Sylvain Rubenthaler

28 octobre 2019



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ★臣▶ ―臣 …の�?

# Gradients

When  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is sufficiently differentiable. We can write a first order development, using many equivalent notations for the first order differential of f:

$$f(x+u) = f(x) + df(x)(u) + o(||u||)$$
  
=  $f(x) + f'(x).u + o(||u||).$ 

We have

$$f'(x).u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x) \times u_i.$$

So, if we define the gradient of f by

$$\nabla f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★□▶ ★□▶ □ のQ@

## Gradients

we then get

$$f'(x).u = \langle \nabla f(x), u \rangle$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

 $(\langle \dots, \dots \rangle$  is the scalar product). A This is not a real proof.

# Maximization of f

Suppose, we have  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $g_1, \ldots, g_p : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ . We set  $M = \{x : g_i(x) = c_i, 1 \le i \le p\}$  (for some constants  $c_i$ ). We are interested in

 $\operatorname{argmax}_{x \in M} f(x),$ 

which is the same as finding

$$\begin{cases} \max f(x) \\ \text{under } g_i(x) = c_i, 1 \le i \le p. \end{cases}$$
(1)

・ロト ・ 日 ・ モート ・ 田 ・ うへで

Suppose we have found a maximum in  $x_0$ . Then, for any "small" move u such that  $g'_i(x_0).u = 0$  (that is, a move that stays in M), we have

$$f(x_0 + u) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0).u + o(||u||).$$

So  $f'(x_0).u = 0$ . This means that

$$\nabla f(x_0) \in \operatorname{Span}(\nabla g_1(x_0), \dots, \nabla g_p(x_0)).$$

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

### Lagrangian function

We set

$$L(x,\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p)=f(x)-\sum_{i=1}^p\lambda_i(g_i(x)-c_i)$$

 $(L: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R})$ . In  $x_0$ , there exist  $\lambda_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \lambda_p^{(0)}$  such that

$$\nabla f(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(0)} \nabla g_i(x_0).$$

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ つ へ ()

#### Lagrangian function

#### Let us compute

$$\nabla L(x,\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_n}(x) \\ -(g_1(x) - c_1) \\ \vdots \\ -(g_p(x) - c_p) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We observe that

$$\nabla L(x_0,\lambda_1^{(0)},\ldots,\lambda_p^{(0)})=0.$$

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ★臣▶ ―臣 …の�?

# Working our way back

The conclusion is that, when trying to find the solution of (1), a good candidate is  $x_0$  such that there exists  $(\lambda_i^{(0)})_{1 \le i \le p}$  with  $\nabla L(x_0, \lambda_1^{(0)}, \dots, \lambda_p^{(0)}) = 0.$ 

The coefficients  $\lambda_i^{(0)}$  are called "Lagrange multipliers".

#### Maximization of f

Suppose, we have  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $g_1, \dots, g_p : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ . We are interested in  $\begin{cases} \max f(x) \\ \inf g_i(x) \le c_i, 1 \le i \le p. \end{cases}$ (2)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

for some  $c_1, \ldots, c_p$ .

Suppose we have found a maximum  $x_0$ . We then divide the indexes into

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ つ へ ()

- ▶ for  $1 \le i \le k$ ,  $g_i(x_0) = c_i$  (we say the constraint is binding)
- For k+1≤i≤p, g<sub>i</sub>(x<sub>0</sub>) < c<sub>i</sub> (we say the constraint is not binding)

for some k in  $\{0, 1, ..., p\}$ .

For v such that  $g'_i(x_0).v = 0$   $(1 \le i \le k)$ , we have

$$f'(x_0).v=0$$

(because  $x_0$  is a maximum of f restrained to  $\{x : g_i(x) = c_i, 1 \le i \le k\}$ ). So there exist  $\lambda_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \lambda_k^{(0)}$  such that

$$\nabla f(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^{(0)} \nabla g_i(x_0).$$

We set

$$\lambda_{k+1}^{(0)} = \cdots = \lambda_p^{(0)} = 0.$$

・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ うらぐ

Let us now take h > 0 ("small"). We have, for all *i* in  $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ ,

$$f(x_0 - h\nabla g_i(x_0)) = f(x_0) - h\langle \nabla f(x_0), \nabla g_i(x_0) \rangle + o(h),$$

and we should have  $f(x_0 - h\nabla g_i(x_0)) \le f(x_0)$ . So

 $\langle \nabla f(x_0), \nabla g_i(x_0) \rangle \geq 0.$ 

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

In the case where the  $\nabla g_i(x_0)$  are orthogonal, the above implies  $\lambda_i^{(0)} \ge 0$ .

#### Lagrangian function

We define

$$L(x,\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p) = f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i (g_i(x) - c_i)$$

 $(L: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R})$ . The gradient of L is (the same as before)

$$\nabla L(x,\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_p) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_n}(x) \\ -(g_1(x) - c_1) \\ \vdots \\ -(g_p(x) - c_p) \end{pmatrix}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

# Lagrangian function

We get that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_1}(x_0) = 0, \dots, \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_n}(x_0) = 0, \\ \lambda_i^{(0)}(g_i(x_i) - c_i) = 0, 1 \le i \le p, \\ g_i(x_0) \le c_i, 1 \le i \le p, \\ \langle \nabla f(x_0), \nabla g_i(x_0) \rangle \ge 0, 1 \le i \le k. \end{cases}$$
(3)

<□▶ <□▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □ > ○ < ○

#### Working our way back

The conclusion is that, when trying to find the solution of (2), a good candidate is  $x_0$  such that there exists  $(\lambda_i^{(0)})_{1 \le i \le p}$  such that Equation (3) is statisfied.

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