

Stability of Discrete Time Recurrent Neural Networks and Nonlinear optimization problems

Dr. Nikita Barabanov, and Jayant Singh

Abstract We consider the method of Reduction of Dissipativity Domain to prove global Lyapunov stability of Discrete Time Recurrent Neural Networks. The standard and advanced criteria for Absolute Stability of these essentially nonlinear systems produce rather weak results. The method mentioned above is proved to be more powerful. It involves a multi-step procedure with maximization of special nonconvex functions over polytopes on every step. We derive conditions which guarantee an existence of at most one point of local maximum for such functions over every hyperplane. This nontrivial result is valid for wide range of neuron transfer functions.

1 Introduction and Problem Setting

In this paper, we study existence of points of local maxima for function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a nonlinear function, over a hyperplane. This problem arises in stability analysis of nonlinear dynamical systems [2], for example Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN). A typical RNN can be described by the following systems of equations;

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{k+1} &= \phi(W_1 x_1^k + V_n x_n^k + b_1), \\ x_2^{k+1} &= \phi(W_2 x_2^k + V_1 x_1^{k+1} + b_2), \\ &\dots \\ x_n^{k+1} &= \phi(W_n x_n^k + V_{n-1} x_{n-1}^{k+1} + b_n), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where n is the number of layers, $\phi(\cdot)$ is the activation function, x_j^k is the state vector of the layer j at time step k , W_j and V_j are fixed weight matrices, and b_j is a fixed vector representing bias.

Stability of RNN has been addressed extensively in literature. In [4], a stability criterion has been developed using NL_q approach. A typical NL_q system (without external inputs), is of the form,

$$p_{k+1} = P_1 Q_1 P_2 Q_2 \dots P_q Q_q p_k \quad (2)$$

where $p_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P_i = (\text{diag} \overline{p_j})_{j=1}^n$, and Q_i is a constant matrix. Here $\overline{p_j}$ depends on p_k continuously. The problem under consideration is to check stability of system (2), with matrices P_i satisfying the relation $\|P_i\| \leq 1$. The stability criterion using NL_q approach says that if there exists diagonal positive definite matrices D_j such that $\|D_j Q_j D_{j+1}^{-1}\| < 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, q \pmod{q}$, then the system (2) is globally asymptotically stable. Using a suitable method [1], the RNN defined in (1) can be transformed to form (2). Therefore the above criterion can be used to check stability of systems of form (1). The NL_q approach gives sufficient conditions for stability of nonlinear systems. However, there exist nonlinear stable systems, for which the NL_q stability criterion is not satisfied. These nonlinear systems, for example, RNN, have shown promise in various applications [5].

Another stability criterion was developed using theory of absolute stability ([1], [3], [7], [8], [12]). A system to be analyzed for stability using this approach should be written in the automatic control form:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= Ax^k + B\psi^k, \\ \sigma^k &= Cx^k, \\ \psi_i &= \phi_i(\sigma_i), i = 1 \dots m, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where, A, B, C are matrices of suitable size, $\psi^k = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m)$ is input vector at step k , $\sigma^k = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ is the output vector at step k , and $\{\phi_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^m$ are nonlinear functions.

Before analyzing the stability of system (1) using theory of Absolute stability, it needs to be transformed to (3). State Space Extension method has been introduced [1] to transform RNN to (3).

One of the significant contribution of theory of absolute stability is the frequency domain criterion ([9], [13], [14]). Frequency domain criterion gives necessary and sufficient condition for existence of quadratic Lyapunov function for class of systems (3) with functions $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfying given local quadratic constraint. One of the most common constraints used for stability analysis of nonlinear systems is sector constraint, and the corresponding stability criterion is known as circle criterion. It has been shown in [1] that stability criterion given by NL_q approach is weaker than the circle criterion.

The circle criterion gives sufficient condition for stability of nonlinear systems, with nonlinear function $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfying sector constraint. It only utilizes the fact that the nonlinear function $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfies a given sector condition. It might happen that given a sector, defined by function $\phi(\cdot)$, there exists a nonlinear function satisfying sector condition, such that the corresponding system is unstable. Additional information about the nonlinear function can be used to check stability of nonlinear systems of particular kind, for example RNN. A modified stability criterion using additional information about the nonlinear function, (e.g. monotonicity) has been developed in [1]. But this criterion has been shown to be essentially sufficient for systems with large number of nonlinear functions. In addition, this criterion is not applicable to some practically stable systems, for instance RNN.

The stability criterion given by theory of absolute stability ([1], [6], [11], [10]) checks necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of Lyapunov functions of a particular kind (e.g. quadratic forms). But there exists stable systems, for which quadratic Lyapunov functions do not exist. An alternative stability criterion has been proposed in [2].

Consider the system

$$x_{k+1} = \phi(x_k) \tag{4}$$

Let D_0 denote the whole space of vector x_k . Suppose there exists sets $\{D_k\}$ such that $D_{k+1} \subset D_k, \phi(D_k) \subseteq D_{k+1}$. If $\{D_k\} \rightarrow 0$ (in Hausdorff metric), as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then obviously system (4) is globally asymptotically stable. This approach is known as reduction of dissipativity domain.

In order to implement this approach, the sets D_k need to be defined. A possible choice of D_k is given by

$$D_{k+1} = \{x \in D_k : f_{k+1,j}(x) \leq \alpha_{k+1,j}, j = 1 \dots m_{k+1}\}$$

where m_k is the number of constraints at step k , $f_{k,j}$ is a function, and $\alpha_{k+1,j} = \max_{x \in D_k} f_{k,j}(\phi(x))$. The set D_k is characterized by the set of pairs $(f_{k,j}, \alpha_{k,j})$ where $j \in \{1 \dots m\}$. A possible choice of $f_{k,j}(\cdot)$ is linear functions. Then D_k takes the shape of a polytope. It has been shown (reference) that if system (4) has a convex Lyapunov function, then there exists linear functions $f_{k,j}$ such that $\{D_k\} \rightarrow 0$.

The set D_k is constructed by computing the value $\alpha_{k,j}$ for every j . Since the function $\phi(\cdot)$ is nonconcave over the set D_k , it can have multiple points of local maxima. At every step k , the points of local maxima for the function $f(\phi(\cdot))$ need to be computed.

Consider a single layer RNN with zero bias. Using substitution $y = Wx$, it can be expressed as

$$y_{k+1} = W\phi(y_k) \tag{5}$$

For the case of RNN in (5), the function $f(\phi(\cdot))$ is given by the inner product $f(x) := \langle l_j, W\phi(x) \rangle$. We need to find points of local maxima for $f(\cdot)$ over polytopes defined by matrix of constraints, $L = \text{col}(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_m)$. It has been seen that, in all the cases, the function $f(\cdot)$ has points of local maxima on the boundary of the polytope. We will first locate the points of local maxima for $f(\cdot)$ on an arbitrary hyperplane. The subject of this paper is the solution to the following problem.

Problem Setting: Consider the hyperplane, $P = \{x : l^T x = b\}$ where l is a unit normal vector and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. How many points of local maxima does the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, $c_i \neq 0$ for all i , have on P ? Here $\phi(\cdot)$ is standard neuron transfer function.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we will develop necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of points of local maxima. In section 3, some assumptions regarding function $\phi(\cdot)$ will be listed. Section 4 gives the possible location of points of local maxima. Then we will talk about number of points of local maxima in main orthant and side orthant. We will conclude with the main result of this paper.

2 Identify the points of local maxima

We will develop the necessary and sufficient condition for a critical point to be a point of local maximum for function $f(\cdot)$ over hyperplane P . Then $D = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} |_{x=x_0} = \text{diag}(d_j)_{j=1}^n$ is Hessian matrix, where $d_j = c_j \phi''(x_j)$. Let $K := (I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2})D(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2})$ denote the projection matrix.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose, x_0 is a critical point of $f(\cdot)$ over P (i.e. l is parallel to $\vec{\nabla} f(x_0)$). Then x_0 is a point of local maximum of $f(\cdot)$ over P only if $K \leq 0$. Moreover, if K has $n - 1$ negative eigenvalues and one zero eigenvalue then x_0 is a point of local maximum.*

Proof. Necessity: Consider the Taylor expansion for $f(\cdot)$ in some neighborhood of x_0 .

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + \left\langle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=x_0}, x - x_0 \right\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle x - x_0, \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=x_0} (x - x_0) \right\rangle + o(\|x - x_0\|^2)$$

Since $x \in P$, we have $l^T x = b$ and $l^T x_0 = b$, hence $x - x_0$ is orthogonal to l . Using the fact that, $\vec{\nabla} f(x_0)$ is parallel to l , we get $\vec{\nabla} f(x_0)^T (x - x_0) = 0$.

Moreover since x_0 is a point of local maximum, we obtain $\left\langle x - x_0, \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=x_0} (x - x_0) \right\rangle \leq 0$ for all x such that $l^T (x - x_0) = 0$. Therefore

$$y^T D y \leq 0 \tag{6}$$

for all y such that $l^T y = 0$.

Pick $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Define $y := (I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2})z$. Then $y \in P$. Next we will show that $K \leq 0$.

Pick z arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z^T K z &= z^T \left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right) D \left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right) z \\ &= z^T \left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right)^T D \left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right) z. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $z^T K z = \left(\left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right) z \right)^T D \left(\left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2} \right) z \right) = y^T D y$. Using equation(6), we have $y^T D y \leq 0$. Therefore, $K \leq 0$.

Sufficiency: Suppose K has $(n - 1)$ negative eigenvalues and one zero eigenvalue. This implies that $z^T K z \leq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We will show that if $z \in \{x : l^T x = 0\}$, then $z^T K z < 0$.

There exists orthonormal basis $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$ of P consisting of eigenvectors of matrix K , with eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}\}$. Since $v_0 = l$ is the eigenvector with zero eigenvalue, we get $\lambda_i < 0$ for all $i \in \{1 \dots n - 1\}$.

Assume $z \in \{x : l^T x = 0\}$. Then $z = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} p_j v_j, p_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and,

$$\begin{aligned} z^T K z &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i v_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i K v_i \right\rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i v_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i \lambda_i v_i \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i p_i^2 < \max(\lambda_i) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i^2 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Pick x in neighborhood of x_0 on P . Then $(x_0 - x) \perp l$. Put $z = x_0 - x$. We obtain $(x_0 - x)^T K (x_0 - x) < 0$. Using definition of matrix K , we get $(x_0 - x)^T K (x_0 - x) = (x_0 - x)^T D (x_0 - x) < 0$. Since x_0 is critical point, $\left\langle \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=x_0}, x - x_0 \right\rangle = 0$. Using Taylor expansion for $f(\cdot)$, we obtain $f(x) < f(x_0)$ in some neighborhood of x_0 on P . Therefore x_0 is a point of local maximum for $f(\cdot)$ on hyperplane P . \square

In the following section, we will list some assumptions about the function $\phi(\cdot)$. These assumptions will be used to show the main result of this paper.

3 Assumptions about Cost function

Notation: The following notation will be followed, unless specified.

$\psi'(s) := \frac{d\psi}{dx} \Big|_{x=s}, \psi_\beta(\beta q) := \frac{d}{d\beta}(\psi(\beta q)), h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n) := \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}(h(\beta, q_j, q_n))$, where $\psi(\cdot)$, and $h(\cdot)$ are functions which will be defined later.

Assumption 1: $\phi(\cdot) \in C^2, \phi(-x) = -\phi(x), \phi'(x) > 0, x\phi''(x) < 0$, for all $x \neq 0$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x) < \infty$. $x\phi''(x) < 0$ implies that $\phi'(x)$ is decreasing function for all $x > 0$. Hence $\phi'(\cdot)^{-1}$ exists. Denote $\phi'(\cdot)^{-1} = \psi(\cdot)$. We get $\psi : (0, \phi'(0)] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. In addition, $\psi'(x) < 0$ for all x .

