

On the paper “A study on concave optimization via canonical dual function”

C. Zălinescu*

Abstract

In this short note we prove by a counter-example that Theorem 3.2 in the paper “A study on concave optimization via canonical dual function” by J. Zhu, S. Tao, D. Gao is false; moreover, we give a very short proof for Theorem 3.1 in the same paper.

Keywords: concave optimization, canonical dual function, counter-example

In [2] one says: “The primary goal of this paper is to study the global minimizers for the following concave optimization problem (primal problem (P) in short).

$$(P) \min P(x) \quad (1.1)$$

s.t. $x \in D$,

where

$$D = \{x \in R^n \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$$

and $P(x)$ is a smooth function in R^n and is strictly concave on the unit ball D , i.e. $\nabla^2 P(x) < 0$, on D .”

Even if it is not said what is meant by “smooth function”, from the context we think that P is assumed to be a C^2 function on R^n . One continues with “Let’s consider the equation

$$\begin{cases} \nabla P(x) + \rho^* x = 0, & x^T x = 1, \\ \rho^* > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Suppose there are only finitely many of root pairs for (2.1):

$$0 < \rho_1^* < \rho_2^* < \dots < \rho_l^*,$$

associated with feasible points on the unit sphere:

$$\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \dots, \hat{x}_l,$$

such that for each i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* \hat{x}_i &= 0, & \hat{x}_i^T \hat{x}_i &= 1, \\ \rho_i^* &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Moreover, one says: “In Section 3, two sufficient conditions for determining a global minimizer are presented.”

The results of [2] are the following.

“Theorem 3.1. If $\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I > 0$ on $\|x\| \leq 1$, then \hat{x}_l is a global minimizer of (1.1).”

“Theorem 3.2. Suppose for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, $\det [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I] \neq 0$ and $\frac{d^2 P_d(\rho_i^*)}{d\rho_i^{*2}} > 0$. Then \hat{x}_l is a global minimizer of (1.1).”

Related to these results we mention that Theorem 3.1 is (almost) trivial and Theorem 3.2 is false even for $n = 1$.

*University “Al.I.Cuza” Iași, Faculty of Mathematics, Romania, email: zalinesc@uaic.ro.

Indeed, because $\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I > 0$ for $x \in D$, there exists $r > 1$ such that $\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I > 0$ for $x \in D_r := \{u \in R^n \mid \|u\| < r\}$. Otherwise there exist the sequences $(x_k) \subset R^n$ with $1 < \|x_k\| \rightarrow 1$ and $(v_k) \subset S = \{u \in R^n \mid \|u\| = 1\}$ such that $v_k^T (\nabla^2 P(x_k) + \rho_l^* I) v_k \leq 0$ for every k . We may assume that $x_k \rightarrow x$ and $v_k \rightarrow v$; hence $x, v \in S$. It follows that $v^T (\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I) v \leq 0$, contradicting our assumption. Since D_r is an open convex set we obtain that $P + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \|\cdot\|^2$ is a (strictly) convex function on D_r . Because $\hat{x}_l \in D \subset D_r$ and $\nabla(P + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \|\cdot\|^2)(\hat{x}_l) = \nabla P(\hat{x}_l) + \rho_l^* \hat{x}_l = 0$, we have that \hat{x}_l is a global minimizer of $P + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \|\cdot\|^2$ on D_r . In particular we have that

$$P(\hat{x}_l) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* = P(\hat{x}_l) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \|\hat{x}_l\|^2 \leq P(x) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \|x\|^2 \leq P(x) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_l^* \quad \forall x \in D,$$

whence $P(\hat{x}_l) \leq P(x)$ for every $x \in D$.

The proof above shows that whenever P is a C^2 function on an open set D_r containing D such that $\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I > 0$ on D (or even less, $\nabla^2 P(x) + \rho_l^* I \geq 0$ on D_r) and $\bar{x} \in S$ and $\bar{\rho} \geq 0$ are such that $\nabla P(\bar{x}) + \bar{\rho} \bar{x} = 0$, then \bar{x} is a global minimizer of P on D .

Related to [2, Th. 3.2], let us observe first that the condition $\frac{d^2 P_d(\rho_i^*)}{d\rho^{*2}} > 0$ is equivalent with $\hat{x}_i^T [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I]^{-1} \hat{x}_i < 0$.

Indeed, one says: “For $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, defined by

$$\nabla P(\hat{x}(\rho^*)) + \rho^* \hat{x}(\rho^*) = 0, \quad \rho^* > 0, \quad \hat{x}(\rho_i^*) = \hat{x}_i \quad (2.3)$$

a branch $\hat{x}_i(\rho^*)$ is a continuously differentiable vector function on ρ^* .” “In what follows, we suppress the index when focusing on a given branch according to the context.

