## TMA947/MAN280 <br> APPLIED OPTIMIZATION

| Date: | $04-06-02$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time: | House V, morning |
| Aids: | Text memory-less calculator |
| Number of questions: | $7 ;$ passed on one question requires 2 points of 3. <br> Questions are not numbered by difficulty. <br> To pass requires 10 points and three passed questions. |
|  | Michael Patriksson <br> Alex Herbertsson (0740-459022) |
| Teacher on duty: | $04-06-11$ <br> Result announced: |
|  | Short answers are also given at the end of <br> the exam on the notice board for optimization <br> in the MD building. |

## Exam instructions

When you answer the questions
State your methodology carefully.
Use generally valid methods and theory.
Only write on one page of each sheet. Do not use a red pen.
Do not answer more than one question per page.

## At the end of the exam

Sort your solutions by the order of the questions.
Mark on the cover the questions you have answered.
Count the number of sheets you hand in and fill in the number on the cover.

## Question 1

(the Simplex method)
Consider the linear program

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} z=x_{1}+2 x_{2}+3 x_{3} \\
& \text { subject to } \quad 2 x_{1}-5 x_{2}+x_{3} \geq 2, \\
& \\
& \\
& 2 x_{1}-x_{2}+2 x_{3} \leq 4, \\
& \\
& \\
& x_{1}, \quad x_{2}, \quad x_{3} \geq 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

(2p) a) Solve the problem by using Phase I \& II of the Simplex method.
$(\mathbf{1 p}) \quad$ b) Is the solution obtained unique? (Motivate!)

In order to calculate necessary matrix inverses the following basic identity might be useful:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b \\
c & d
\end{array}\right)^{-1}=\frac{1}{a d-b c}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
d & -b \\
-c & a
\end{array}\right) .
$$

## (3p) Question 2

(modelling)
Figure 1 describes two production processes by which we can make the product D from the raw materials $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C .

Process 1


Process 2


Figure 1: The production processes.

The figure illustrates that process 1 requires 1 unit of raw material A, 2 units of raw material B , and 3 units of raw material C in order to produce 1 unit of product D , and process 2 requires 3 units of $\mathrm{A}, 2$ units of B , and 1 unit of C in order to produce one unit of D . The capacities of the processes 1 and 2 are $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$, respectively, of units of the product D. Further the processes 1 and 2 are associated with the fixed start-up costs $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$. For example, if process 1 is used for production, then $f_{1}$ must be paid independently of how many units of D that are actually produced. The cost per unit of the raw materials $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, and C are $c_{A}, c_{B}$, and $c_{C}$, respectively. There are three demand centers that require $d_{1}, d_{2}$, and $d_{3}$ units, respectively, of product D . We may assume that the transportation cost is negligible compared to all other costs.

Formulate a linear integer programming model (that is, if the integer requirements are relaxed we shall end up with an ordinary linear program) for finding the production quantities that minimize the total cost given that demand is fulfilled.

## Question 3

## (Newton's algorithm)

An engineer has decided to verify numerically that the exponential function $x \mapsto$ $\exp (x)=e^{x}$ grows faster than any polynomial. In order to do so he/she studies the optimization problem to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{minimize} f(x)=x^{\alpha}-\exp (x) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha$ is the highest power of the polynomial (we assume it is an even, positive integer number). The engineer uses a Newton method (with unit steps!) to solve the problem. He/she argues that if the exponential function grows faster than any polynomial, then the sequence $\left\{x_{k}\right\}$ generated by the method should converge to infinity, because the objective function $f$ can be decreased indefinitely by increasing the value of $x$.
(1p) a) State the Newton iteration explicitly for the given problem (1).
$(\mathbf{1 p}) \quad$ b) Find the error in the engineer's reasoning and formally explain it.
c) Construct a numerical example (that is, choose a value of $\alpha \in\{2,4, \ldots\}$, and a starting point of the Newton algorithm) illustrating the engineer's error in reasoning.

## Question 4

(claims about optimality)
Each of the three questions below are to be answered independently. For each of them we now describe the task to be performed: After the problem description, a claim is made. Given the properties stated before the claim, the claim is not true. However, under additional properties of the problem the claim is true. Your task is to describe a reasonable and mild additional set of properties that makes the claim valid. (All claims are based on basic results in the course notes.) In addition to providing these additional properties, you must also state why this property is needed, by providing a counter-example to the claim for the case when the property is not present.
(1p) a) Consider the standard LP problem to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} \boldsymbol{c}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{x}, \\
& \text { subject to } \quad \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x} \geq \boldsymbol{b}, \\
& \boldsymbol{x} \geq \mathbf{0}^{n},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \boldsymbol{c}, \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, and $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$. Suppose further that there exist feasible solutions to this problem.
Claim: There exists at least one optimal solution to this problem.
(1p) b) Consider the problem to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(\boldsymbol{x}), \\
& \text { subject to } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and lower bounded on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Suppose that to this problem we apply the steepest descent algorithm with the Armijo step length rule, starting at some $\boldsymbol{x}_{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and generating a sequence $\left\{\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right\}$ of iterates.
Claim: The following is true:

- $\left\{f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\} \downarrow \bar{f} \in \mathbb{R} ;$
- $\left\{\nabla f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}^{n}$;
- $\left\{\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right\}$ has at least one accumulation point, $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$; for each accumulation point $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}, f(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})=\bar{f}$ and $\nabla f(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})=\mathbf{0}^{n}$ holds.
(1p) c) Consider the problem to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(\boldsymbol{x}), \\
& \text { subject to } g(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq b,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions, and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that this problem has a globally optimal solution, $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$, and that $g\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)<b$ holds.

Claim: The vector $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ is also a globally optimal solution to the unconstrained problem to

> minimize $f(\boldsymbol{x})$,
> subject to $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

## Question 5

(duality)
Consider the optimization problem to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{minimize} f(x, y)=y \\
& \text { s.t. } \quad(x-1)^{2}+y^{2} \leq 1  \tag{1}\\
& \quad(x+1)^{2}+y^{2} \leq 1
\end{align*}
$$

where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.
$(\mathbf{1 p})$ a) Find every point of global and local minimum (you may do this graphically). Is this a convex problem? Does it verify Slater's CQ or the linear independence CQ (LICQ)?
$(\mathbf{1 p}) \quad$ b) Derive the expression of the Lagrangian dual function $q: \mathbb{R}_{+}^{2} \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup$ $\{-\infty,+\infty\}$ associated with the Lagrangian relaxation of both constraints of the problem (1).
$\mathbf{( 1 p )}$ c) Show that strong duality holds, that is, that $f^{*}=\sup _{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{2}} q(\lambda)$ holds, where $f^{*}$ is the optimal value of the primal problem (1).

## Question 6

(convexity)
Throughout the course we have stressed that convexity is a crucial property of functions when analyzing optimization models in general and studying optimality conditions in particular. There are, however, certain properties of convex functions that are shared also by classes of non-convex functions. The purpose of this question is to relate the convex functions to two such classes of non-convex functions by means of some example properties.

Suppose that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and that $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $S$.
$(\mathbf{1 p}) \quad$ a) Suppose further that $f$ is continuously differentiable on $S\left(C^{1}\right.$ on $\left.S\right)$. We say that the function $f$ is pseudo-convex on $S$ if, for every $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in S$,

$$
\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})^{\mathrm{T}}(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}) \geq 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f(\boldsymbol{y}) \geq f(\boldsymbol{x})
$$

Establish the following two statements: (1) every differentiable, convex function on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is pseudo-convex on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ (that is, "convexity implies pseudoconvexity"); (2) the reverse statement ("pseudo-convexity implies convexity") is not true. Hint: On the statement (2) you may construct an explicit or graphical counter-example.
$(\mathbf{1 p}) \quad$ b) A well-known property of a differentiable convex function is its role in necessary and sufficient conditions for globally optimal solutions. Suppose now that $S$ is convex. If $f$ is a convex function on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ which is in $C^{1}$ on $S$ then the following statement holds (Theorem 4.21 in the course notes): $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ is a global minimum of $f$ over $S \Longleftrightarrow \nabla f\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) \geq 0, \forall \boldsymbol{y} \in S$.

Establish that this equivalence relation still holds if the convexity of $f$ is replaced by the pseudo-convexity of $f$.
$\mathbf{( 1 p )}$ c) Let $S$ be convex. We say that the function $f$ is quasi-convex on $S$ if its level sets are convex. In other words, $f$ is quasi-convex on $S$ if

$$
\operatorname{lev}_{f}^{S}(b):=\{\boldsymbol{x} \in S \mid f(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq b\}
$$

is convex for every $b \in \mathbb{R}$.
Establish the following two statements: (1) every convex function on $S$ is quasi-convex on $S$ (that is, "convexity implies quasi-convexity"); (2) the reverse statement ("quasi-convexity implies convexity") is not true. Hint: On the statement (2) you may construct an explicit or graphical counterexample.

## (3p) Question 7

## (Lagrangian duality)

Consider the optimization problem to find

$$
\begin{align*}
& f^{*}:=\underset{x}{\operatorname{infimum}} f(\boldsymbol{x}), \\
& \text { subject to } \quad g_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq 0, \quad i=1, \ldots, m,  \tag{1}\\
& \boldsymbol{x} \in X,
\end{align*}
$$

where $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g_{i}: \mathbb{R}^{n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}(i=1,2, \ldots, m)$ are given functions, $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$; we assume that $-\infty<f^{*}<\infty$. For an arbitrary vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$, we define the Lagrange function

$$
L(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}):=f(\boldsymbol{x})+\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_{i} g_{i}(\boldsymbol{x})=f(\boldsymbol{x})+\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) .
$$

We call the vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{*} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ a Lagrange multiplier if it is non-negative and if $f^{*}=\inf _{x \in X} L\left(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{*}\right)$ holds.

For the problem (1), establish the following theorem on global optimality conditions in the absence of a duality gap:

The vector $\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{*}\right)$ is a pair of optimal primal solution and Lagrange multiplier if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
\boldsymbol{\mu}^{*} \geq \mathbf{0}^{m}, & \text { (Dual feasibility) }  \tag{2a}\\
\boldsymbol{x}^{*} \in \arg \min _{x \in X} L\left(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}^{*}\right), & \text { (Lagrangian optimality) }  \tag{2b}\\
\boldsymbol{x}^{*} \in X, \quad \boldsymbol{g}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) \leq \mathbf{0}^{m}, & \text { (Primal feasibility) }  \tag{2c}\\
\mu_{i}^{*} g_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)=0, \quad i=1, \ldots, m . & \text { (Complementary slackness) } \tag{2d}
\end{align*}
$$

Good luck!

