Continuous (convex) optimisation

M2 - PSL / Dauphine / S.U.

Antonin Chambolle, CNRS, CEREMADE

Université Paris Dauphine PSL

Oct.-Dec. 2021

Lecture 3: Subgradients, Monotone operators.

Contents

Generalized gradients: Subgradients of convex functions

Consider f convex, proper (the definition also is valid for a non-convex function but conflicts with more reasonable, local definitions).

Definition: subgradient

The subgradient of f at $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$ is the set:

$$\partial f(x) := \{p \in \mathcal{X} \,:\, f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle p, y - x\rangle \;\forall y \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

This is clearly a closed, convex set.

Subgradient: fundamental property

Theorem (?)

Let $f : \mathcal{X} \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ be convex, proper. Then $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a minimizer of f if and only if $0 \in \partial f(x)$.

Proof: actually this is the definition of the subgradient.

Subgradient

If f (convex) is Gateaux-differentiable at x, that is if there exists $\nabla f(x) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for any h,

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{f(x+th)-f(x)}{t} = \langle \nabla f(x), h\rangle$$

then $\partial f = \{\nabla f(x)\}$.

Subgradient

If f (convex) is Gateaux-differentiable at x, that is if there exists $\nabla f(x) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for any h,

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{f(x+th) - f(x)}{t} = \langle \nabla f(x), h \rangle$$

then $\partial f = \{\nabla f(x)\}$.

Indeed one has also for $p \in \partial f(x)$, $f(x+th) - f(x) \geq t \langle p, h \rangle$ so that $\langle \nabla f(x) - p, h \rangle \geq 0$. Since this is true for any h, $p = \nabla f(x)$.

Subgradient

If f (convex) is Gateaux-differentiable at x, that is if there exists $\nabla f(x) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for any h,

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{f(x+th) - f(x)}{t} = \langle \nabla f(x), h \rangle$$

then $\partial f = \{\nabla f(x)\}$.

Indeed one has also for $p \in \partial f(x)$, $f(x+th) - f(x) \geq t \langle p, h \rangle$ so that $\langle \nabla f(x) - p, h \rangle \geq 0$. Since this is true for any h, $p = \nabla f(x)$.

Conversely, since f is convex also (for any h) $\phi : t \mapsto f(x+th)$ is, and one has $\phi(1) \geq \phi(0) + \phi'(0)$, that is:

$$f(x+h) \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), h \rangle$$

i.e. $\nabla f(x) \in \partial f(x)$.

Subgradient

Existence of subgradients

If f is convex, $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$, $v \in \mathcal{X}$, $t > s > 0$:

$$f(x+sv) = f((s/t)(x+tv) + (1-s/t)x) \le \tfrac{s}{t} f(x+tv) + (1-\tfrac{s}{t}) f(x)$$

so that

$$\frac{f(x+sv)-f(x)}{s} \le \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t}.$$

It follows that

$$f'(x;v) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t} = \inf_{t>0} \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t}$$

is well defined (in $[-\infty,\infty]$), and $< +\infty$ as soon as $\{x+tv : t > 0\} \cap \operatorname{dom} f \neq \emptyset$.

Subgradient

Existence of subgradients

If f is convex, $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$, $v \in \mathcal{X}$, $t > s > 0$:

$$f(x+sv) = f((s/t)(x+tv) + (1-s/t)x) \le \frac{s}{t} f(x+tv) + (1-\frac{s}{t}) f(x)$$

so that

$$\frac{f(x+sv)-f(x)}{s} \le \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t}.$$

It follows that

$$f'(x;v) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t} = \inf_{t>0} \frac{f(x+tv)-f(x)}{t}$$

is well defined (in $[-\infty, \infty]$), and $< +\infty$ as soon as $\{x+tv : t>0\} \cap \operatorname{dom} f \ne \emptyset$.

Hence: if $x \in \overbrace{\operatorname{dom} f}^{\circ}$, then $f'(x;v) < \infty$ for all v. In addition $f'(x;0) = 0 \le f'(x;v) + f'(x;-v)$ hence $f'(x;v) > -\infty$.

Subgradient

Existence of subgradients

One has: $f'(x;\cdot)$ is a limit of convex functions, and hence convex, moreover, it is clearly positively 1-homogeneous: $f'(x;\lambda v) = \lambda f'(x;v)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and all v.
Letting $C = \{p : \langle p, v\rangle \leq f'(x;v)\ \forall v\}$ we know that the convex, lower-semicontinous envelope of $v \mapsto f'(x;v)$ is the support function of C (which could be empty).

Subgradient

Existence of subgradients

One has: $f'(x;\cdot)$ is a limit of convex functions, and hence convex, moreover, it is clearly positively 1-homogeneous: $f'(x;\lambda v) = \lambda f'(x;v)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and all v.
Letting $C = \{p : \langle p, v\rangle \leq f'(x;v)\ \forall v\}$ we know that the convex, lower-semicontinous envelope of $v \mapsto f'(x;v)$ is the support function of C (which could be empty).

For $p \in C$, $f(x+v) - f(x) \geq f'(x;v) \geq \langle p, v\rangle$ for all v, hence $p \in \partial f(x)$. The converse is also clear.
In finite dimension it is enough to deduce that the subgradient $\partial f(x)$ is not empty for any x in the interior of the domain (actually in $\operatorname{ri}\operatorname{dom} f$, also).

In infinite dimension it is a bit more complicated. We assume in addition f is *lower semicontinuous*. Then we have seen that f is bounded in the interior of its domain and therefore locally Lipschitz. One deduces that $(f(x+tv)-f(x))/t$ converges uniformly in v to $f'(x;v)$, which is also Lipschitz. In particular,

$$f'(x;v) = \sup_{p \in C} \langle p, v \rangle$$

and $C = \partial f(x) \neq \emptyset$. (We will show later on that in general, for a convex lsc function, $\operatorname{dom} \partial f$ is dense in $\operatorname{dom} f$.)

Subgradient

Existence of subgradients

In infinite dimension it is a bit more complicated. We assume in addition f is *lower semicontinuous*. Then we have seen that f is bounded in the interior of its domain and therefore locally Lipschitz. One deduces that $(f(x+tv)-f(x))/t$ converges uniformly in v to $f'(x;v)$, which is also Lipschitz. In particular,

$$f'(x;v) = \sup_{p\in C} \langle p, v\rangle$$

and $C = \partial f(x) \neq \emptyset$. (We will show later on that in general, for a convex lsc function, $\mathrm{dom}\, \partial f$ is dense in $\mathrm{dom}\, f$.)

Additionally, in this case if $\partial f(x) = \{p\}$, then $f'(x;v) = \langle p, v\rangle$ for any v, that is: f is Gateaux differentiable in x.

Lemma

Let f be convex lsc and $x \in \overbrace{\mathrm{dom}\, f}^{\circ}$. Then f is (Gateaux) differentiable at x if and only if ∂f has exactly one element.

Legendre-Fenchel Identity

If x realizes the sup in $f^*(y) = \sup_x \langle y, x \rangle - f(x)$ then for all z,

$$\langle y, x \rangle - f(x) \geq \langle y, z \rangle - f(z) \;\Leftrightarrow\; f(z) \geq f(x) + \langle y, z - x \rangle$$

which means that $y \in \partial f(x)$.
Conversely if $y \in \partial f(x)$, $f(x) - \langle y, x \rangle \geq f(x') - \langle y, x' \rangle$ for all x' hence $f^*(y) \leq \langle y, x \rangle - f(x)$, and then $f^{**}(x) = f(x)$, $y \in \partial f^{**}(x)$, and f is lsc at x. In particular we see that $\partial f^{**}(x) \supseteq \partial f(x)$ for all x. Precisely we have:

Legendre-Fenchel identity

$$y \in \partial f(x) \Leftrightarrow \langle x, y \rangle = f(x) + f^*(y) \Rightarrow x \in \partial f^*(y),$$

the latter being also an equivalence if f is lsc, convex (if $f = f^{**}$).

"Subdifferential calculus"

A first simple example: minimizing $f + g$ with g smooth.

Lemma

Assume $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a minimizer of $f + g$, where f is convex and g is C^1. Then for all $y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) - \langle \nabla g(x), y - x \rangle$$

that is, $-\nabla g(x) \in \partial f(x) \Leftrightarrow \partial f(x) + \nabla g(x) \ni 0$.

Proof: For $t > 0$ small enough,

$$f(x) + g(x) \leq f(x + t(y - x)) + g(x + t(y - x)) \leq f(x) + t(f(y) - f(x)) + g(x + t(y - x))$$

so that

$$\frac{g(x) - g(x + t(y - x))}{t} \leq f(y) - f(x)$$

and we recover the claim in the limit $t \to 0$.

Remark: density of subgradients

Corollary

Let f be convex, lsc: then $\operatorname{dom} \partial f$ is dense in $\operatorname{dom} f$.

Proof: Let $\bar{x} \in \operatorname{dom} f$, $\tau > 0$ and let x_τ be the minimizer of $|x - \bar{x}|^2/(2\tau) + f(x)$. Then by the previous result,

$$\frac{\bar{x} - x_\tau}{\tau} \in \partial f(x_\tau)$$

so that $x_\tau \in \operatorname{dom} \partial f$. In addition, $|x_\tau - \bar{x}|^2 \leq \tau f(\bar{x}) \to 0$ as $\tau \to 0$ since $f(\bar{x}) < +\infty$. □

Remark: strongly convex functions in Hilbert spaces

Corollary

Let f be strongly convex with parameter $\mu > 0$. Then for any $x \in \operatorname{dom} \partial f$, $y \in \operatorname{dom} f$ and $p \in \partial f(x)$,

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle p, y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}|x - y|^2$$

Proof: We use that $g'(y) = g(y) - \langle p, y \rangle - \mu|y - x|^2/2$ is also convex. We have, since $p \in \partial g(x)$:

$$g'(y) + \frac{\mu}{2}|y - x|^2 \geq g'(x)$$

for all y, hence by the previous lemma, $0 = -\mu(y - x)|_{y=x} \in \partial g'(x)$ and therefore g' is also minimal at x. Hence:

$$g(y) = g'(y) + \langle p, y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}|y - x|^2 \geq g'(x) + \langle p, y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}|y - x|^2 = g(x) + \langle p, y - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}|y - x|^2$$

Theorem

Let f, g be convex, proper.

- *For all x, $\partial f(x) + \partial g(x) \subset \partial(f+g)(x)$.*
- *If there exists $\bar{x} \in \operatorname{dom} f$ where g is continuous, then $\partial f(x) + \partial g(x) = \partial(f+g)(x)$. (In finite dimension, a relevant, weaker condition is $\operatorname{ri}\operatorname{dom} g \cap \operatorname{ri}\operatorname{dom} f \neq \emptyset$.)*

Proof: the inclusion is obvious from the definition. For the reverse inclusion, we assume $p \in \partial(f+g)(x)$ and want to show that it can be decomposed as $q + r$ with $q \in \partial f(x)$ and $r \in \partial g(x)$.

By definition, we have that $f(y) + g(y) \geq f(x) + g(x) + \langle p, y - x\rangle$.

Subdifferential calculus

Thanks to the assumption that g is continuous at $\bar{x}$, $\operatorname{epi}(g(\cdot) - \langle p, \cdot \rangle)$ contains a ball B centered at $(\bar{x}, g(\bar{x}) - \langle p, \bar{x} \rangle + 1)$ and has non empty interior. Denote E this interior, and F the following translation/flip of $\operatorname{epi} f$:

$$F = \{(y, t) : -t \geq f(y) - [f(x) + g(x) - \langle p, x \rangle]\},$$

which is convex.

For $(y, t) \in F$, one has $-t \geq f(y) - [f(x) + g(x) - \langle p, x \rangle] \geq -[g(y) - \langle p, y \rangle]$, that is $t \leq [g(y) - \langle p, y \rangle]$ so that $(y, t) \notin E$.
Hence by the separation theorem there exists $(q, \lambda) \neq (0, 0)$, such that for all $(y, t) \in E$, $(y', t') \in F$,

$$\langle q, y \rangle + \lambda t \geq \left\langle q, y' \right\rangle + \lambda t'.$$

As t' can be sent to $-\infty$ (or t to $+\infty$), $\lambda \geq 0$. Moreover since $\bar{x}$ is in $\operatorname{dom} f$, if $\lambda = 0$ one finds that $\langle q, y - \bar{x} \rangle \leq 0$ for all $y \in \operatorname{dom} g$ which contains a ball centered in $\bar{x}$, so that $q = 0$, which is a contradiction.

Subdifferential calculus

Hence $\lambda > 0$ so that without loss of generality we can assume $\lambda = 1$.
In particular choosing $t' = f(x) + g(x) - \langle p, x\rangle - f(y')$,

$$\langle q, y\rangle + t \geq \left\langle q, y'\right\rangle + f(x) + g(x) - \langle p, x\rangle - f(y').$$

for all $(y,t) \in E$. The closure of E contains $\text{epi}\,(g(\cdot) - \langle p, \cdot\rangle)$: indeed any $(y,t) \in \text{epi}\,(g(\cdot) - \langle p, \cdot\rangle)$ is on the boundary of the set $\{ty + (1-t)B : 0 < t < 1\} \subset \text{epi}\,(g(\cdot) - \langle p, \cdot\rangle)$. Hence it follows that for all y, y',

$$\begin{aligned}\langle q, y\rangle + g(y) - \langle p, y\rangle \geq \left\langle q, y'\right\rangle + f(x) + g(x) - \langle p, x\rangle - f(y')\\ \Leftrightarrow f(y') + g(y) \geq f(x) + g(x) + \langle p, y - x\rangle + \left\langle q, y' - y\right\rangle\\ = f(x) + g(x) + \langle p - q, y - x\rangle + \left\langle q, y' - x\right\rangle\end{aligned}$$

showing that $q \in \partial f(x)$ and $r = p - q \in \partial g(x)$, as requested. □

Remark: For f, g convex, proper, lsc. the result is also deduced from the theorem on inf-convolutions...

Subdifferential calculus

Theorem

Let $A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a continuous operator between two Hilbert spaces and f a proper, convex function on $\mathcal{Y}$. Let $g = f(Ax)$, then if there is $\bar{x}$ such that f is continuous at $A\bar{x}$, $\partial g(x) = A^*\partial f(Ax)$. In finite dimension, one can just require that $A\bar{x} \in \operatorname{ri} \operatorname{dom} f$.

Proof is similar (again, one inclusion is easy).

Application: Karush-Kuhn-Tucker's theorem

KKT's Theorem

Let f, g_i, $i = 1, \dots, m$ *be* C^1, *convex and assume*

$$\exists\, \bar{x},\ (g_i(\bar{x}) < 0\, \forall\, i = 1, \dots, m) \qquad \textit{(Slater's condition)}$$

Then x^* *is a solution of*

$$\min_{g_i(x) \le 0, i=1,\dots,m} f(x)$$

if and only if there exists $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^m$, $\lambda_i \ge 0$ *such that*

$$\nabla f(x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \nabla g_i(x^*) = 0,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i g_i(x^*) = 0 \qquad \textit{(complementary slackness condition)}$$

KKT's Theorem

Proof: Observe that since $g_i(x^*) \leq 0$ and $\lambda_i \geq 0$ the complementary condition is also equivalent to: $\forall i$, $g_i(x^*) = 0$ or $\lambda_i = 0$.
If the last statements are true, then x^* is is a minimizer of the convex function $f + \sum_i \lambda_i g_i$. Then obviously for any x with $g_i(x) \leq 0$ for all i,

$$f(x) \geq f(x) + \sum_i \lambda_i g_i(x) \geq f(x^*) + \sum_i \lambda_i g_i(x^*) = f(x^*).$$

Conversely, consider for all i the function

$$\delta_i(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_i(x) \leq 0, \\ +\infty & \text{else.}, \end{cases}$$

then the problem is equivalent to $\min_x f(x) + \sum_i \delta_i(x)$. By Slater's condition, we know that there exists $\bar{x}$ where all functions f, δ_i are continuous. Hence by the previous theorems:

$$0 \in \partial(f + \sum_i \delta_i)(x^*) = \nabla f(x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \partial\delta_i(x^*).$$

KKT's Theorem

It remains to characterize $\partial\delta_i(x^*)$.
If $g_i(x^*) < 0$ then it is negative in a neighborhood of x^* and $\partial\delta_i(x^*) = \{0\}$.
If $g_i(x^*) = 0$, then we need to characterize the vectors p such that for all y with $g_i(y) \leq 0$,

$$0 \geq \langle p, y - x^* \rangle .$$

Let $v \perp \nabla g_i(x^*)$, and consider $y = x^* - t(\nabla g_i(x^*) + v)$: then

$$g_i(y) = -t \langle \nabla g_i(x^*), \nabla g_i(x^*) + v \rangle + o(t) = -t|\nabla g_i(x^*)|^2 + o(t) < 0$$

if $t > 0$ is small enough, hence

$$0 \leq \langle p, \nabla g_i(x^*) + v \rangle .$$

We easily deduce that we must have $p = \lambda_i \nabla g_i(x^*)$, for some $\lambda_i \geq 0$ (in other words, $\partial\delta_i(x^*) = \mathbb{R}_+ \nabla g_i(x^*)$). The theorem follows. □

KKT's Theorem

Remark: in case g_i is affine it is enough to assume $g_i(\bar{x}) = 0$, this allows in particular to treat also the case of affine equality constraints ($g(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (g(x) \leq 0 \text{ and } -g(x) \leq 0)$).

Monotone operators in Hilbert spaces

A fundamental property of subgradients is the *monotonicity*: Using that for all $p \in \partial f(x)$, $p' \in \partial f(x')$:

$$f(x') \geq f(x) + \langle p, x' - x \rangle, \quad f(x) \geq f(x') + \langle p', x - x' \rangle,$$

and summing both inequalities, we find

$$0 \geq \langle p - p', x' - x \rangle.$$

In $1D$, this is equivalent to saying that ∂f is non-decreasing (if $x' > x$, p' must be $\geq p$). In general one says that ∂f is a "monotone operator":

Definition

The operator $A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is monotone if and only if $\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall p \in Ax$ and $p' \in Ax'$, one has

$$\langle p' - p, x' - x \rangle \geq 0.$$

Monotone operators in Hilbert spaces

More definitions

Definition

The operator $A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is (μ-)strongly monotone if and only if $\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall p \in Ax$ and $p' \in Ax'$, one has

$$\langle p - p', x - x' \rangle \geq \mu |x - x'|^2.$$

It is (μ-)co-coercive if

$$\langle p - p', x - x' \rangle \geq \mu |p - p'|^2.$$

It is *maximal* if the graph $\{(x, p) \ : \ p \in Ax\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is maximal with respect to inclusion, among all the graphs of monotone operators.

In dimension 1: graphs of nondecreasing functions / (sub)gradients of convex functions.
In higher dimension, not true anymore (example: an antisymmetric linear mapping in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$).
The subgradient of a convex function f is monotone, strongly monotone if f is strongly convex, co-coercive if ∇f is Lipschitz ("Baillon-Haddad").

Monotone operators in Hilbert spaces

Lemma

Let f be convex. Then ∂f is a maximal-monotone operator if and only it is the subgradient of a lower-semicontinuous function.

Proof: (*cf* Rockafellar): if f is lsc, to show that ∂f is maximal we must show that if $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $p \notin \partial f(x)$ then one can find y and $q \in \partial f(y)$ with $\langle p - q, x - y \rangle < 0$.
Replacing f with $f(x) - \langle p, x \rangle$ we can assume that $p = 0$. Then $0 \notin \partial f(x)$ if and only if x is not a minimizer, i.e. $\exists\, y \in \mathcal{X}$ with $f(y) < f(x)$.
Consider now the minimizer of $f(y) + |y - x|^2/2$ which exists as this function is strongly convex and lsc. The minimizer is characterized by $\partial f(y) + (y - x) \ni 0$ that is, $q = x - y \in \partial f(y)$.

$$\langle p - q, x - y \rangle = \langle -q, x - y \rangle = -|x - y|^2 < 0,$$

unless $y = x$. (But $y = x$ would imply that $q = 0 \in \partial f(x)$, a contradiction.)
Hence ∂f is maximal.

Conversely if ∂f is maximal, since $\partial f^{**} \supset \partial f$, then this operator is also the subgradient of the convex, lsc function f^{**}. We are *not* proving here that $f = f^{**}$, only that ∂f is *also* the subgradient of the convex, lsc function f^{**}.

Monotone operators in Hilbert spaces

Definition

Given A a monotone operator, with graph $\{(x,p) \,:\, p \in Ax\}$, its *inverse* is $A^{-1} : p \mapsto \{x : Ax \ni p\}$, with graph $\{(p,x) \,:\, p \in Ax\}$.
Therefore, it is maximal if and only if A is maximal, co-coercive if and only if A is strongly monotone.

Remark: For f convex lsc.*, $(\partial f)^{-1} = \partial f^*$ (by Legendre-Fenchel's identity).

Lemma

Let A, B be maximal monotone operators. if $\overbrace{\mathrm{dom}\, A}^{\circ} \cap \mathrm{dom}\, B \neq \emptyset$, then $A + B$ (which is always monotone) is maximal monotone.

(Cor 2.7 in H. Brézis: *Opérateurs maximaux-monotones et semi-groupes de contraction dans les espaces de Hilbert*).

Theorem (Minty 62)

The *resolvent* of a maximal-monotone operator A, defined by

$$x \mapsto y = (I + A)^{-1}x =: J_A x \Leftrightarrow y + Ay \ni x$$

is a well (everywhere) defined single-valued nonexpansive mapping. (Conversely, for a monotone operator A if $(I + A)$ is surjective then A is maximal.)

Minty's theorem

Proof: We introduce the graph $G = \{(y+x, y-x) : x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in Ax\}$. If (a,b), $(a',b') \in G$, with $a = y+x, b = y-x$ and $a' = y'+x', b = y'-x'$, then

$$|b-b'|^2 = |y-y'|^2 - 2\left\langle y-y', x-x'\right\rangle + |y+y'|^2 = |a-a'|^2 - 4\left\langle y-y', x-x'\right\rangle \le |a-a'|^2$$

that is G is the graph of a 1-Lipschitz function.
Moreover, if $G' \supseteq G$ is also the graph of a 1-Lipschitz function, then defining $A' = \{((a-b)/2, (a+b)/2) : (a,b) \in G'\}$ the same computation shows that $A' \supseteq A$ is the graph of a monotone operator, hence if A is maximal: $A' = A$ and $G' = G$.
In particular, if G is defined for all a then clearly G and therefore A are maximal (Remark: being 1-Lipschitz, G is necessarily single-valued).

So the theorem is equivalent to the question whether a 1-Lipschitz function which is not defined in the whole of $\mathcal{X}$ can be extended.

This result (which is true only in Hilbert spaces) is known as Kirszbraun-Valentine's theorem (1935), we give a quick proof derived from Federer (*Geometric measure theory*, 2.10.43).

Minty's / Kirszbraun-Valentine's theorem

The basic brick is the following extension from n to $n+1$ points:

Lemma

If $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$, $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ are points in Hilbert spaces respectively $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\forall i,j\,,\ |y_i - y_j| \le |x_i - x_j|$, then for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $|y_i - y| \le |x_i - x|$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof: It is enough to prove this for $x = 0$: we need to find a common point to $\bar{B}(y_i, |x_i|)$. There is nothing to prove if $x = x_i$ for some i, so we assume $x_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
We define

$$\bar{c} = \min\left\{ c \ge 0 : \bigcap_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(y_i, c|x_i|) \neq \emptyset \right\} > 0$$

(if the y_i are distinct, which we may also assume). This is a min because the closed balls are weakly compact, and we can consider y such that $|y - y_i| \le \bar{c}|x_i|$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We must show that $\bar{c} \le 1$.

Kirszbraun-Valentine's theorem

Then: y must be a convex combination of the points $(y_i)_{i\in I}$ such that $|y-y_i| = \bar{c}|x_i|$.
Indeed, if not, let y' be the projection of y onto $\overline{\text{co}}\,\{y_i : i \in I\}$. As for any $i \in I$, $\langle y_i - y', y - y'\rangle \le 0$ one has, letting $y_t = (1-t)y + ty'$, that for any $i \in I$:

$$\begin{aligned} |y_i - y_t|^2 = |y_i - y + t(y-y')|^2 &= |y_i - y|^2 + 2t\left\langle y_i - y, y - y'\right\rangle + t^2|y-y'|^2 \\ &= |y_i - y|^2 + 2t\left\langle y_i - y', y - y'\right\rangle - 2t|y-y'|^2 + t^2|y-y'|^2 \\ &\le |y_i - y|^2 - t(2-t)|y-y'|^2 < |y_i - y|^2 \end{aligned}$$

if $t \in (0,2)$.

Hence if $t > 0$ is small enough, one sees that $|y_i - y_t| < |y_i - y| = \bar{c}|x_i|$ for $i \in I$, while since for $i \notin I$, $|y_i - y| < \bar{c}|x_i|$, one can still guarantee the same strict inequality for y_t if t is small enough. But this contradicts the definition of $\bar{c}$, since then there would exists $c < \bar{c}$ such that $y_t \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(y_i, c|x_i|)$.

Kirszbraun-Valentine's theorem

Hence wee can write $y = \sum_{i\in I}\theta_i y_i$ as a convex combination ($\theta_i \in [0,1], \sum_{i\in I}\theta_i = 1$). Then since $2\langle a,b\rangle = |a|^2 + |b|^2 - |a-b|^2$,

$$0 = |\sum_{i\in I}\theta_i y_i - y|^2 = \sum_{i,j\in I}\theta_i\theta_j\langle y_i - y, y_j - y\rangle$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j\in I}\theta_i\theta_j\left(|y_i - y|^2 + |y_j - y|^2 - |y_i - y_j|^2\right)$$
$$\geq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j\in I}\theta_i\theta_j\left(\bar{c}^2|x_i|^2 + \bar{c}^2|x_j|^2 - |x_i - x_j|^2\right)$$
$$= \bar{c}^2\sum_{i,j\in I}\theta_i\theta_j\langle x_i, x_j\rangle - \frac{1-\bar{c}^2}{2}|x_i - x_j|^2$$

which shows that

$$(1-\bar{c}^2)\sum_{i,j\in I}\theta_i\theta_j|x_i - x_j|^2 \geq 2\bar{c}^2|\sum_{i\in I}\theta_i x_i|^2$$

so that $\bar{c} \leq 1$. Hence, y satisfies $|y - y_i| \leq |x_i|$, as requested, which shows the Lemma.

Minty's theorem

We finish the proof of Minty'sTheorem: if there exists $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\{x\} \times \mathcal{X} \cap G = \emptyset$, consider the set

$$K = \bigcap_{(a,b)\in G} \bar{B}(b, |x-a|)$$

which is an intersection of weakly compact sets.
We show that because the compact sets defining K have the "*finite intersection property*", K can not be empty: Choosing $(a_0, b_0) \in G$, if $\bar{B}_0 = \bar{B}(b_0, |x - b_0|)$, we see that

$$K = \bar{B}_0 \cap \left(\bigcap_{(a,b)\in G} \bar{B}(b, |x-a|) \right)$$

hence $\bar{B}_0 \setminus K = \bar{B}_0 \cap \bigcup_{(a,b)\in G} \bar{B}(b, |x-a|)^c$.
If this is $\bar{B}_0$, by compactness one can extract a finite covering $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(b_i, |x-a_i|)^c$ for $(a_i, b_i) \in G$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We find that

$$\bar{B}_0 \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(b_i, |x-a_i|)^c = \bar{B}_0$$

or equivalently that

$$\bar{B}_0 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \bar{B}(b_i, |x-a_i|) = \emptyset$$

which contradicts The Lemma.

Minty's theorem

Hence, $\bar{B}_0 \setminus K \neq \bar{B}_0$ which means that $K \neq \emptyset$. Choosing $y \in K$, we find that $G \cup \{(x, y)\}$ is the graph of a 1-Lipschitz function and is strictly larger than G, which contradicts the maximality of A.

The non-expansiveness of $(I + A)^{-1}$ follows from, if $y + Ay \ni x$, $y' + Ay' \ni x'$, $p = x - y \in Ay$, $p' = x' - y' \in Ay'$:

$$|x - x'|^2 = |y - y'|^2 + 2\left\langle p - p', y - y' \right\rangle + |p - p'|^2 \geq |y - y'|^2 + |p - p'|^2,$$

that is, for $T = (I + A)^{-1}$:

$$|Tx - Tx'|^2 + |(I - T)x - (I - T)x'|^2 \leq |x - x'|^2.$$

An operator which satisfies this is said *firmly non-expansive*.

Reflexion operator

Given A maximal monotone, we define the *Reflexion of A*:

$$R_A = 2J_A - I = 2(I + A)^{-1} - I$$

Lemma

R_A is nonexpansive, and in particular, $J_A = I/2 + R_A/2$ is $(1/2)$-averaged.

In fact one has even:

Proposition

For an operator $T : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$, the following are equivalent:

1. T is the resolvent of a maximal-monotone operator.
2. T is firmly non-expansive;
3. T is $1/2$-averaged, that is, $R = 2T - I$ is non-expansive;

Reflexion operator

Proof of the lemma: We prove (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) in the theorem. It follows in an obvious way from the parallelogram identity: for any x, x',

$$|Rx - Rx'|^2 = |(Tx - x) - (Tx' - x') + Tx - Tx'|^2$$
$$= 2|(I-T)x - (I-T)x'|^2 + 2|Tx - Tx'|^2 - |x - x'|^2 \leq |x - x'|^2$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \quad |(I-T)(x) - (I-T)(x')|^2 + |Tx - Tx'|^2 \leq |x - x'|^2.$$

Remark: more generally, the parallelogram identity/strong convexity of $|\cdot|^2/2$ shows that: T_θ is θ-averaged for some $0 < \theta \leq 1$ (that is $T_\theta = (1-\theta)I + \theta T$, T 1-Lipschitz) if and only if for all x, x':

$$|T_\theta x - T_\theta x'|^2 + \frac{1-\theta}{\theta}|(I - T_\theta)x - (I - T_\theta)x'|^2 \leq |x - x'|^2$$

To finish the proof of the theorem, we have to prove that if an operator $T = I/2 + R/2$ is $(1/2)$-averaged (R is non-expansive), then there exists a maximal monotone operator A such that $T = J_A$.

Reflexion operator

The proof follows by the same (or reverse) construction as in the beginning of the proof of Minty's theorem: we consider the graph

$$G = \{((x+y)/2, (x-y)/2) : x \in \mathcal{X}, y = Rx\} = \{(Tx, (I-T)x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$$

and denote by A the corresponding operator ($y \in Ax \Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in G$). Then A is monotone: if $(\xi, \eta), (\xi', \eta') \in G$, then for some $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $\xi = (x + Rx)/2$, $\eta = (x - Rx)/2$, etc., and we find:

$$\langle \xi - \xi', \eta - \eta' \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \langle x + Rx - x' - Rx', x - Rx - x' + Rx' \rangle$$
$$= \frac{1}{4} \left(|x - x'|^2 - |Rx - Rx'|^2 \right) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, A is maximal, if not, one could build as before from $A' \supset A$ a non-expansive graph $\{(\xi + \eta, \xi - \eta) : \eta \in A'\xi\}$ strictly larger than the graph $\{(x, Rx) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, which is of course impossible. By construction, $ATx \ni (I - T)x$ for all x, hence $(I + A)Tx \ni x \Leftrightarrow Tx = (I + A)^{-1}x$.

A practical consequence: proximal point algorithm

If $x^0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $x^{k+1} = (I+A)^{-1}x^k$, $k \geq 0$, and there exists $\bar{x}$ with $A\bar{x} \ni 0 \Leftrightarrow (I+A)^{-1}\bar{x} = \bar{x}$, then $x^k \rightharpoonup x$ where $Ax \ni 0$ (KM's theorem). In particular if $A = \tau\partial g$ for g convex, lsc and $\tau > 0$,

$$x^{k+1} = (I+A)^{-1}(x^k) \Leftrightarrow x^{k+1} \in x^k - \tau\partial g(x^{k+1}) \Leftrightarrow x^{k+1} = \arg\min_x g(x) + \frac{1}{2\tau}|x - x^k|^2$$

we see that the implicit gradient descent converges, as the iterations of a $1/2$-averaged operator.

Definition

The resolvent of the subgradient ∂g of a convex, lsc function is called the "proximity operator" (or "proximal") of g:

$$\operatorname{prox}_g(x) = (I+\partial g)^{-1}(x) = \arg\min_{x'} g(x') + \frac{1}{2}|x' - x|^2.$$

Moreau's identity

Lemma

Let A be a maximal-monotone operator. Then for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$x = (I + A)^{-1}(x) + (I + A^{-1})^{-1}x.$$

Proof: one has $y = (I + A)^{-1}x \Leftrightarrow y + Ay \ni x \Leftrightarrow y \in A^{-1}(x - y)$, letting then $z = x - y$, this is $x \in z + A^{-1}z \Leftrightarrow z = (I + A^{-1})^{-1}x$. □

This is often written, for $\tau > 0$:

$$x = (I + \tau A)^{-1}(x) + \tau(I + \tfrac{1}{\tau}A^{-1})^{-1}(\tfrac{x}{\tau}),$$

or for $A = \partial g$, g convex lsc,

$$x = (I + \tau\partial g)^{-1}(x) + \tau(I + \tfrac{1}{\tau}\partial g^*)^{-1}(\tfrac{x}{\tau}) = \mathrm{prox}_{\tau g}(x) + \tau \mathrm{prox}_{g^*/\tau}(\tfrac{x}{\tau}).$$

Remark: Yosida regularization and gradient flows

Given A a maximal monotone operator, the maximal monotone operator $A_\tau = [x - (I + \tau A)^{-1}x]/\tau$ is called a *Yosida* approximation of A: it is a $(1/\tau)$-Lipschitz-continuous mapping, with full domain. In case $A = \partial f$, $A_\tau = \nabla f_\tau$ where

$$f_\tau(x) = \min_{x'} f(x') + \frac{1}{2\tau}|x - x|^2.$$

The operator τA_τ is firmly non-expansive, since $I - \tau A_\tau$ is. It is a key tool for establishing the existence of solutions to:

$$\dot{x} + Ax \ni 0$$

(*cf* H. Brézis, *Opérateurs maximaux-monotones et semi-groupes de contraction dans les espaces de Hilbert*).

Back to Fenchel-Rockafellar duality

Consider again:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(Kx) + g(x)$$

with $K : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is continuous linear map and f, g convex, lsc. Then we have seen that a solution can be found as a saddle-point of

$$\mathcal{L}(x, y) = \langle y, Kx \rangle - f^*(y) + g(x),$$

, satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}(x^*, y) \leq \mathcal{L}(x^*, y^*) \leq \mathcal{L}(x, y^*) \qquad (\mathcal{S})$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then:

Fenchel-Rockafellar duality: saddle point

By optimality in the saddle-point problem: $Kx^* - \partial f^*(y^*) \ni 0$, $K^*y^* + \partial g(x^*) \ni 0$, that is:

$$0 \in \begin{pmatrix} \partial g(x) \\ \partial f^*(y) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & K^* \\ -K & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$$

meaning the solution can be found by finding the "zero" of the sum of two monotone operators. So a solution can be computed if we have an algorithm for solving $Ax + Bx \ni 0$, A, B maximal monotone.
This can be solve by a class or methods called (operator) "splitting algorithms".