

AD-A044 910

STANFORD UNIV CALIF DEPT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH
A GENERALIZATION OF THE FRANK-WOLFE THEOREM. (U)

F/G 12/1

UNCLASSIFIED

JUL 77 A F PEROLD
TR-77-18

N00014-75-C-0267
NL

| OF |
AD
A044 910



END
DATE
FILMED
10-77
DDC

(12)
B.S.

A GENERALIZATION OF THE FRANK-WOLFE THEOREM

ADA044910

[Handwritten signature]
73

BY
ANDRE F. PEROLD

TECHNICAL REPORT 77-18
July 1977

DDC
RECEIVED
OCT 5 1977
C

Department of
Operations
Research

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Stanford
University



Stanford
California
94305

AD No.
DDC FILE COPY

A GENERALIZATION OF THE FRANK-WOLFE THEOREM

by

Andre F. Perold



TECHNICAL REPORT 77-18 ✓

July 1977

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH

Stanford University
Stanford, California

Research and reproduction of this report were partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant MCS76-81259; and the Office of Naval Reserach Contract N00014-75-C-0267.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purposes of the United States Government. This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

Abstract

The Frank-Wolfe Theorem states that a quadratic function, bounded below on a nonempty polyhedral convex set, attains its infimum there. This paper gives sufficient conditions under which a function either attains its infimum on a nonempty polyhedral convex set or is unbounded below on some halfline of that set. Quadratic functions are shown to satisfy these sufficient conditions.

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	Write Section ☒
DOC	B W Section ☐
MANUSCRIPT	☐
JUL 1 1964	
BY	
RESEARCH CENTER	
SPECIAL	
A	

1. Introduction

The existence theorem for quadratic programming states that a quadratic function Q bounded below on a nonempty polyhedral convex set C attains its infimum there. This result was first proved in 1956 by Frank and Wolfe [1]. Alternative proofs have since been given by Collatz and Wetterling [2] (for the case when Q is convex), Eaves [3] and Blum and Oettli [4].

Eaves [3] also improved on this result by showing that if Q does not attain its infimum on C , then Q must be unbounded below on some halfline contained in C . This was first claimed, but not proved, by Dennis in 1959 [5].

In [1], the example $Q(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 + (1 - x_1 x_2)^2$ is given to show that these results do not hold in general for higher order polynomials. (Q here does not attain its infimum, zero, in the plane.) This leads one to ask: what is so special about a quadratic; and also perhaps, what is so special about polyhedral convex sets. Unfortunately, the proofs in [1], [2], [3] and [4] are specifically tailored to the quadratic and polyhedral case, and shed little light on the answers to these questions.

In this paper we shall deal with the first question. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the class of all continuous functions $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ (some n) such that for any polyhedral convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, f either attains its infimum on C or is unbounded below on some halfline contained in C . We shall define a class of functions $\mathcal{G}$ which, in particular, contains all quadratic functions, and shall show that $\mathcal{G}$ is contained (strictly) in $\mathcal{F}$.

2. Notation and Definitions

Let $\underline{n}$ denote $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha \subseteq \underline{n}$, let $x_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k$ denote

$$(x_{\alpha_1}, \dots, x_{\alpha_k})^T \text{ where } \alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}, \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k$$

For $A \in R^{m \times n}$, $\alpha \subseteq m$, $\beta \subseteq n$, let $A_{\alpha \cdot}$ denote the row submatrix of A whose rows are indexed by α ; let $A_{\cdot \beta}$ denote the column submatrix of A whose columns are indexed by β ; let $A_{\alpha \beta}$ denote $(A_{\alpha \cdot})_{\cdot \beta}$.

The symbol // will be used to denote the end of a proof.

A function $f : R^n \rightarrow R$ is said to be norm-coercive if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |f(x_k)| = \infty$ for every sequence $\{x_k\} \subseteq R^n$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_k\| = \infty$.

3. The class $\mathcal{H}$ and some examples

We define $\mathcal{H}$ by induction and the number of variables.

