DATTORRO

CONVEX OPTIMIZATION † EUCLIDEAN DISTANCE GEOMETRY 2ε

Mεβoo

Dattorro

CONVEX OPTIMIZATION

EUCLIDEAN DISTANCE GEOMETRY

Meboo

Convex Optimization
†
Euclidean Distance Geometry

$\mathcal{M}\varepsilon\beta oo$ Publishing

Meboo Publishing USA
PO Box 12
Palo Alto, California 94302

Dattorro, *Convex Optimization † Euclidean Distance Geometry*,
$\mathcal{M}\varepsilon\beta oo$, 2005, v2019.10.28.

ISBN 978-0-578-16140-2

This is version 2019.10.28: available in print at Lulu.com, as conceived, in color.
Latest electronic version available at ccrma.stanford.edu/%7Edattorro/0976401304.pdf

Cybersearch:

I. semidefinite program
II. rank constraint
III. cardinality minimization
IV. audio signal processing
V. convex geometry
VI. convex cones
VII. distance matrix

PROGRAMS BY MATLAB 

Typesetting by WinEdt

Donations from **MATHWORKS**, **SIAM**, and **AMS**.

COVER ART DERIVES FROM NEW TOWN HALL, MUNICH BY SZE WAN

This searchable electronic color pdfBook is click-navigable within the text by page, section, subsection, chapter, theorem, example, definition, cross reference, citation, equation, figure, table, and hyperlink. A pdfBook has no electronic copy protection and can be read and printed by most computers. The publisher hereby grants the right to reproduce this work in any format but limited to personal use.

© 2005-2019 $\mathcal{M}\varepsilon\beta oo$ Publishing USA

for *Jennie Columba*

◊

Antonio

◊

◊

& *Sze Wan*

$$\mathbb{EDM} = \mathbb{S}_h \cap \left(\mathbb{S}_c^{\perp} - \mathbb{S}_+ \right)$$

Prelude

The constant demands of my department and university and the ever increasing work needed to obtain funding have stolen much of my precious thinking time, and I sometimes yearn for the halcyon days of Bell Labs.

−Steven Chu, Nobel laureate [92]

Convex Analysis is an emerging calculus of inequalities while Convex Optimization is its application. Analysis is inherently the domain of a mathematician while Optimization belongs to the engineer. A convex optimization problem is conventionally regarded as minimization of a convex objective function subject to an artificial convex domain imposed upon it by the problem constraints. The constraints comprise equalities and inequalities of convex functions whose simultaneous solution set generally constitutes the imposed convex domain: called *feasible set.*

It is easy to minimize a convex function over any convex subset of its domain because any local minimum must be a global minimum. But it is difficult to find the maximum of a convex function over some convex domain because there can be many local maxima; although this has practical application (Eternity II §4.8, §C.5), it is not a convex problem. Tremendous benefit accrues when a mathematical problem can be transformed to an equivalent convex optimization, primarily because any locally optimal solution is then guaranteed globally optimal.[0.1] An *optimal* solution is a best solution to the problem posed; a certificate can be obtained guaranteeing that no better solution exists.

To provide a concrete example of what it meant by *optimal,* recall the ordinary *least squares* problem espoused by Gauss and Legendre over 200 years ago: (§E.0.1.0.1)

$$\underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \;\; \|Ax-b\|_2^2$$

Suppose we were to pose this problem a bit differently by *constraining* variable vector x simultaneously with the minimization. In particular, let's suppose that each entry of x were bounded above by the same maximum allowable value:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} & \|Ax-b\|_2^2 \\ \text{subject to} & x \preceq x_{\max} \end{array}$$

Would a constrained solution, so obtained, be equivalent to an ordinary least squares solution whose entries (exceeding the prescribed bound) are simply clipped to the maximum value? The two solutions are, generally, different when clipping occurs. We argue that a constrained solution is better than a clipped solution; indeed, it is optimal.

[0.1] Solving a nonlinear system for example, by instead solving an equivalent convex optimization problem, is therefore highly preferable and what motivates *geometric programming*; a form of convex optimization invented in 1960s [67] [90] that has driven great advances in the electronic circuit design industry. [38, §4.7] [288] [459] [462] [117] [215] [224] [225] [226] [227] [228] [305] [306] [356]

Both of the foregoing ordinary and bounded least squares problems are convex. Recognizing a problem as convex is an acquired skill; that being, to know when an objective function is convex and when constraints specify a convex feasible set. The challenge, which is indeed an art, is how to express difficult problems in a convex way: perhaps, problems previously believed nonconvex. Practitioners in the art of Convex Optimization engage themselves with discovery of which hard problems can be transformed into convex equivalents; because, once convex form of a problem is found, then a globally optimal solution is close at hand - the hard work is finished: Finding convex expression of a problem is itself, in a very real sense, its solution.

Yet, that skill acquired by understanding the geometry and application of Convex Optimization will remain more an art for some time to come; the reason being, there is generally no unique transformation of a given problem to its convex equivalent. This means, two researchers pondering the same problem are likely to formulate a convex equivalent differently; hence, one solution is likely different from the other although any convex combination of those two solutions remains optimal. Any presumption of only one right or correct solution becomes nebulous. Study of equivalence & sameness, uniqueness, and duality therefore pervade study of Optimization.

It can be difficult for the engineer to apply convex theory without an understanding of Analysis. These pages comprise my journal over an eighteen year period bridging gaps between engineer and mathematician; they constitute a translation, unification, and cohering of about five hundred papers, books, and reports from several different fields of mathematics and engineering. Although beacons of historical accomplishment are cited throughout, much of what is written here will not be found elsewhere. Care to detail, clarity, accuracy, consistency, and typography accompanies removal of ambiguity and verbosity, out of respect for the reader. But the book is nonlinear in its presentation. Consequently there is much indexing, cross referencing, linkage to online sources, and background material provided in the text, footnotes, and appendices so as to be more self-contained and to provide understanding of fundamental concepts.

