1. 

(a)

Substituting $v_{k}=(1+\beta) x_{k}-\beta x_{k-1}$ and $x_{k+1}=(1+\beta) x_{k}-\beta x_{k-1}-\alpha \nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(x_{k}-v_{k}\right)+\frac{m}{2}\left\|x_{k}-v_{k}\right\|^{2}+\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(v_{k}-x_{k+1}\right)-\frac{L}{2}\left\|v_{k}-x_{k+1}\right\|^{2} \\
= & \beta \nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(x_{k-1}-x_{k}\right)+\frac{m \beta^{2}}{2}\left\|x_{k-1}-x_{k}\right\|^{2}+\alpha\left\|\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)\right\|^{2}-\frac{L \alpha^{2}}{2}\left\|\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)\right\|^{2} \\
= & {\left.\left[\begin{array}{c}
x_{k}-x^{*} \\
x_{k-1}-x^{*} \\
\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right]^{\top}\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\beta^{2} m & -\beta^{2} m & -\beta \\
\frac{\beta^{2}}{2}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\beta^{2} m & \beta \\
-\beta & \beta
\end{array}\right](2-L \alpha)
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{p}\right)\left[\begin{array}{c}
x_{k}-x^{*} \\
x_{k-1}-x^{*} \\
\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we have

$$
X_{1}=\frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\beta^{2} m & -\beta^{2} m & -\beta \\
-\beta^{2} m & \beta^{2} m & \beta \\
-\beta & \beta & \alpha(2-L \alpha)
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{p}
$$

(b)

Substituting $v_{k}=(1+\beta) x_{k}-\beta x_{k-1}$ and $x_{k+1}=(1+\beta) x_{k}-\beta x_{k-1}-\alpha \nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(x^{*}-v_{k}\right)+\frac{m}{2}\left\|x^{*}-v_{k}\right\|^{2}+\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left(v_{k}-x_{k+1}\right)-\frac{L}{2}\left\|v_{k}-x_{k+1}\right\|^{2} \\
= & -\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)^{\top}\left((1+\beta)\left(x_{k}-x^{*}\right)-\beta\left(x_{k-1}-x^{*}\right)\right)+\frac{m}{2}\left\|(1+\beta)\left(x_{k}-x^{*}\right)-\beta\left(x_{k-1}-x^{*}\right)\right\|^{2} \\
& +\alpha\left\|\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)\right\|^{2}-\frac{L \alpha^{2}}{2}\left\|\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)\right\|^{2} \\
= & {\left[\begin{array}{c}
x_{k}-x^{*} \\
x_{k-1}-x^{*} \\
\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right]^{\top}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
(1+\beta)^{2} m & -\beta(1+\beta) m & -(1+\beta) \\
-\beta(1+\beta) m & \beta^{2} m & \beta \\
-(1+\beta) & \beta & \alpha(2-L \alpha)
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{p}\right)\left[\begin{array}{c}
x_{k}-x^{*} \\
x_{k-1}-x^{*} \\
\nabla f\left(v_{k}\right)
\end{array}\right] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we have

$$
X_{2}=\frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
(1+\beta)^{2} m & -\beta(1+\beta) m & -(1+\beta) \\
-\beta(1+\beta) m & \beta^{2} m & \beta \\
-(1+\beta) & \beta & \alpha(2-L \alpha)
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{p}
$$

(c)

Now it is straightforward to verify that the following holds

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}
A^{\top} P A-\rho^{2} P & A^{\top} P B \\
B^{\top} P A & B^{\top} P B
\end{array}\right]-X=\frac{\sqrt{m}(\sqrt{L}-\sqrt{m})^{3}}{2(L+\sqrt{L m})}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
-1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right] \otimes I_{p} \leq 0
$$

This above fact can be verified using Matlab symbolic toolbox.
(d)

To guarantee $f\left(x_{T}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right) \leq \varepsilon$, we can use the bound $f\left(x_{T}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right) \leq C\left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right)^{k}$. If we choose $T$ such that $C\left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right)^{T} \leq \varepsilon$, then we guarantee $f\left(x_{T}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right) \leq \varepsilon$. Notice $C\left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right)^{k} \leq \varepsilon$ is equivalent to

$$
\log C+k \log \left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right) \leq \log (\varepsilon)
$$

The above inequality is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \geq-\log \left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right) / \log \left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice we have $\sqrt{\frac{L}{m}} \geq-1 / \log \left(1-\sqrt{\frac{m}{L}}\right)$. Therefore, we can choose $T=O\left(\sqrt{\frac{L}{m}} \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$ to guarantee $f\left(x_{T}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right) \leq \varepsilon$.
2.
(a)

A Matlab code is provided on the course website. From Figure 1, we can see Heavy-ball method performs best for the positive definite quadratic minimization problem. Nesterov's accelerated method performs also well, and is just worse than Heavy-ball method by a constant factor. When the condition number is large, the gradient method is very slow. But Nesterov's method and Heavy-ball method still work well.

Finally, another thing worth mentioning is that the iteration complexity is independent of the problem dimension $p$. We can also see this in the plots. When $p$ is changed and the condition number is fixed, the required iteration number does not change.


Figure 1. In the simulations, we vary $p, m$, and $L$. The condition number for the plots in the first row is small, i.e. $L / m=10$. The condition number of the plots in the second row is large, i.e. $L / m=10000$. Then the gradient method becomes extremely slow.
(b) A Matlab code for this problem is also posted on the course website. From the simulation, we can see that Heavy-ball method with the given parameters does not converge. Although Heavy-ball method with these parameter choices works well for the positive definite quadratic minimization problem, it is not guaranteed to work for optimization of all smooth strongly-convex functions. Both the gradient method and Nesterov's method still work well for this example, as guaranteed by the iteration complexity theory.


Figure 2. Heavy-ball method does not converge in this case.

