COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

Math 650 – Optimization January 2000 (Osman Güler)

INSTRUCTIONS:

You must answer Questions 1 (30 points), 2 (35 points), and 3 (15 points). Choose either Question 4 or 5 (20 points each). The exam is worth 100 points. You must show all your work for full credit!

Q1. Consider the convex programming problem

min
$$(x_1 - 3)^2 + (x_2 - 2)^2$$

subject to $x_1^2 + x_2^2 \le 5$
 $x_1 + 2x_2 \le 4$ (P)
 $x_1 \ge 0, x_2 \ge 0.$

- (a) Note that the optimal solution to the above problem is the projection from a certain point in the plane to the convex region defined by the constraints. Sketch the constraint region and use it to numerically determine the optimal solution $x^* = (x_1^*, x_2^*)$.
- (b) (i) Write down the Lagrangian function for the optimization problem; (ii) write down the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions; (iii) use the KKT conditions to numerically determine the Kuhn–Tucker (Lagrange) multipliers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ at the optimal solution x^* in (a);
- (c) (i) Use the Lagrangian in (b) to determine the dual program (D) explicitly as a maximization problem in which only the variables λ appear.
- (d) Give a theoretical reason as to why the duality gap $\min(P) \sup(D)$ is zero, or if it is not, explain why not. (You may use a theorem proved in class relevant to the situation at hand, but state carefully the theorem.)

Q2. Consider the optimization problem (P) $\min\{f(x) : g_i(x) \le 0, i = 1, ..., m\}$ in which all the functions f, g_i are differentiable. Denote the feasible region $\mathcal{F} = \{x : g_i(x) \le 0, i = 1, ..., m\}$.

- (a) Write down the Fritz John (FJ) conditions and the KKT conditions at a local minimizer x^* of (P).
- (b) Suppose that the functions $g_i(x)$ are convex, and that there exists a feasible point $x^0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g_i(x^0) < 0, i = 1, ..., m$. Prove that a constraint qualification is satisfied, so that the KKT conditions are satisfied at any local minimizer $x^* \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (c) Now, consider the optimization problem in Problem 1 above, except that the objective function is now min $-(x_1 3)^2 (x_2 2)^2$ (that is, we are now maximizing the objective function in Problem 1). Use the results of (b) to show that the KKT conditions are satisfied at each local optimizer.
- (d) Show that the KKT conditions are satisfied at the point (i) (0,0); (ii) (0,2).

(e) State second order *necessary* and *sufficient* conditions for optimality at a KKT point. Use these to investigate whether (i) the 2nd order sufficient conditions are satisfied at (0,0);
(ii) whether the 2nd order necessary and sufficient conditions are satisfied KKT conditions at (0,2).

Q3. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function with continuous second order partial derivatives. Consider the following three conditions: (i) f is convex; (ii) $f(y) \ge f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$; (iii) the Hessian Hf(x) is positive semidefinite for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Prove the following results.

- (a) (i) implies (ii)
- (b) (ii) implies (i)
- (c) (iii) implies (ii).

Q4. Recall that if K is a convex body (that is, a compact convex set) in \mathbb{R}^n containing the origin in its interior, then its *polar* is defined to be the convex body

$$K^* := \{ c \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle c, x \rangle \le 1 \quad \forall x \in K \}.$$

Now consider the triangle

$$K = \{ (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 + x_2 \le 1, -x_1 + x_2 \le 1, -x_2 \le 1 \}.$$

Prove that its polar is given by

$$K^* = \{y_1(1,1) + y_2(-1,1) + y_3(0,-1) : y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \le 1, y_i \ge 0, i = 1, 2, 3\}$$

Consequently, show $K^* = conv(\{(1,1), (-1,1), (0,-1)\})$ is the triangle with the vertices (1,1), (-1,1), and (0,-1).

Hint: Interpret K^* as one part of Farkas Lemma: if (x_1, x_2) satisfies the three linear inequalities in the definition of K, then (x_1, x_2) must also satisfy $c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 \leq 1$. Alternatively, use linear programming duality.

Q5. Consider the set $K := \{x : Ax < 0\}$ where A is an $m \times n$ matrix.

(a) Show, by elementary arguments (that is, using no convexity), that $K = \emptyset$ if and only if

$$\{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y_i < 0, i = 1, \dots, m\} \cap \{Ax : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \emptyset.$$
(1)

(b) Assuming (1) is true, show by a separation argument, that there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$a \ge 0, \quad a \ne 0, \quad A^T a = 0. \tag{2}$$

(c) Combine (a) and (b) to prove that $\{x : Ax < 0\} = \emptyset$ if and only if the zero vector is in the convex hull of the rows of A.

Remark: (c) is Gordan's lemma used in proving Fritz John's conditions.