Fundamentals of Linear Algebra and Optimization Weak and Strong Duality

Jean Gallier and Jocelyn Quaintance

CIS Department University of Pennsylvania jean@cis.upenn.edu

November 23, 2020

・ロト ・日子・ ・ヨト・・ヨト

3

Dual Bounds Primal Problem (P)

Another important property of the dual function G is that it provides a *lower* bound on the value of the objective function J.

Dual Bounds Primal Problem (P)

Another important property of the dual function G is that it provides a *lower* bound on the value of the objective function J.

Indeed, we have

$$G(\mu) \le L(u,\mu) \le J(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in U \text{ and all } \mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+, \tag{\dagger}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

since $\mu \ge 0$ and $\varphi_i(u) \le 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, so

$$G(\mu) = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\Omega} L(\mathbf{v},\mu) \le L(\mathbf{u},\mu) = J(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i \varphi_i(\mathbf{u}) \le J(\mathbf{u}).$$

Weak Duality

If the Primal Problem (P) has a minimum denoted p^* and the Dual Problem (D) has a maximum denoted d^* , then the above inequality implies that

$$d^* \le p^* \tag{\dagger}_w$$

known as weak duality.

Weak Duality Restated

Equivalently, for every optimal solution λ^* of the dual problem and every optimal solution u^* of the primal problem, we have

$$G(\lambda^*) \leq J(u^*).$$
 (†_{w'})

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

Weak Duality Restated

Equivalently, for every optimal solution λ^* of the dual problem and every optimal solution u^* of the primal problem, we have

$$G(\lambda^*) \leq J(u^*).$$
 (†_{w'})

In particular, if $p^* = -\infty$, which means that the primal problem is unbounded below, then the dual problem is unfeasible.

Weak Duality Restated

Equivalently, for every optimal solution λ^* of the dual problem and every optimal solution u^* of the primal problem, we have

$$G(\lambda^*) \leq J(u^*).$$
 (†_{w'})

In particular, if $p^* = -\infty$, which means that the primal problem is unbounded below, then the dual problem is unfeasible.

Conversely, if $d^* = +\infty$, which means that the dual problem is unbounded above, then the primal problem is unfeasible.

Strong Duality

Definition. The difference $p^* - d^* \ge 0$ is called the *optimal duality gap*. If the duality gap is zero, that is, $p^* = d^*$, then we say that *strong duality* holds.

Strong Duality

Definition. The difference $p^* - d^* \ge 0$ is called the *optimal duality gap*. If the duality gap is zero, that is, $p^* = d^*$, then we say that *strong duality* holds.

Even when the duality gap is strictly positive, the inequality (\dagger_w) can be helpful to find a lower bound on the optimal value of a primal problem that is difficult to solve, since the dual problem is *always* convex.

Strong Duality

Definition. The difference $p^* - d^* \ge 0$ is called the *optimal duality gap*. If the duality gap is zero, that is, $p^* = d^*$, then we say that *strong duality* holds.

Even when the duality gap is strictly positive, the inequality (\dagger_w) can be helpful to find a lower bound on the optimal value of a primal problem that is difficult to solve, since the dual problem is *always* convex.

If the primal problem and the dual problem are feasible and if the optimal values p^* and d^* are finite and $p^* = d^*$ (no duality gap), then the complementary slackness conditions hold for the inequality constraints.

Complementary Slackness Conditions

Proposition (*complementary slackness*). Given the Minimization Problem (*P*)

minimize
$$J(\mathbf{v})$$

subject to $\varphi_i(\mathbf{v}) \leq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$,

and its Dual Problem (D)

maximize $G(\mu)$ subject to $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$,

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

Complementary Slackness Conditions

if both (P) and (D) are feasible, $u \in U$ is an optimal solution of (P), $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$ is an optimal solution of (D), and $J(u) = G(\lambda)$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \varphi_i(u) = 0$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

In other words, if the constraint φ_i is inactive at u, then $\lambda_i = 0$.

Weak Duality for Linear Programming

Going back to the example of the last lesson, we see that weak duality says that for any feasible solution u of the Primal Problem (P), that is, some $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$Au \leq b, \ u \geq 0,$$

and for any feasible solution $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m$ of the Dual Problem (D_1) , that is,

$$A^{\top}\mu \geq -c, \ \mu \geq 0,$$

we have

$$-b^{\top}\mu \leq c^{\top}u.$$

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ 二副 - のへで

Weak Duality for Linear Programming

Actually, if u and λ are optimal, then it can be shown that strong duality holds, namely $-b^{\top}\mu = c^{\top}u$, but the proof of this fact is nontrivial.



The following theorem establishes a link between the solutions of the Primal Problem (P) and those of the Dual Problem (D). It also gives *sufficient conditions* for the *duality gap to be zero*.