3.1 Definition: Let $f : R^n \rightarrow R^1$ be continuous. Then $f \in \mathcal{H}$ if there exists a nonsingular matrix Q , and a partition of $\underline{n}$, $\underline{n} = \alpha \cup \beta$, such that $g : R^n \rightarrow R$ defined by $g(x) = f(Qx)$ satisfies

- (i) if $\beta \neq \emptyset$ then $g(x_\alpha, \cdot)$ is a concave function
- (ii) if $\beta = \emptyset$ then g is norm-coercive
- (iii) if $\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and $\beta \neq \emptyset$ then for all A and b of appropriate dimensions, the function $h(\cdot)$, defined by $h(x_\alpha) = g(x_\alpha, Ax_\alpha + b)$, is a member of $\mathcal{H}$.

Note that for $n = 1$, condition (iii) is trivially satisfied since either α or β must be empty. Hence a function of one variable, f , is in $\mathcal{H}$ if f is concave or if f is norm-coercive and continuous.

Note also that the induction step in the defn of $\mathcal{H}$ is in condition (iii).

3.2 Examples

- (i) All continuous norm-coercive functions are in $\mathcal{H}$.

Set $Q = I$, $\alpha = \underline{n}$, $\beta = \emptyset$ in Definition 3.1

- (ii) All concave functions are in $\mathcal{H}$.

Set $Q = I$, $\alpha = \emptyset$, $\beta = \underline{n}$ in Definition 3.1

- (iii) All quadratic functions are in $\mathcal{H}$.

We shall prove this by induction on n , the number of variables. Let

$$f(x) = c^T x + \frac{1}{2} x^T D x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $n = 1$ then f is either concave or $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, and we are done.

Suppose the result is true for quadratic functions of $n-1$ variables or fewer. Without loss of generality we may assume that D is symmetric. Hence there is an orthogonal matrix Q such that

$$Q^T D Q = \text{Diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

where the λ_i are the real eigenvalues of D .

Set $d = Q^T c$, and $g(x) = f(Qx)$. Then

$$g(x) = \sum_{\lambda_i > 0} (\lambda_i x_i^2 + d_i x_i) + \sum_{\lambda_i \leq 0} (\lambda_i x_i^2 + d_i x_i)$$

Let $\alpha = \{i : \lambda_i > 0\}$, $\beta = \{i : \lambda_i \leq 0\}$. Then α and β partition $\underline{n}$, and $g(x)$ clearly satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Definition 3.1.

Also, since for any A and b , $g(x_\alpha, Ax_\alpha + b)$ is a quadratic function in fewer variables, the induction hypothesis applies and condition (iii) of Definition 3.1 is established.

(iv) Any function of the form

$$f(u, v) = [u^T B u]^k - (v^T D v)^m$$

where B is positive definite, D is positive semidefinite and $k > m \geq 0$, is in $\mathcal{H}$.

Set $Q = I$, and identify x_α with u and x_β with v .

Since B is positive definite

$$x_\alpha^T B x_\alpha \geq \xi \|x_\alpha\|^2 \quad \forall x_\alpha \quad (1)$$

where $\xi > 0$ is the smallest eigenvalue of B .

Since D is positive semi-definite, and the function t^m is nondecreasing in $t \geq 0$, $(x_\beta^T D x_\beta)^m$ is convex in x_β .

Hence conditions (i) and (ii) of Definition 3.1 are satisfied.

Further, since D is positive semi-definite,

$$0 \leq x_\beta^T D x_\beta \leq \eta \|x_\beta\|^2 \quad \forall x_\beta$$

where $\eta \geq 0$ is the largest eigenvalue of D . Thus for any A and b

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (Ax_\alpha + b)^T D (Ax_\alpha + b) \\ &\leq \eta \|Ax_\alpha + b\|^2 \\ &\leq \eta (\mu \|x_\alpha\| + \|b\|)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where μ is the largest row norm of A .

Combining (1) and (2) we obtain

$$f(x_\alpha, Ax_\alpha + b) \geq \xi^k \|x_\alpha\|^{2k} - \eta^m (\mu \|x_\alpha\| + \|b\|)^{2m}$$

The right hand side of this inequality is a polynomial in

$\|x_\alpha\|$ with leading coefficient $\xi^k > 0$. Hence

$f(x_\alpha, Ax_\alpha + b) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|x_\alpha\| \rightarrow \infty$. This establishes condition (iii) of Definition 3.1 by an application of example (i).

Remark: Example (iv) shows that the class $\mathcal{F}$ is indeed interesting, that is, $\mathcal{F}$ consists of functions to which the Frank-Wolfe theorem as it stands is not applicable.

