

1

TECHNICAL NOTE

2

Sufficient Global Optimality Conditions for Bivalent Quadratic Optimization

3

4

M. Ç. PINAR¹

5

Communicated by P. Tseng

6 **Abstract.** We prove a sufficient global optimality condition for the
7 problem of minimizing a quadratic function subject to quadratic
8 equality constraints where the variables are allowed to take values -1
9 and 1 . We extend the condition to quadratic problems with matrix
10 variables and orthonormality constraints, and in particular to the
11 quadratic assignment problem.

12 **Key Words.** Quadratic optimization with binary variables, global
13 optimality, sufficient optimality condition, quadratic assignment prob-
14 lem.

15 1. Introduction

16 We consider the bivalent quadratic optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(QP)} \quad & \min \quad (1/2)x^T Qx + c^T x, \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad x^T E_i x + d_i^T x = f_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & \quad \quad x \in \{-1, 1\}^n, \end{aligned}$$

17
18 where $Q \in \mathcal{S}^n$ and where $E_i \in \mathcal{S}^n, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, c, d_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$
19 for all $i = 1, \dots, m$; here, \mathcal{S}^n denotes the space of $n \times n$ symmetric real
20 matrices. These problems are known to be NP hard even when the qua-
21 dratic constraints are absent; see Ref. 1.

22 The purpose of this note is to present a sufficient condition for global
23 optimality in QP and to give a natural extension to nonconvex quadratic

¹Associate Professor, Department of Industrial Engineering, Bilkent University, Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey.



24 programs in matrix variables, and in particular to the quadratic assign-
 25 ment problem. The result is inspired by the work of Beck and Teboulle
 26 (Ref. 2), which gave a sufficient condition for optimality in the problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \quad (1/2)x^T Qx + c^T x, \\ 27 \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad x \in \{-1, 1\}^n. \end{aligned}$$

28 2. Results

29 Let D^T denote the $n \times m$ matrix with columns d_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$. We
 30 define $X = \text{Diag}(x)$ to be the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal equal
 31 to the vector x . Naturally,

$$32 \quad x = Xe,$$

33 where e represents the n -dimensional vector of ones. We use \otimes to denote
 34 Kronecker product. Our main result is the following.

35 **Theorem 2.1.** Let x be a feasible point for QP. If there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$
 36 which solves

$$\begin{aligned} 37 \quad & Q + \text{Diag} \left(-XQx - X \left(\sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x - Xc - (1/2)XD^T z \right) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

39 then x is a global optimal solution for QP.

40 **Remark 2.1.** The proof of this theorem follows from the following
 41 well-known fact; see e.g. Refs. 3–4. The Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) con-
 42 ditions are sufficient for optimality if the Lagrangian function is convex
 43 in the unknown x for the optimal Lagrange multiplier. More precisely, let
 44 λ^* denote the optimal Lagrange multiplier. The KKT conditions for the
 45 equality constrained problem at x^* are stationarity and feasibility, i.e.,

$$46 \quad \nabla L(x^*, \lambda^*) = 0$$

47 for x^* feasible. The convexity of $L(\cdot, \lambda^*)$ is equivalent to

$$48 \quad \nabla^2 L(x, \lambda^*) \succeq 0, \quad \forall x.$$

49 The proof below verifies that the Hessian of the Lagrangian is posi-
 50 tive semidefinite (i.e., the Lagrangian is convex); stationarity holds by

51 substituting for the vector of Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the
 52 bivalency constraints.

53 **Proof.** The proof is essentially identical to the proof of Theorem 2.3
 54 of Ref. 2 with the necessary modifications. We write QP as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(QP)} \quad & \min \quad (1/2)x^T Qx + c^T x, \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad x^T E_i x + d_i^T x = f_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & \quad \quad x_j^2 = 1, \quad \quad \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

56 Now, consider the Lagrangian function associated with QP,

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, y, z) = & (1/2)x^T \left(Q + Y + \sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x - (1/2)y^T e + c^T x \\ & - (1/2)z^T f + (1/2)x^T D^T z, \end{aligned}$$

59 where we have introduced multipliers $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $Y = \text{Diag}(y)$, for the biva-
 60 lency constraints, and multipliers $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for the first set of quadratic con-
 61 straints after multiplying all constraints by one half, and have rearranged
 62 the expression of the function L to regroup quadratic and linear terms
 63 together. It is well known that we have

$$64 \quad \inf_x L(x, y, z) > -\infty$$

65 if and only if there exist multipliers y and z such that

$$66 \quad Q + Y + \sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \geq 0 \tag{1}$$

67 and

$$68 \quad \left(Q + Y + \sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x + c + (1/2)D^T z = 0 \tag{2}$$

69 is consistent for some x . For a feasible x , define

$$70 \quad y := -XQx - X \left(\sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x - Xc - (1/2)XD^T z,$$

71 for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$. It is verified easily, using the fact that

$$72 \quad XX = I,$$

73 that the vector y so defined satisfies (2) along with x and z .

