

# EE8725 Homework 5

Volker Landenberger

## 1 Optimization of a non-linear function with one inequality constraint

The function  $f(x)$  with one non-linearity constraint  $g(x)$  is to be minimized using the *Kuhn-Tucker-Condition* and the *Interior Point Method*.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min f(x) \\ & \text{s.t.} \\ & g(x) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

### 1.1 Kuhn-Tucker (KKT)

The Lagrangian is:

$$L(x, \mu) = f(x) + \mu g(x) \tag{1.2}$$

According to KKT, the necessary condition for a minimum at  $(x^*, \mu^*)$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x L(x^*, \mu^*) &= \nabla f(x^*) + \mu^* \nabla g(x^*) &= 0 \\ g(x^*) &\leq 0 \\ \mu^* g(x^*) &= 0 \\ \mu^* &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

### 1.2 Interior Point Method with Logarithmic Barrier Function

Equation 1.1 can be rewritten by means of the slack variable  $s$  and the logarithmic barrier function  $B(x) = -\mu^k \ln(s)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min f(x) - \mu^k \ln(s) \\ & \text{s.t.} \\ & g(x) + s = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

That will force  $s \geq 0$ .

The Lagrangian of equation 1.4 yields:

$$L(x, s, \lambda) = f(x) - \mu^k \ln(s) + \lambda(g(x) + s) \quad (1.5)$$

and the minimum can be found at  $(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*)$  with the necessary condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x L(x^*, s^*, \lambda^*) &= \nabla f(x^*) + \lambda^* \nabla g(x^*) &= 0 \\ \nabla_\lambda L(x^*, s^*, \lambda^*) &= g(x^*) + s^* &= 0 \\ \nabla_s L(x^*, s^*, \lambda^*) &= \frac{\mu^k}{s^*} + \lambda^* &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

## HW 5 Problem

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= 0.25x_1^2 + x_2^2 \\ g(x) &= x_2 - 0.05x_1^2 - 0.5x_1 + 2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

The gradient vectors are:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(x) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.5x_1 \\ 2x_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \nabla g(x) &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.1x_1 - 0.5 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

### Kuhn-Tucker Solution

With 1.3 and 3.19, the necessary condition for the minimum is:

$$\begin{aligned} 0.5x_1^* + \mu^*(-0.1x_1^* - 0.5) &= 0 \\ 2x_2^* + \mu^* &= 0 \\ x_2^* - 0.05(x_1^*)^2 - 0.5x_1^* + 2 &\leq 0 \\ \mu^*(x_2^* - 0.05(x_1^*)^2 - 0.5x_1^* + 2) &= 0 \\ \mu^* &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Like in Problem 1,  $\mu = 0$  results in a violation of the inequality. The set of equations that satisfy the necessary condition for the minimum can therefore be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} 0.5x_1^* + \mu^*(-0.1x_1^* - 0.5) &= 0 \\ 2x_2^* + \mu^* &= 0 \\ x_2^* - 0.05(x_1^*)^2 - 0.5x_1^* + 2 &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

3.21 is a non-linear system of equations which can be solved with the Newton method. The solution is:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^* &= 2.0896 \\ x_2^* &= -0.7368 \\ \mu^* &= 1.4737 \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

## Interior Point Method

Equations 3.19 and 3.18 in 1.6 result in a non-linear set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 h_1(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_1}(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) = 0.5x_1^* + \lambda^*(-0.1x_1^* - 0.5) = 0 \\
 h_2(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_2}(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) = 2x_2^* + \lambda^* = 0 \\
 h_3(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda}(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) = x_2^* - 0.05(x_1^*)^2 - 0.5x_1^* + 2 + s^* = 0 \\
 h_4(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial s}(x^*, \lambda^*, s^*) = -\frac{\mu^k}{s^*} + \lambda^* = 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

These can be solved with the Newton method.