4. Preliminary results.

Let C be a nonempty polyhedral convex set of the form

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \geq b\}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

4.1 Definition: Let $x \in C$, and let $\gamma = \{i : A_{i \cdot} x = b_i\}$. Then x is called a pseudo-extreme point of C if x uses linearly independent columns of $A_{\gamma \cdot}$, i.e. if $\delta = \{j : x_j \neq 0\}$ then $A_{\gamma \delta}$ has full column rank.

For convenience, when A is the zero matrix, define the origin to be the pseudo-extreme point of C .

One can easily show that C always has pseudo-extreme points. Furthermore, it follows by Lemma 4.3 (stated below) that the extreme points of C , when they exist, are pseudo-extreme points of C .

Geometrically, the pseudo-extreme points of C are the extreme points of all the sections of C at $x_\alpha = 0$ where α ranges over all subsets (including the empty set) of $\underline{n}$.

In the following examples, the pseudo-extreme points are marked with asterisks. The set C is the shaded area.

$$(i) \quad C = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$




Fig. 1

$$(ii) \quad C = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$




Fig. 2

The following theorem shows that C has a representation in terms of its pseudo-extreme points.

4.2 Theorem: C has a representation

$$C = \{s + \mu t : s \in S, t \in T, \mu \geq 0\}$$

where S is the convex hull of the pseudo-extreme points of C , and T is the intersection of a polyhedral convex cone with the unit sphere.

To prove this result, we require 3 lemmas.

4.3 Lemma: Let $x \in C$ and let $\gamma = \{i : A_i \cdot x = b_i\}$. Then x is an extreme point of C iff the rank of A_γ is n .

4.4 Lemma: If C has extreme points then C has the representation

$$C = \{s + \mu t : s \in S, t \in T, \mu \geq 0\} \text{ where}$$

S is the convex hull of the extreme points of C and T is the intersection of a polyhedral convex cone with the unit sphere.

The proofs of these two lemmas can be found in Goldman [6].

In the following, let x^+ and x^- denote the positive and negative parts of x , respectively.

4.5 Lemma: Let $\bar{C} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 : Au - Av \leq b \right\}$. Then x is a pseudo-extreme point of C if and only if $\begin{pmatrix} x^+ \\ x^- \end{pmatrix}$ is an extreme point of $\bar{C}$.

Proof: Let x be a pseudo-extreme point of C . Let $\gamma = \{i : A_{i\cdot} x = b_i\}$.

Then since x uses linearly independent columns of $A_{\gamma\cdot}$, $\begin{pmatrix} x^+ \\ x^- \end{pmatrix}$ uses linearly independent columns, say $\delta \subseteq \underline{2n}$, of the partitioned matrix $(A_{\gamma\cdot}, -A_{\gamma\cdot})$.

Let $B = (A, -A)$ and let I be the identity matrix of dimension $2n$.

Then $\bar{C}$ can be written as

$$\bar{C} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} : \bar{A} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} b \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

where

$$\bar{A} = \begin{pmatrix} B \\ I \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus the row submatrix of $\bar{A}$ corresponding to the constraints which $\begin{pmatrix} x^+ \\ x^- \end{pmatrix}$ satisfies with equality is

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_{\gamma\cdot} \\ I_{\bar{\delta}\cdot} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\bar{\delta}$ denotes $\underline{2n} \sim \delta$

Rewrite this matrix as

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_{\gamma\delta} & B_{\gamma\bar{\delta}} \\ 0 & I_{\bar{\delta}\bar{\delta}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Since $B_{\gamma\delta}$ and $I_{\bar{\delta}\bar{\delta}}$ both have full column rank it follows that

$$\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} B_{\gamma\cdot} \\ I_{\bar{\delta}\cdot} \end{pmatrix} = 2n$$

By lemma 4.3 $\begin{pmatrix} x^+ \\ x^- \end{pmatrix}$ is an extreme point of $\bar{C}$, and the first implication is established.

The converse follows easily along similar lines.

//

Proof of Theorem 4.2: Let $\bar{C}$ be as in the statement of Lemma 4.5.

Since C has pseudo-extreme points, it follows by Lemma 4.5 that $\bar{C}$ has extreme points.