74 Consider now the dual problem

$$75 \quad \sup_{y,z} h(y, z),$$

76 where

$$77 \quad h(y, z) = \inf_x L(x, y, z).$$

78 Using (2), we write immediately $h(y, z)$ as

$$79 \quad h(y, z) = -(1/2)x^T \left(Q + Y + \sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x - (1/2)y^T e - (1/2)z^T f.$$

80 Now, evaluate h at the point (x, y, z) defined above. Using the fact that
81 $XX = I$, a simple calculation shows that this yields

$$82 \quad h(y, z) = (1/2)x^T Qx + (1/2)x^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^m z_i E_i \right) x + c^T x$$

$$83 \quad + (1/2)x^T D^T z - (1/2)z^T f.$$

84 But, since x is feasible, the second, fourth, and fifth terms sum up to zero.
85 Therefore, we see that the value of the dual function equals the value of
86 the primal objective function, which is sufficient to ensure global optimal-
87 ity of x from basic duality theory [c.f. Rockafellar (Ref. 5)]. \square

88 Notice that the sufficient condition involves the solution of a linear
89 matrix inequality (LMI) and as such can be checked using polynomial-
90 time interior-point methods; see Ref. 6. However, it is difficult admittedly
91 to find a feasible point for problem QP; in fact this is as difficult as the
92 minimization problem itself. Furthermore, the original Beck–Teboulle con-
93 ditions are simpler as they do not involve dual variables. The increased
94 complexity of the sufficient conditions is the price to be paid for dealing
95 with a harder problem.

96 When one has only linear constraints, the sufficient condition becomes
97 simpler. Consider the following linearly constrained problem:

$$98 \quad (\text{LCQP}) \quad \min \quad (1/2)x^T Qx + c^T x,$$

$$99 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax = b,$$

$$100 \quad x \in \{-1, 1\}^n,$$

101 where $Q \in S^n$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

102 **Corollary 2.1.** Let x be a feasible point for LCQP. If there exists
 103 $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ which solves

$$104 \quad \lambda_{\min}(Q)e \geq XQx + Xc + XA^T z,$$

105 then x is a global optimal solution for LCQP.

106 **Proof.** The sufficient condition reduces to

$$107 \quad Q + \text{Diag}(-XQx - Xc - XA^T z) \succeq 0.$$

108 Since we have always

$$109 \quad \lambda_{\min}(Q + Y) \geq \lambda_{\min}(Q) + \lambda_{\min}(Y),$$

110 the above condition is satisfied if

$$111 \quad \lambda_{\min}(Q) \geq -\lambda_{\min} \text{Diag}(-XQx - Xc - XA^T z).$$

112 But since the right-hand matrix is diagonal, the result follows. \square

113 Notice that the condition in Corollary 2.1 is closer to the original
 114 result of Beck and Teboulle (i.e., Theorem 2.3 of Ref. 2), which did not
 115 involve an LMI condition.

116 The main result of the paper is related also to the work of
 117 Hiriart-Urruty on global optimality conditions for nonconvex optimization
 118 problems developed in a series of papers; see e.g. Refs. 7–9. Hiriart-Urruty
 119 develops a general global optimality condition, based on a generalized
 120 subdifferential concept, and specializes the condition to several problems
 121 of nonconvex optimization, including maximization of a convex quadratic
 122 function subject to strictly convex quadratic inequalities, minimization of
 123 a quadratic function subject to a single quadratic inequality (trust-region
 124 problem) and subject to two quadratic inequalities (two-trust-region prob-
 125 lem). While the sufficient condition obtained in Theorem 4.6 of Ref. 8 fol-
 126 lows essentially from the result that we used in our Theorem 2.1 (see also
 127 Remark 2.1), our result further develops that of Hiriart-Urruty by exploit-
 128 ing the special bivalency structure and yields more compact sufficiency con-
 129 dition. Hiriart-Urruty obtains also conditions that are both necessary and
 130 sufficient in Refs. 7–9 for nonconvex quadratic programs. However, these
 131 results involve a condition stating that some homogeneous function mixing
 132 first-order and second-order information about the problem data should
 133 have a constant sign on a convex cone, in addition to the first-order stati-
 134 onarity condition. It is not clear at present whether these conditions could
 135 be simplified further, in the presence of bivalency constraints in addition

136 to the quadratic equality constraints, and lead to implementable criteria.
 137 An effort in this direction is reported in Ref. 10, where the Hiriart-Urruty
 138 global optimality conditions have been implemented and tested with some
 139 success on unconstrained quadratic 0–1 optimization problems.

140 When one deals with a linear bivalent program ($Q \equiv 0$), we have the
 141 following corollary.

142 **Corollary 2.2.** Let x be a feasible point. If there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satis-
 143 fying

$$144 \quad Xc + XA^T z \leq 0,$$

145 then x is a global optimal solution.

146 Note that it is equally easy to treat inequality constraints by restrict-
 147 ing the sign of the multiplier; see Theorem 2.2 below.

