# Solutions for Mid-Term 2

ECE490 Introduction to Optimization

Fall 2018

### 1 Problem 1

- 1. (15 points) Apply Newton's method (in the pure form) to the minimization of the function  $f(x) = x^3$ . Write out the iteration formula and show that Newton's method achieves a linear convergence rate in this case.
- 2. (10 points) Suppose we apply the BFGS method  $x_{k+1} = x_k \alpha_k H_k^{-1} \nabla f(x_k)$  to minimize

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^{\mathsf{T}}Qx$$

where 
$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$
. For simplicity, we start with  $x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\alpha_0 = 0.1$ , and  $H_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . What is  $H_1^{-1}$ ?

### Solution:

1. Newton's method iterates as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - (\nabla^2 f(x_k))^{-1} \nabla f(x_k)$$

Since  $\nabla f(x_k) = 3x_k^2$  and  $\nabla^2 f(x_k) = 6x_k$ , Newton's method actually iterates as

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \left(\frac{1}{6x_k}\right) 3x_k^2 = \frac{1}{2}x_k$$

Therefore, Newton's method converges to the stationary point  $x^* = 0$  at a linear rate  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ .

2. We need to calculate  $s_0 = x_1 - x_0$  and  $y_0 = \nabla f(x_1) - \nabla f(x_0)$ . We have

$$\nabla f(x_0) = Qx_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$x_1 = x_0 - 0.1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 \\ 0.7 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\nabla f(x_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 \\ 0.7 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2.7 \\ 1.8 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$y_0 = \nabla f(x_1) - \nabla f(x_0) = \begin{bmatrix} -3.3 \\ -1.2 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$s_0 = x_1 - x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.6 \\ -0.3 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$H_1^{-1} = \left(I - \frac{s_0 y_0^{\mathsf{T}}}{y_0^{\mathsf{T}} s_0}\right) H_0^{-1} \left(I - \frac{y_0 s_0^{\mathsf{T}}}{y_0^{\mathsf{T}} s_0}\right) + \frac{s_0 s_0^{\mathsf{T}}}{y_0^{\mathsf{T}} s_0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.272 & -0.249 \\ -0.249 & 0.933 \end{bmatrix}$$

## 2 Problem 2

Consider the unconstrained minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ f(x) + \mu \| x \|_1 \right\}$$

where f is L-smooth and m-strongly convex. Suppose  $x^*$  is a point satisfying  $-\nabla f(x^*) \in \partial \mu \|x^*\|_1$ . Apply the proximal gradient method with a constant stepsize  $\alpha$ .

- 1. (5 points) Please write down the proximal gradient method for the above problem.
- 2. (5 points) How to perform the proximal step for the above problem? (Hint: Shrinkage.)
- 3. (15 points) Since f is m-strongly convex and L-smooth, the following inequality holds for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x^*) \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}} \begin{bmatrix} 2mLI & -(m+L)I \\ -(m+L)I & 2I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x - x^* \\ \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(x^*) \end{bmatrix} \le 0$$

Use the above inequality to show the proximal gradient method with stepsize  $\alpha = \frac{1}{L}$  satisfies

$$||x_k - x^*|| \le \left(1 - \frac{m}{L}\right)^k ||x_0 - x^*||$$

#### Solution:

- 1. The proximal gradient method updates as  $x_{k+1} = \text{prox}_{g,\alpha}(x_k \alpha \nabla f(x_k))$  where  $g(x) = \mu ||x||_1$ .
- 2. Denote  $h_k = x_k \alpha \nabla f(x_k)$ . Suppose the *j*-th entry of  $h_k$  is  $h_k^J$ . Then the *j*-th entry of  $x_{k+1}$  is updated using the shrinkage operator as follows

$$x_{k+1}^{j} = \begin{cases} h_{k}^{j} - \mu\alpha & \text{if } h_{k}^{j} \ge \mu\alpha \\ 0 & \text{if } -\mu\alpha < h_{k}^{j} < \mu\alpha \\ h_{k}^{j} + \mu\alpha & \text{if } h_{k}^{j} \le -\mu\alpha \end{cases}$$