Thus by Lemma 4.4 $\bar{C}$ has a representation

$$\bar{C} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ s'' \end{pmatrix} + \mu \begin{pmatrix} t' \\ t'' \end{pmatrix} : \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ s'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{S}, \begin{pmatrix} t' \\ t'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{T}, \mu \geq 0 \right\}$$

where $\bar{S}$ is the convex hull of the extreme points of $\bar{C}$, and $\bar{T}$ is the intersection of a polyhedral convex cone with the unit sphere.

Now C can be written as

$$C = \{u-v : \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{C}\}$$

Hence

$$C = \{(s' - s'') + \mu(t' - t'') : \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ s'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{S}, \begin{pmatrix} t' \\ t'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{T}, \mu \geq 0\}$$

Set

$$S = \{s' - s'' : \begin{pmatrix} s' \\ s'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{S}\}$$

Then by Lemma 4.5 S is the convex hull of the pseudo-extreme points of C .

Set

$$T = \left\{ \frac{t' - t''}{\|t' - t''\|} : \begin{pmatrix} t' \\ t'' \end{pmatrix} \in \bar{T}, t' - t'' \neq 0 \right\}$$

Then

$$C = \{s + \mu t : s \in S, t \in T, \mu \geq 0\}$$

as required.

Theorem 4.6: Let $g : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be concave. Then either g attains its infimum at a pseudo-extreme point of C or g is unbounded below on some halfline of C .

In 1961 Hirsch and Hoffman [7] proved a similar theorem using a different representation of C . They decomposed C as

$$C = M \oplus L$$

where L is a linear subspace and M is the $L^\perp$ -section of C , and showed that a concave function bounded below on C attains its infimum at an extreme point of M . In fig. 1 the extreme points of M are circled. Note that they are not the same as the pseudo-extreme points of C .

Proof of Theorem 4.6:

Let $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ be the set of pseudo-extreme points of C .

Let

$$g(p_m) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} g(p_i)$$

Let S and T be as in Theorem 4.2.

For any $s \in S$ $\exists \lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, k, \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1$ such that

$$s = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i p_i$$

By the concavity of g ,

$$g(s) = g\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i p_i\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i g(p_i)$$

Hence $g(s) \geq g(p_m) \quad \forall s \in S. \quad (1)$

Now suppose that g does not attain its infimum at a pseudo-extreme point of C .

Then by (1) $\exists x \in C \setminus S$ with

$$g(x) < g(p_m)$$

By Theorem 4.2 x can be written as

$$x = s + \mu t$$

for some $s \in S, t \in T, \mu \geq 0$.

Since $x \notin S, \mu > 0$.

Further, the half-line

$$H = \{s + \xi t : \xi \geq \mu\}$$

is contained in C .

Now $\forall \xi \geq \mu$

$$s + \mu t = (1 - \frac{\mu}{\xi}) s + (\frac{\mu}{\xi})(s + \xi t).$$

Since g is concave

$$g(s + \mu t) \geq (1 - \frac{\mu}{\xi})g(s) + (\frac{\mu}{\xi})g(s + \xi t).$$

Upon rearrangement we get

$$g(s + \xi t) \leq g(s) - \left(\frac{g(s) - g(s + \mu t)}{\mu}\right)\xi.$$

Since

$$g(s) - g(s + \mu t) \geq g(pm) - g(x) > 0$$

it follows that

$$g(s + \xi t) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \xi \rightarrow \infty.$$

i.e. g is unbounded below on H .

//

The following result is of interest in its own right.

Theorem 4.7: Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 2$, be continuous and norm-coercive.

Then g is either bounded above or bounded below.

The proof of this result uses the concept of path connectedness. A set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be path connected if for any $x, y \in D$ there is a continuous mapping $p : [0,1] \rightarrow D$ such that $p(0) = x$ and $p(1) = y$.

Let K_r denote the closed ball of radius r , and $\bar{K}_r$ its complement. For $n \geq 2$ $\bar{K}_r$ is path connected.

Proof of Theorem 4.7: By assumption on g , there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$x \in \bar{K}_r \Rightarrow |g(x)| \geq 1. \quad (1)$$

We shall show that either $g(x) \geq 1 \quad \forall x \in \bar{K}_r$ or $g(x) \leq -1 \quad \forall x \in \bar{K}_r$.

If not, $\exists x, y \in \bar{K}_r \ni g(x) \geq 1$ and $g(y) \leq -1$. Since K_r is path connected there is a continuous mapping $p : [0,1] \rightarrow \bar{K}_r \ni p(0) = x \quad p(1) = y$.