Assumption 2: $x(\ln |\psi'(x)|)'$ is a monotonically increasing function of x . This implies that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)} \right) > 0$, where $p > q$.

Assumption 3: Set $h(\beta, q_j, q_n) = \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}$. Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left[\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right]$ is sign definite, where $q_j < q_n < q_l$.

Assumption 4 : For all $p > q$, we have $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0$.

Assumption 5: For all $x > 0$, we have $\frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) \right) \geq 0$.

4 Possible Locations of Points of Local Maxima

In this section, we will use above assumptions to locate the possible locations of points of local maxima for function $f(\cdot)$ over hyperplane P . Recall $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ and $P = \{x : l^T x = b\}$, where $l = (l_j)_{j=1}^n$ is the normal vector.

First, we change basis in order to get $c_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Suppose $c_j = 0$ for some $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$, then the corresponding term in the sum is zero, and we obtain $f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_k x_k$. The problem is reduced to similar problem of dimension $n - 1$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $c_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Next assume that $c_{j_0} < 0$ for some $j_0 \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Using assumption (1), $\phi(\cdot)$ is odd function. This implies that $c_{j_0} \phi(x_{j_0}) = -c_{j_0} \phi(-x_{j_0})$. Hence, if $c_{j_0} < 0$ then replacing c_{j_0} by $-c_{j_0}$, and e_{j_0} by $-e_{j_0}$, the function $f(x)$ remains unchanged, and coefficient $c_{j_0} > 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $c_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$.

Next, we consider the signs of the components of vector l . If $l_{j_0} = 0$ for some $j_0 \in \{1 \dots n\}$, then x_{j_0} can be increased arbitrarily, still $\sum_{j=1}^n l_j x_j$ remains unchanged. Hence, the function $f(x)$ does not have a point of local maximum on P . Therefore we can assume that $l_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Next, assume that there exists $j_0, j_1 \in \{1 \dots n\}$ where $j_0 \neq j_1$, such that $l_{j_0} < 0 < l_{j_1}$. Then we will increase x_{j_0} and x_{j_1} such that $\sum_{j=1}^n l_j x_j$ is unchanged. It is easy to see that the function $f(x)$ is increasing on P . The function $f(x)$ does not have a point of local maximum on P . Hence, we can assume that for any $j_0, j_1 \in \{1 \dots n\}$, where $j_0 \neq j_1$ the product $l_{j_0} l_{j_1}$ is positive. Suppose $l_j < 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Then we replace b by $-b$ and vector l by $-l$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $l_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose x_0 is a critical point for function $f(\cdot)$. Then, x_0 is a point of local maximum only if the orthant has at most one negative coordinate (i.e. $x_j < 0$ for at most one j , where $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$).*

Proof. Notice that $D = \text{diag}(d_j)_{j=1}^n$, and l denotes the normal vector. The characteristic polynomial of K is given by $\det(\lambda I - K) = 0$, where λ denotes eigenvalue of matrix K . First we will compute $\det(\lambda I - K)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\lambda I - K) &= \det\left(\lambda I - \left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2}\right)D\left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \det\left(\lambda I - D\left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2}\right)\left(I - \frac{ll^T}{\|l\|^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \det(\lambda I - D) \det\left(I + \frac{l^T(\lambda I - D)^{-1}Dl}{\|l\|^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

using Sylvester identity.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\lambda I - K) &= \det(\lambda I - D) \left(1 + \frac{l^T(\lambda I - D)^{-1}Dl}{\|l\|^2}\right) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda - d_i)\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda l_i^2}{\|l\|^2 (\lambda - d_i)}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

It follows from equation (7) that $\lambda = 0$ is an eigenvalue of K . Denote $g(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda l_i^2}{\|l\|^2 (\lambda - d_i)}$.

We can see that $g(\lambda)$ has vertical asymptotes at d_j . Suppose all d_j 's are distinct. Then, we can arrange them as $d_1 < d_2 < \dots < d_n$. It is easy to see that for all $d_j > 0$, $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_j^+} g(\lambda) = \infty$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_j^-} g(\lambda) = -\infty$. If $d_j < 0$, then $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_j^+} g(\lambda) = -\infty$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_j^-} g(\lambda) = \infty$. Since function $g(\cdot)$ is continuous in (d_j, d_{j+1}) , there exists a root, λ_j of function $g(\cdot)$ in this open interval. Number λ_j is an eigenvalue of K for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, $\{0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}\}$ are all eigenvalues of matrix K . Now consider the general case. We order the values of d_j : $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$. If $d_j < d_{j+1}$ then the proof is same as above. If $d_{j-1} \neq d_j = d_{j+1} = \dots = d_{j+k} \neq d_{j+k+1}$, then there are k eigenvalues $\lambda_j = \lambda_{j+1} = \dots = \lambda_{j+k-1}$ of K at point d_j . Together with the zero eigenvalue the set of such numbers $\{\lambda_j\}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ is the set of all eigenvalues of K .

Claim 1: $d_j > 0$ for at most one j where $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$.

Suppose there exists d_j, d_k , where $j \neq k$ such that $d_k > d_j > 0$. Then $g(\lambda) = 0$ for some $\lambda \in (d_j, d_k)$. This implies that matrix K has a positive eigenvalue, but $K \leq 0$ (Theorem 2.1). Hence, we arrive at a contradiction. Claim 1 proved.

Case 1: Suppose $d_j \leq 0$ for all j . Using definition of d_j , and assumption 1, we obtain $x_j \geq 0$ for all j .

Case 2: Suppose $d_j > 0$ for some j . It can be analyzed in a similar manner to Case 1. We obtain that $x_j < 0$ for some j .

Combining the results of Case 1 and Case 2, we obtain that a stationary point, x_0 , is a point of local maximum only if the orthant has at most one negative coordinate. \square

Using Theorem 4.1, we can deduce that function $f(x)$ can have points of local maxima in main orthant or side orthant with at most one coordinate negative. Next, we will show that $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in main orthant.

5 Points of Local Maxima in Main Orthant

In this section, we will show that $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in main orthant (i.e. $x_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$).

Proposition 5.1. *The function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the main orthant.*

Proof. This is obvious, since $f(\cdot)$ is concave over the main orthant. \square

Next, we will present the necessary and sufficient condition for existence of point of local maximum in main orthant.

Proposition 5.2. *A point x_0 is a point of local maximum in main orthant if and only if there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^n l_j \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}) = b$, where $\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j} < \phi'(0)$ for all j , and b is such that $l'x_0 = b$.*

Proof. Necessity: Suppose that x_0 is a point of local maxima in the main orthant and $x_0 \in P$, the hyperplane. Then x_0 is a critical point. We obtain $\vec{\nabla} f(x_0) = \beta l$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $l_j > 0$ for all j , and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} = c_j \phi'(x_j) > 0$, we obtain that $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Hence, $\phi'(x_0^j) = \beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$, which in turn implies that $x_0^j = \psi(\beta q_j)$ where $q_j := \frac{l_j}{c_j}$, and $\psi := (\phi'(\cdot))^{-1}$. Since x_0 lies on hyperplane P , we obtain $b = l'x_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j)$. for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Sufficiency: Assume that there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $b = \sum_{j=1}^n l_j \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j})$. Using definition of $\psi(\cdot)$, we get $b = \sum_{j=1}^n l_j (\phi')^{-1}(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j})$. Denote $x_0^j := (\phi')^{-1}(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j})$. This implies $\phi'(x_0^j) = \beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Therefore, $\vec{\nabla} f(x_0) = \beta l$. Hence x_0 is a stationary point in main orthant. Since $f(x)$ is concave over the main orthant, x_0 is a point of local maximum in the main orthant. \square

In Theorem 4.1 we saw that a critical point x_0 for function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ can be a point of local maximum only if it is lying in orthant with at most one negative component. In this section, we developed the necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of local maximum in main orthant. In addition, we also showed that $f(x)$ can have at most one point of local maximum in main orthant. Next we will show similar result for the case of side orthant with one negative component. In later sections we will use *side orthant* to denote side orthant with one negative component.

6 Points of local maxima in side orthant

In this section, we will show that the function $f(x)$, defined on the hyperplane, has at most one point of local maximum in side orthant. Here we have shown the result for the side orthant, with last component negative. Other cases can be analyzed similarly.

First, we will develop the necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of local maximum in side orthant (i.e $x_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n - 1\}, x_n < 0$). Suppose x_0 is a critical point for function $f(\cdot)$ in the side orthant (i.e $x_0^j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n - 1\}, x_0^n < 0$). Then, there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$c_j \phi'(x_0^j) = \beta l_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. This implies $x_0^j = \text{sign}(x_0^j)(\phi')^{-1}(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}) = \text{sign}(x_0^j)(\phi')^{-1}(\beta q_j)$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Recall that $d_j = c_j \phi''(x_j)$. Using assumption 1, we obtain $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_{n-1} < 0 < d_n$.

Denote $g_1(\beta) := l'x_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j (\phi')^{-1}(\beta q_j) - l_n (\phi')^{-1}(\beta q_n)$, where $q_j = \frac{l_j}{c_j}$. Using the notation $(\phi')^{-1} := \psi$, we obtain

$$g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n) \quad (8)$$

Theorem 6.1. *Let $g(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda l_i^2}{\|l\|^2(\lambda - d_i)}$. If $g'(0) < 0$ and $g_1(\beta) = b$, for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then x_0 is a point of local maximum for the function $f(\cdot)$, over the hyperplane P . Moreover, x_0 is a point of local maximum only if $g'(0) \leq 0$ and $g_1(\beta) = b$, for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.*

Proof. Sufficiency: It is easy to see that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_n^-} g(\lambda) = -\infty$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow d_{n-1}^+} g(\lambda) = -\infty$. We saw earlier that there exists unique $\lambda \in (d_j, d_{j+1})$ for all $j \leq n-2$ and λ is eigenvalue of K . Thus matrix K has $n-2$ negative eigenvalues.

So we have 2 roots of $g(\lambda)$ in the interval (d_{n-1}, d_n) . One of the roots is 0. Denote the other root as $\hat{\lambda}$. Notice that $d_{n-1} < 0 < d_n$. This implies that $\hat{\lambda}$ can be negative or positive. But under the assumption that $g'(0) < 0$, we have $\hat{\lambda} < 0$. Moreover, $\hat{\lambda} \in (d_{n-1}, 0)$. Hence we conclude that matrix K has $n-1$ negative eigenvalues and a zero eigenvalue. Using theorem 2.1, x_0 is a point of local maximum.

Necessity: Suppose that x_0 is a point of local maximum. Then $K \leq 0$. This implies $g'(0) \leq 0$ and $b = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n)$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$. \square

In theorem 6.1 we developed the necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of point of local maximum in side orthant. These conditions can be rewritten in terms of function $g_1(\beta)$. To this end, we need the following equivalent statement.

Lemma 6.1. *Consider function $g(\lambda)$ as defined above. Then $g'(0) < 0$ if and only if $g'_1(\beta) > 0$.*

Proof. Necessity: We can rewrite $g'(0)$ as

$$g'(0) = \sum_{j=1}^n -\frac{l_j^2}{d_j \|l\|^2} = \frac{1}{\|l\|^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{l_j^2}{c_j \phi''(\text{sign}(x_0^j) \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}))},$$

where, $d_j = c_j \phi''(x_0^j) = c_j \phi''(\text{sign}(x_0^j) \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j}))$, and x_0 is critical point for $f(\cdot)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} g'(0) &= -\frac{1}{\|l\|^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{l_j q_j}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_j))} + \frac{l_n q_n}{\phi''(-\psi(\beta q_n))} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|l\|^2} \left(\frac{l_n q_n}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_n))} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{l_j q_j}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_j))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

since $\phi''(\cdot)$ is odd.

