

Lecture 19:

Introduction to Optimization

Computer Graphics
CMU 15-462/15-662, Fall 2015

Assignment 4 out today!



Last time: physically-based animation

- **Use dynamics to drive motion**
- **Complexity from simple models**
- **Technique: numerical integration**
 - **formulate equations of motion**
 - **take little steps forward in time**
 - **general, powerful tool**
- **Today: numerical optimization**
 - **another general, powerful tool**
 - **basic idea: “ski downhill” to get a better solution**
 - **used everywhere in graphics (not just animation)**
 - **image processing, geometry, rendering, ...**




What is an optimization problem?

- Natural human desire: find the best solution among all possibilities (subject to certain constraints)
- E.g., cheapest flight, shortest route, tastiest restaurant ...
- Has been studied since antiquity, e.g., isoperimetric problem:

"The first optimization problem known in history was practically solved by Dido, a clever Phoenician princess, who left her Tyrian home and emigrated to North Africa, with all her property and a large retinue, because her brother Pygmalion murdered her rich uncle and husband Acerbas, and plotted to defraud her of the money which he left. On landing in a bay about the middle of the north coast of Africa she obtained a grant from Hiarbas, the native chief of the district, of as much land as she could enclose with an ox-hide. She cut the ox-hide into an exceedingly long strip, and succeeded in enclosing between it and the sea a very valuable territory on which she build Carthage."


—Lord Kelvin, 1893

"Obvious" solution is a circle...



...but wait, what about the coastline?

Optimization in Graphics



Sumit Jain, Yuting Ye, and C. Karen Liu, *"Optimization-based Interactive Motion Synthesis"*


Optimization in Graphics




Niloy J. Mitra, Leonidas Guibas, Mark Pauly, “Symmetrization”

Optimization in Graphics

optimized result



© Disney, ETH zürich



Moritz Bächer, Emily Whiting, Bernd Bickel, Olga Sorkine-Hornung,
"Spin-It: Optimizing Moment of Inertia for Spinnable Objects"

Optimization in Graphics




Nobuyuki Umetani, Yuki Koyama, Ryan Schmidt & Takeo Igarashi,
"Pteromys: Interactive Design and Optimization of Free-formed Free-flight Model Airplanes"

Continuous vs. Discrete Optimization

■ DISCRETE:

- domain is a discrete set (e.g., finite or integers)
- Example: best vegetable to put in a stew
 - Basic strategy? Try them all! (exponential)
 - sometimes clever strategy (e.g., MST)
 - more often, NP-hard (e.g., TSP)



■ CONTINUOUS:

- domain is not discrete (e.g., real numbers)
- Example: best temperature to cook an egg
- still many (NP-)hard problems, but also large classes of “easy” problems (e.g., convex)



Optimization Problem in Standard Form

- Can formulate most continuous optimization problems this way:

“objective”: how much does solution x cost?

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f_0(x) \\ \text{subject to} & f_i(x) \leq b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{array}$$


$(f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad i = 0, \dots, m)$
often (but not always) continuous, differentiable, ...

“constraints”: what must be true about x ? (“ x is feasible”)

- **Optimal solution x^* has smallest value of f_0 among all feasible x**
- **Q: What if we want to *maximize* something instead?**
- **A: Just flip the sign of the objective!**
- **Q: What if we want *equality* constraints, rather than inequalities?**
- **A: Include two constraints: $g(x) \leq c$ and $g(x) \leq -c$**


Local vs. Global Minima

- *Global* minimum is absolute best among all possibilities
- *Local* minimum is best “among immediate neighbors”



Philosophical question: does a local minimum “solve” the problem?
Depends on the problem! (E.g., real protein folding is *local* minimum)
Other times, local minima can be really bad (e.g., path planning)

Optimization Problem, Visualized



$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} \quad & x_1^2 - x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Q: Is this an optimization problem in standard form?


A: Yes.

Q: Where is the optimal solution?

A: There are two, $(0,1)$, $(0,-1)$.