Since g is continuous, the mapping $h : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h(t) = g(p(t))$$

is continuous. Moreover $h(0) \geq 1$ and $h(1) \leq -1$. By the intermediate value theorem there exists $t_0 \in [0,1]$ such that $h(t_0) = 0$,

$$\text{i.e.} \quad g(p(t_0)) = 0$$

Since $p(t_0) \in \bar{K}_r$ this contradicts (1).

Hence g is either bounded above or below on $\bar{K}_r$. Since K_r is compact and g is continuous, g is bounded on K_r . //

The following theorem is obtained as a consequence of the above result.

Theorem 4.8: Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and norm-coercive.

Let P be any nonempty closed convex set. Then g either attains its infimum on P or is unbounded below on some half-line contained in P .

Proof: If g is bounded below on P , then

$$\|x\| \rightarrow \infty, x \in P \Rightarrow g(x) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus for k sufficiently large the set

$$R = \{x : g(x) \leq k\} \cap P$$

is nonempty and compact.

Since g is continuous g attains its infimum on R . The infimum of g on R is equal to the infimum of g on P and we are done.

Suppose g is unbounded below on P . Then since g is continuous, there is a sequence $\{x_n\} \subseteq P \ni g(x_n) \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\|x_n\| \rightarrow \infty$.

If $n = 1$, one of the half-lines $P \cap [-\infty, 0]$, $P \cap [0, \infty)$ will do.

If $n \geq 2$, it follows by Theorem 4.7 that

$$\|x\| \rightarrow \infty, x \in P \Rightarrow g(x) \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Since any unbounded convex set contains half-lines, any half-line in P will do. //

4.9 Lemma: Let $P(b) = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$. Then there is a finite collection

$\{(\gamma_i, \delta_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, \ell\}$ where $\gamma_i \subseteq m$, $\delta_i \subseteq n$ such that

$\forall b, x$ is a pseudo-extreme point of $P(b) \Rightarrow$ there exists $i \in \underline{\ell}$ such that

$$(i) \quad A_{\gamma_i \delta_i} x_{\delta_i} = b_{\gamma_i}$$

$$(ii) \quad A_{\gamma_i \delta_i}^{-1} \text{ exists}$$

$$(iii) \quad x_{\delta_i}^- = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{\delta}_i = n \setminus \delta_i$$

The proof is immediate from Definition 4.1 and will be omitted.

5. Proof of the main result: $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{P}$

The proof is by induction on the number of variables.

Let C be any non-empty polyhedral convex set defined by

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

For $n = 1$, if $f \in \mathcal{H}$ then f is either concave or $|f(x)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

In the former case, Theorem 4.6 applies. In the latter case, Theorem 4.8 applies.

Suppose the result holds for all $k < n$. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}$, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Let Q , α and β be as in definition 3.1. Since Q is nonsingular, it suffices to prove the result for g defined by

$$g(x) = f(Qx)$$

on the set

$$\bar{C} = \{x : \bar{A} x \leq b\}$$

where $\bar{A} = AQ$.

If either $\alpha = \phi$ or $\beta = \phi$, then g is either concave or norm-coercive and we can use Theorem 4.6 or 4.8.

So assume $\alpha \neq \phi$, $\beta \neq \phi$. Let $\{x^k\} = \{(x_\alpha^k, x_\beta^k)\}$ be a minimizing sequence for g in the sense that $g(x^k) \searrow -\infty$ if g is unbounded below on $\bar{C}$, or else

$$g(x^k) \searrow \inf \{g(x) : x \in \bar{C}\} = \rho > -\infty \quad (\text{say}).$$

Now for each k , hold x_α^k fixed and solve

$$\min g(x_\alpha^k, u_\beta)$$

subject to $u_\beta \in \bar{C}_k \triangleq \{y : \bar{A}_\alpha x_\alpha^k + \bar{A}_\beta y \leq b\}$. Since $g(x_\alpha^k, \cdot)$ is concave, we can apply theorem 4.6:

If $g(x_\alpha^k, \cdot)$ is unbounded below on $\bar{C}_k$ then there is a half line $\{s + \mu t : \mu \geq 0\} \subseteq \bar{C}_k$ such that

$$g(x_\alpha^k, s + \mu t) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \mu \rightarrow \infty.$$

i.e. g is unbounded below on the half-line

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_\alpha^k \\ s \end{pmatrix} + \mu \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ t \end{pmatrix} : \mu \geq 0 \right\} \subseteq \bar{C}$$

and the result is proved.