Hence $g'(0) < 0$ implies

$$\frac{q_n l_n}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_n))} < \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_j l_j}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_j))} \quad (9)$$

Next, we want to express $g'_1(\beta)$ in a form similar to $g'(0)$. To this end, we need an auxiliary result.

Claim 2: $\frac{1}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q))} = \psi'(\beta q)$. Using definition of $\psi(\cdot)$, we obtain $\psi(\phi'(x)) = x$. Differentiating with respect to x we get $\psi'(\phi'(x))\phi''(x) = 1$. This give us $\phi''(x) = \frac{1}{\psi'(\phi'(x))}$. Let $\phi'(x) = y$. Then $x = \psi(y)$. Evaluating $\phi''(x)$ we get $\phi''(x) = \phi''(\psi(y))$. Hence $\frac{1}{\psi'(y)} = \phi''(\psi(y))$. Claim 2 proved.

From equation (8) it is easy to see that

$$g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n) \quad (10)$$

where, $\frac{d\psi}{dx} |_{x=\beta q} := \psi'(x)$. Using Claim 2, equation (10) can be rewritten as $g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{l_j q_j}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_j))} - \frac{l_n q_n}{\phi''(\psi(\beta q_n))}$. Hence $g'(0) < 0$ implies that $g'_1(\beta) > 0$.

Sufficiency: It easily follows from claim 2, and equation (10). \square

As a consequence, we have the following result.

Corollary 6.1. *A critical point x_0 is a point of local maximum in side orthant if $g'_1(\beta) > 0, g_1(\beta) = b$, and only if $g'_1(\beta) \geq 0, g_1(\beta) = b$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.*

Proof. The proof easily follows from theorem 6.1 and lemma 6.1. \square

Next we will show that the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ has at most one point of local maximum in side orthant. Before going over the proof, we will prove some useful properties of function $g_1(\cdot)$, which will be used frequently in following sections. Notice that

$$g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n)$$

and,

$$g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n)$$

Remark 6.1. *If $q_j = q_k$ for some j, k then the optimization problem can be reduced to similar problem of lower dimension. Therefore, in the future sections, we will assume that q_j where $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$ takes distinct values.*

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $q_n < q_{j_0}$, where $j_0 \neq n$. Then the following statements are true.*

- (i) $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most two roots on the interval $(0, \beta_{max}]$.
- (ii) $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$.

Proof. Denote $h(\beta, q_j, q_n) := \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}$, and $h(\beta, q_l, q_n) := \frac{\psi'(\beta q_l)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}$, where $j, l \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Recall that $\psi'(\beta q) = \frac{d\psi}{ds} |_{s=\beta q}$.

(i) Suppose $q_n < q_{j_0}$ for some $j_0 \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Let $q_1 < q_2 < \dots < q_k < q_n < q_{k+1} < \dots < q_{n-1}$.

Using assumption 2, and definition of $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$, we get $h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n) \neq 0$. In assumption 3, we saw that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left[\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right]$ has the same sign for all (β, q_j, q_n, q_l) such that $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$, and $0 < q_j < q_n < q_l$.

Using assumptions 2 and 3, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left(\log \left| \frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right| \right) = \frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left(\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right) \neq 0.$$

Notice that for all pairs (q_j, q_l) such that $q_j < q_l$ the expression $h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n)h_{\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) - h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n)h_{\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n)$ is sign definite, where $h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}(h_{\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n))$. This implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \underbrace{l_j q_j l_l q_l}_{\text{is positive}} \left[h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n)h_{\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) - h_{\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n)h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) \right] \neq 0,$$

which, in turn implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n) \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l h_{\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) - \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j h_{\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n) \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) \neq 0$$

where, $\alpha_j := l_j q_j$, and $\alpha_l := l_l q_l$.

Denote $g(\beta) := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{\sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l h_{\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n)}$. We can see that left side of above equation is same as numerator of $g'(\beta)$. This implies that $g'(\beta)$ is sign definite. Therefore there exists at most one β , such that $g(\beta_1) = -1$. This implies that $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j h_{\beta}(\beta, q_j, q_n) + \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l h_{\beta\beta}(\beta, q_l, q_n) = 0$ for at most one value of β .

Using definition of $h_{\beta}(\beta, q, q_n)$, we obtain $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}(h(\beta, q_j, q_n)) + \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta}(h(\beta, q_l, q_n)) - l_n q_n$ has at most one root. Recalling definition of $h(\beta, q_j, q_n)$ we obtain that function $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)} \right) + \sum_{l=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_l \frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta q_l)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)} \right) - l_n q_n$ has at most one root. It is easy to see that above function is equal to $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{g'_1(\beta)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)} \right)$. Since $\psi'(\beta q) < 0$, we obtain that $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most two roots in $(0, \beta_{max}]$. This completes the proof for part(i).

(ii) Using assumption 1, $\phi'(x)$ is a decreasing function for all $x > 0$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(x) = 0$ (since $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \phi(y) < \infty$). Since $\psi(\cdot) := \phi'(\cdot)^{-1}$, we get $\psi : (0, \phi'(0)] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Moreover, $\psi'(x) < 0$ for all $x > 0$. Using the fact that $\psi'(y) = \frac{1}{\phi''((\phi')^{-1}(y))}$ (by Claim 2 in lemma 6.1) and $\phi''(0) = 0$, we obtain

$$\psi'(y) \rightarrow -\infty, \text{ as } y \rightarrow \phi'(0). \quad (11)$$

Recall that $g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n)$. Since, $q_n < q_{j_0} = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^n$, we get $q_{j_0} \beta_{max} = \phi'(0)$. Hence using equation (11), we obtain that $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Proof for part (ii) completed. \square

Remark 6.2. Similarly we can show that if $q_n = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^n$, then $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$.

Lemma 6.3. Suppose that $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Then, $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most one root. Moreover, if $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) \geq 0$, then $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$.

Proof. Assume $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. We will use contrapositive approach to prove this claim.

Suppose there exist $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ such that $g'_1(\beta_1) = g'_1(\beta_2) = 0$. Since $g'_1(\beta_1) = 0$, we get $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta_1 q_j)}{l_n q_n \psi'(\beta_1 q_n)} =$

1. Similarly, $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta_2 q_j)}{l_n q_n \psi'(\beta_2 q_n)} = 1$. Denote $\frac{l_j q_j}{l_n q_n} := \alpha_j > 0$ for all j , and $F(\beta) := \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_j \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}$.

Hence there exist $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ such that $F(\beta_1) = F(\beta_2) = 1$. So there exist β_0 such that $F'(\beta_0) = 0$. This implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \alpha_j \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)} \right) |_{\beta=\beta_0} = 0$, where, $q_j < q_n$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Since $\alpha_j > 0$ for all

$j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$, we conclude that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)} \right) |_{\beta=\beta_0}$ is not sign definite. Hence we obtain contradiction to assumption 2, which says that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)} \right)$, where $p \neq q$ is sign definite. Therefore, if $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$, then $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most one root in the interval $(0, \beta_{max})$.

Moreover, assume that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) \geq 0$, where $g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n)$. First, consider the case when $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) > 0$. Then, the function $g_1(\cdot)$ can either be identically increasing or $g_1(\cdot)$ changes monotonicity. We will show that the second case cannot happen. Using the remark 6.2 we obtain

$$g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } \beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}. \quad (12)$$

Suppose by contradiction that $g_1(\cdot)$ changes monotonicity. Using the fact $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) > 0$, and (12), we get $g_1(\beta)$ has two critical points, given by $\bar{\beta}$ and β_1 . But this contradicts first part of this lemma. Hence $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$.

Next let $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) = 0$. Using remark 6.2 and first part of this lemma, we obtain that $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$. \square

Remark 6.3. *In lemmas 6.2 and 6.3, we assumed that the last component is negative. Similar results hold true for side orthant with first or second component negative. These results will be used in the proof for case of two side orthants.*

Next, we will show the main result of the section.

Proposition 6.1. *The function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the side orthant.*

Proof. Recall that, $g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n)$, and $g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n)$.

Case 1: Suppose $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. We need to show that for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists at most one value of $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$ such that $g_1(\beta) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ (corollary 6.1). Using remark 6.2, we get that $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Moreover, from lemma 6.3, we obtain that if $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$, then $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most one root. Hence, there exists at most one value of β such that $g_1(\beta) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta) > 0$. This completes the proof for Case 1.

Case 2: Suppose $q_n < q_{j_0}$ where $j_0 \neq n$. Using lemma 6.2 we get that $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most two roots in the interval $(0, \beta_{max}]$. In addition, we showed in lemma 6.2 that $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Hence, for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists at most one $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$ such that $g_1(\beta) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta) \geq 0$. Therefore $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in side orthant. Case 2 completed. \square

In section 4, we saw that the function $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in main orthant or side orthant with one component negative. It might happen that there are two points of local maxima, one in main orthant and other in side orthant with one component negative. But in the next section we will show that $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in both main orthant and side orthant with one negative component.

7 Points of Local Maxima in Main and Side Orthant

In this section we will show that the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, defined on the hyperplane P, does not have points of local maxima in both main orthant and side orthant. In the main orthant $f(x)$ is of the form

$$f_1(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i \psi(\beta q_i),$$

and in side orthant it is of the form

$$g_1(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} l_i \psi(\beta q_i) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n).$$

We will first present two auxiliary results. These will be used to show that $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in both main orthant and side orthant.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose $f_1(\beta)$ and $g_1(\beta)$ are defined as above. Then the following are true:*

- (i) $f_1(\beta) \geq g_1(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$
- (ii) $f'_1(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$.

Proof. It can be easily checked that

$$f'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j), \quad (13)$$

and,

$$g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_n q_n \psi'(\beta q_n). \quad (14)$$

where $\psi(\cdot) = (\phi'(\cdot))^{-1}$, $\psi'(\beta q) = \frac{d\psi}{ds} |_{s=\beta q}$.

- (i) We will first show that $f_1(\beta) \geq g_1(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$. Using assumption 1, we have $\phi'(x) \geq 0$ for all x . Hence $\psi(x) \geq 0$ for all x . Moreover, it is easy to see that the expressions for $f_1(\beta)$ and $g_1(\beta)$ are identical except the term $l_n \psi(\beta q_n)$. Since $l_n \psi(\beta q_n) \geq 0$, we obtain $f_1(\beta) \geq g_1(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max}]$. This completes the proof for (i).
- (ii) The proof follows from the fact that $\psi'(x) < 0$ for all x (assumption 1).

□

Now, we will present the main result of this section.

Proposition 7.1. *The function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ has at most one point of local maximum in main orthant and side orthant.*

Proof. We need to show that $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in both main orthant and side orthant. Using proposition 5.2 and corollary 6.1, we need to show that for given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there does not exist $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \in (0, \beta_{max}]$ such that $f_1(\beta_1) = b$, and $g_1(\beta_2) = b$, $g'_1(\beta_2) \geq 0$. We will prove the above result using two cases.

Case 1: Let $q_n > q_j$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Using assumption 1, we get that $\psi'(y) < 0$, and $\psi(y) \in [0, \infty)$ where $y \in (0, \phi'(0)]$. We obtain that $\lim_{y \rightarrow \phi'(0)} \psi(y) = 0$. Define $y := \beta q$, then $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}} \psi(\beta q_n) = 0$, which in turn gives $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}} l_n \psi(\beta q_n) = 0$. Hence

$$f_1(\beta_{max}) = g_1(\beta_{max}). \quad (15)$$

Now we will look at following possibilities.

