CSED490Y: Optimization for Machine Learning Week 03-2: Convex optimization

Namhoon Lee

POSTECH

Spring 2022



 C^0 definition of convex functions

$$\checkmark f(\theta x_1 + (1-\theta)x_2) \leq \theta f(x_1) + (1-\theta)f(x_2) \ , \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } 0 \leq \theta \leq 1 \ .$$



 C^1 definition of convex functions





 C^2 definition of convex functions

$$P_{\overline{f}(x)}^{2} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \overline{f}}{\partial x_{2} \partial x_{3}} \end{bmatrix} \qquad M \succeq 0 \qquad : \qquad M \qquad is partime remidetingent of M, \ \lambda_{7} = 1, \dots, n^{2}$$

$$\nabla^{2} f(x) \succeq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}. \qquad \lambda_{7} \ge 0$$

$$Heisiun$$

Show that the C^2 definition is equivalent to the C^1 definition.

Show that the C^2 definition is equivalent to the C^1 definition.

First, let's recall the fundamental theorem of calculus:

$$\int_0^1 \underbrace{F'(t)}_{=} dt = \underbrace{F(1)}_{=} - \underbrace{F(0)}_{=}$$

$$\int x^{2} dx = \frac{1}{3} x^{3} \Big|_{0}^{2} = \frac{1}{3}$$

Show that the C^2 definition is equivalent to the C^1 deifnition.

6

First, let's recall the fundamental theorem of calculus:

Now consider the following:

$$\int_{0}^{1} F'(t) dt = F(1) - F(0)$$

$$\int_{0}^{1} (x - y)^{\top} \nabla^{2} f(tx + (1 - t)y) dt =$$

$$F(t) = F(1) - F(0)$$

Show that the C^2 definition is equivalent to the C^1 deifnition.

First, let's recall the fundamental theorem of calculus:

$$\int_0^1 F'(t)dt = F(1) - F(0)$$

Now consider the following:

$$\int_0^1 (x-y)^\top \nabla^2 f(tx+(1-t)y) dt = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \left(\nabla f(tx+(1-t)y) \right) dt$$

Show that the C^2 definition is equivalent to the C^1 deifnition.

First, let's recall the fundamental theorem of calculus:

$$\int_0^1 F'(t)dt = F(1) - F(0)$$

Now consider the following:

$$\int_0^1 (x-y)^\top \nabla^2 f(tx+(1-t)y) dt = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \left(\nabla f(\underline{t}x+(1-\underline{t})y) \right) dt = \underline{\nabla}f(x) - \underline{\nabla}f(y)$$

Multiplying by x - y both sides gives

$$\int_0^1 (x-y)^\top \nabla^2 f(tx+(1-t)y)(x-y)dt = \langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), \underline{x-y} \rangle$$

Multiplying by x - y both sides gives

$$\int_{0}^{1} (x-y)^{\top} \nabla^{2} f(tx+(1-t)y)(x-y) dt = \langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x-y \rangle$$

By applying C^2 definition, we obtain



$$\int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \quad f((y-x)t+x)$$

$$\int_{0}^{t} F(t) dt = F(t) - F(0)$$

$$\int_0^1 \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^\top (y-x)dt = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \Big(f((y-x)t+x)\Big)dt =$$

$$\int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt = \int_{0}^{1} \frac{d}{dt} \Big(f((y-x)t+x) \Big) dt = f(y) - f(x)$$

$$\int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt = \int_{0}^{1} \frac{d}{dt} \left(f((y-x)t+x)\right)dt = f(y) - f(x)$$
Rearranging it gives
$$f(y) = f(x) + \int_{0}^{1} \frac{h(y)}{\nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)}dt$$

$$c' def. \quad f(y) = f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y-x \rangle$$

Next, consider the following:

Ø

$$\int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt = \int_{0}^{1} \frac{d}{dt} \left(f((y-x)t+x) \right) dt = f(y) - f(x)$$
Rearranging it gives
$$\int_{0}^{1} h(t) dt = h(t)$$

$$(f(y) = f(x) + \int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt) = f(y) + \int_{0}^{1} \nabla f((y-x)t+x)^{\top}(y-x)dt$$

C, def.

We want to relate this to the C^1 definition, while using monotonicity.