3. We can rewrite the proximal gradient method as  $x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha u_k - \alpha r_k$  where  $u_k = \nabla f(x_k)$  and  $r_k \in \partial g(x_{k+1})$ . Since f is m-strongly convex and L-smooth, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_k - x^* \\ \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x^*) \\ r_k - r^* \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}} \begin{bmatrix} 2mLI & -(L+m)I & 0 \\ -(L+m)I & 2I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_k - x^* \\ \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x^*) \\ r_k - r^* \end{bmatrix} \le 0$$

Since g is convex, we directly have  $(r_k - r^*)^{\mathsf{T}}(x_{k+1} - x^*) \ge 0$ . This can be rewritten as a quadratic inequality:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_k - x^* \\ \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x^*) \\ r_k - r^* \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{T}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -I \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha I \\ -I & \alpha I & 2\alpha I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_k - x^* \\ \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x^*) \\ r_k - r^* \end{bmatrix} \le 0$$

Therefore, we have  $||x_{k+1} - x^*||^2 \le \rho^2 ||x_k - x^*||^2$  if there exists non-negative  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - \rho^2 & -\alpha & -\alpha \\ -\alpha & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 \\ -\alpha & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 2mL & -(L+m) & 0 \\ -(m+L) & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \\ -1 & \alpha & 2\alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

For  $\alpha = \frac{1}{L}$ , we can choose  $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{L^2}$  and  $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{L}$  to satisfy the above inequality and show the desired convergence rate.

### 3 Problems 3

1. (10 points) Consider the constrained minimization problem

minimize 
$$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4$$
  
subject to  $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 = 1$ 

Determine all the local mins for the above problem.

2. (15 points) Consider minimizing the function  $f(x) = \frac{\mu}{2} ||x||^2 + \frac{1}{2} ||Ax - b||^2$  where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . This is the so-called ridge regression problem where x is the decision variable. This problem can be rewritten as

minimize  $\frac{\mu}{2} ||x||^2 + \frac{1}{2} ||y - b||^2$ subject to Ax = y

Write out the Lagrangian  $L(x, y, \lambda)$  for the above problem and calculate the related dual function  $D(\lambda) = \min_{x,y} L(x, y, \lambda)$ .

#### Solution:

1. First, we write out the Lagrangian as

$$L(x,\lambda) = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + \lambda(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 - 1)$$

Applying  $\nabla_x L(x^*, \lambda^*) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{split} 1 + 2\lambda^* x_1^* &= 0, \\ 1 + 2\lambda^* x_2^* &= 0, \\ 1 + 2\lambda^* x_3^* &= 0, \\ 1 + 2\lambda^* x_4^* &= 0. \end{split}$$

We also have  $(x_1^*)^2 + (x_2^*)^2 + (x_3^*)^2 + (x_4^*)^2 = 1$ . There are two possible solutions: (i)  $x_1^* = x_2^* = x_3^* = x_4^* = \frac{1}{2}, \ \lambda^* = -1$ ; (ii)  $x_1^* = x_2^* = x_3^* = x_4^* = -\frac{1}{2}, \ \lambda^* = 1$ . Notice  $\nabla_{xx}^2 L(x^*, \lambda^*) = 2\lambda^* I$  which is negative definite for  $\lambda^* = -1$  and positive definite for  $\lambda^* = 1$ . So the only local min is  $x_1^* = x_2^* = x_3^* = x_4^* = -\frac{1}{2}$ .

2. First, we write out the Lagrangian as

$$L(x, y, \lambda) = \frac{\mu}{2} \|x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|y - b\|^2 + \lambda^{\mathsf{T}} (Ax - y)$$

Minimizing L over x and y with fixed  $\lambda$  is a positive definite quadratic minimization problem. We can just set the derivatives to 0 and obtain

$$\nabla_x L(x^*, y^*, \lambda) = 0 \to \mu x^* + A^{\mathsf{T}} \lambda = 0 \to x^* = -\frac{1}{\mu} A^{\mathsf{T}} \lambda$$
$$\nabla_y L(x^*, y^*, \lambda) = 0 \to y^* = b + \lambda$$