Sub Case (i): Suppose $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$. First, we will consider the case when $g_1(\beta)$ is decreasing identically. Using corollary 6.1, $f(x)$ does not have any point of local maximum in side orthant. So $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the main orthant.

Next, suppose that $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity. We showed in lemma 6.3 that $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most one root. Denote $\bar{\beta} \in [0, \beta_{max}]$ as the point where $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity. To summarize, $f_1(\beta)$ and $g_1(\beta)$ satisfy the following conditions :

- (i) $f'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $f_1(\beta) > g_1(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$; see lemma 7.1
- (ii) $g'_1(\beta) < 0$ on the interval $(0, \bar{\beta}]$ and $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ on the interval $[\bar{\beta}, \beta_{max}]$.
- (iii) $f_1(\beta_{max}) = g_1(\beta_{max})$.

Using the above conditions, we can deduce that for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$ there does not exist $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ such that $f_1(\beta) = b$ and $g_1(\beta) = b, g'_1(\beta) > 0$. Hence, $f(\cdot)$ has at most one point of local maximum in either main or side orthant. This completes the proof for Sub Case (i).

Sub Case (ii): Suppose $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) \geq 0$. From lemma 6.3, we get that $g_1(\beta)$ is a monotonically increasing function. Using lemma 7.1, $f_1(\beta) > g_1(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in [0, \beta_{max})$, and $f'_1(\beta) < 0$ for all β . At the same time, $g_1(\beta_{max}) = f_1(\beta_{max})$. Hence, for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists at most one $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$ such that either $f_1(\beta) = b$, or $g_1(\beta) = b, g'_1(\beta) > 0$.

Proof for Sub Case 2 completed. Combining the results of Sub Case 1 and Sub Case 2, we conclude that $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in both main orthant and side orthant. This completes the proof for Case 1.

Case 2: Suppose $q_n < q_{j0}$, where $j0 \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. We will go over this case by contradiction. Suppose the function $f(x)$ has two points of local maxima, one in each main and side orthant. This implies that there exist $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$, such that for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_1(\beta_1) = g_1(\beta_2) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta_2) \geq 0$. Notice that β_1 and β_2 lie in $(0, \beta_{max}]$. Recall that $f_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j)$, and $g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_n \psi(\beta q_n)$.

Using part (ii) of lemma 6.2, we get $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. In addition, we assume that $g'_1(\beta_2) > 0$. This implies that there exists $\beta' \in (\beta_2, \beta_{max})$ such that $g'_1(\beta') = 0$, and $g_1(\beta') > b = f_1(\beta_1) > f_1(\beta_{max})$ (lemma 7.1).

Since $g'_1(\beta') = 0$, we get $l_n = \frac{1}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j)$. This implies that $g_1(\beta') = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \left(\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) \right)$. Moreover, we also have $f_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \left(\psi(\beta q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) \right)$. Then, $f_1(\beta_{max}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \left(\psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j) \right)$. Since $g_1(\beta') > f_1(\beta_{max})$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \left(\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) \right) > \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} l_j \left(\psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j) \right).$$

We saw in section 4, that $l_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Hence there exists $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$ such that

$$\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) > \psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j).$$

We will show that the above inequality is not true. In other words, we will show that for all q_j , where $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$,

$$\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) \leq \psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j). \quad (16)$$

Pick arbitrary q_j , where $j \in \{1 \dots n-1\}$. Then we will consider the following possibilities.

Sub Case (i): Let $q_n > q_j$. Using assumption 2, we have $\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)}, p > q$ is an increasing function of β .

This implies $-\frac{q_j}{q_n}\psi(\beta q_n)\frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}\right) > 0$ (since $\psi(\cdot) > 0$). Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j)\right) &= q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) - \frac{q_j}{q_n} \psi(\beta' q_n) \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\frac{\psi'(\beta' q_j)}{\psi'(\beta' q_n)}\right) - \frac{q_j}{q_n} \frac{\psi'(\beta' q_j)}{\psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n) \\ &= -\frac{q_j}{q_n} \psi(\beta' q_n) \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\frac{\psi'(\beta' q_j)}{\psi'(\beta' q_n)}\right) \\ &> 0.\end{aligned}$$

The left hand side of inequality (16) is an increasing function of β . Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) &< \psi(\beta_{max} q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j) \\ &< \psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j).\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

since $\frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j) > 0$.

Therefore inequality (16) is true. This completes the proof for Sub Case (i).

Sub Case (ii): Suppose $q_n < q_j$. Using assumption 4 we have $\frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\frac{\psi(\beta q)}{\psi(\beta p)}\right) > 0$, where $p > q$. Then we obtain a sequence of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\ln \frac{\psi(\beta q)}{\psi(\beta p)}\right) &> 0, \\ \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\ln(\psi(\beta q))\right) &> \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\ln(\psi(\beta p))\right) \\ \frac{1}{\psi(\beta p)} \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\psi(\beta p)\right) &< \frac{1}{\psi(\beta q)} \frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\psi(\beta q)\right) \\ \psi(\beta p) &< \psi(\beta q) \frac{\frac{d}{d\beta}(\psi(\beta p))}{\frac{d}{d\beta}(\psi(\beta q))}.\end{aligned}$$

since $\psi'(x) < 0$, and $\psi(x) > 0$.

Let $p := q_j, q := q_n, \beta := \beta'$, we obtain $\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) < 0$. Hence left hand side of inequality (16) is negative.

We have seen earlier that $\psi(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (0, \phi'(0)]$, and $\psi'(x) < 0$ for all $x \in (0, \phi'(0))$. This implies that $\psi(\beta_{max} q_j) + \frac{\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta_{max} q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta_{max} q_j) > 0$. Therefore inequality (16) is true. This completes the proof for Sub Case (ii).

Sub Case (iii): Assume that $q_n = q_j$. Then it is easy to see that $\psi(\beta' q_j) - \frac{\psi(\beta' q_n)}{q_n \psi'(\beta' q_n)} q_j \psi'(\beta' q_j) = 0$. The left hand side of inequality (16) is zero. The right hand side of inequality (16) is equal to $2\psi(\beta_{max} q_n)$. If $\beta_{max} q_n = \phi'(0)$, then $\psi(\beta_{max} q_n) = 0$. Hence we get equality.

Therefore, we obtain contradiction to our assumption. Combining the results of Case 1 and Case 2, we obtain that $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in main orthant and side orthant. \square

We have seen that the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i), c_i \neq 0$ for all $i \in \{1 \dots n\}$ does not have points of local maxima in main and side orthant. Now, we will show similar result for two side orthants.

8 Points of local maxima in Two Side Orthants

In this section, we will show that function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, $c_i \neq 0$ for all n , does not have points of local maxima in two side orthants. We will show the proof for the case, when the first and second components are negative. Other cases can be analyzed similarly.

In the first side orthant, $f(x)$ takes the form

$$g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=2}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_1 \psi(\beta q_1), \quad (18)$$

and in the second side orthant $f(x)$ is of the form

$$g_2(\beta) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_2 \psi(\beta q_2). \quad (19)$$

It can be easily checked that

$$g_1'(\beta) = \sum_{j=2}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_1 q_1 \psi'(\beta q_1), \quad (20)$$

and

$$g_2'(\beta) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_2 q_2 \psi'(\beta q_2). \quad (21)$$

First, we will solve an auxiliary problem. The main result of this section will be an easy consequence of the solution to this auxiliary problem.

8.1 Three Point Problem

Lemma 8.1. *Consider the functions $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ defined above. Suppose β_1 , and β_2 are critical points for $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ respectively. Moreover assume that $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$. Then the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \right] \quad (22)$$

$$+ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} \right) \quad (23)$$

$$+ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \right) \quad (24)$$

$$+ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \quad (25)$$

$$+ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \quad (26)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \Big] < 0.$$

Here, $\psi_\beta(\beta_i q_j) := \frac{d}{d\beta}(\psi(\beta q_j))|_{\beta=\beta_i}$, and $i \in \{1, 2\}, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Proof. Notice that the proof is quite technical. Since $g'_1(\beta_1) = 0$, and $g'_2(\beta_2) = 0$, we obtain

$$l_1 q_1 \psi'(\beta_1 q_1) = l_2 q_2 \psi'(\beta_1 q_2) + \sum_{j=3}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta_1 q_j), \text{ and}$$

$$l_2 q_2 \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) = l_1 q_1 \psi'(\beta_2 q_1) + \sum_{j=3}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta_2 q_j)$$

Solving for l_1 and l_2 we get

$$l_1 = \frac{1}{q_1} \sum_{j=3}^n l_j q_j \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j)}{\psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) - \psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_2)} \right), \text{ and} \quad (27)$$

$$l_2 = \frac{1}{q_2} \sum_{j=3}^n l_j q_j \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) - \psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \quad (28)$$

For simplicity, denote $\psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) - \psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_2) := \Delta$. Since $l_j > 0$ for all j , and $\psi'(\cdot) < 0$, we get $\Delta > 0$.

Using equations (27) and (28) we can rewrite the expressions for $g_1(\beta_1)$ and $g_2(\beta_2)$ as

$$g_1(\beta_1) = \sum_{j=3}^n l_j \left[q_j \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{q_2} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) \psi'(\beta_1 q_1)}{\Delta} \right) - \frac{q_j \psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{q_1} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j)}{\Delta} \right) + \psi(\beta_1 q_j) \right], \text{ and} \quad (29)$$

$$g_2(\beta_2) = \sum_{j=3}^n l_j \left[q_j \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{q_1} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) \psi'(\beta_2 q_2)}{\Delta} \right) - \frac{q_j \psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{q_2} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j)}{\Delta} \right) + \psi(\beta_2 q_j) \right] \quad (30)$$

Since $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) = & \sum_{j=3}^n l_j \left[- \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j)}{\Delta} \right) \left(\frac{q_j \psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{q_1} + \frac{q_j \psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{q_1} \right) \right. \\ & + \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) + \psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j)}{\Delta} \right) \left(\frac{q_j \psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{q_2} + \frac{q_j \psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{q_2} \right) \\ & \left. + (\psi(\beta_1 q_j) - \psi(\beta_2 q_j)) \right] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides of the inequality by $4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_1 q_2 \Delta$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=3}^n l_j \left[- \left(4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_2 q_j \psi'(\beta_1 q_2) \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) + 4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_2 q_j \psi'(\beta_2 q_2) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) \right) (\psi(\beta_1 q_1) + \psi(\beta_2 q_1)) \right. \\ & + \left(4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_1 q_j \psi'(\beta_2 q_1) \psi'(\beta_1 q_j) + 4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_1 q_j \psi'(\beta_2 q_j) \psi'(\beta_1 q_1) \right) (\psi(\beta_1 q_2) + \psi(\beta_2 q_2)) \\ & \left. + 4\beta_1 \beta_2 q_1 q_2 \Delta (\psi(\beta_1 q_j) - \psi(\beta_2 q_j)) \right] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $l_j > 0$ for all j , at least one of the coefficients in the above sum should be negative. Without loss of generality let $j = 3$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & -4\beta_1\beta_2q_2q_3 \left[\psi'(\beta_1q_2)\psi'(\beta_2q_3) + \psi'(\beta_2q_2)\psi'(\beta_1q_3) \right] \left(\psi(\beta_1q_1) + \psi(\beta_2q_1) \right) \\ & + 4\beta_1\beta_2q_1q_3 \left(\psi'(\beta_2q_1)\psi'(\beta_1q_3) + \psi'(\beta_2q_3)\psi'(\beta_1q_1) \right) \left(\psi(\beta_1q_2) + \psi(\beta_2q_2) \right) \\ & + 4\beta_1\beta_2q_1q_2 \Delta \left(\psi(\beta_1q_3) - \psi(\beta_2q_3) \right) \Big] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