Looking toward the future, there remains much to be done in the area of machine computation if mathematical Optimization is to become fully embraced by the signal processing community. Wordlength of contemporary computers and numerical burdens upon them prohibit real time solution and accuracy sufficient to embed optimization problems within a recursive mathematical setting. When optimization problems constitute only intermediate solution to much larger problems, acquiring only a "few digits" accuracy can throw off subsequent dependent calculations. *Barrier* methods of solution are the principal obstacle to accuracy while *simplex* methods are the principal setback to speed. Novel, not hybrid, methods of solution are needed.

Audio distortion & noise analysis and measurement §8.1-§8.4 was begun 2016. Sinusoid tracking proved superior to Fourier and other filtering methods in 2017. Discerning harmonic and intermodulation distortion of device under test (DUT), from that produced by D/A→DUT→A/D signal chain, was discovered then. By 2018, the preferred "analyzer" had become discrete D/A and A/D converter because commercial analyzers (test gear) could not accept 32-bit inputs required for antidistortion injection. So it was discovered how D/A and A/D could themselves become DUT, opening up analysis to converter chip designers; submeasurable capability never prior had. The term *submeasurable* was introduced in 2019 to define levels below what was then measurable by very best commercial analyzers. Entrepreneurship prohibited publication in those years.

—Jon Dattorro
Stanford, California
2019

Convex Optimization
Euclidean Distance Geometry $^{2\mathcal{E}}$

1 Overview **19**

2 Convex Geometry **31**
2.1 Convex set . . . 31
2.2 Vectorized-matrix inner product . . . 42
2.3 Hulls . . . 50
2.4 Halfspace, Hyperplane . . . 58
2.5 Subspace representations . . . 69
2.6 Extreme, Exposed . . . 74
2.7 Cones . . . 77
2.8 Cone boundary . . . 85
2.9 Positive semidefinite (PSD) cone . . . 90
2.10 Conic independence (c.i.) . . . 111
2.11 When extreme means exposed . . . 115
2.12 Convex polyhedra . . . 116
2.13 Dual cone & generalized inequality . . . 122

3 Geometry of Convex Functions **171**
3.1 Convex real and vector-valued function . . . 171
3.2 Practical norm functions, absolute value . . . 175
3.3 Powers, roots, and inverted functions . . . 183
3.4 Affine function . . . 186
3.5 Epigraph, Sublevel set . . . 189
3.6 Gradient . . . 195
3.7 First-order convexity condition, real function . . . 201
3.8 First-order convexity condition, vector-valued . . . 204
3.9 Second-order convexity condition, real function . . . 205
3.10 Second-order convexity condition, vector-valued . . . 205
3.11 Convex matrix-valued function . . . 206
3.12 First-order convexity condition, matrix-valued . . . 208
3.13 Epigraph of matrix-valued function, sublevel sets . . . 209
3.14 Second-order convexity condition, matrix-valued . . . 209
3.15 Quasiconvex . . . 211
3.16 Salient properties . . . 215

4 Semidefinite Programming **217**
4.1 Conic problem . . . 218
4.2 Framework . . . 224
4.3 Rank reduction . . . 234
4.4 Cardinality reduction . . . 240
4.5 Rank constraint by Convex Iteration . . . 243
4.6 Constraining cardinality . . . 263
4.7 Cardinality and rank constraint examples . . . 274
4.8 Eternity II . . . 296
4.9 Quantum optimization . . . 311
4.10 Constraining rank of indefinite matrices . . . 318
4.11 Convex Iteration rank-1 . . . 322

5 Euclidean Distance Matrix **329**
5.1 EDM . . . 329
5.2 First metric properties . . . 330
5.3 $\exists$ fifth Euclidean metric property . . . 331
5.4 EDM definition . . . 334
5.5 Invariance . . . 358
5.6 Injectivity of $\mathbf{D}$ & unique reconstruction . . . 361
5.7 Embedding in affine hull . . . 366
5.8 Euclidean metric *versus* matrix criteria . . . 370
5.9 Bridge: Convex polyhedra to EDMs . . . 375
5.10 EDM-entry composition . . . 380
5.11 EDM indefiniteness . . . 383
5.12 List reconstruction . . . 387
5.13 Reconstruction examples . . . 391
5.14 Fifth property of Euclidean metric . . . 395

6 Cone of Distance Matrices **403**
6.1 Defining EDM cone . . . 404
6.2 Polyhedral bounds . . . 406
6.3 $\sqrt{\text{EDM}}$ cone is not convex . . . 407
6.4 EDM definition in $\mathbf{11}^{\mathrm{T}}$ . . . 407
6.5 Correspondence to PSD cone $\mathbb{S}_+^{N-1}$ . . . 414
6.6 Vectorization & projection interpretation . . . 418
6.7 A geometry of completion . . . 424
6.8 Dual EDM cone . . . 429
6.9 Theorem of the alternative . . . 441
6.10 Postscript . . . 441

7 Proximity Problems **443**
7.1 First prevalent problem: . . . 448
7.2 Second prevalent problem: . . . 456
7.3 Third prevalent problem: . . . 464
7.4 Conclusion . . . 471

8 Audio Analysis **473**
8.1 Distortion & noise measurement . . . 473
8.2 Harmonic distortion measurement of Audio . . . 473
8.3 Intermodulation distortion measurement of Audio . . . 473
8.4 Distortion & noise test procedures . . . 473