

Exercise Sheet 5 (due date for Exercises 5.1 - 5.3: Jan. 16)

Exercise 5.1 (Homework)

The partition problem is defined as follows: Given integers a_1, \dots, a_n , does there exist a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = \sum_{i \notin S} a_i$?

An optimization version of this problem is the following:

$$\text{minimize}_{S \subseteq [n]} \left(\sum_{i \in S} a_i - \sum_{i \notin S} a_i \right)^2$$

1. Reformulate the problem as a binary quadratic program and formulate an SDP relaxation.
2. Show how to change the relaxation to handle the constraint $|S| = k$.

Exercise 5.2 (Homework)

Copositive programming formulation of the maximum independent set

A conic optimization problem involving the cone \mathcal{C}_n (or its dual) is called a *copositive program*. The goal of this exercise is to show that the maximum independent set of a graph can be computed by solving a copositive program. Hence copositive programming is intractable, but it is known that copositive programs can be *approximated* by SDPs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph with n vertices. We recall that the stability number satisfies $\alpha(G) \leq \vartheta(G)$, where $\vartheta(G)$ is the Lovasz-theta number of G :

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(G) = \max_X \quad & \langle J, X \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \langle I, X \rangle = 1 \\ & X_{ij} = 0, \quad \forall ij \in E \\ & X \succeq_{\mathbb{S}_+^n} 0. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we will show that $\alpha(G) = \vartheta^*(G)$, where $\vartheta^*(G)$ is the value of the copositive program obtained by replacing the constraint “ $X \succeq_{\mathbb{S}_+^n} 0$ ” by “ $X \succeq_{\mathcal{C}_n^*} 0$ ”.

Recall the following definitions: $\mathbf{x} \in K$ is an *extreme ray* of a convex cone K if the only possibility to express \mathbf{x} as a barycenter of two other rays $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in K$ is to take $\mathbf{y} = \alpha \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z} = \beta \mathbf{x}$ for some scalars α and β . Similarly, $\mathbf{x} \in S$ is an *extreme point* of a convex set S if the only possibility to express \mathbf{x} as a barycenter of two other points $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in S$ is to take $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z}$.

You can use (without proof) the following result:

Let K be a convex cone, and let $H = \{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = b\}$ be a hyperplane, with $\mathbf{a} \in \text{int}K^*$. Then it holds

$$\text{ext-points}(K \cap H) = \text{ext-rays}(K) \cap H.$$

1. Define $\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{C}_n^* : \forall ij \in E, X_{ij} = 0\}$, and observe that \mathcal{K} is a cone. Show that X is an extreme ray of \mathcal{K} iff $X = \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ supported by a stable set of G (i.e., $S = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$ is stable).
2. Use the result of 1. to identify the set of extreme points of the feasible set of the copositive program for $\vartheta^*(G)$. Conclude that $\vartheta^*(G) = \alpha(G)$.

Exercise 5.3 (Homework)

We will give another proof of the copositive programming formulation for $\alpha(G)$ (i.e., $\vartheta^*(G) = \alpha(G)$) relying on the Motzkin-Straus theorem, which can be stated as follows (Motzkin and Straus originally stated an equivalent result involving the clique number $\omega(G)$):

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph with n vertices. Then, $1/\alpha(G)$ is the minimum of a (nonconvex) quadratic over the probability simplex $\Delta_n^{\bar{=}}$:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha(G)} = \min_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ \mathbf{x}^T (I + A) \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1 \right\},$$

where A is the adjacency matrix of G , i.e. the $\{0, 1\}$ -symmetric matrix such that $A_{ij} = 1 \iff ij \in E$.

1. We recall the definition

$$\vartheta^*(G) := \max_X \left\{ \langle J, X \rangle : \langle I, X \rangle = 1, X \succeq_{C_n^*} 0, X_{ij} = 0, \forall ij \in \bar{E} \right\}.$$

Show that $\vartheta^*(G) \geq \alpha(G)$.

To show the converse inequality, we consider the dual program defining $\vartheta^*(G)$. By dualizing the copositive program from the previous exercise as in the lecture, but dualizing over C_n^* instead of \mathbb{S}_+^n , we can show (you don't have to prove this):

$$\vartheta^*(G) = \min_{t, Z} \left\{ t : tI + Z \succeq_{C_n} J, Z_{ij} = 0, \forall ij \in \bar{E}, Z_{ii} = 0, \forall i \in [n] \right\}.$$

2. Show that there is a solution to the above program in which all nonzero elements of Z are equal, and hence,

$$\vartheta^*(G) = \min_{t, z \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t : tI + zA \succeq_{C_n} J \right\}.$$

3. By the Motzkin-Straus theorem (cf. text at the beginning of this exercise), we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha(G)} \leq \mathbf{x}^T (I + A) \mathbf{x}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_n^{\bar{=}}.$$

Show that this implies $\frac{1}{\alpha(G)} J \preceq_{C_n} I + A$, and then show that $\vartheta^*(G) \leq \alpha(G)$.

Exercise 5.4

In the lecture, we studied the SDP relaxation of MAXCUT

$$\begin{aligned} p^* &= \max_X \frac{1}{4} \langle L, X \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \text{diag}(X) = \mathbf{1} \\ & X \succeq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $L := \sum_{ij \in E} w_{ij} (\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)^T$ is the Laplacian matrix of G .

1. Show that the dual of this SDP is

$$\begin{aligned} d^* &= \min_{\mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{y} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & L \preceq \text{Diag}(\mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

2. Does strong duality hold?

3. Show that

$$\text{maxcut}(G) \leq \frac{n}{4} \lambda_{\max}(L).$$

Exercise 5.5

We return to Motzkin-Straus theorem studied in Exercise 5.3. Let $Q := I + A$. After a simple change of variable (substitute $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ by $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{x} = (x_i^2)_{i \in [n]}$), we can formulate $1/\alpha(G)$ as the minimum value of a quartic (a polynomial of degree 4) over the unit sphere:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha(G)} = \min \left\{ \sum_{i,j} Q_{i,j} x_i^2 x_j^2 : \sum_i x_i^2 = 1 \right\}.$$

1. Write down the first level ($\delta = 0$) of the Lasserre hierarchy for the above problem: Explain what is the dimension of the vector of moments \mathbf{y} , and give the coordinates of the moment and localizing matrices.
2. Simplify the LMI constraints involving the localizing matrix as much as you can. You can use the notation

$$Y_i = y_{\mathbf{e}_i}, \quad Y_{ij} = y_{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j}, \quad Y_{ijk} = y_{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{e}_k}, \quad Y_{ijkl} = y_{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j + \mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{e}_l}.$$