The Convex Dual

CS 246/446 Notes

Constrained Optimization 1

Consider a constrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{x} f(x)$$

s.t. $g(x) = 0$

At the solution, the gradient of the objective function f must be perpendicular to the constraint surface (feasible set) defined by g(x) = 0, so there exists a scalar Lagrange multiplier λ such that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + \lambda \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} = 0$$

at the solution.

Inequalities 2

Consider an optimization problem with constraints specified as inequalities:

$$\min_{x} f(x) \tag{1}$$
s.t. $g(x) \le 0$

If, at the solution, g(x) = 0, then as before there exists a λ such that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + \lambda \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} = 0 \tag{2}$$

and furthermore $\lambda > 0$, otherwise we would be able to decrease f(x) by mov-

ing in the direction $-\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ without leaving the feasible set defined by $g(x) \leq 0$. If, on the other hand, at the solution g(x) < 0, then we must be at a maximum of f(x), so $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = 0$ and eq. 2 holds with $\lambda = 0$. In either case, the following

system of equations (known as the KKT conditions) holds:

$$\lambda g(x) = 0$$
$$\lambda \ge 0$$
$$g(x) \le 0$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + \lambda \frac{\partial g}{\partial x} = 0$$

3 Convex Optimization

Suppose now that f(x) is convex, g(x) is also convex, and both are continuously differentiable. Define

$$L(x,\lambda) = f(x) + \lambda g(x)$$

and Equation 2 is equivalent to

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x} = 0$$

For any fixed $\lambda \ge 0$, *L* is convex in *x*, and has a unique minimum. For any fixed *x*, *L* is linear in λ .

Define the **dual function**

$$h(\lambda) = \min_{x} L(x, \lambda)$$

The minimum of a set of linear functions is concave, and has a maximum corresponding to the linear function with derivative of 0. Thus $h(\lambda)$ also has a unique maximum over $\lambda \ge 0$. Either the maximum of h occurs at $\lambda = 0$, in which case

$$h(0) = \min_{x} L(x, 0) = \min_{x} f(x)$$

and we are at the global minimum of f, or the maximum of h occurs at

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = g(x) = 0$$

and we are on the boundary of the feasible set. Because $\lambda > 0$, we cannot decrease *f* by moving into the interior of the feasible set, and therefore this is the solution to the original problem (1). In either case, the solution to **dual problem**

$$\max_{\lambda} h(\lambda)$$

s.t. $\lambda \ge 0$

corresponds to the solution of the original **primal** problem. Generalizing to primal problems with more than one constraint, the dual problem has one dual variable λ_i for each constraint in the primal problem, and has simple non-negativity constraints on each dual variable. The dual problem is often easier to solve numerically due to its simple constraints. Thus one approach to solving convex optimization problems us to find the dual problem by using calculus to solve $\frac{\partial L}{\partial x} = 0$, and then solving the dual problem numerically.

Substituting the definition of the dual function into the dual problem yields the **primal-dual problem**:

$$\max_{\lambda} \min_{x} L(x, \lambda)$$

s.t. $\lambda \ge 0$

Another approach to solving convex optimization problems is to maintain both primal and dual variables, and to solve the primal-dual problem numerically.

We have already seen that the KKT conditions must hold at the solution to the primal-dual problem. If the objective function and constraint functions are convex and differentiable, and if the feasible set has an interior (Slater's condition), than any solution to the KKT conditions is also a solution to the primal-dual problem.

4 An Example

Minimize x^2 subject to $x \ge 2$.

$$L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \lambda g(x)$$
$$= x^{2} + \lambda (2 - x)$$

The Lagrangian function *L* has a saddle shape:









$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x} = 0$$
$$2x - \lambda = 0$$

and solve for x: $x = \lambda/2$. Substituting $x = \lambda/2$ into L gives $h(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 - 2\lambda$. Setting $\frac{\partial h}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ yields $\lambda = 4$, which we see is the maximum of the concave shape in the figure. Substituting back into the original problem yields x = 2, a solution on the boundary of the constraint surface.