We saw earlier that $\psi'(x) < 0$. Dividing both sides of above inequality by $-8\beta_1^3q_1q_2q_3\psi'(\beta_1q_1)\psi'(\beta_1q_2)\psi'(\beta_1q_3)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\beta_1q_1\psi'(\beta_1q_1)} \left(\frac{2\beta_2q_2\psi'(\beta_2q_2)}{2\beta_1q_2\psi'(\beta_1q_2)} + \frac{2\beta_2q_3\psi'(\beta_2q_3)}{2\beta_1q_3\psi'(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \left(\psi(\beta_1q_1) + \psi(\beta_2q_1) \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2\beta_1q_2\psi'(\beta_1q_2)} \left(\frac{2\beta_2q_1\psi'(\beta_2q_1)}{2\beta_1q_1\psi'(\beta_1q_1)} + \frac{2\beta_2q_3\psi'(\beta_2q_3)}{2\beta_1q_3\psi'(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \left(\psi(\beta_1q_2) + \psi(\beta_2q_2) \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2\beta_1q_3\psi'(\beta_1q_3)} \left(\frac{2\beta_2q_2\psi'(\beta_2q_2)}{2\beta_1q_2\psi'(\beta_1q_2)} - \frac{2\beta_2q_1\psi'(\beta_2q_1)}{2\beta_1q_1\psi'(\beta_1q_1)} \right) \left(\psi(\beta_1q_3) - \psi(\beta_2q_3) \right) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

After distributing the terms on left side we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} + \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \right) \right. \\ & + \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \left(-\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \right) \\ & + \left. \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \right) \left(-\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} + \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \right] \\ & = \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \right) \right. \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \right) \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \right) \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \\ & \left. - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \right] < 0. \tag{31} \end{aligned}$$

We can see that the first three terms out of nine terms in the latter sum of inequality (31) are monotonic in terms of q . Next we will express the remaining six terms in similar form. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)} + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)} \right. \\ & - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)} \\ & \left. + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_3)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For brevity, denote $x_j = \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$, and $y_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}$, where $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In new notation, the above expression can be expressed as

$$\frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left(x_3 x_1 y_1 + x_2 x_1 y_1 - x_1 x_2 y_2 - x_3 x_2 y_2 + x_2 x_3 y_3 - x_1 x_3 y_3 \right). \quad (32)$$

Adding and subtracting the terms, $\frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} x_3 x_1 y_2$ and $\frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} x_1 x_2 y_3$ to (32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left(x_3 x_1 y_1 - x_3 x_1 y_2 + x_3 x_1 y_2 + x_2 x_1 y_1 - x_2 x_1 y_3 + x_2 x_1 y_3 - x_1 x_2 y_2 - x_3 x_2 y_2 + x_3 x_2 y_3 - x_1 x_3 y_3 \right) \\ &= \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left(x_3 x_1 (y_1 - y_2) + x_2 x_1 (y_1 - y_3) + (y_2 - y_3) (x_3 x_1 - x_1 x_2 - x_3 x_2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of x_j , and y_j , the above sum is same as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} \right) + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above expression with the first three monotonic terms of inequality (31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} \right) \right. \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \right) + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \\ & + \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) + \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \cdot \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} \right) \right] < 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Denote $x_j = \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$, $y_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}$, and $z_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$. In the new notation, the above inequality can be expressed as

$$\frac{\beta_2}{2\beta_1^2} \left[x_3 (z_1 - z_2) + x_3 x_1 (y_1 - y_2) + x_2 (z_1 - z_3) + x_2 x_1 (y_1 - y_3) + x_1 (z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2) (x_1 x_2 + x_3 x_2 - x_3 x_1) \right] < 0 \quad (33)$$

Next, we will check whether there exist positive numbers $\beta_1, \beta_2, q_1, q_2$, and q_3 such that inequality (33) is satisfied. We will name this problem as Three point problem. This is the subject of discussion in the following section.

8.2 Solution To Three Point Problem

We will present the solution to three point problem using two different cases. In Case I, we will assume that $q_3 < \max(q_1, q_2)$. Without loss of generality we will assume that $q_1 > q_2$. The other situation, where $q_2 > q_1$ can be analyzed similarly. We will show that if $q_1 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^3$, then (33) is not satisfied. To this end, we will present some auxiliary results.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose that $q_1 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^3$. Then, $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, where $g'_1(\beta_1) = g'_2(\beta_2) = 0$.*

Proof. We saw earlier that $\Delta = \psi'(\beta_1 q_1)\psi'(\beta_2 q_2) - \psi'(\beta_2 q_1)\psi'(\beta_1 q_2) > 0$. This implies that

$$\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2)} > \frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi'(\beta_2 q_2)}. \quad (34)$$

Suppose by contradiction, $\beta_1 < \beta_2$. Moreover, assumption 2 gives $\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)}$, $p > q$ is an increasing function of β . Using assumption 2, and the assumption that $\beta_2 > \beta_1$, we get $\frac{\psi'(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi'(\beta_1 q_2)} < \frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi'(\beta_2 q_2)}$. Here $p = q_1$, and $q = q_2$. This contradicts (34). Hence, $\beta_1 > \beta_2$. \square

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose that $q_1 > q_3 > q_2$. Then the following inequalities are satisfied.*

- (i) $z_1 > z_3 > z_2$.
- (ii) $y_1 > y_3 > y_2$.
- (iii) $x_2 > x_3 > x_1 > 0$.

Proof. Notice, $x_j = \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$, $y_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}$, and $z_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$.

(i) We will show that $z_1 > z_2$. Remaining inequalities can be shown similarly.

We need to show that $\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)}$. From assumption 4, we know that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0$, where $p > q$. This implies that $\psi_\beta(\beta p)\psi(\beta q) < \psi(\beta p)\psi_\beta(\beta q)$. Put $\beta = \beta_1$, $p = q_1$, and $q = q_2$. Then, we obtain $\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)\psi(\beta_1 q_2) < \psi(\beta_1 q_1)\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)$, which in turn implies that $\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_1)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)}$. Similarly, we can show other inequalities. Proof for (i) completed.

(ii) The proof is identical to (i).

(iii) We will show that $x_2 > x_3$. Remaining inequalities can be shown similarly.

We need to show that $\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} > \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)}$. Using assumption 2 and the fact that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, we obtain $\frac{d}{dq} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q)} \right) < 0$. Hence we obtain $\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} > \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)}$. Moreover, since $\psi'(x) < 0$, we get $x_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. This completes the proof for (iii). \square

Lemma 8.4. *Suppose $q_1 > q_2 > q_3$. Then the following inequalities hold true.*

- (i) $x_3(y_2 - y_3) < z_2 - z_3$.
- (ii) $0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3$.
- (iii) $z_1 > z_2 > z_3$.
- (iv) $y_1 > y_2 > y_3$.

Proof. Using assumption (2), we get $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)} \right) > 0$, $p > q$. Recall that $\psi'(\beta q) = \frac{d}{ds} \psi(s)|_{s=\beta q}$. This implies that $\frac{q}{p} \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)} \right) > 0$, which, in turn implies $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right) > 0$. Hence $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta q)}{\psi_\beta(\beta p)} \right) < 0$, where

$p > q$. Here $p = q_2$, and $q = q_3$. Since $\psi(\cdot)$ is a non-negative function, we can rewrite the inequality $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta q)}{\psi_\beta(\beta p)} \right) < 0$ as

$$\psi_\beta(\beta q_3) - \psi_\beta(\beta q_2) \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q_2)} - \psi(\beta q_2) \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q_2)} \right) > 0$$

The left hand side of the above inequality is the derivative of $\psi(\beta q_3) - \psi_\beta(\beta q_3) \frac{\psi(\beta q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q_2)}$. Since, $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, we obtain following sequence of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\beta_1 q_3) - \psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3) \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} &> \psi(\beta_2 q_3) - \psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3) \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}, \\ \psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3) \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} - \psi(\beta_2 q_3) &> \psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3) \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} - \psi(\beta_1 q_3), \\ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_3)} \right) &< \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_2)} - \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_3)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $x_3(y_2 - y_3) < z_2 - z_3$. The proofs for remaining inequalities are similar to lemma 8.3. \square

Next, we will use the above auxiliary results to show that inequality (33) is not satisfied. Notice that $x_j = \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$, $y_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_j)}$, and $z_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1 q_j)}$.

Lemma 8.5. *Suppose $q_1 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^3$. Then inequality (33) does not hold.*

Proof. (i) Suppose that $q_1 > q_3 > q_2$. We need to show that

$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1)$ is positive. From (i) and (ii) in lemma 8.3, we obtain

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) > 0$$

It remains to show that $(y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_2x_3 - x_3x_1) > 0$. From (ii) and (iii) in lemma 8.3, we obtain $y_3 > y_2$ and $x_1(x_2 - x_3) > 0$ respectively. Hence

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1) > 0$$

(ii) Next suppose that $q_1 > q_2 > q_3$. We need to show that

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1) \quad (35)$$

is positive.

Using parts (ii) and (iii) of lemma 8.4, we get $x_2(z_1 - z_3) > 0$ and $x_1(z_3 - z_2) < 0$. In addition, we also obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) &= x_2(z_1 - z_2 + z_2 - z_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) \\ &= x_2(z_1 - z_2) + (x_1 - x_2)(z_3 - z_2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite expression (35) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) \\
& + x_2(z_1 - z_2) + (x_1 - x_2)(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1) \\
& = x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_1x_2(y_1 - y_2) \\
& + x_1x_2(y_2 - y_3) + x_2(z_1 - z_2) + (x_1 - x_2)(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1) \\
& = (z_1 - z_2)(x_2 + x_3) + (y_1 - y_2)(x_1x_3 + x_1x_2) \\
& + (x_1 - x_2)\left((z_3 - z_2) + x_3(y_2 - y_3)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using parts (ii), (iii), and (iv) of lemma 8.4 we deduce that $(z_1 - z_2)(x_2 + x_3) + (y_1 - y_2)(x_1x_3 + x_1x_2) > 0$. Next, it suffices to show that $\left((z_3 - z_2) + x_3(y_2 - y_3)\right) < 0$. This is obvious from part (i) of lemma 8.4. Hence expression (35) is positive. This completes the proof for part (ii).

Summarizing the results from parts (i), and (ii) we obtain that when $q_3 < \max(q_1, q_2)$, the expression $x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_3x_1(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_3x_2 - x_3x_1)$ is positive. □

Next we will consider Case II. Assume that $q_3 > \max(q_1, q_2)$. Without loss of generality assume that $q_1 > q_2$. The other case can be analyzed similarly. We will show that

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)(x_1x_2 + x_2x_3 - x_1x_3) > 0. \quad (36)$$

Before going over the proof, we will present some auxiliary results. Notice that $x_j = \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_j)}$, $y_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_j)}$, and $z_j = \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_j)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_j)}$.

