CS 450: Numerical Anlaysis<sup>1</sup> Numerical Optimization

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>These slides have been drafted by Edgar Solomonik as lecture templates and supplementary material for the book "Scientific Computing: An Introductory Survey" by Michael T. Heath (slides).

## Numerical Optimization

• Our focus will be on *continuous* rather than *combinatorial* optimization:

 $\min_{\boldsymbol{x}} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \boldsymbol{0}$ 

> We consider linear, quadratic, and general nonlinear optimization problems:

## Local Minima and Convexity

Without knowledge of the analytical form of the function, numerical optimization methods at best achieve convergence to a *local* rather than *global* minimum:

A set is *convex* if it includes all points on any line, while a function is convex if it is greater or equal to points on any of its tangent lines:

## **Existence of Local Minima**

Level sets are all points for which f has a given value, sublevel sets are all points for which the value of f is less than a given value:

If there exists a closed and bounded sublevel set in the domain of feasible points, then *f* has has a global minimum in that set:

## **Optimality Conditions**

▶ If *x* is an interior point in the feasible domain and is a local minima,

$$abla f(oldsymbol{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} rac{df}{dx_1}(oldsymbol{x}) & \cdots & rac{df}{dx_n}(oldsymbol{x}) \end{bmatrix}^T = oldsymbol{0}:$$

• *Critical points* x satisfy  $\nabla f(x) = 0$  and can be minima, maxima, or saddle points:

## **Hessian Matrix**

To ascertain whether a critical point *x*, for which ∇*f*(*x*) = 0, is a local minima, consider the *Hessian matrix*:

• If  $x^*$  is a minima of f, then  $H_f(x^*)$  is positive semi-definite:

#### **Optimality on Feasible Region Border**

Given an equality constraint g(x) = 0, it is no longer necessarily the case that ∇f(x\*) = 0. Instead, it may be that directions in which the gradient decreases lead to points outside the feasible region:

$$\exists oldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad -
abla f(oldsymbol{x}^*) = oldsymbol{J}_{oldsymbol{g}}^T(oldsymbol{x}^*)oldsymbol{\lambda}$$

Such *constrained minima* are critical points of the Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ , so they satisfy:

$$abla \mathcal{L}(oldsymbol{x}^*,oldsymbol{\lambda}) = egin{bmatrix} 
abla f(oldsymbol{x}^*) + oldsymbol{J}_{oldsymbol{g}}^T(oldsymbol{x}^*)oldsymbol{\lambda} \ oldsymbol{g}(oldsymbol{x}^*) \end{bmatrix} = oldsymbol{0}$$

# Sensitivity and Conditioning

The condition number of solving a nonlinear equations is  $1/f'(x^*)$ , however for a minimizer  $x^*$ , we have  $f'(x^*) = 0$ , so conditioning of optimization is inherently bad:

To analyze worst case error, consider how far we have to move from a root x\* to perturb the function value by e:

# Golden Section Search

► Given bracket [a, b] with a unique local minimum (f is unimodal on the interval), golden section search considers consider points f(x<sub>1</sub>), f(x<sub>2</sub>), a < x<sub>1</sub> < x<sub>2</sub> < b and discards subinterval [a, x<sub>1</sub>] or [x<sub>2</sub>, b]:

Since one point remains in the interval, golden section search selects x<sub>1</sub> and x<sub>2</sub> so one of them can be effectively reused in the next iteration:

# Newton's Method for Optimization

At each iteration, approximate function by quadratic and find minimum of quadratic function:

▶ The new approximate guess will be given by  $x_{k+1} - x_k = -f'(x_k)/f''(x_k)$ :

#### Successive Parabolic Interpolation

▶ Interpolate *f* with a quadratic function at each step and find its minima:

 $\blacktriangleright$  The convergence rate of the resulting method is roughly 1.324

## Safeguarded 1D Optimization

Safeguarding can be done by bracketing via golden section search:

Backtracking and step-size control:

Demo: Nelder-Mead Method

# **General Multidimensional Optimization**

Direct search methods by simplex (*Nelder-Mead*):

Steepest descent: find the minimizer in the direction of the negative gradient:

## **Convergence of Steepest Descent**

Steepest descent converges linearly with a constant that can be arbitrarily close to 1:

• Given quadratic optimization problem  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x + c^T x$  where A is symmetric positive definite, consider the error  $e_k = x_k - x^*$ :

## Gradient Methods with Extrapolation

▶ We can improve the constant in the linear rate of convergence of steepest descent by leveraging *extrapolation methods*, which consider two previous iterates (maintain *momentum* in the direction  $x_k - x_{k-1}$ ):