Therefore, the dual function can be calculated as

$$D(\lambda) = \frac{\mu\lambda^{\mathsf{T}}AA^{\mathsf{T}}\lambda}{2\mu^2} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\mathsf{T}}\lambda + \lambda^{\mathsf{T}}\left(\frac{-AA^{\mathsf{T}}\lambda}{\mu} - b - \lambda\right) = -\frac{1}{2\mu}\lambda^{\mathsf{T}}AA^{\mathsf{T}}\lambda - \frac{1}{2}\|\lambda\|^2 - \lambda^{\mathsf{T}}b$$

# 4 Problems 4

1. (10 points) What is ADMM? Write down the ADMM update rule for the following problem:

minimize 
$$f(x) + g(y)$$
  
subject to  $Ax + By = c$ 

2. (15 points) Consider the problem  $\min_x \{\mu \| x \|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} (a_i^\mathsf{T} x - b_i)^2 \}$  where  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . This problem can be rewritten as

minimize 
$$\mu \|y\|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x^i)$$
  
subject to  $x^i - y = 0, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ 

where  $f_i(x^i) = \frac{1}{2}(a_i^{\mathsf{T}}x^i - b_i)^2$ , and  $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is a vector having the same dimension as  $a_i$ . The augmented Lagrangian is given by

$$L_{\rho} = \mu \|y\|_{1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ f_{i}(x^{i}) + (\lambda^{i})^{\mathsf{T}}(x^{i} - y) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x^{i} - y\|^{2} \right\}$$

Your task is to write out the ADMM update formula for the above problem. Specifically, express  $x_{k+1}^i$ ,  $y_{k+1}$ , and  $\lambda_{k+1}^i$  as functions of  $x_k^i$ ,  $y_k$ ,  $\lambda_k^i$ ,  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\rho$ . (Hint: use the shrinkage operator for the update of  $y_{k+1}$ .)

#### Solution:

1. ADMM is the alternating direction method of multipliers. It iterates as

$$x_{k+1} = \underset{x}{\arg\min} L_{\rho}(x, y_k, \lambda_k)$$
$$y_{k+1} = \underset{y}{\arg\min} L_{\rho}(x_{k+1}, y, \lambda_k)$$
$$\lambda_{k+1} = \lambda_k + \rho(Ax_{k+1} + By_{k+1} - c)$$

where  $L_{\rho}$  is the augmented Lagrangian defined as

$$L_{\rho}(x, y, \lambda) = f(x) + g(y) + \lambda^{\mathsf{T}}(Ax + By - c) + \frac{\rho}{2} ||Ax + By - c||^{2}.$$

2. By definition, ADMM iterates as

$$x_{k+1}^{i} = \underset{x^{i}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \left\{ f_{i}(x^{i}) + (\lambda_{k}^{i})^{\mathsf{T}}(x^{i} - y_{k}) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x^{i} - y_{k}\|^{2} \right\}$$
$$y_{k+1} = \underset{y}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \left\{ \mu \|y\|_{1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( -(\lambda_{k}^{i})^{\mathsf{T}}y + \frac{\rho}{2} \|x^{i} - y\|^{2} \right) \right\}$$
$$\lambda_{k+1}^{i} = \lambda_{k}^{i} + \rho(x_{k+1}^{i} - y_{k+1})$$

Since  $f_i(x^i) = \frac{1}{2}(a_i^{\mathsf{T}}x^i - b_i)^2$ , we eventually have

$$x_{k+1}^{i} = (a_{i}a_{i}^{\mathsf{T}} + \rho I)^{-1}(a_{i}b_{i} + \rho y_{k} - \lambda_{k}^{i})$$
$$y_{k+1} = S_{\mu/(\rho n)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{k+1}^{i} + \lambda_{k}^{i}/\rho)\right)$$
$$\lambda_{k+1}^{i} = \lambda_{k}^{i} + \rho(x_{k+1}^{i} - y_{k+1})$$

where  $S_{\mu/(\rho n)}$  is the shrinkage operator that shrinks every value between  $-\mu/(\rho n)$  and  $\mu/(\rho n)$  to 0.

[space for Problem 4. ]