Lemma 8.6. *Suppose $q_3 > q_1 > q_2$. Then the following inequalities hold true.*

- (i) $x_2 > x_1 > x_3$.
- (ii) $z_3 > z_1 > z_2$.
- (iii) $y_3 > y_1 > y_2$.
- (iv) $\frac{z_1}{x_1} > \frac{z_2}{x_2}$

Proof. (i) From assumption 2, we know that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta p)}{\psi'(\beta q)} \right) > 0$, where $p > q$. This condition can be restated as $\frac{d}{dq} \left(\frac{\psi'(\beta_2q)}{\psi'(\beta_1q)} \right) < 0$, where $\beta_2 < \beta_1$ (lemma (8.2)). This implies that $\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)} > \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)}$, and we obtain $x_2 > x_1$. Here $\psi_\beta(\beta p) := \frac{d}{d\beta}(\psi(\beta p))$. Similarly, we can show that $x_1 > x_3$. Hence we get $x_2 > x_1 > x_3 > 0$.

(ii) Using assumption 4, we know that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0$ for all $p > q$. This implies that $\psi_\beta(\beta q)\psi(\beta p) > \psi_\beta(\beta p)\psi(\beta q)$. If we put $\beta = \beta_1$, $p = q_1$, and $q = q_2$, we obtain $\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_1)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_1q_2)}$. This implies $z_1 > z_2$. Similarly, we get $z_3 > z_1$. Hence $z_3 > z_1 > z_2$.

(iii) The proof is similar to (ii).

(iv) We need to show that $\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_1)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1q_2)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}$. This is equivalent to showing that $\frac{\psi(\beta_1q_1)}{\psi(\beta_1q_2)} < \frac{\psi(\beta_2q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2q_2)}$. (since $\psi_\beta(\cdot) < 0$)

Using assumption (2), we obtain $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right) > 0$. This implies $\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} > \lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}$. Now we will show that $\lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}$ exists.

Since $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right) > 0$, we obtain that $\left(\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right)$ is a decreasing function of β , as $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$. Hence $\left\{ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right\}$ has an upper bound for small but positive values of β . Moreover since $\psi_\beta(\cdot)$ is negative, $\left\{ \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta p)}{\psi_\beta(\beta q)} \right\}$ has a lower bound too. We obtain a monotonic and bounded sequence, hence $\lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}$ exists.

Using L'hospital's rule we get $\lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} = \lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi'(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi'(\beta_2 q_2)}$. Notice that $\psi(y) \rightarrow \infty$, as $y \rightarrow 0^+$. In addition, assumption (4) gives $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0, p > q$. This implies that $\lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}$. Hence we obtain the following chain of inequalities

$$\frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} > \lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)} \stackrel{LH}{=} \lim_{\beta_2 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\psi(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi(\beta_2 q_2)} > \frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)}$$

Therefore we get $\frac{\psi(\beta_1 q_1)}{\psi(\beta_1 q_2)} < \frac{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_1)}{\psi_\beta(\beta_2 q_2)}$. Proof for (iv) completed. □

Lemma 8.7. *Suppose that $q_3 > q_1 > q_2$. Then inequality (36) holds true.*

Proof. From lemma 8.2, we obtain that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$. The left hand side of (36) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2 z_1 - x_2 z_3 \\ & + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + x_1 x_2(y_1 - y_2 + y_2 - y_3) \\ & + (y_3 - y_2)x_1 x_2 + (y_3 - y_2)(x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_3) \\ & = x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + z_3(x_1 - x_2) \\ & + x_2 z_1 - x_1 z_2 + x_1 x_2(y_1 - y_2) + (y_3 - y_2)x_3(x_2 - x_1). \end{aligned}$$

Using parts (i), (ii), and (iii), of lemma 8.6, we get $x_3(z_1 - z_2) > 0, x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) > 0, z_3(x_1 - x_2) > 0$, and $(y_3 - y_2)x_3(x_2 - x_1) > 0$.

Hence $x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + z_3(x_1 - x_2) + x_2 z_1 - x_1 z_2 + x_1 x_2(y_1 - y_2) + (y_3 - y_2)x_3(x_2 - x_1) > x_2 z_1 - x_1 z_2 + (x_1 x_2)(y_1 - y_2)$. Next we will show that $x_2 z_1 - x_1 z_2 + (x_1 x_2)(y_1 - y_2) > 0$. Since $x_1 x_2(y_1 - y_2) > 0$ (using (iii)), it suffices to show that $x_2 z_1 - x_1 z_2 > 0$. This is equivalent to showing that $\frac{z_1}{x_1} > \frac{z_2}{x_2}$. But we saw in (iv) that $\frac{z_1}{x_1} - \frac{z_2}{x_2} > 0$. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2 z_1 - x_2 z_3 \\ & + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + x_1 x_2(y_1 - y_2 + y_2 - y_3) \\ & + (y_3 - y_2)x_1 x_2 + (y_3 - y_2)(x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_3) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for the case when $q_3 > q_1 > q_2$. □

This completes the solution to Three Point problem. Now we have all the required tools to present the main result of this section. We will show that the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i), c_i \neq 0$ for all i has at most one point of local maxima in two side orthants.

8.3 Number of Points of Local maxima in two Side orthants

Recall that in the first side orthant $f(x)$ is of the form $g_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=2}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_1 \psi(\beta q_1)$, and in the second side orthant $f(x)$ is of the form $g_2(\beta) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^n l_j \psi(\beta q_j) - l_2 \psi(\beta q_2)$. It can be easily checked

that $g'_1(\beta) = \sum_{j=2}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_1 q_1 \psi'(\beta q_1)$, and $g'_2(\beta) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^n l_j q_j \psi'(\beta q_j) - l_2 q_2 \psi'(\beta q_2)$.

We will first show that for small values of β , either $g_1(\beta)$ or $g_2(\beta)$ is a non-increasing function. Since $\psi'(x) < 0$, we obtain that $\text{sign}(g'_1(\beta)) = -\text{sign}\left(\sum_{j=2}^n l_j q_j \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_1)} - l_1 q_1\right)$. Similarly for $g'_2(\beta)$.

Suppose $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) > 0$, and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) > 0$. This implies that $\left(\sum_{j=2}^n l_j q_j \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_1)} - l_1 q_1\right) < 0$ for values of beta close to zero. Since l_j , and q_j are positive for all j , we get $l_1 q_1 > l_2 q_2 \frac{\psi'(\beta q_2)}{\psi'(\beta q_1)}$. Similarly, $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) > 0$ implies that $l_2 q_2 > l_1 q_1 \frac{\psi'(\beta q_1)}{\psi'(\beta q_2)}$. From above inequalities we obtain $\frac{l_1 q_1}{l_2 q_2} > \frac{\psi'(\beta q_2)}{\psi'(\beta q_1)}$ and, $\frac{l_1 q_1}{l_2 q_2} < \frac{\psi'(\beta q_2)}{\psi'(\beta q_1)}$. Hence contradiction.

Proposition 8.1. *The function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ does not have points of local maxima in both side orthants.*

Proof. We showed earlier that for small values of β , either $g_1(\beta)$ or $g_2(\beta)$ is non-increasing function. In this proof, we will only consider the situation, when $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$. Other case can be analyzed similarly.

Case I: Suppose $q_1 > q_j$ for all $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$. Then $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, and $g'_2(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. From remark 6.3, we obtain that $g_1(\cdot)$ has at most one stationary point, and $g_2(\cdot)$ has at most two stationary points. These observations will be used throughout the proof of this case. We will consider the following sub cases.

Sub Case (i): Suppose $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ for all β , and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$. Using the fact $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$, we deduce that $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity exactly once. So for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists at most one $\beta_1 \in [0, \beta_{max}]$ such that $g_1(\beta_1) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta_1) > 0$. Using corollary 6.1, we conclude that, $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the side orthant with first component negative.

In addition, $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ for all β implies that the function $f(x)$ does not have any point of local maximum in the orthant with second component negative (corollary 6.1). Hence $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the side orthants. This completes the proof for (i).

Sub Case (ii): Suppose $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) < 0$. We know that the function $g_1(\beta)$ has at most one critical point in the interval $(0, \beta_{max}]$. Together with the fact that $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$, we deduce that $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity once. Denote critical point of $g_1(\beta)$ as β_1 . It can be easily checked that $g_1(\beta)$ is increasing on the interval $(\beta_1, \beta_{max}]$, and decreasing otherwise.

Meanwhile, since $g'_2(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$, and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) < 0$, we conclude that $g_2(\beta)$ is either monotonically decreasing or changes monotonicity. If $g_2(\beta)$ is monotonically decreasing, then we get the situation similar to Sub Case (i). Here, we will consider the situation when $g_2(\beta)$ changes monotonicity. It is easy to see that function $g_2(\beta)$ has two critical points, given by β'' , and β_2 . It can be easily checked that $g'_2(\beta) > 0$ for all $\beta \in (\beta'', \beta_2)$, and $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ elsewhere.

Suppose by contradiction, $f(x)$ has two points of local maxima, one in each orthant. Hence there exist $\beta' \neq \beta'''$ such that for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $g_1(\beta') = g_2(\beta''') = b$, $g_1(\beta') > 0$, and $g_2(\beta''') > 0$. Here $\beta' \in (\beta_1, \beta_{max})$, and $\beta''' \in (\beta'', \beta_2)$.

Since $g_1(\cdot)$ is increasing on the interval (β_1, β_{max}) , and $\beta' \in (\beta_1, \beta_{max})$, we get $g_1(\beta_1) < g_1(\beta') = b$. Similarly, we obtain $g_2(\beta_2) > b$. This implies that $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$. This leads us to the Three point problem. See Lemma (8.1). Hence we get

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2 x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)((x_1 x_2 + x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_3) < 0.$$

But in Lemma 8.5, we showed that if $q_1 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^3$, then

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1 x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2 x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)((x_1 x_2 + x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_3) > 0.$$

Hence contradiction to our assumption. Therefore, $f(x)$ cannot have points of local maxima in both side orthants. Proof for (ii) completed.

Sub Case (iii): Suppose $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) > 0$. We saw earlier that $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow \infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Since $g'_1(\beta)$ has at most one root, there exists unique $\beta_1 \in (0, \beta_{max})$ such that $g'_1(\beta_1) = 0$. It can be easily checked that $g'_1(\beta) < 0$ in the interval $(0, \beta_1)$ and $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ in the interval $(\beta_1, \beta_{max}]$.

At the same time, $g'_2(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Since $g'_2(\beta)$ has at most two roots, there exists unique $\beta_2 \in (0, \beta_{max})$ such that $g'_2(\beta_2) = 0$. It is easy to see that $g'_2(\beta) > 0$ in the interval $(0, \beta_2)$ and $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ in the interval (β_2, β_{max}) .

Assume that $f(x)$ has two points of local maxima, one in each side orthant. Using corollary 6.1, we conclude that for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\beta' \neq \beta''$ such that $g_1(\beta') = g_2(\beta'') = b > 0$, $g'_1(\beta') > 0$, and $g'_2(\beta'') > 0$. It can be easily checked that $\beta' \in (\beta_1, \beta_{max})$, and $\beta'' \in (0, \beta_2)$.

Notice that $g_1(\beta_1) < b$ and $g_2(\beta_2) > b$. Hence $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$. This case can be analyzed in similar manner as Sub Case (ii). We will obtain a contradiction to the fact that $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$. Hence $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in both side orthants. This completes the proof for (iii).

To recapitulate, when $q_1 > q_j$ for all $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$, the function $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in two side orthants. This completes the proof for Case I.

Case II: Let $q_2 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^n$. The proof for this case is similar to Case I.

Case III. Let $q_{j_0} = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^n$. Here $j_0 \neq 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, let $j_0 = 3$. Then $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, and $g'_2(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Moreover, using remark 6.3, we obtain that both functions $g_1(\cdot)$ and $g_2(\cdot)$ have at most two stationary points. These observations will be used throughout the proof of this case. We will consider the following sub cases.