The dual function [6] with respect to a given branch $\hat{x}(\rho^*)$ is defined as

$$P_d(\rho^*) = P(\hat{x}(\rho^*)) + \frac{\rho^*}{2} \hat{x}^T(\rho^*) \hat{x}(\rho^*) - \frac{\rho^*}{2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that [6] above is our reference [1].

In order to obtain a solution \hat{x} of (2.3) the authors use differential equations. In fact, let $F : R^n \times R \rightarrow R^n$ be defined by $F(x, \rho) := \nabla P(x) + \rho x$. Clearly, F is a C^1 function, $\nabla_\rho F(x, \rho) = x$, whence $\nabla_\rho F(\hat{x}_i, \rho_i^*) = \hat{x}_i \neq 0$. By the implicit function theorem a C^1 function $\hat{x} : J \rightarrow R^n$ exists such that $F(\hat{x}(\rho), \rho) = 0$ for $\rho \in J$ and $\hat{x}(\rho_i^*) = \hat{x}_i$, where J is an open interval containing ρ_i^* . It follows that

$$\nabla_x F(\hat{x}(\rho), \rho) \hat{x}'(\rho) + \nabla_\rho F(\hat{x}(\rho), \rho) = [\nabla_x^2 P(\hat{x}(\rho)) + \rho I] \hat{x}'(\rho) + \hat{x}(\rho) = 0 \quad \forall \rho \in J.$$

Because $\det [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I] \neq 0$, we may assume that $\det [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}(\rho)) + \rho I] \neq 0$ for all $\rho \in J$ (taking a smaller J if necessary). Hence

$$\hat{x}'(\rho) = - [\nabla_x^2 P(\hat{x}(\rho)) + \rho I]^{-1} \hat{x}(\rho) \quad \forall \rho \in J.$$

From the expression of P_d in (2.6), using (2.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_d'(\rho) &= \nabla P(\hat{x}(\rho)) \hat{x}'(\rho) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{x}^T(\rho) \hat{x}(\rho) + \rho \hat{x}^T(\rho) \hat{x}'(\rho) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{x}^T(\rho) \hat{x}(\rho) - \frac{1}{2}, \\ P_d''(\rho) &= \hat{x}^T(\rho) \hat{x}'(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

for every $\rho \in J$. Using the expression of $\hat{x}'(\rho)$ obtained above we get

$$P_d''(\rho_i^*) = -\hat{x}^T(\rho_i^*) [\nabla_x^2 P(\hat{x}(\rho_i^*)) + \rho_i^* I]^{-1} \hat{x}(\rho_i^*) = -\hat{x}_i^T [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I]^{-1} \hat{x}_i.$$

This shows that instead of the condition $\frac{d^2 P_d(\rho_i^*)}{d\rho^{*2}} > 0$, which uses a quite complicated function, it was preferable to consider the condition

$$\hat{x}_i^T [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I]^{-1} \hat{x}_i < 0,$$

which is written using the data of the problem.

Example 1 Consider $P : R \rightarrow R$ defined by $P(x) = -x^4 - \frac{8}{5}x^3 - \frac{6}{5}x^2 + \frac{12}{5}x$. Then

$$P'(x) = -4x^3 - \frac{24}{5}x^2 - \frac{12}{5}x + \frac{12}{5}, \quad P''(x) = -12x^2 - \frac{48}{5}x - \frac{12}{5}.$$

We have that $P''(x) \leq P''(-\frac{2}{5}) = -\frac{12}{25} < 0$ for every $x \in R$; hence P is a strictly concave function. The system (2.1) becomes $x = \pm 1$, $\rho^* = -x^{-1}P'(x)$, $\rho^* > 0$. The solutions are (\hat{x}_i, ρ_i^*) , $i \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\hat{x}_1 = -1$, $\hat{x}_2 = 1$, $\rho_1^* = P'(-1) = 4$, $\rho_2^* = -P'(1) = \frac{44}{5}$. Hence $l = 2$ and $0 < \rho_1^* < \rho_2^*$. The condition $\hat{x}_i^T [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I]^{-1} \hat{x}_i < 0$ becomes $P''(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* < 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, in which case $\det [\nabla^2 P(\hat{x}_i) + \rho_i^* I] \neq 0$. But $P''(-1) + 4 = -\frac{4}{5} < 0$, $P''(1) + \frac{44}{5} = -\frac{76}{5} < 0$. Using [2, Th. 3.2] we obtain that $\hat{x}_2 = 1$ is the global minimizer of P on $[-1, 1]$. However, $P(-1) = -3 < -\frac{7}{5} = P(1)$, proving that [2, Th. 3.2] is false.

References

- [1] D.Y. Gao, *Duality Principles in Nonconvex Systems, Theory, Methods and Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (now Springer), Dordrecht, 2000.
- [2] J. Zhu, S. Tao, D. Gao, *A study on concave optimization via canonical dual function*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 224 (2009), 459–464.