From the monotonicity, we can show that the integrand/is smallest at t = 0, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigotimes \quad \langle \nabla f((y-x)t+x) - \nabla f(x), (y-x)t + x - x \rangle \geq 0 \\ & \bigotimes \quad \langle \nabla f((y-x)t+x) - \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0 \\ & \swarrow \quad & \downarrow \end{aligned}$$

$$L = h(t) - h(t) \ge 0 \iff h(t) \ge h(t)$$

$$\int_{0}^{t} h(t) \ge h(t) \cdot L$$

From the monotonicity, we can show that the integrand is smallest at t = 0, *i.e.*,

$$egin{aligned} &\langle
abla f((y-x)t+x) -
abla f(x), (y-x)t+x-x
angle \geq 0 \ &\langle
abla f((y-x)t+x) -
abla f(x), y-x
angle \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can say

$$f(y) \ge f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle$$

From the monotonicity, we can show that the integrand is smallest at t = 0, *i.e.*,

$$egin{aligned} &\langle
abla f((y-x)t+x) -
abla f(x), (y-x)t+x-x
angle \geq 0 \ &\langle
abla f((y-x)t+x) -
abla f(x), y-x
angle \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can say

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle$$

If function is monotone, it's convex.

More rigorous proofs exist.

Example: For $f(x) = x^{\top}Qx$ where Q is postive semidefinite, show f is convex using definitions of convex functions.

$$O \xrightarrow{c^{-}} t = 2 \cdot q = 2 \cdot q$$





Another way to show a function is convex is through convexity-preserving operations:

- Nonnegative weighted sum; *i.e.* if α, β ≥ 0 and f₁, f₂ convex, αf₁ + βf₂ is convex.
 Pointwise maximum; *i.e.*, if f₁, ..., f_m are convex, max{f₁(x), ..., f_m(x)} is convex.
 Composition with affine map; *i.e.*, if f is convex, f(Ax + b) is convex.

More on convex functions..
Notice from C¹ definition that ∑f(x) = 0 implies f(y) ≥ f(x) for all y, so x is a global minimizer; this further explains why least squares can be solved by setting the derivative equal to zero.

Strictly-convex function have at most one global minimum; w and v can't both be global minima if w ≠ v; it would imply convex combinations u of w and v would have f(u) below the global minimum.



For strictly convex objective f there can be at most one global optimum.

For strictly convex objective f there can be at most one global optimum.

Proof:

1. Suppose x^* is a local minimum and also there exists another local minimum $x^{\#}$ $(\neq x^*)$.

For strictly convex objective f there can be at most one global optimum.

Proof:

- 1. Suppose x^* is a local minimum and also there exists another local minimum $x^{\#}$ $(\neq x^*)$.
- Since f is convex (because it is strictly convex), f(x*) and f(x#) are both global minima, and f(x*) = f(x#).

For strictly convex objective f there can be at most one global optimum.

Proof:

- 1. Suppose x^* is a local minimum and also there exists another local minimum $x^{\#}$ $(\neq x^*)$.
- Since f is convex (because it is strictly convex), f(x*) and f(x#) are both global minima, and f(x*) = f(x#).
- 3. The C^0 definition for $y = \theta x^* + (1 \theta) x^{\#}$, *i.e.*,

$$f(y) < \theta f(x^*) + (1 - \theta)f(x^{\#}) = \theta f(x^*) + (1 - \theta)f(x^*) = f(x^*)$$

contradicts that x^* is a global minimum.

For strictly convex objective f there can be at most one global optimum.

Proof:

- 1. Suppose x^* is a local minimum and also there exists another local minimum $x^{\#}$ $(\neq x^*)$.
- Since f is convex (because it is strictly convex), f(x*) and f(x#) are both global minima, and f(x*) = f(x#).
- 3. The C^0 definition for $y = \theta x^* + (1 \theta) x^{\#}$, *i.e.*,

$$f(y) < \theta f(x^*) + (1 - \theta)f(x^{\#}) = \theta f(x^*) + (1 - \theta)f(x^*) = f(x^*)$$

contradicts that x^* is a global minimum.

4. This means that for $x^{\#}$ to be a local minimum, it must be that $x^{\#} = x^*$.

Any questions?

A lot of material in this course is borrowed or derived from the following:

- Numerical Optimization, Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright.
- Convex Optimization, Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe.
- Convex Optimization, Ryan Tibshirani.
- Optimization for Machine Learning, Martin Jaggi and Nicolas Flammarion.
- Optimization Algorithms, Constantine Caramanis.
- Advanced Machine Learning, Mark Schmidt.