Existence & Uniqueness of Minimizers

- Already saw that (global) minimizer is not unique.
- Does it always exist? Why?
- Just consider all possibilities and take the smallest one, right?



- **WRONG!** Not all objectives are bounded from below.
- It's like that old adage: *"no matter how good you are, there will always be someone better than you."*

Feasibility

- Ok, but suppose the objective is bounded from below.
- Then we can just take the best feasible solution, right?

value of objective doesn't depend on x ;
all feasible solutions are equally good

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & 0 \\ \text{subject to} & f_i(x) \leq b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{array}$$


problem now is just finding a feasible solution—
which can be really hard (or impossible!)

- Not if there aren't any!
- Every system of equations is an optimization problem.
- But not all problems have solutions!
- (You'll appreciate this more as you get older.)

Feasibility - Example

Q: Is this problem feasible?


$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} & \sin(x_1) + x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & (x_1 - 2)^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1, \\ & x_1 \leq -1 \end{array}$$



A: No—the two sublevel sets (points where $f_i(x) \leq 0$) have no common points, i.e., they do not overlap.

Existence & Uniqueness of Minimizers, cont.


- Even being bounded from below is not enough:



- No matter how big x is, we never achieve the lower bound (0)
- So when does a solution exist? Two *sufficient* conditions:
- *Extreme value theorem*: continuous objective & compact domain
- *Coercivity*: objective goes to $+\infty$ as we travel (far) in any direction

Characterization of Minimizers


- Ok, so we have some sense of when a minimizer might *exist*
- But how do we know a given point x is a minimizer?



- Checking if a point is a global minimizer is (generally) hard
- But we can certainly test if a point is a local minimum (ideas?)
- (Note: a global minimum is also a local minimum!)

Characterization of Local Minima

- Consider an objective $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. How do you find a minimum?
- (Hint: you may have memorized this formula in high school!)



- Also need to check *second* derivative (how?)
- Make sure it's *positive*
- Ok, but what does this all mean for more general functions f_0 ?

must also satisfy

$$f''_0(x^*) \geq 0$$

Optimality Conditions (Unconstrained)

- In general, our objective is $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ (goes to \mathbb{R}^n , not just \mathbb{R})
- How do we test for a local minimum?
- 1st derivative becomes *gradient*; 2nd derivative becomes *Hessian*

$$\nabla f := \begin{bmatrix} \partial f / \partial x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \partial f / \partial x_n \end{bmatrix}$$

GRADIENT
(measures "slope")

$$\nabla^2 f := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n} \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

HESSIAN
(measures "curvature")

- Optimality conditions?

$$\nabla f_0(x^*) = 0$$

1st order


$$\nabla^2 f_0(x^*) \succeq 0$$

2nd order

positive semidefinite (PSD)
($u^T A u \geq 0$ for all u)

Optimality Conditions (Constrained)

- What if we have constraints?
- Is gradient at minimizer still zero?
- Is Hessian at minimizer still PSD?
- Not necessarily! (See example above)
- In general, any (local or global) minimizer must *at least* satisfy the *Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT)* conditions:



$$\exists \lambda_i \text{ s.t. } \nabla f_0(x^*) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \nabla f_i(x^*) \quad \text{stationarity}$$

$$f_i(x^*) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \text{primal feasibility}$$




$$\lambda_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \text{dual feasibility}$$

$$\lambda_i f_i(x^*) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \text{complementary slackness}$$

- ...we won't work with these in this class!
(But good to know where to look.)

Convex Optimization

- Special class of problems that are almost always “easy” to solve (polynomial-time!)
- Problem *convex* if it has a convex domain *and* convex objective



- Why care about convex problems in graphics?
 - can make guarantees about solution (always the best)
 - doesn't depend on initialization (strong convexity)
 - often quite efficient, but not always

Convex Quadratic Objectives & Linear Systems

- Very important example: convex *quadratic* objective
- Already saw this with, e.g., quadric error simplification
- Valuable “*variational*” way of looking at many common equations
- Can be expressed via positive-semidefinite (PSD) matrix:

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - x^T b, \quad A \succeq 0$$

- Q: 1st-order optimality condition?


$$Ax = b$$

just solve a linear system!