Otherwise, $\forall k$, $g(x_\alpha^k, \cdot)$ attains its infimum at a pseudo-extreme point $u_\beta^k \in \bar{C}_k$. By Lemma 4.9 there exists (γ_1, δ_1) such that

$$\bar{A}_{\gamma_i \delta_i}^{-1} u_{\delta_i}^k = b_{\gamma_i} - \bar{A}_{\gamma_i \alpha} x_{\alpha}^k$$

$$\bar{A}_{\gamma_i \delta_i}^{-1} \text{ exists} \quad (1)$$

$$u_{\delta_i}^k = 0 \quad \text{where } \bar{\delta}_i = \beta \sim \delta_i$$

Since the pair $(x_{\alpha}^k, u_{\beta}^k)$ is feasible

$$\bar{A}_{\gamma_i \beta} u_{\beta}^k \leq b_{\gamma_i} - \bar{A}_{\gamma_i \alpha} x_{\alpha}^k \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_i = \alpha \sim \gamma_i$

Since there are only finitely many such (γ_i, δ_i) there is an infinite subsequence K such that some $(\gamma_i, \delta_i) = (\gamma, \delta)$ (say) is repeated for all $k \in K$.

Using (1) to eliminate u_{β}^k from (2) we get, $\forall k \in K$

$$u_{\beta}^k = d - D x_{\alpha}^k$$

$$B x_{\alpha}^k \leq c$$

where

$$d = \begin{pmatrix} d_{\delta} \\ d_{\bar{\delta}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_{\gamma \delta}^{-1} b_{\gamma} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} D_{\delta} \\ D_{\bar{\delta}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_{\gamma \delta}^{-1} \bar{A}_{\gamma \alpha} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$c = b_{\bar{\gamma}} - \bar{A}_{\bar{\gamma} \beta} d$$

$$B = \bar{A}_{\bar{\gamma} \alpha} - \bar{A}_{\bar{\gamma} \beta} D$$

Now since $\{(x_\alpha^k, x_\beta^k)\}$ is a minimizing sequence for $g(\cdot)$ on $\bar{C}$, it follows that $\{(x_\alpha^k, u_\beta^k)\}$ is a minimizing sequence for $g(\cdot)$ on $\bar{C}$ since by definition of u_β^k ,

$$g(x_\alpha^k, u_\beta^k) \leq g(x_\alpha^k, x_\beta^k)$$

But $(x_\alpha^k, u_\beta^k) = (x_\alpha^k, d - Dx_\alpha^k) \quad \forall k \in K$. Hence $\{x_\alpha^k\}_{k \in K}$ is a minimizing sequence for $h(\cdot)$ on $\bar{C}$ where

$$h(z) \triangleq g(z, d - Dz)$$

$$\bar{C} = \{z : Bz \leq c\}$$

We can now apply the induction hypothesis to $h(\cdot)$ on $\bar{C}$ using condition (iii) of Definition 3.1 as follows:

If g is bounded below on $\bar{C}$ then

$$g(x_\alpha^k, x_\beta^k) \searrow \rho \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

so that

$$g(x_\alpha^k, d - Dx_\alpha^k) = h(x_\alpha^k) \searrow \rho \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, k \in K.$$

Hence there exists $\bar{x}_\alpha \in \bar{C}$ such that $h(\bar{x}_\alpha) = \rho$ i.e. $g(\bar{x}_\alpha, d - D\bar{x}_\alpha) = \rho$, and we are done.

Otherwise $g(x_\alpha^k, x_\beta^k) \searrow -\infty$ so that $h(x_\alpha^k) \searrow -\infty, k \in K$, i.e. $h(\cdot)$ is unbounded below on $\bar{C}$. Hence there exists a half-line $\{s + \mu t : \mu \geq 0\} \subseteq \bar{C}$ such that

$$h(s + \mu t) \searrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \mu \rightarrow \infty$$

i.e. $g(\cdot)$ is unbounded below on the half-line

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} s \\ d - Ds \end{pmatrix} + \mu \begin{pmatrix} t \\ -Dt \end{pmatrix} : \mu \geq 0 \right\}$$

in $\bar{C}$. This completes the proof. //

6. Concluding Remarks

We might ask questions about the structures of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$.