Sub Case (i): Suppose $g'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ for all values of $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$. Using corollary 6.1, $f(x)$ does not have any point of local maximum in both side orthants.

Sub Case (ii): Assume that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$. If $g'_1(\beta)$ is negative for all β , then we obtain same situation as Sub Case (i) above.

Here, we will assume that $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity. We know that, $g_1(\beta)$ can have at most two critical points in $(0, \beta_{max})$. Moreover, $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$. Hence there exist $\beta' \neq \beta''$ such that $g'_1(\beta') = g'_1(\beta'') = 0$. Notice that $g_1(\beta)$ is increasing on the interval (β', β'') and is decreasing elsewhere. This implies that for given $b \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists at most one value of β , say β_3 such that $g_1(\beta_3) = b$, and $g'_1(\beta_3) > 0$. It is easy to see that $\beta_3 \in (\beta', \beta'')$.

Next, $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$ implies that $f(x)$ does not have any point of local maxima in the side orthant with second component negative (corollary 6.1).

From the above discussion, we conclude that $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in side orthant with first component negative. This completes the proof for (ii).

Sub Case (iii): Assume that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_1(\beta) < 0$, and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} g'_2(\beta) > 0$. Since $g'_2(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$, we deduce that either $g_2(\beta)$ has one stationary point or three stationary points. But we know that $g_2(\beta)$ can have at most two stationary points. Therefore there exists $\beta_2 \in (0, \beta_{max})$ such that $g'_2(\beta_2) = 0$. It can be easily checked that $g'_2(\beta) > 0$ in $(0, \beta_2)$ and $g'_2(\beta) < 0$ in (β_2, β_{max}) .

In the side orthant with first component negative, we can have two possibilities, either $g'_1(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$, or $g_1(\beta)$ changes monotonicity.

If $g'_1(\beta) < 0$ for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_{max})$, then $f(x)$ does not have any point of local maximum in side orthant with first component negative (corollary 6.1). Moreover, since $g_2(\beta)$ has exactly one critical point, there exists at most one value of $\beta \in (0, \beta_2)$ such that for given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $g_2(\beta) = b$, and $g'_2(\beta) > 0$. This implies that $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum in side orthant with second component negative.

Next, suppose $g_1(\cdot)$ changes monotonicity. Since $g'_1(\beta) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $\beta \rightarrow \beta_{max}$, the function $g_1(\beta)$ will have exactly two stationary points. Denote the two stationary points, as β_1 , and β'' , where $\beta_1 < \beta''$. Notice that $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ in the interval (β_1, β'') and is negative elsewhere. In addition, $g'_2(\beta) > 0$ in $(0, \beta_2)$.

Suppose $f(x)$ has two points of local maxima, one in each side orthant. This implies there exist $\beta_3 \neq \beta_4$ such that for a given $b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $g_1(\beta_3) = g_2(\beta_4) = b > 0$, $g'_1(\beta_3) > 0$, and $g'_2(\beta_4) > 0$. It is easy to see that $\beta_4 \in (0, \beta_2)$ and $\beta_3 \in (\beta_1, \beta'')$.

Since $g'_1(\beta) > 0$ for all $\beta \in (\beta_1, \beta'')$ and $g_1(\beta_3) = b$, we get $g_1(\beta_1) < b$. Similarly we obtain $g_2(\beta_2) > b$.

Hence we obtain $g_1(\beta_1) - g_2(\beta_2) < 0$. This leads to the Three Point problem, which in turn implies that $x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)((x_1x_2 + x_2x_3 - x_1x_3)) < 0$.

But in lemma 8.7, we showed that if $q_3 = \max(q_j)_{j=1}^3$, then

$$x_3(z_1 - z_2) + x_1x_3(y_1 - y_2) + x_2(z_1 - z_3) + x_2x_1(y_1 - y_3) + x_1(z_3 - z_2) + (y_3 - y_2)((x_1x_2 + x_2x_3 - x_1x_3)) > 0.$$

Hence contradiction to our assumption. This completes the proof for Case III. Therefore, $f(x)$ does not have points of local maxima in both side orthants. \square

9 Special Case

In previous sections, we have analyzed the behavior of function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$ only in the open orthant (i.e. $x_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$). Moreover, we also noticed that $f(x)$ can have at most one point of local maximum in the open orthant on hyperplane P. But it might happen that function $f(\cdot)$ has two points of local maxima, one in the open orthant and other on the boundary of the orthant (i.e. $x_j = 0$ for at least one $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$). In this section, we will show that this cannot happen.

First, notice that the function $f(x)$ cannot have infinitely many points of local maxima on the boundary of the orthant. Suppose $f(x)$ has infinitely many points of local maxima, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. Since x_i lies on the boundary, then for all i , we obtain $x_i^j = 0$ for at least one $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. This implies that $g(\beta_k) = b$, for the sequence $\{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, where $g(\beta) := \sum_{j=1}^n \pm l_j \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j})$. Recall that $\psi(\cdot) = \phi'(\cdot)^{-1}$. Using the fact that $\phi(\cdot)$ is an analytic function, we obtain that $g(\beta) \equiv b$. This implies that $g(\cdot)$ is constant function. Hence contradiction. Therefore, the points of local maxima on the boundary of the orthant are isolated.

Lemma 9.1. *Suppose x_0 is a isolated point of local maximum for function $f(\cdot)$ on hyperplane $P = \{x : l^T x = b\}$. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_0 > 0, \tilde{l}, \tilde{b}$ such that $\|l - \tilde{l}\| < \delta_0, |b - \tilde{b}| < \delta_0$, and a point \tilde{x}_0 with all components nonzero such that \tilde{x}_0 is a point of local maximum of function $f(\cdot)$ over $\tilde{P} = \{x : \tilde{l}^T x = \tilde{b}\} \cap \|x_0 - \tilde{x}_0\| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Since x_0 is a isolated point of local maximum for $f(\cdot)$ on P, there exists sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for all x , where $x \in P$ and $\|x - x_0\| < \varepsilon_0$, we get $f(x) \leq f(x_0)$.

Fix a positive number $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Since x_0 is a point of local maximum, there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $x_0^j = \pm \psi(\beta \frac{l_j}{c_j})$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. If all components of x_0 are nonzero, then we are done. Suppose that x_0 has zero components. Without loss of generality, let $x_0^1 = \dots = x_0^m = 0$. Then, using assumption (1), we obtain $\beta \frac{l_k}{c_k} = \phi'(0)$ for all $k \in \{1 \dots m\}$.

Since $f(\cdot)$ is continuous function, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $f(\cdot)$ has a point of local maximum over the set $\{x : \tilde{l}^T x = \tilde{b}\} \cap \{x : \|x - x_0\| < \varepsilon\}$ for all vectors \tilde{l} , and numbers \tilde{b} such that $\|l - \tilde{l}\| < \delta_0$, and $|b - \tilde{b}| < \delta_0$.

Fix positive numbers δ, δ_1 , such that $\delta_1 < \delta$. Denote $\tilde{l}_1 = l_1 - \delta_1, \tilde{l}_j = l_j - \delta$, for $2 \leq j \leq m, \tilde{l}_j = l_j$ for $j > m$. Denote by \tilde{x}_0 the point with coordinates $\tilde{x}_0^1 = \pm \psi(\beta \frac{l_1 - \delta_1}{c_1}), \tilde{x}_0^j = \pm \psi(\beta \frac{l_j - \delta}{c_j})$ for $2 \leq j, m, \tilde{x}_0^j = x_0^j$ for $j > m$. Denote $\tilde{b} := \tilde{l}^T \tilde{x}_0$. Assume that $\frac{\tilde{l}_1}{c_1} < \frac{\tilde{l}_j}{c_j}$ for all $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$.

We will choose δ such that $\|l - \tilde{l}\| < \delta_0$, and $|b - \tilde{b}| < \delta_0$. Then $f(\cdot)$ has a point of local maximum, \tilde{x} over the set $\tilde{P} = \{x : \tilde{l}^T x = \tilde{b}\} \cap \{x : \|x - x_0\| < \varepsilon\}$. There exists $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ such that $\tilde{x}^j = \pm \psi(\tilde{\beta} \frac{\tilde{l}_j}{c_j})$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. If all components of \tilde{x} are nonzero, then we are done.

Assume at least one component of \tilde{x} is zero. Due to choice of δ_1 , it should be the first component \tilde{x}^1 . This implies that $\tilde{\beta} \frac{\tilde{l}_1}{c_1} = \phi'(0)$, and we get $\tilde{l} \tilde{x} = \tilde{b}$. Next consider positive number $\hat{\delta}$ and a vector \hat{l} with

components $\hat{l}_1 = \tilde{l}_1, \hat{l}_j = \tilde{l}_j - \hat{\delta}$ for $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$. Define the vector \hat{x} with components $\hat{x}^j = \pm\psi(\tilde{\beta} \frac{\tilde{l}_j}{c_j})$, where $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. The number $\hat{\delta}$ is chosen in such way that $\|\hat{l} - l\| < \delta_0, \hat{l}^T \hat{x} \neq \tilde{b}$, and $\frac{\hat{l}_1}{c_1} > \frac{\tilde{l}_1}{c_1}$ for $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$. Consider the hyperplane $\hat{P} = \{x : \hat{l}^T x = \tilde{b}\}$. There exists a point of local maximum, y of function over $\hat{P} \cap \|y - x_0\| < \varepsilon$. Therefore there exists $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $y^j = \pm\psi(\hat{\beta} \frac{\hat{l}_j}{c_j})$ for all $j = 1 \dots n$. Since $\hat{l}^T \hat{x} \neq \tilde{b}$, we get that $\hat{x} \notin \hat{P}$.

If all components of y are nonzero, then we are done. Assume y has a zero component. Then due to choice of $\delta_1, \hat{\delta}$, we get $y^1 = 0, y^j \neq 0$ where $j \in \{2 \dots n\}$. This implies that $\frac{\hat{\beta} \hat{l}_1}{c_1} = \frac{\tilde{\beta} \tilde{l}_1}{c_1} = \phi'(0)$. Therefore $\hat{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}$. But in this case $y = \hat{x}$, and therefore vector y does not belong to hyperplane \hat{P} . Hence we obtain contradiction. Therefore components of vector y are nonzero. Thus y is a point of local maximum of function f over \hat{P} such that $\|\hat{l} - l\| < \delta_0, |b - \hat{b}| < \delta_0$, and $\|y - x_0\| < \varepsilon$.

□

As a consequence we obtain the following result.

Corollary 9.1. *The function $f(x)$ does not have two points of local maximum; one in open orthant and other on the boundary of orthant.*

Proof. Suppose x_0 , and x_1 are two points of local maxima for function $f(\cdot)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that x_0 is in the open orthant i.e. $x_0^j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{1 \dots n\}$. Since $f(\cdot)$ has at most one point of local maximum in the open orthant, x_0 is isolated point. Then using lemma 9.1 we can find another point of local maximum \hat{x}_0 such that all the components of \hat{x}_0 are nonzero.

Using similar reasoning as above we can also find another point of local maximum \hat{x}_1 such that all the components of \hat{x}_1 are nonzero. Then we end up with two points of local maxima in the open orthant, on the new hyperplane \hat{P} . Hence contradiction. □

10 Main Result

In Section 3, some assumptions about the function $\phi(\cdot)$ were listed. Those assumptions turned out to be sufficient conditions for the above results to be true. Therefore, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 10.1. *Consider the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, where $c_i \neq 0$. Suppose the function $\phi(\cdot)$ satisfies the conditions (1) – (5) stated in Section 3. The function $f(x)$ has at most one point of local maximum on the hyperplane, P defined by $\{x : l^T x = b\}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. The proof follows from the previous results. □

In the next section, we will present couple of examples of neuron transfer functions, $\phi(\cdot)$, which satisfy the conditions proposed in section 3.