► The *heavy ball method*, which uses constant  $\alpha_k = \alpha$  and  $\beta_k = \beta$ , achieves better convergence than steepest descent:

#### Demo: Conjugate Gradient Method

# **Conjugate Gradient Method**

• The *conjugate gradient method* is capable of making the optimal choice (for quadratic programs) of  $\alpha_k$  and  $\beta_k$  at each iteration:

Parallel tangents implementation of the method in a general nonlinear setting proceeds as follows

## Nonlinear Conjugate Gradient

- Various formulations of conjugate gradient are possible for nonlinear objective functions, which differ in how they compute β below
- Fletcher-Reeves is among the most common, computes the following at each iteration
  - 1. Perform 1D minimization for  $\alpha$  in  $f(\boldsymbol{x}_k + \alpha \boldsymbol{s}_k)$

$$2. \ \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_k + \alpha \boldsymbol{s}_k$$

- 3. Compute gradient  $g_{k+1} = \nabla f(x_{k+1})$
- 4. Compute  $\beta = \boldsymbol{g}_{k+1}^T \boldsymbol{g}_{k+1} / (\boldsymbol{g}_k^T \boldsymbol{g}_{k+1})$
- $5. \ \boldsymbol{s}_{k+1} = -\boldsymbol{g}_{k+1} + \beta \boldsymbol{s}_k$

## Conjugate Gradient for Quadratic Optimization

- Conjugate gradient is an optimal iterative method for quadratic optimization,  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x$
- For such problems, it can be expressed in an efficient and succinct form, computing at each iteration

1. 
$$\alpha = \boldsymbol{r}_k^T \boldsymbol{r}_k / \boldsymbol{s}_k^T \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{s}_k$$

$$\mathbf{2.} \ \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_k + \alpha \boldsymbol{s}_k$$

3. Compute gradient  $r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k A s_k$ 

4. Compute 
$$eta = oldsymbol{r}_{k+1}^T oldsymbol{r}_{k+1} / (oldsymbol{r}_k^T oldsymbol{r}_{k+1})$$

$$5. \ \boldsymbol{s}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{r}_{k+1} + \beta \boldsymbol{s}_k$$

Note that for quadratic optimization, the negative gradient -g corresponds to the residual r = b - Ax

# Krylov Optimization

Demo: Conjugate Gradient Parallel Tangents as Krylov Subspace Method

• Conjugate Gradient finds the minimizer of  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x - b^T x$  within the Krylov subspace of A:

# Newton's Method

Newton's method in n dimensions is given by finding minima of n-dimensional quadratic approximation:

## **Quasi-Newton Methods**

Quasi-Newton methods compute approximations to the Hessian at each step:

▶ The *BFGS* method is a secant update method, similar to Broyden's method:

## Nonlinear Least Squares

An important special case of multidimensional optimization is *nonlinear least* squares, the problem of fitting a nonlinear function  $f_x(t)$  so that  $f_x(t_i) \approx y_i$ :

We can cast nonlinear least squares as an optimization problem and solve it by Newton's method:

#### **Gauss-Newton Method**

> The Hessian for nonlinear least squares problems has the form:

▶ The *Gauss-Newton* method is Newton iteration with an approximate Hessian:

## **Constrained Optimization Problems**

• We now return to the general case of *constrained* optimization problems:

- Generally, we will seek to reduce constrained optimization problems to a series of unconstrained optimization problems:
  - sequential quadratic programming:
  - penalty-based methods:
  - active set methods:

# Sequential Quadratic Programming

Sequential quadratic programming (SQP) corresponds to using Newton's method to solve the equality constrained optimality conditions, by finding critical points of the Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$ ,

• At each iteration, SQP computes 
$$\begin{bmatrix} m{x}_{k+1} \\ m{\lambda}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} m{x}_k \\ m{\lambda}_k \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} m{s}_k \\ m{\delta}_k \end{bmatrix}$$
 by solving

# Inequality Constrained Optimality Conditions

The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions are necessary coniditions for local minima of a problem with equality and inequality constraints, they include

To use SQP for an inequality constrained optimization problem, consider at each iteration an *active set* of constraints:

# **Penalty Functions**

Alternatively, we can reduce constrained optimization problems to unconstrained ones by modifying the objective function. *Penalty* functions are effective for equality constraints g(x) = 0:

The augmented Lagrangian function provides a more numerically robust approach:

## **Barrier Functions**

▶ *Barrier functions (interior point methods)* provide an effective way of working with inequality constraints  $h(x) \leq 0$ :