Theorem. Consider the Minimization Problem (*P*):

minimize
$$J(\mathbf{v})$$

subject to $\varphi_i(\mathbf{v}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$

where the functions J and φ_i are defined on some open subset Ω of a finite-dimensional Euclidean vector space V (more generally, a real Hilbert space V).

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

(1) Suppose the functions $\varphi_i \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, and that for every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$, the Problem (P_μ) :

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & L(\mathbf{v}, \mu) \\ \text{subject to} & \mathbf{v} \in \Omega, \end{array}$

has a *unique solution* u_{μ} , so that

$$L(u_{\mu},\mu) = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\Omega} L(\mathbf{v},\mu) = G(\mu),$$

and the function $\mu \mapsto u_{\mu}$ is continuous (on \mathbb{R}^m_+).

and the function $\mu \mapsto u_{\mu}$ is continuous (on \mathbb{R}^{m}_{+}). Then the function *G* is differentiable for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{m}_{+}$, and

$$G'_{\mu}(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i arphi_i(u_{\mu}) \quad ext{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

and the function $\mu \mapsto u_{\mu}$ is continuous (on \mathbb{R}^{m}_{+}). Then the function G is differentiable for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{m}_{+}$, and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mu}'(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i arphi_i(u_{\mu}) \quad ext{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

If λ is any solution of Problem (D):

maximize $G(\mu)$ subject to $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$,

then the solution u_{λ} of the corresponding Problem (P_{λ}) is a solution of Problem (P).

(2) Assume Problem (P) has some solution u ∈ U, and that Ω is convex (open), the functions φ_i (1 ≤ i ≤ m) and J are convex and differentiable at u, and that the constraints are qualified. Then Problem (D) has a solution λ ∈ ℝ^m₊, and J(u) = G(λ); that is, the duality gap is zero.

Informally, in Part (1) of the preceding theorem, the hypotheses say that if $G(\mu)$ can be "computed nicely," in the sense that there is a *unique minimizer* u_{μ} of $L(\mathbf{v},\mu)$ (with $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega$) such that $G(\mu) = L(u_{\mu},\mu)$, and if a maximizer λ of $G(\mu)$ (with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$) can be determined, then u_{λ} yields the minimum value of J, that is, $p^* = J(u_{\lambda})$.

Informally, in Part (1) of the preceding theorem, the hypotheses say that if $G(\mu)$ can be "computed nicely," in the sense that there is a *unique minimizer* u_{μ} of $L(\mathbf{v},\mu)$ (with $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega$) such that $G(\mu) = L(u_{\mu},\mu)$, and if a maximizer λ of $G(\mu)$ (with $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$) can be determined, then u_{λ} yields the minimum value of J, that is, $p^* = J(u_{\lambda})$.

If the constraints are qualified and if the functions J and φ_i are convex and differentiable, then since the KKT conditions hold, the duality gap is zero; that is,

$$G(\lambda) = L(u_{\lambda}, \lambda) = J(u_{\lambda}).$$

Example. Going back to the example of the previous lesson where we considered the Linear Program (P)

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & c^{\top}v\\ \text{subject to} & Av \leq b, \ v \geq 0, \end{array}$

with A an $m \times n$ matrix, the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{v}, \mu, \nu)$ is given by

$$L(\mathbf{v}, \mu, \nu) = -\mathbf{b}^{\top} \mu + (\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{A}^{\top} \mu - \nu)^{\top} \mathbf{v},$$

and we found that the dual function $G(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{R}^n} L(\mathbf{v},\mu,\nu)$ is given for all $\mu \ge 0$ and $\nu \ge 0$ by

$$G(\mu,\nu) = \begin{cases} -b^{\top}\mu & \text{if } A^{\top}\mu - \nu + c = 0, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The hypotheses of Part (1) certainly fail since there are infinitely $u_{\mu,\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $G(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(\nu,\mu,\nu) = L(u_{\mu,\nu},\mu,\nu)$.

The hypotheses of Part (1) certainly fail since there are infinitely $u_{\mu,\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $G(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(\nu,\mu,\nu) = L(u_{\mu,\nu},\mu,\nu)$.

Therefore, the dual function G is no help in finding a solution of the Primal Problem (P).

The hypotheses of Part (1) certainly fail since there are infinitely $u_{\mu,\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $G(\mu,\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(\nu,\mu,\nu) = L(u_{\mu,\nu},\mu,\nu)$.

Therefore, the dual function G is no help in finding a solution of the Primal Problem (P).

As we saw earlier, if we consider the modified dual Problem (D_1) , then strong duality holds, but this *does not* follow from the preceding theorem, and a different proof is required.

Thus, we have the somewhat counter-intuitive situation that the *general* theory of Lagrange duality does not apply, at least directly, to linear programming, a fact that is not sufficiently emphasized in many expositions. *A separate treatment of duality is required*.

