T = -QX$

optimization Page

- from UXC=U we priv ~- ~~ ~~ ~~

- from Duz =0 we find $u = -R^{-1}B^{T}X^{T}$

- combining these we find $u^* = -R^{-1}B^TQX$