148 The above results admit natural extensions to nonconvex quadratic
 149 programs with matrix variables and orthonormality constraints. In partic-
 150 ular, consider the following quadratic assignment problem:

$$\begin{aligned} 151 \quad (\text{QAP}) \quad & \min \quad \text{Tr}(AXBX^T) + \text{Tr}(CX^T), \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad XX^T = I, \\ & \quad \quad Xe = e, \\ & \quad \quad X^T e = e, \\ & \quad \quad X \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

152 where A, B are symmetric $n \times n$ matrices and C, X are an $n \times n$ matrices.

153 We use $\mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ to denote the space of $n \times n$ real nonnegative matrices.

154 **Theorem 2.2.** Let X be a feasible point for QAP. If there exists $u \in$
 155 \mathbb{R}^n , $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $T \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, with $T_{ij} = 0$ for all (i, j) , such that $X_{ij} > 0$
 156 satisfy the LMI

$$157 \quad B \otimes A - I \otimes (AXBX^T + CX^T - (ue^T + ew^T + T)X^T) \succeq 0,$$

158 then X is global optimal in QAP.

159 **Proof.** The proof is essentially identical to the proof of Theorem 2.1,
 160 with the necessary modifications. \square

161 The sufficient condition remains an LMI with some linear side con-
 162 ditions.

163 A well-known relaxation of the QAP is the following nonconvex
 164 quadratic program defined over orthonormal matrices (Stiefel manifold)

165 known as the eigenvalue bounds program for $C \equiv 0$ (see Refs. 11–12 and
166 results and references therein):

$$\begin{aligned} 167 \quad & \min \quad \text{Tr}(AXBX^T) + \text{Tr}(CX^T), \\ 168 \quad & \text{s.t.} \quad XX^T = I. \end{aligned}$$

169 The sufficient condition for optimality is simplified in this case.

170 **Corollary 2.3.** Let X be an orthonormal matrix. If

$$171 \quad \lambda_{\min}(B \otimes A) \geq \lambda_{\max}(AXBX^T + CX^T),$$

172 then X is global optimal.

173 Note that the conditions obtained in Refs. 11–12 have proved important
174 in relaxations for QAP. They have been used by Anstreicher and
175 coauthors in Refs. 13–14 and follow-up numerical work, to solve many
176 previously unsolved hard instances of QAP.

177 As future work, it would be interesting to look for necessary conditions
178 for QP and related problems and test the usefulness of the conditions
179 of the present paper in algorithms for QAP among others.

180 References

- 181 1. GAREY, M. R. and JOHNSON, D. S., *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the*
182 *Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, California, 1979.
- 183 2. BECK, A. and TEBoulLE, M., *Global Optimality Conditions for Quadratic with*
184 *Binary Constraints*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, Vol. 11, pp. 179–188,
185 2000.
- 186 3. BERTSEKAS, D. P., *Nonlinear Programming*, Athena Scientific, Belmont, Massa-
187 chusetts, 1995; see 2nd Edition, 1999.
- 188 4. LUENBERGER, D. G., *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*, John Wiley, New
189 York, NY, 1969.
- 190 5. ROCKAFELLAR, R. T., *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton,
191 New Jersey, 1970.
- 192 6. NESTEROV, Y., and NEMIROVSKI, A., *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Con-*
193 *convex Programming*, SIAM, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1993.
- 194 7. HIRIART-URRUTY, J. B., *Conditions for Global Optimality*, Handbook for Global
195 Optimization, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Holland, pp. 1–26,
196 1999.
- 197 8. HIRIART-URRUTY, J. B., *Conditions for Global Optimality 2*, Journal of Global
198 Optimization, Vol. 13, pp. 349–367, 1998.
- 199 9. HIRIART-URRUTY, J. B., *Global Optimality Conditions in Maximizing a Convex*
200 *Quadratic Function under Convex Quadratic Constraints*, Journal of Global
201 Optimization, Vol. 21, pp. 445–455, 2001.

- 202 10. CARRARESI, P., FARINACCIO, F., and MALUCELLI, F., *Testing Optimality for Qua-*
203 *dratic 0–1 Problems*, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 85, pp. 407–421, 1999.
- 204 11. ANSTREICHER, K., CHEN, X., WOLKOWICZ, H., and YUAN, Y., *Strong Duality for*
205 *a Trust-Region Type Relaxation of the Quadratic Assignment Problem*, *Linear*
206 *Algebra and Its Applications*, Vol. 301, pp. 121–136, 1999.
- 207 12. ANSTREICHER, K., and WOLKOWICZ, H., *On Lagrangian Relaxation of Quadratic*
208 *Matrix Constraints*, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Vol.
209 22, pp. 41–55, 2000.
- 210 13. ANSTREICHER, K., *Eigenvalue Bounds versus Semidefinite Relaxations for the*
211 *Quadratic Assignment Problem*, Technical Report, University of Iowa, Iowa
212 City, Iowa, 1999.
- 213 14. ANSTREICHER, K., and BRIXIUS, N. W., *A New Bound for the Quadratic Assign-*
214 *ment Problem Based on Convex Quadratic Programming*, *Mathematical Pro-*
215 *gramming*, Vol. 89, pp. 341–357, 2001.

Uncorrected Proof