

# IOE511 HW10

Tianjian Tang

Winter, 2017

10

1.

(a)

We have  $\frac{1}{2}\|x - d\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}(x - d)^T(x - d) = \frac{1}{2}[x - c - (\frac{1-e^T c}{n}e)]^T[x - c - (\frac{1-e^T c}{n}e)] \Rightarrow$   
 $= \frac{1}{2}(x - c)^T(x - c) - (\frac{1-e^T c}{n})e^T(x - c) + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1-e^T c}{n})^2 e^T e$ , as  $e^T x = 1$ , we can get

$$\min \frac{1}{2}\|x - d\|_2^2 = \min \frac{1}{2}(x - c)^T(x - c) = \min \frac{1}{2}\|x - c\|_2^2$$

So that  $(P_c)$  and  $(P_d)$  have the same optimal solutions.

(b)

As  $e^T d = 1 \Rightarrow e^T x^* = 1, d \geq 0 \Rightarrow x^* \geq 0$ , so that  $x^*$  is a feasible solution.

On the other hand,  $\frac{1}{2}\|x - d\|_2^2 \geq 0, \frac{1}{2}\|x^* - d\|_2^2 = 0 \Rightarrow x^*$  is an optimal solution.

(c)

We have  $\nabla g_i(x) = e_i$ , which are linearly independent. So that  $x^*$  must satisfy KKT conditions:  $\nabla f(x) + \sum u_i \nabla g_i(x) + v \nabla h(x) = 0, u_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n, u_i g_i(x) = 0. \Rightarrow$

$x_i - d_i - u_i + v = 0, i = 1, \dots, n$ . By combining all  $n$  equations we can get  $v = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \geq 0$ . If  $x_j^* > 0$ , then  $u_j^* = 0$ , we have  $x_j - d_j - u_j + v > 0$ , yielding the contradiction needed. So that  $x_j^* = 0$ .

(d)

Calculate  $d$ , if  $d \geq 0$ , then  $x^* = d$ . Otherwise, set  $x_j^* = 0$  for  $d_j < 0$ . Eliminate  $x_j, d_j$  in the objective function to form a new function  $\frac{1}{2}\|x - c_2\|_2^2$ , where  $c_2$  is  $d$  eliminating negative entries. It's trivial to see  $x_i^*$ , where  $i \neq j$  in the original problem is the same as the new optimal  $x_i^*$  in the new problem. Then calculate  $d_2$  and repeat the step. At each step, at least one  $x_i^*$  can be found so that it takes at most  $n$  steps to find all  $x_i^*$ .

$nv = \sum u_i$

10

2.

If  $C = D$ , it's trivial to see  $S_C(y) = S_D(y)$ .

For  $S_C(y) = S_D(y)$ , if  $C \neq D$ , without loss of generality, assume there exists  $x^* \in C, x^* \notin D$ , as  $D$  is a closed convex set, then there exists  $p \neq 0$  and  $\alpha$ , such that for all  $x$  in  $D, p^T x < \alpha$ , and  $p^T x^* > \alpha$ . As  $x^* \in C$ , we have  $S_C(p) > S_D(p)$ , yielding the contradiction needed.

3.

We have

$$L^*(u) = \inf_{x \in X} f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(x) \leq \inf_{x \in \bar{X}} f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(x) \leq \inf_{x \in \bar{X}} f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^r g_i(x) = \bar{L}^*(u),$$

so that  $L^*(u) \leq \bar{L}^*(u)$  for all  $u$ . So that  $v^* = \sup_u L^*(u) \leq \sup_u \bar{L}^*(u) = \bar{v}^*$ .  
Combining weak duality, we can get  $v^* \leq \bar{v}^* \leq f^*$ .

4.

(a)

Approach 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min f_1(x) \\ & s.t. \quad -f_j(x) - b_j \leq 0, j = 2, \dots, s \\ & \quad \quad g_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

Approach 2:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \sum_{j=1}^s w_j f_j(x) \\ & s.t. \quad g_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

(b)

Suppose the optimal solution for Approach 2 is  $\bar{x}$ , then we can find corresponding target level for approach 1 which is  $b_j = f_j(\bar{x})$ .

It's trivial to see that  $\bar{x}$  is a feasible solution in Approach 1. If  $\bar{x}$  is not an optimal solution, then we can find  $\hat{x}$  such that  $f(\hat{x}) < f(\bar{x})$  and satisfies all the constraints in Approach 1. So that  $\sum_{j=1}^s w_j f_j(\hat{x}) < \sum_{j=1}^s w_j f_j(\bar{x})$ , and  $\hat{x}$  satisfy all the constraints in Approach 2, which means  $\bar{x}$  is not an optimal solution for Approach 2, yielding the contradiction needed.

(c)

Approach 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla f_1(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=2}^s \nabla f_i(\bar{x}) u_i + \sum_{j=1}^m \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) v_j = 0, \\ & [u \ v]^T \geq 0, \\ & u_i f_i(\bar{x}) = 0, i = 2, \dots, s, v_j g_j(\bar{x}) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

Approach 2:

$$\sum_{i=1}^s w_i f_i(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \nabla g_j(\bar{x}) v_j = 0,$$

$$v \geq 0,$$

$$v_j g_j(x) = 0, j = 1, \dots, m$$

(d)

Suppose the optimal solution for approach 1 is  $\bar{x}$ , then it satisfies the first order necessary conditions. Let  $\frac{w_i}{w_1} = u_i, i = 2, \dots, s$ , as Approach 2 is now a convex problem, we can find that  $\bar{x}$  satisfies KKT sufficient conditions. So that  $\bar{x}$  is an optimal solution in Approach 2.

5.

As  $f(x), h(x)$  are all convex,  $x_{ij}$  evidently belongs to a convex set, the problem is a convex problem. From KKT sufficient condition, we have  $\nabla f(x) + u \nabla h(x) = 0$ , that is for any  $x_{ij}, \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{ij}} + u_i(-1) + u_j(1) = 0 \Rightarrow v_i - v_j - u_i + u_j = 0$ . So that for the solution  $\bar{x}$  we can find  $u_i = v_i$  for all  $i$ , such that  $\bar{x}$  satisfies KKT sufficient condition.  $\Rightarrow \bar{x}$  is an optimal solution. If there is another optimal solution, as all constraints are linear, it must satisfy KKT necessary condition, which are the same conditions that will lead to  $\bar{x}$ . So that  $\bar{x}$  is the unique solution.