

# 1. Parameter Optimization Problems:

## 1.3. Inequality Constrained Optimization

©Erik I. Verriest\*

November 19, 2008

### 1 Kuhn-Tucker Problem

We will now develop the necessary conditions for  $y^* \in \mathbf{R}^n$  to be a local minimum for the function  $L(y)$ , with the  $p$ -dimensional constraint  $f(y) \leq 0$ . We denote by  $x \leq 0$ , for a vector  $x$ , the scalar conditions  $x_i \leq 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ .

If for some of the constraints  $f_i(y^*) < 0$ , we say that the corresponding constraint is *inactive*, and it may be eliminated from the set. If on the other hand  $f_i(y) = 0$ , then this constraint is said to be *active*. Clearly if at  $y^*$  all constraints are inactive, the necessary condition for optimality is that  $L_y = 0$  as before.

Consider the more interesting case where  $0 < m \leq p$  of the  $p$  given constraints are active. Consequently, we'll only look at these  $m$  constraints, and with some abuse of notation, we'll denote this  $m$ -vector of constraints again by  $f(y)$ . At this point  $m$  may be larger or smaller than  $n$ . We will also assume that the rank of  $f$  at  $y^*$  is  $r$ . This means that at the point  $y^*$ , the  $m \times n$  gradient matrix satisfies

$$\text{rank } f_y(y^*) = r \leq \min(m, n)$$

Equivalently, this expresses that the gradients of the effective constraints span an  $r$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

In what follows we shall also make use of the class of *selection matrices*. An  $r - m$  selection matrix  $\Gamma$  is an  $r \times m$  matrix whose rows are arbitrarily chosen from the  $m \times m$  identity matrix. There always exists a selection matrix  $\Gamma$  such that  $\text{rank } \Gamma f_y f_y' \Gamma' = r$ .

If  $r < n$ , denote by  $\Gamma^c$  the complementary selection matrix, so that the rows of  $f$  are a permutation of the rows of  $\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma f_y \\ \Gamma^c f_y \end{bmatrix}$ .

---

\*School of ECE, Georgia Tech, Atlanta, GA, USA. Presently with SCD, ESAT, KULeuven.

First we will derive the set of *admissible* perturbations  $dy$ . A suitable basis for the tangent space at  $y^*$ , i.e., the vector space attached at  $y^*$  (or with origin at  $y^*$ ), are the  $r$  selected gradients (the rows of  $\Gamma f_y$ ) augmented (if  $r < n$ ) with  $n - r$  independent row vectors  $\eta$  in the orthogonal complement of the rowspace of  $\Gamma f_y$ . Denoting this space by  $f_y^\perp$ , we also have that  $f_y^\perp = [\Gamma f_y]^\perp$ . Recall that vectors in the tangent space are row vectors. These rows,  $\eta$ , satisfy  $\Gamma f_y \eta' = 0$ . Changing back to columns (more precisely: the dual space), any arbitrary (column)-vector  $dy$  of dimension  $n$  can then be expressed as

$$dy = (\Gamma f_y)' (\Gamma f_y f_y' \Gamma')^{-1} \epsilon + \eta' \quad ; \quad \Gamma f_y \eta' = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}^r$ . Note that  $(\Gamma f_y f_y' \Gamma')^{-1} \epsilon$  selects a particular linear combination of the columns of  $(\Gamma f_y)'$ . The vector  $\eta$  may also be expressed as

$$\eta = f_y^{\perp'} \nu, \quad (2)$$

with  $\nu \in \mathbf{R}^{n-r}$ . If  $r = n$ , then  $f_y^\perp = 0$ . This may seem like a strange parametrization, but the reason will become clear shortly. Admissibility of the perturbation, requires that the corresponding changes in  $f$  satisfy the constraint, or  $df \leq 0$ . Thus

$$df = f_y dy = f_y (\Gamma f_y)' (\Gamma f_y f_y' \Gamma')^{-1} \epsilon + f_y f_y^{\perp'} \nu \quad (3)$$

from which:

$$\Gamma df = \epsilon, \quad (4)$$

$$\Gamma^c df = 0, \quad (5)$$

since  $f_y f_y^{\perp'} = 0$  by definition. The condition for *admissibility* is thus  $\epsilon \leq 0$ .

What is now the effect on  $dL$  of such an admissible perturbation? We express the gradient  $L_y$  also in terms of the basis in the tangent space. Let thus for some row vectors  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$

$$L_y = -\lambda \Gamma f_y + \mu f_y^\perp \quad (6)$$

be the expansion of the gradient  $L_y$  in the chosen basis for the tangent space. Then the change in  $L$  due to the *admissible* perturbation  $dy$  is

$$\begin{aligned} dL &= L_y dy = [-\lambda \Gamma f_y + \mu f_y^\perp] [(\Gamma f_y)' (\Gamma f_y f_y' \Gamma')^{-1} \epsilon + \eta'] \\ &= -\lambda \epsilon + \mu f_y^\perp \eta' \\ &= -\lambda \epsilon + \mu f_y^\perp f_y^{\perp'} \nu \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The two other terms vanish because  $f_y f_y^\perp = 0$ . As  $\nu$  is arbitrary, the second term can have either sign unless  $\mu = 0$ . If  $y^*$  is a stationary solution to the problem *IC*, then at  $y^*$ ,  $dL$  is necessarily nonnegative for all *admissible* excursions. The increment  $dL$  is positive for all admissible excursions  $dy$  if  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\mu = 0$ . The second condition is equivalent to  $L_y \in \text{rowspan} f_y$ , while the first further restricts  $L_y$  to be in the *cone* spanned by the rows of  $-f_y$  (the negative gradients of the constraints). This means that  $L_y = -\lambda f_y$ , where  $\lambda$

cannot have negative components. This proves the following.

**Kuhn-Tucker Theorem**

*The necessary conditions for  $y^*$  to minimize  $L(y)$ , subject to the  $m$  constraints,  $f_y \leq 0$ , are that*

$$\begin{aligned}L_y(y^*) + \lambda f_y(y^*) &= 0 \\ \lambda f(y^*) &= 0 \\ \lambda &\geq 0 \text{ with } \lambda_i = 0 \text{ if } f_i(y^*) < 0.\end{aligned}$$