Thus, we have the somewhat counter-intuitive situation that the *general* theory of Lagrange duality does not apply, at least directly, to linear programming, a fact that is not sufficiently emphasized in many expositions. *A separate treatment of duality is required*.

Unlike the case of linear programming, which needs a separate treatment, the preceding theorem applies to the optimization problem involving a convex quadratic objective function and a set of affine inequality constraints.

Thus, we have the somewhat counter-intuitive situation that the *general* theory of Lagrange duality does not apply, at least directly, to linear programming, a fact that is not sufficiently emphasized in many expositions. *A separate treatment of duality is required*.

Unlike the case of linear programming, which needs a separate treatment, the preceding theorem applies to the optimization problem involving a convex quadratic objective function and a set of affine inequality constraints.

So in some sense, convex quadratic programming is simpler than linear programming!

Example. Consider the quadratic objective function

$$J(\mathbf{v}) = rac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^{ op} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^{ op} \mathbf{b},$$

where A is an $n \times n$ matrix which is *symmetric positive definite*, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the constraints are affine inequality constraints of the form

$$Cv \leq d$$
,

where C is an $m \times n$ matrix and $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For the time being, we do not assume that C has rank m.

Since *A* is symmetric positive definite, *J* is *strictly convex*.

Since A is symmetric positive definite, J is strictly convex.

The Lagrangian of this quadratic optimization problem is given by

$$L(\mathbf{v},\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}}A\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}}b + (C\mathbf{v} - d)^{\mathsf{T}}\mu$$

= $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}}A\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}}(b - C^{\mathsf{T}}\mu) - \mu^{\mathsf{T}}d.$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

Since A is symmetric positive definite, the function $v \mapsto L(v, \mu)$ has a *unique* minimum obtained for the solution u_{μ} of the linear system

$$A\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{C}^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\mu};$$

that is,

$$u_{\mu} = A^{-1}(b - C^{\top}\mu).$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲∃▶ ▲∃▶ ∃ りゅつ

This shows that the Problem (P_{μ}) has a *unique* solution which depends continuously on μ . Then for *any* solution λ of the dual problem, $u_{\lambda} = A^{-1}(b - C^{\top}\lambda)$ is an optimal solution of the primal problem.

This shows that the Problem (P_{μ}) has a *unique* solution which depends continuously on μ . Then for *any* solution λ of the dual problem, $u_{\lambda} = A^{-1}(b - C^{\top}\lambda)$ is an optimal solution of the primal problem.

We find that $G(\mu)$ is given by

$$G(\mu) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{\top} C A^{-1} C^{\top} \mu + \mu^{\top} (C A^{-1} b - d) - \frac{1}{2} b^{\top} A^{-1} b.$$

Since A is symmetric positive definite, the matrix $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is symmetric positive semidefinite. It can be shown that $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is symmetric positive definite iff C has rank m.

Since A is symmetric positive definite, the matrix $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is symmetric positive semidefinite. It can be shown that $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is symmetric positive definite iff C has rank m.

In this case it can be shown that *if* the inequalities $Cx \le d$ have a solution, *then* the primal problem has a unique solution.

As a consequence, by Part (2) of the duality gap theorem, the function $-G(\mu)$ always has a minimum, which is unique if *C* has rank *m*. The fact that $-G(\mu)$ has a minimum is not obvious when *C* has rank < m, since in this case $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is not invertible.

As a consequence, by Part (2) of the duality gap theorem, the function $-G(\mu)$ always has a minimum, which is unique if *C* has rank *m*. The fact that $-G(\mu)$ has a minimum is not obvious when *C* has rank < m, since in this case $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is not invertible.

We also verify easily that the gradient of G is given by

$$\nabla G_{\mu} = Cu_{\mu} - d = -CA^{-1}C^{\top}\mu + CA^{-1}b - d.$$

Observe that since $CA^{-1}C^{\top}$ is symmetric positive semidefinite, $-G(\mu)$ is convex.

Therefore, if C has rank m, a solution of Problem (P) is obtained by finding the unique solution λ of the equation

$$-CA^{-1}C^{\top}\mu + CA^{-1}b - d = 0,$$

and then the minimum u_{λ} of Problem (*P*) is given by

$$u_{\lambda} = A^{-1}(b - C^{\top}\lambda).$$

Therefore, if C has rank m, a solution of Problem (P) is obtained by finding the unique solution λ of the equation

$$-CA^{-1}C^{\top}\mu + CA^{-1}b - d = 0,$$

and then the minimum u_{λ} of Problem (*P*) is given by

$$u_{\lambda} = A^{-1}(b - C^{\top}\lambda).$$

If C has rank < m, then we can find $\lambda \ge 0$ using a method called ADMM.