

# MATH60005/70005: Optimisation (Autumn 23-24)

## Week 8: Problem Session

Dr Dante Kalise, Dr Estefanía Loayza-Romero and Sara Bicego  
Department of Mathematics  
Imperial College London, United Kingdom  
{dkaliseb,kloayzar,s.bicego21}@imperial.ac.uk

1. Derive the orthogonal projection formula for a closed ball centered at  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $B[\mathbf{x}_0, r]$ .
2. Show that the stationarity condition over the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , that is,

$$\min\{f(\mathbf{x}) : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1\}$$

is given by  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$ , or  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| = 1$  and there exists  $\lambda \leq 0$  such that  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \lambda \mathbf{x}^*$ .

3. Consider the minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & 2x_1^2 + 3x_2^2 + 4x_3^2 + 2x_1x_2 - 2x_1x_3 - 8x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

- Show that the vector  $(\frac{17}{7}, 0, \frac{6}{7})^\top$  is an optimal solution.
- Implement a projected gradient method with constant stepsize  $\frac{1}{L}$ , where  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of the gradient of the function.

## Solutions

1. We need to solve the problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_0\| \leq r.$$

Using the change of variables  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0$ , then, then problem can be rewritten as

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}} \|\mathbf{z} - (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{z}\| \leq r,$$

Notice that the optimal solution of the last problem is  $\mathbb{P}_{B[0,r]}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}_{B[\mathbf{x}_0,r]} = \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbb{P}_{B[0,r]}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)$$



Therefore, we only need to derive an expression for  $\mathbb{P}_{B[0,r]}(\mathbf{x})$ . This problem can be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq r^2,$$

which in turn – by expanding the square and  $\|\mathbf{y}\| \leq r \iff \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq r^2$  – becomes

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}} \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - 2\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq r^2.$$

If  $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq r$ , then  $\mathbb{P}_{B[0,r]} = \mathbf{x}$ . On the other hand, when  $\|\mathbf{x}\| > r$  we know that  $\mathbf{y}$  lies in the boundary, hence  $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2 = r^2$ . Thus, the optimization problem reduces to

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}} \left\{ -2\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y} \right\} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 = r^2.$$

Now, we will find a lower bound of the objective function using Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$-2\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{x} \geq -2\|\mathbf{y}\|\|\mathbf{x}\| = -2r\|\mathbf{x}\|$$

which is attained at  $\mathbf{y} = -r \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}$ . Summarizing,

$$\mathbb{P}_{B[0,r]}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}, & \text{if } \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq r, \\ r \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_{B[\mathbf{x}_0,r]}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}, & \text{if } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\| \leq r, \\ \mathbf{x}_0 + r \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\|}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. Using the definition of stationarity of  $\mathbf{x}^*$  over the unit ball, we have:

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in B[0,1].$$

This is equivalent to claim that

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in B[0,1]} \left\{ \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*) \right\} \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

**Lemma:** For any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$\min_{\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1} \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} = -\|\mathbf{a}\|$$

which is attained at  $\mathbf{x}^* = -\frac{\mathbf{a}}{\|\mathbf{a}\|}$ . This can be shown as

$$\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} \geq -\|\mathbf{a}\|\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq -\|\mathbf{a}\|.$$

On one hand, the Lemma implies that (1) is equivalent to  $-\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top \mathbf{x}^* \geq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\|$ . On the other hand, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$-\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top \mathbf{x}^* \leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\| \|\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\|$$

as  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq 1$ . This leads to

$$-\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top \mathbf{x}^* = \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\|. \quad (2)$$

We now discuss two different cases:



a)  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$  (and  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\| \leq 1$ )  $\implies$  (2) holds;

b)  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) \neq 0 \implies \|\mathbf{x}^*\| = 1$  and then

$$-\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top \mathbf{x}^* = \underbrace{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*)\| \|\mathbf{x}^*\|}_1 \iff \exists \lambda \leq 0 \text{ s.t. } \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \lambda \mathbf{x}^*$$

3. see week8.m

### Extra exercise (7)

Given  $f, g$  convex functions over  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  convex set, suppose  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a solution of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in X} f(\mathbf{x}) \text{ subject to } g(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \quad (3)$$

that satisfies  $g(\mathbf{x}^*) < 0$ . Show that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is also a solution of

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in X} f(\mathbf{x}).$$

We assume there exists  $\mathbf{y} \in X \cap \{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}$  such that  $f(\mathbf{y}) < f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ . Both  $\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y} \in X$ , which is convex, and  $g(\mathbf{x}^*) < 0$  while  $g(\mathbf{y}) > 0$ . Due to continuity of  $g$ , we have that there exists a  $\mathbf{z} \in [\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}] \in X$  such that  $g(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ , with  $\mathbf{z} = \lambda \mathbf{y} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{x}^*$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $f$  is a convex function, we have

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = f(\mathbf{x}^* + \lambda(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}^*)) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^*) + \underbrace{\lambda}_{>0} \overbrace{(f(\mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}^*))}^{>0 \text{ by assumption}} < f(\mathbf{x}^*),$$

thus  $f(\mathbf{z}) < f(\mathbf{x}^*)$  for a  $\mathbf{z} \in X$  such that  $g(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{z}$  belongs to the feasible set of (3), this leads to a contradiction to the optimality of  $\mathbf{x}^*$  for (3).