11 Examples

In section 3, some assumptions regarding function $\phi(\cdot)$ were presented. In the previous section, we saw that these assumptions turned out to be sufficient conditions for Theorem 10.1 to be true. In this section we will check these properties for two functions, namely $\tanh(\cdot)$, and $\arctan(\cdot)$.

1. $\phi(\cdot) \in C^2, \phi(-x) = -\phi(x), \phi'(x) > 0, x\phi''(x) < 0$, for all $x \neq 0$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x) < \infty$.

- (i) Suppose $\phi(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$. Notice that $\phi''(x) = -\frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(x)}{\cosh^2(x)}$. It is easy to see the the graph of $\phi''(\cdot)$ lies in second and fourth quadrants. Remaining properties can be easily checked.
- (ii) Now we will consider the case when $\phi(\cdot) = \arctan(\cdot)$. Notice that $\phi''(x) = -\frac{x}{(1+x^2)^2}$. Remaining properties can be checked easily.
2. The function $\phi'(\cdot)$ is invertible.
- (i) Suppose that $\phi(x) = \tanh(x)$. Then $\phi'(x) = \operatorname{sech}^2(x)$, where $x \geq 0$. Denote $\operatorname{sech}^2(x) = y$. This implies $\psi(x) = \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})$, where $\psi(\cdot) := \phi^{-1}(\cdot)$.
- (ii) Next, consider $\phi(x) = \arctan(x)$. This implies $\phi'(x) = \frac{1}{1+x^2}$. Hence $\psi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{x} - 1}$.
3. $\psi(x)$ is decreasing function of x .

- (i) Suppose $\psi(x) = \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})$. Using definition of $\operatorname{arctanh}(x)$, we get $\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x}) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1-x}}{1 - \sqrt{1-x}} \right)$. Now, we will evaluate $\psi'(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(x) &= \frac{1}{2x} \left(\frac{-1 + \sqrt{1-x}}{2\sqrt{1-x}} - \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-x}}{2\sqrt{1-x}} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2x\sqrt{1-x}}. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) Similarly, for the case of $\psi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{x} - 1}$, we obtain $\psi'(x) = -\frac{1}{2x^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{1-x}} < 0$.

4. $x(\ln |\psi'(x)|)'$ is a monotonically increasing function of x .

- (i) First, consider $\psi(x) = \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\ln |\psi'(x)|)' &= \frac{1}{2x\sqrt{1-x}} \cdot -2 \left(\sqrt{1-x} - \frac{x}{2\sqrt{1-x}} \right) \\ &= \frac{3x-2}{2x(1-x)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\frac{d}{dx}(x(\ln |\psi'(x)|)') = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3-3x+3x-2}{(1-x)^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2(1-x)^2} > 0$.

Therefore $x(\ln |\psi'(x)|)'$ is a monotonically increasing function of x .

- (ii) Next, suppose $\psi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{x} - 1}$. Then $\psi'(x) = -\frac{1}{2x^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{1-x}}$. Now we will evaluate $(\ln |\psi'(x)|)'$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\ln |\psi'(x)|)' &= -\frac{1}{2x^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{1-x}} \left(\frac{3\sqrt{x}(1-x) - x^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{1-x}} \right) \\ &= \frac{4x-3}{2x(1-x)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\frac{d}{dx}(x(\ln |\psi'(x)|)') = \frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{4x-3}{2(1-x)x} \right) = \frac{1}{2(1-x)^2} > 0$.

5. Denote $h(\beta, q_j, q_n) := \frac{\psi'(\beta q_j)}{\psi'(\beta q_n)}$. Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left[\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right] \neq 0$, where $q_j < q_n < q_l$.

(i) Suppose $\phi(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$. Then $\psi'(\beta q_j) = -\frac{1}{2\beta q_j \sqrt{1-\beta q_j}}$. This implies $h(\beta, q_j, q_n) = \frac{q_n}{q_j} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta q_n}{1-\beta q_j}}$.

Next, we will compute the quotient $\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)}$.

It is easy to see that $h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n) = \frac{q_n}{2q_j} \cdot \frac{q_j - q_n}{\sqrt{1-\beta q_n}(1-\beta q_j)^{3/2}}$. Therefore, $\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} = \frac{q_l(q_j - q_n)}{q_j(q_l - q_n)} \cdot \frac{(1-\beta q_l)^{3/2}}{(1-\beta q_j)^{3/2}}$. It can be easily checked that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left(\frac{h_\beta(\beta, q_j, q_n)}{h_\beta(\beta, q_l, q_n)} \right) \neq 0$ for all (β, q_j, q_n, q_l) where $q_j < q_n < q_l$.

(ii) Now consider $\phi(\cdot) = \arctan(\cdot)$. Then $\psi'(\beta q) = -\frac{1}{2(\beta q)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{1-\beta q}}$.

Using the expression for $\psi'(\beta q)$, we obtain $h(\beta, q_j, q_n) = \left(\frac{q_n}{q_j}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta q_n}{1-\beta q_j}}$, and $h(\beta, q_l, q_n) = \left(\frac{q_n}{q_l}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta q_n}{1-\beta q_l}}$. These are identical to case of $\phi(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$. Remaining details can be checked in similar manner.

6. For all $p > q$, we have $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0$.

(i) Consider $\phi(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$.

Then $\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} = \frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta p})}{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta q})}$. Using definition of $\operatorname{arctanh}(\cdot)$, we get

$$\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} = \frac{\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta p}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta p}} \right)}{\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta q}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta q}} \right)}. \text{ Now we will compute } \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right).$$

It is easy to see that $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta p}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta p}} \right) \right) = -\frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{1-\beta p}}$.

$$\text{Therefore } \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta p}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta p}} \right)}{\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta q}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta q}} \right)} \right) = \frac{-\frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{1-\beta p}} \ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta q}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta q}} \right) + \frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{1-\beta q}} \ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta p}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta p}} \right)}{\ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\beta q}}{1-\sqrt{1-\beta q}} \right)^2}.$$

Recall that $\operatorname{arctanh}(x) = \ln \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-x}}{1-\sqrt{1-x}} \right)$. Since $p > q$, we get $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta p}} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta q}}$, and $\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta p}) < \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta q})$. This implies that

$$\frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{1-\beta q}} \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta p}) - \frac{1}{\beta \sqrt{1-\beta p}} \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-\beta q}) < 0.$$

Hence $\frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) < 0$, where $p > q$.

(ii) Now, consider $\phi(\cdot) = \arctan(\cdot)$.

Then $\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} = \sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta p}{1-\beta q}}$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\beta} \left(\frac{\psi(\beta p)}{\psi(\beta q)} \right) &= \sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta q}{1-\beta p}} \left(\frac{-p(1-\beta q) - (-q)(1-\beta p)}{(1-\beta q)^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \sqrt{\frac{1-\beta q}{1-\beta p}} \left(\frac{q-p}{(1-\beta q)^2} \right) < 0 \text{ (since } p > q\text{)}. \end{aligned}$$

7. For all $x > 0$, function $\psi(\cdot)$ satisfies the following property;

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) \right) \geq 0$$

(i) Consider $\phi(\cdot) = \tanh(\cdot)$. For this case $\psi(x) = \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})$, and $\psi'(x) = -\frac{1}{2x\sqrt{1-x}}$.

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{x \cdot \frac{-1}{2x\sqrt{1-x}}} \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{2\sqrt{1-x}} + \frac{1}{2x} \right) = \frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{\sqrt{1-x}} + \frac{1}{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) \right) &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{x \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{\sqrt{1-x}} + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-x)} \left(\sqrt{1-x} \operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x}) + \frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{\sqrt{1-x}} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We know that $\frac{d}{dx}(\operatorname{arctanh}(x)) > 1$ for all x such that $0 < x < 1$, which, in turn implies that $\frac{\operatorname{arctanh}(\sqrt{1-x})}{\sqrt{1-x}} > 1$. Hence $\frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) \right) > 0$.

(ii) Now suppose $\phi(\cdot) = \arctan(\cdot)$. Here $\psi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{x} - 1}$. Moreover $\psi'(x) = -\frac{1}{2x^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{1-x}}$.

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) &= -\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1-x}}{x\sqrt{x}} \cdot 2\sqrt{1-xx^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \\ &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it is easy to see that $\frac{d}{dx} \left(x \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{\psi(x)}{x\psi'(x)} \right) \right) = 2 > 0$.

12 Conclusion

We have studied existence of points of local maxima for the function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi(x_i)$, over a hyperplane. We have found conditions, imposed on the function $\phi(\cdot)$, which guarantee existence of at most one point of local maximum for the function on the hyperplane. Those conditions are satisfied by wide range of neuron transfer functions. The next step involves computing the points of local maxima for the nonlinear function over planes of lower dimension.

References

- [1] N.E.Barabanov and D.Prokhorov, "Stability of Discrete Time Recurrent Neural Networks", IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks, Vol.13, Pages 292–303, 2002.
- [2] N.E. Barabanov and D.Prokhorov, "A New Method for Stability Analysis of Nonlinear Discrete Time Systems", IEEE Trans. of Automatic Control, Vol. 48, Issue 12, Pages 2250–2255, 2003.
- [3] N.E. Barabanov, "Frequency Domain Criteria for stability and instability in the large for the stationary sets of nonlinear systems of differential equations with a monotone nonlinearity", Siberian Mathematics Journal, Vol. XXVIII, Issue 2, Pages 21–34, 1987.
- [4] J.A.K.Sukyens, J.P.L. Vandwalle, and B.L.R. De Moor, "Artificial Neural Networks for the Modeling and Control of Nonlinear Systems", Kluwer, 1996.
- [5] L.A. Feldkamp, and G.V. Puskorius, "A signal processing framework based on dynamic neural networks with applications to problems in adaptation, filtering and classification", Proceedings of IEEE, Vol. 86, Pages 2259-2277, 1998.
- [6] V.A. Yakubovich, "The method of matrix inequalities in the stability theory of nonlinear control systems", Automation and Remote Control, Vol.25, Pages 261–267, 1964.
- [7] V.A. Yakubovich, "Frequency conditions for the absolute stability of control systems with several nonlinear and linear stationary blocks", Automation and Remote Control, Vol. 28,Pages 857–880, 1967.
- [8] K.S Narendra and J.Taylor, "Frequency Domain Methods for Absolute stability", New York: Academic, 1973.
- [9] G.Szegö, R.Kalman, "Sur la stabilite absolue dun Systeme dequations aux differences finies. Comptes Rendus del Academie des Sciences", Paris, 257:388390, 1963.
- [10] P.Lankaster, A.C.M Ran, L.Rodman, "Hermitian Solutions of the discrete time Riccati Equation", International Journal of Control, 44(1986), Pages 777–802.
- [11] B.P. Molinari, "The stabilizing solution of the discrete algebraic Riccati equations", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 20(1975), Pages 396–399.
- [12] M.A Aizerman, F.R. Gantmakher, "Absolute stability of Nonlinear Controlled Systems (in Russian), Izd-vo AN SSSR, Moscow(1963).
- [13] V.A Yakubovich, "The S-procedure in nonlinear control theory", Vestn. Leningr. Un-ta No. 1, pages 62–77(1971).
- [14] V.A Yakubovich, "A frequency theorem in Control theory", Sibirsk. Matem. Zh., 14, No. 2, pages 384–420,(1973).