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## 1 Dynamic Programming

The number of crimes in 3 areas of a city as a function of the number of police patrol cars assigned there is indicated in the following table:

| n | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Area 1 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 4 |
| Area 2 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 14 |
| Area 3 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 8 |

We have a total of only 3 police cars to assign. Solve the problem of minimizing the total number of crimes in the city by assigning patrol cars using dynamic programming.

## Solution.

Firstly, we define the following elements of our dynamic program. We let $N=3$, so we have 4 stages. At $k=0$, we assign some number of cars to area 1 , then we are finished with area 1 . Then at stage $k=1$ we assign from our remaining cars some number to area 2 , and so on. At $k=N=3$, we are done and any leftover cars have no cost.

1. State $x_{k}=$ number of patrol cars available at stage $k$;
2. Control $u_{k}=$ number of patrol cars to assign at stage $k$ to area $k+1$;
3. Randomness $\omega_{k}$ constant;
4. Dynamics: $x_{k+1}=x_{k}-u_{k}$;
5. Boundary Conditions: $J_{N}\left(x_{N}\right)=0, \quad \forall x_{N}$;
6. Recursion: $J_{k}\left(x_{k}\right)=\min _{u_{k} \in \mathcal{U}_{k}}\left[g_{k}\left(x_{k}, u_{k}, \omega_{k}\right)+J_{k}\left(x_{k+1}\right)\right]=\min _{u_{k} \in \mathcal{U}_{k}}\left[g_{k}\left(x_{k}, u_{k}\right)+J_{k}\left(x_{k}-u_{k}\right)\right]$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{2}\left(x_{2}\right) & =\min _{u_{2} \in\left\{0, \ldots, x_{2}\right\}}\left[g_{2}\left(x_{2}, u_{2}\right)+0\right] \\
\Longrightarrow J_{2}()^{\top} & \left.=[20,14,11,8] \text { (ie notation for } J_{2}(0)=20, J_{2}(1)=14, \text { etc }\right) . \\
J_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) & =\min _{u_{1} \in\left\{0, \ldots, x_{1}\right\}}\left[g_{1}\left(x_{1}, u_{1}\right)+J_{2}\left(x_{1}-u_{1}\right)\right] \\
\Longrightarrow J_{1}()^{\top} & =[25+20, \min \{25+14,19+20\}, \min \{25+11,19+14,16+20\}, \\
& \min \{25+8,19+11,16+14,14+20\}] \\
& =[45,39,33,30] . \\
J_{0}(3) & =\min _{u_{0} \in\{0, \ldots, 3\}}\left[g_{0}\left(x_{0}, u_{0}\right)+J_{1}\left(x_{0}-u_{0}\right)\right] \\
& =\min \{14+30,10+33,7+39,4+45\}=43 .
\end{aligned}
$$

So the optimal cost is 43 crimes. Tracing the argminima, we see that the optimal solution is to assign one car to each of the three areas.

## 2 Linear Algebra/Calculus Review for NLP

Definition. $A$ norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ that satisfies:
a) $\|x\| \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,
b) $\|c x\|=|c| \cdot\|x\|, \quad \forall c \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,
c) $\|x\|=0 \Longleftrightarrow x=0$,
d) $\|x+y\| \leq\|x\|+\|y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

The following are common norms:

- The Euclidean Norm (or $L_{2}$-norm): $\|x\|_{2}=\sqrt{x^{\top} x}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$;
- The $L_{1}$-norm: $\|x\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}\right|$;
- The $p$-norm $(p \geq 1):\|x\|_{p}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|x_{i}\right|^{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ ( $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$ are p-norms);
- The $L_{\infty}$-norm (or max norm): $\|x\|_{\infty}=\max \left\{\left|x_{1}\right|, \ldots,\left|x_{n}\right|\right\}$.

Let $A$ be a real-valued symmetric (i.e. $A=A^{\top}$ ) $n \times n$ matrix. Then:

- Its eigenvalues are real.
- The following are equivalent:
a) A is positive definite.
b) All eigenvalues of $A$ are $>0$.
c) $x^{\top} A x>0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash\{0\}$.
- The following are equivalent:
a) A is positive semi-definite.
b) All eigenvalues of $A$ are $\geq 0$.
c) $x^{\top} A x \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

Definition. Let $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then, when they exist,

- $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{i}}=\lim _{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{f\left(x+\alpha e_{i}\right)-f(x)}{\alpha}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$ partial derivative of $f$ at $x$.
- $\nabla f(x)=\left[\begin{array}{c}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{1}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{n}}\end{array}\right]$ is the gradient of $f$ at $x$.
$\bullet \nabla^{2} f(x)=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{1}^{2}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{1} x_{n}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{n} x_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{n}^{2}}\end{array}\right]$ is the hessian of $f$ at $x$.


## 3 How to determine whether a function is convex

Once we know a few basic classes of convex functions, we can use the following facts:

- Linear functions $f(x)=a^{\top} x+b$ are convex.
- Quadratic functions $f(x)=\frac{1}{2} x^{\top} Q x+b^{\top} x$ are convex if $Q$ is PSD (positive semidefinite).
- Norms are convex functions (the proof is left an exercise, using the properties of norms defined above).
- $g(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i} f_{i}(x)$ is convex if $a_{i} \geq 0, f_{i}$ convex, $\forall i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Alternatively, if a function is differentiable, we can use the following facts:

- $\nabla^{2} f(x)$ is PSD $\forall x \Longrightarrow \mathrm{f}$ is convex.
- $\nabla^{2} f(x)$ is PD (positive definite) $\forall x \Longrightarrow \mathrm{f}$ is strictly convex.

Finally, if the function is not differentiable and we cannot use one of the above approaches, we check the definition of convexity:

Definition. A function $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex if $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we have

$$
f(\lambda x+(1-\lambda) y) \leq \lambda f(x)+(1-\lambda) f(y), \quad \forall \lambda \in[0,1] .
$$

### 3.1 Example

Let $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \mapsto x_{1} x_{2}^{2}-x_{1}$. So

- $\nabla f(x)=\left[\begin{array}{l}x_{2}^{2}-1 \\ 2 x_{1} x_{2}\end{array}\right]$,
- $\nabla^{2} f(x)=\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 2 x_{2} \\ 2 x_{2} & 2 x_{1}\end{array}\right]$.

To solve for the eigenvalues of the hessian, we get the following quadratic in $\lambda$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det}\left(\nabla^{2} f(x)\right)=\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
-\lambda & 2 x_{2} \\
2 x_{2} & 2 x_{1}-\lambda
\end{array}\right] & =0 \\
\lambda^{2}-2 x_{1} \lambda-4 x_{2}^{2} & =0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the constant term is negative, we cannot have two roots (i.e. eigenvalues) of the same sign. Hence $f$ can be neither convex nor concave.

MIT OpenCourseWare
http://ocw.mit.edu

### 15.093J / 6.255J Optimization Methods

Fall 2009

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.