H replaces J in  
Newton's Method

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 - 0.1\lambda & 0 & -0.1x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ -0.1x_1 - 0.5 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \frac{\mu^k}{s^2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.24}$$

See following pages for Matlab program and sample results with different starting points.

function interior\_point

%function to minimize the function  $f(x) = 0.25*x1^2 + x2^2$

% subject to constraint:  $g(x) = x2 - 0.05*x1^2 - 0.5*x1 + 2 \leq 0$

```
display(' ')
```

```
%initialize start values
x1 = 10;
x2 = 10;
lambda = 1;
s = 2;
mu = 20;
%mu = 0.002;

eps = 1E-4; %tolerance
alpha = 0.5;
display(' STARTING POINT ')
disp([' mu x1 x2 lambda s f(x) g(x)' ]);
for x = 0.25*x1^2 + x2^2;
gofx = x2 - 0.05*x1^2 - 0.5*x1 + 2;
fprintf(' %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f \n', mu, x1, x2, lambda, s, gofx, gofx );
display(' ')
```

  

```
x=[x1 x2 lambda s];
display(' ITERATIVE STEPS');
disp([' mu x1 x2 lambda s f(x) g(x)' );
while 1;
    %mu loop, keep decreasing mu till x does not change anymore
    x_pre=x;
    while 1;
        %Newton loop, iterate till norm(h(x)) < eps
        H = Hessian(x, mu);
        rhs = h(x, mu);
        delta_x = -H \ rhs;
        if (norm(rhs)<eps)
            break;
        end
        x=x + alpha*delta_x;
    end
    x1 = x(1);
    x2 = x(2);
    lambda = x(3);
    s = x(4);
    gofx = 0.25*x1^2 + x2^2;
    gofx = x2 - 0.05*x1^2 - 0.5*x1 + 2;
```

```

fprintf(' %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f %10.5f \n', mu, x1, x2, lambda, s, fofx, gofx );
if (norm(x-x_pre)<eps)
    break;
end

mu=mu/2;

function H = Hessian (x, mu)
%calculate the Hessian of the Newton solution

x1 = x(1);
x2 = x(2);
lambda = x(3);
s = x(4);

H=[(0.5-0.1*lambda) 0 (-0.1*x1) 0;
    0 2 1 0;
    (-0.1*x1-.5) 1 0 1;
    0 0 1 mu/s^2 ];


function res = h(x, mu)
%calculate the function residuals which will become the new rhs

x1 = x(1);
x2 = x(2);
lambda = x(3);
s = x(4);

res = zeros(4,1);

res(1) = 0.5*x1+lambda*(-0.1*x1-0.5);
res(2) = 2*x2 + lambda;
res(3) = x2 - 0.05*x1^2 - 0.5*x1 + 2 + s;
res(4) = -mu/s+lambda;

```

> HW4\_interior\_point

STARTING POINT	mu	x1	x2	lambda	s	f(x)	g(x)
20.00000	10.00000	10.00000	10.00000	1.00000	2.00000	125.00000	2.00000
<b>ITERATIVE STEPS</b>							
mu	x1	x2	lambda	s	f(x)	g(x)	
20.00000	7.85850	-1.52786	3.05577	6.54491	17.77336	-6.54491	
10.00000	5.66521	-1.32795	2.65591	3.76527	9.78711	-3.76529	
5.00000	4.24983	-1.14862	2.29723	2.17658	5.83459	-2.17659	
2.50000	3.35585	-1.00403	2.00806	1.24504	3.82351	-1.24504	
1.25000	2.80615	-0.89869	1.79738	0.69548	2.77626	-0.69549	
0.62500	2.48060	-0.82901	1.65801	0.37697	2.22559	-0.37697	
0.31250	2.29630	-0.78680	1.57360	0.19860	1.93731	-0.19860	
0.15625	2.19637	-0.76301	1.52602	0.10240	1.78819	-0.10240	
0.07813	2.14395	-0.75027	1.50053	0.05207	1.71203	-0.05207	
0.03906	2.11704	-0.74365	1.48730	0.02627	1.67348	-0.02627	
0.01953	2.10340	-0.74028	1.48056	0.01319	1.65408	-0.01319	
0.00977	2.09653	-0.73858	1.47715	0.00661	1.64435	-0.00661	
0.00488	2.09308	-0.73772	1.47544	0.00331	1.63948	-0.00331	
0.00244	2.09135	-0.73729	1.47458	0.00166	1.63704	-0.00166	
0.00122	2.09049	-0.73708	1.47415	0.00083	1.63582	-0.00083	
0.00061	2.09006	-0.73697	1.47394	0.00041	1.63521	-0.00041	
0.00031	2.08984	-0.73691	1.47383	0.00021	1.63490	-0.00021	
0.00015	2.08973	-0.73689	1.47377	0.00010	1.63475	-0.00010	
0.00008	2.08968	-0.73687	1.47375	0.00005	1.63467	-0.00005	