- Q: 2nd-order optimality condition?

$$A \succeq 0$$


satisfied by definition



positive definite



positive semidefinite



indefinite

**Sadly, life is not usually that easy.
How do we solve optimization
problems in general?**


Descent Methods

An idea as old as the hills:



Gradient Descent (1D)

- Basic idea: follow the gradient “downhill” until it’s zero
- (Zero gradient was our 1st-order optimality condition)




- Do we always end up at a (global) minimum?
- How do we compute gradient descent in practice?

Gradient Descent Algorithm (1D)

- Did you notice that gradient descent equation is an ODE?
- Q: How do we solve it numerically? $\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = -f'_0(x(t))$
- One way: forward Euler:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \tau f'_0(x_k)$$

- Q: How do we pick the time step?
- If we're not careful, we'll go zipping all over the place; won't make any progress.



- Basic idea: use “*step control*” to determine step size based on value of objective & derivatives.
- A careful strategy (e.g., Armijo-Wolfe) can guarantee convergence at least to a *local* minimum.
- For now we will do something simpler: make τ *really small*!

Gradient Descent Algorithm (nD)

- Q: How do we write gradient descent equation in general?


$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = -\nabla f_0(x(t))$$

- Q: What's the corresponding discrete update?

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \tau \nabla f_0(x_k)$$

- Basic challenge in nD:


- solution can “oscillate”
- takes many, many small steps
- very slow to converge



Higher Order Descent

- General idea: apply a coordinate transformation so that the local energy landscape looks more like a “round bowl”
- Gradient now points directly toward nearby minimizer
- Most basic strategy: Newton’s method:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \underbrace{\tau(\nabla^2 f_0(x_k))^{-1}}_{\text{Hessian inverse}} \underbrace{\nabla f_0(x_k)}_{\text{gradient}}$$




- Great for convex problems (even proofs about # of steps!)
- For nonconvex problems, need to be more careful
- In general, nonconvex optimization is a *BLACK ART*
- Meta-strategy: try lots of solvers, see what works!
 - quasi-Newton, trust region, L-BFGS, ...

Example: Inverse Kinematics




Forward Kinematics

- Many systems well-described by a *kinematic chain*
 - collection of rigid bodies, connected by joints
 - joints have various behaviors (ball, piston, ...)
 - also have constraints (e.g., range of angles)
 - hierarchical structure (body → leg → foot)
- In animation, often called a *rig*
- How do we specify the configuration of a “rig”?
 - One way: artist sets each joint individually
 - Another way: ...optimization!



Simple Kinematic Chain



- Consider a simple path-like chain in 2D
- Q: How do we write p_1 in terms of the root position p_0 , angles, & vectors $u := c_{i+1} - c_i$?


$$p_1 = p_0 + \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_0 & \sin \theta_0 \\ -\sin \theta_0 & \cos \theta_0 \end{bmatrix} u_0$$

- (For brevity, can use complex numbers:)

$$p_1 = p_0 + e^{i\theta_0} u_0$$

- Q: How about p_2 ?

$$p_2 = p_0 + e^{i\theta_0} u_0 + e^{i\theta_0} e^{i\theta_1} u_1$$



Simple IK Algorithm

- **Basic idea behind our IK algorithm:**
 - **write down distance between final point and “target”**
 - **compute gradient with respect to angles**
 - **apply gradient descent**


- **Objective?**

$$f_0(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} |\tilde{p}_n - p_n|^2$$

- **Constraints?**

- **None! The joint angle can take any value.**
- **Though we could limit joint angles (for instance)**

Coming up next: PDEs in Computer Graphics



Frank Losasso, Jerry O. Talton, Nipun Kwatra, and Ron Fedkiw, *"Two-Way Coupled SPH and Particle Level Set Fluid Simulation"*