(i) Neither is closed under addition

e.g. Let $f(x) = e^{x^2} + e^{-x}$, $g(x) = -e^{x^2}$. Then both f and $g \in \mathcal{H}$ but $f + g \notin \mathcal{F}$. This example also shows that $\mathcal{H}$ is properly contained in $\mathcal{F}$.

(ii) $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under arbitrary linear transformations of the variables whereas $\mathcal{H}$ is not.

To prove the first assertion, let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and let $C = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$.

We must show that $f(Bx + d)$ has the required properties on C .

Let $E = \{(x, y) : Ax \leq b, y = Bx + d\}$. Since E is a polyhedral convex set, its projection onto y space, πE is a polyhedral convex set.

If

$$\inf\{f(Bx + d) : x \in E\} = \rho > -\infty$$

then

$$\inf\{f(y) : y \in \pi E\} = \rho.$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $\bar{y} \in \pi E$ such that $f(\bar{y}) = \rho$

By definition of πE there exists $\bar{x} \in C$ such that $\bar{y} = B\bar{x} + d$. Hence $f(B\bar{x} + d) = \rho$, and we are done.

If $f(Bx + d)$ is unbounded below then $f(y)$ is unbounded on πE .

Hence $\exists$ half-line $H = \{s + \mu t : \mu \geq 0\} \subseteq \pi E$ such that

$$f(y) \rightarrow -\infty \text{ as } \|y\| \rightarrow \infty, y \in H.$$

Define the linear map $h : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$h(x) = Bx + d.$$

Then by linearity of $h(\cdot)$, $h^{-1}(H)$ is an unbounded convex subset of C , and hence contains a half-line, G .

Thus $f(Bx + d) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty, x \in G$, as required.

To show $\mathcal{H}$ is not closed under arbitrary linear transformations of the variables, consider

$$f(x) = e^{x^2} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The function $f(y+z) = e^{(y+z)^2}$ is concave neither in y nor z , and along the ray $y = -z$, $|f(y+z)| \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. $f(y+z) \notin \mathcal{H}$.

Note that $\mathcal{H}$ is however closed under nonsingular linear transformations of the variables. This follows by definition of $\mathcal{H}$.

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Professors R.W. Cottle and V. Chvátal for their helpful suggestions during the preparation of this manuscript.

Bibliography

1. Frank, M. and Wolfe, P. "An algorithm for Quadratic Programming", Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 3 (1956) p. 95-110.
2. Collatz, L. and Wetterling, W. "Optimization Problems", Springer (1975).
3. Blum, E. and Oettli, W. "Direct Proof of the Existence Theorem for Quadratic Programming". Operations Research (20) (1972) p. 165-167.
4. Eaves, B.C. "On Quadratic Programming", Management Science, Vol. 17 #11 July 1971 p. 698-711.
5. Dennis, J.B. "Mathematical Programming and Electrical Networks" Wiley and Tech Press of MIT. (1959).
6. Goldman, A.J. "Resolution and Separation Theorems for Polyhedral Convex Sets" in "Linear Inequalities and Related Systems", Kuhn & Tucker (Eds) (1956) p. 41-51.
7. Hirsch, W.M. and Hoffman, A.J. "Extreme Varieties, Concave Functions and the Fixed Charge Problem". Comm on Pure and Appl. Math vol. XIV p. 355-369 (1961).

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 14 TR-77-18 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER 9
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6 A GENERALIZATION OF THE FRANK-WOLFE THEOREM,		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
7. AUTHOR(S) 10 Andre F. Perold		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) NR-047-064
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Operations Research Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Operations Research Program Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE 11 Jul 1977
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12 22p.		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 19
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) 15 N00014-75-C-0267 VNSF-MCS-76-81259		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Nonlinear Programming Optimization Quadratic Programming Polyhedral Sets Norm-coercive functions Concave functions		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Frank-Wolfe Theorem states that a quadratic function, bounded below on a nonempty polyhedral convex set, attains its infimum there. This paper gives sufficient conditions under which a function either attains its infimum on a nonempty polyhedral convex set or is unbounded below on some halfline of that set. Quadratic functions are shown to satisfy these sufficient conditions.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

402766 ✓

AB