$$(5.4) (\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \ge g(\lambda(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \le g(\lambda L(x) + (1-\lambda)f(y))$$

$$\le \lambda g(f(x)) + (1-\lambda)g(f(y))$$

$$= \lambda (3.4) (4) + (1-\lambda)(6.4) (5) //$$

$$x^{(2)} = x^{(1)} = \widetilde{T} \cdot \nabla \mu(x^{(1)})$$
$$= (-2, 0)$$
$$= (-2, 0)$$

c) No, because it's going to licep alternating between (-2,-1) and (-2,0).

This happens because the learning nate is too high so me overshoot the actual solution to the problem and get stuck in a loop.

An obvious solution to this problem would be to use other methods of implementing gradient descent, such as adaptive g.d. or other mone advanced methods, or simply using a smaller learning nate such as 0.1.

(1) a) The sheded negion isn't corner since you can draw a lime between two points in s and verify that the nearthy line ism't contained in S. For example, $(1,3.5) \rightarrow (3.5,6)$.

take the formal definition.

· S is connex iff
$$\forall x,y \in S: \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y \in S$$
, $\lambda \in [0,1]$

$$1/2 \cdot (1,3.5) + 1/2 (3.5,6) = (0.5 + 1.75, 1.75 + 3) = (2.25, 1.75)$$

does not woult in a point contained in 5, which is equivelent to swying 5 is not convex

Simu the algorithm only works in convex regions, we assume it ignores the epistance of local minima. Such that the early way of using it to compute the global minimum of 5, would be to break 5 who convex regions and applying the afforthem individually to each regions' By comparing the solutions computed, it would be possible to compute he global minimum our S.