Starting Point near the final solution

> HW4\_interior\_point

STARTING POINT		x1	x2	lambda	s	f(x)	g(x)
mu	20.00000	2.00000	-0.73000	1.00000	2.00000	1.53290	0.07000
ITERATIVE STEPS							
20.00000	7.85841	-1.52788	3.05577	6.54482	17.77309	-6.54482	
10.00000	5.66521	-1.32795	2.65591	3.76527	9.78711	-3.76529	
5.00000	4.24983	-1.14862	2.29723	2.17658	5.83459	-2.17659	
2.50000	3.35585	-1.00403	2.00806	1.24504	3.82351	-1.24504	
1.25000	2.80615	-0.89869	1.79738	0.69548	2.77626	-0.69549	
0.62500	2.48060	-0.82901	1.65801	0.37697	2.22559	-0.37697	
0.31250	2.29630	-0.78680	1.57360	0.19860	1.93731	-0.19860	
0.15625	2.19637	-0.76301	1.52602	0.10240	1.78819	-0.10240	
0.07813	2.14395	-0.75027	1.50053	0.05207	1.71203	-0.05207	
0.03906	2.11704	-0.74365	1.48730	0.02627	1.67348	-0.02627	
0.01953	2.10340	-0.74028	1.48056	0.01319	1.65408	-0.01319	
0.00977	2.09653	-0.73858	1.47715	0.00661	1.64435	-0.00661	
0.00488	2.09308	-0.73772	1.47544	0.00331	1.63948	-0.00331	
0.00244	2.09135	-0.73729	1.47458	0.00166	1.63704	-0.00166	
0.00122	2.09049	-0.73708	1.47415	0.00083	1.63582	-0.00083	
0.00061	2.09006	-0.73697	1.47394	0.00041	1.63521	-0.00041	
0.00031	2.08984	-0.73691	1.47383	0.00021	1.63490	-0.00021	
0.00015	2.08973	-0.73689	1.47377	0.00010	1.63475	-0.00010	
0.00008	2.08968	-0.73687	1.47375	0.00005	1.63467	-0.00005	

Starting Point very far from solution

> HW4\_interior\_point

STARTING POINT		x1	x2	lambda	s	f(x)	g(x)
mu	20.00000	-10.00000	-10.00000	1.00000	2.00000	125.00000	-8.00000
ITERATIVE STEPS							
20.00000	-2.24509	2.03748	-4.07496	-4.90802	5.41143	4.90800	
10.00000	-1.67781	1.26245	-2.52490	-3.96060	2.29754	3.96060	
5.00000	-1.16871	0.76253	-1.52506	-3.27859	0.922292	3.27859	
2.50000	-0.75835	0.44687	-0.89374	-2.79729	0.34347	2.79729	
1.25000	-0.45934	0.25284	-0.50568	-2.47196	0.11668	2.47196	
0.62500	-0.26162	0.13796	-0.27591	-2.26534	0.03614	2.26534	
0.31250	-0.14189	0.07292	-0.14585	-2.14286	0.01035	2.14286	
0.15625	-0.07440	0.03767	-0.07533	-2.07459	0.00280	2.07459	
0.07813	-0.03825	0.01917	-0.03835	-2.03822	0.00073	2.03822	
0.03906	-0.01947	0.00968	-0.01936	-2.01940	0.00019	2.01940	
0.01953	-0.00989	0.00487	-0.00974	-2.00981	0.00005	2.00981	
0.00977	-0.00504	0.00244	-0.00489	-2.00496	0.00001	2.00496	
0.00488	-0.00259	0.00123	-0.00246	-2.00252	0.00000	2.00252	
0.00244	-0.00136	0.00062	-0.00124	-2.00130	0.00000	2.00130	
0.00122	-0.00081	0.00032	-0.00065	-2.00073	0.00000	2.00073	
0.00061	-0.00050	0.00017	-0.00035	-2.00042	0.00000	2.00042	
0.00031	-0.00034	0.00010	-0.00020	-2.00027	0.00000	2.00027	
0.00015	-0.00027	0.00007	-0.00014	-2.00020	0.00000	2.00020	
0.00008	-0.00020	0.00004	-0.00009	-2.00015	0.00000	2.00015	
0.00004	-0.00020	0.00004	-0.00009	-2.00015	0.00000	2.00015	

Here it does not converge, can you determine why?