

# Math 164 - Fall'02 - Final Exam

1. (8 points) Let  $f$  be concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Show that

$$U = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : f(x) \geq a\}$$

is convex set.

2. (12 points) Consider the problem

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & z = c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 \\ \text{subject to} & a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 \leq b \\ & x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \quad (*)$$

- (a) (4 points) Under what conditions is the feasible set not empty?  
 (b) (8 points) If an optimal solution to  $(*)$  exists, derive a simple rule to find one.
3. (10 points) Given the constraints

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{I} & x_1 + 4x_2 \leq 6 \\ \text{II} & x_2 \leq 2 \\ \text{III} & 5x_1 - x_2 \leq 4 \\ \text{IV} & x_1 - x_2 \leq 2 \end{array}$$

the point  $\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}$  and the at  $\bar{x}$  feasible direction  $p = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ , perform a ratio test to determine the maximal step length  $\bar{\alpha}$  such that  $\bar{x} + \bar{\alpha}p$  remains feasible. Show work and justify your steps.

4. (8 points) Consider the following (primal) linear programming problem  $P$ .

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & z = x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{subject to} & x_1 - x_2 \leq 1 \\ & x_1, x_2 \geq 0 . \end{array} \right\} (P)$$

- (a) (4 points) Find the dual  $D$  of  $P$ .  
 (b) (4 points) With respect to infeasibility and unboundedness, what can you say about one of the two problems  $P$  and  $D$ , and using duality theory, what can you conclude about the other? Explain your answers by mentioning the relevant theorems or corollaries you are using.

5. (10 points) Consider

$$f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^4 + x_2^4 - 4x_1x_2 + 1$$

Find all stationary points and classify them according to local minimizer, maximizer or saddle showing that the respective FONC and SOSC hold.

6. (12 points) Consider

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 x_2^2 \\ \text{subject to} & x^T x = 1 \end{array} \right\} \quad (*)$$

(a) (8 points) Show that on the feasible set given by the above constraint  $f$  has a local maximum of  $\frac{1}{4}$  at  $x^* = \left[ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \right]^T$  with Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda^* = \frac{1}{2}$ .

(b) (4 points) Given two positive numbers  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , define

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{\sqrt{a_i}}{\sqrt{a_1 + a_2}}, i = 1, 2.$$

Show that  $\bar{x} = [\bar{x}_1 \quad \bar{x}_2]^T$  is feasible for the problem  $(*)$  and deduce from your result from part (a)<sup>1</sup> that the geometric mean  $\sqrt{a_1 a_2}$  of the two positive numbers  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  is no greater than their arithmetic mean  $\frac{1}{2}(a_1 + a_2)$ . Therefore assume<sup>2</sup> that the local maximum from part (a) is a global maximum on the feasible set.<sup>3</sup>

7. (14 points)

(a) (10 points) Using the method of Lagrange multipliers solve<sup>4</sup>

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = -x_1 x_2 - x_1 x_3 - x_2 x_3 \\ \text{subject to} & x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 3. \end{array} \right.$$

(b) (4 points) Consider now the perturbed problem

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = -x_1 x_2 - x_1 x_3 - x_2 x_3 \\ \text{subject to} & x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 3 + \delta. \end{array} \right.$$

Using the Lagrange multiplier from part (a)<sup>5</sup> find a first-order estimate of the minimum value of the perturbed problem.

8. (8 points) Consider the constraint

$$g(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - x_2^2)(x_1 + x_2) = 0$$

Find the tangent cone and the null space of the Jacobian matrix<sup>6</sup> of  $g$  at  $x^* = [0 \quad 0]^T$ .

<sup>1</sup>You can do this even if you have not succeeded in 'solving' part (a)!

<sup>2</sup>This can be shown, but you do not need to do this.

<sup>3</sup>This problem can be generalized to  $n$  variables to show that the geometric mean of  $n$  positive numbers is no greater than their arithmetic mean.

<sup>4</sup>This means find a global minimizer.

<sup>5</sup>If you have not solved part (a), use  $\lambda$  as your Lagrange multiplier.

<sup>6</sup>Note that here the Jacobian is simply the gradient, because  $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .