Let us evaluate the result of one step of the steepest descent method.
Consider $\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{x}-h f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})$. From Lemma 3.4,

$$
\begin{align*}
f(\boldsymbol{y}) & \leq f(\boldsymbol{x})+\left\langle f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}\right\rangle+\frac{L}{2}\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2}^{2} \\
& =f(\boldsymbol{x})-h\left\|f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})\right\|_{2}^{2}+\frac{h^{2} L}{2}\left\|f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})\right\|_{2}^{2} \\
& =f(\boldsymbol{x})-h\left(1-\frac{h}{2} L\right)\left\|f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})\right\|_{2}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, one step of the steepest descent method decreases the value of the objective function at least as follows for $h^{*}=1 / L$.

$$
f(\boldsymbol{y}) \leq f(\boldsymbol{x})-\frac{1}{2 L}\left\|f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

Now, for the Goldstein-Armijo Rule, since $\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}=\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-h_{k} f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)$, we have:

$$
f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)-f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\right) \leq \beta h_{k}\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

and from (5)

$$
f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)-f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\right) \geq h_{k}\left(1-\frac{h_{k}}{2} L\right)\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

Therefore, $h_{k} \geq 2(1-\beta) / L$.
Also, substituting in

$$
f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)-f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\right) \geq \alpha h_{k}\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2} \geq \frac{2}{L} \alpha(1-\beta)\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

Thus, in the three step-size strategies excepting the BB step size considered here, we can say that

$$
f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)-f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}\right) \geq \frac{\omega}{L}\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}
$$

for some positive constant $\omega$.
Summing up the above inequality we have:

$$
\frac{\omega}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{N}\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{N+1}\right) \leq f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{*}
$$

where $f^{*}$ is the optimal value of the problem.
As a simple consequence we have

$$
\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad k \rightarrow \infty
$$

Finally,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{N}^{*}:=\min _{0 \leq k \leq N}\left\|f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N+1}}\left[\frac{L}{\omega}\left(f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{*}\right)\right]^{1 / 2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 5.8 $g_{N}^{*} \rightarrow 0$, but we cannot say anything about the rate of convergence of the sequence $\left\{f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)\right\}$ or $\left\{\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right\}$.

Example 5.9 Consider the function $f(x, y)=\frac{1}{2} x^{2}+\frac{1}{4} y^{4}-\frac{1}{2} y^{2} .(0,-1)^{T}$ and $(0,1)^{T}$ are local minimal solutions, but $(0,0)^{T}$ is a stationary point.

If we start the steepest descent method from $(1,0)^{T}$, we will only converge to the stationary point.

We focus now on the following problem class:

| Model: | 1. $\min _{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}} f(\boldsymbol{x})$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 2. $f \in \mathcal{C}_{L}^{1,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ |
|  | 3. $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ is bounded from below |
|  | Only function values are available |
| Oracle: | Find $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $f(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)$ and $\left\\|f^{\prime}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})\right\\|_{2}<\epsilon$ |

From (6), we have

$$
g_{N}^{*}<\varepsilon \quad \text { if } \quad N+1>\frac{L}{\omega \varepsilon^{2}}\left(f\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{*}\right) .
$$

Remark 5.10 This is much better than the result of Theorem 5.6, since it does not depend on $n$.
Finally, consider the following problem under Assumption 5.11.


## Assumption 5.11

1. $f \in \mathcal{C}_{M}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$;
2. There is a local minimum $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ of the function $f(\boldsymbol{x})$;
3. We know some bound $0<\ell \leq L<\infty$ for the Hessian at $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ :

$$
\ell \boldsymbol{I} \preceq f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) \preceq L \boldsymbol{I} ;
$$

4. Our starting point $\boldsymbol{x}_{0}$ is close enough to $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$.

Theorem 5.12 Let $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ satisfy our assumptions above and let the starting point $\boldsymbol{x}_{0}$ be close enough to a local minimum:

$$
r_{0}=\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}<\bar{r}:=\frac{2 \ell}{M} .
$$

Then, the steepest descent method with step-size $h^{*}=2 /(L+\ell)$ converges as follows:

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{\bar{r} r_{0}}{\bar{r}-r_{0}}\left(1-\frac{2 \ell}{L+3 \ell}\right)^{k} .
$$

This rate of convergence is called (R-)linear.
Proof:
In the steepest descent method, the iterates are $\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}=\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-h_{k} f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)$.
Since $f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)=0$,

$$
f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}\right)-f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)=\int_{0}^{1} f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right)\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) d \tau=\boldsymbol{G}_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right),
$$

and therefore,

$$
\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}=\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}-h_{k} \boldsymbol{G}_{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)=\left(\boldsymbol{I}-h_{k} \boldsymbol{G}_{k}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) .
$$

Let $r_{k}=\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}$. From Lemma 3.6,

$$
f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)-\tau M r_{k} \boldsymbol{I} \preceq f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right) \preceq f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)+\tau M r_{k} \boldsymbol{I} .
$$

Integrating all parts from 0 to 1 and using our hypothesis,

$$
\left(\ell-\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right) \boldsymbol{I} \preceq \boldsymbol{G}_{k} \preceq\left(L+\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right) \boldsymbol{I} .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\left(1-h_{k}\left(L+\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)\right) \boldsymbol{I} \preceq \boldsymbol{I}-h_{k} \boldsymbol{G}_{k} \preceq\left(1-h_{k}\left(\ell-\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)\right) \boldsymbol{I} .
$$

We arrive at

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{I}-h_{k} \boldsymbol{G}_{k}\right\|_{2} \leq \max \left\{\left|a_{k}\left(h_{k}\right)\right|,\left|b_{k}\left(h_{k}\right)\right|\right\}
$$

where $a_{k}(h)=1-h\left(\ell-\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)$ and $b_{k}(h)=h\left(L+\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)-1$.
Notice that $a_{k}(0)=1$ and $b_{k}(0)=-1$.
Now, let us use our hypothesis that $r_{0}<\bar{r}$.
When $a_{k}(h)=b_{k}(h)$, we have $1-h\left(\ell-\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)=h\left(L+\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)-1$, and therefore

$$
h_{k}^{*}=\frac{2}{L+\ell} .
$$

(Surprisingly, it does not depend neither on $M$ nor $r_{k}$ ). Finally,

$$
r_{k+1}=\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2} \leq\left(1-\frac{2}{L+\ell}\left(\ell-\frac{r_{k}}{2} M\right)\right)\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2} .
$$

That is,

$$
r_{k+1} \leq\left(\frac{L-\ell}{L+\ell}+\frac{r_{k} M}{L+\ell}\right) r_{k} .
$$

and $r_{k+1}<r_{k}<\bar{r}$.
Now, let us analyze the rate of convergence. Multiplying the above inequality by $M /(L+\ell)$,

$$
\frac{M r_{k+1}}{L+\ell} \leq \frac{M(L-\ell)}{(L+\ell)^{2}} r_{k}+\frac{M^{2} r_{k}^{2}}{(L+\ell)^{2}} .
$$

Calling $\alpha_{k}=\frac{M r_{k}}{L+\ell}$ and $q=\frac{2 \ell}{L+\ell}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{k+1} \leq(1-q) \alpha_{k}+\alpha_{k}^{2}=\alpha_{k}\left(1+\alpha_{k}-q\right)=\frac{\alpha_{k}\left(1-\left(\alpha_{k}-q\right)^{2}\right)}{1-\left(\alpha_{k}-q\right)} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, since $r_{k}<\frac{2 \ell}{M}, \alpha_{k}-q=\frac{M r_{k}}{L+\ell}-\frac{2 \ell}{L+\ell}<0$, and $1+\left(\alpha_{k}-q\right)=\frac{L-\ell}{L+\ell}+\frac{M r_{k}}{L+\ell}>0$. Therefore, $-1<\alpha_{k}-q<0$, and (7) becomes $\leq \frac{\alpha_{k}}{1+q-\alpha_{k}}$.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{1}{\alpha_{k+1}} \geq \frac{1+q}{\alpha_{k}}-1 . \\
\frac{q}{\alpha_{k+1}}-1 \geq \frac{q(1+q)}{\alpha_{k}}-q-1=(1+q)\left(\frac{q}{\alpha_{k}}-1\right) .
\end{gathered}
$$

and then,

$$
\frac{q}{\alpha_{k}}-1 \geq(1+q)^{k}\left(\frac{q}{\alpha_{0}}-1\right)=(1+q)^{k}\left(\frac{2 \ell}{L+\ell} \frac{L+\ell}{M r_{0}}-1\right)=(1+q)^{k}\left(\frac{\bar{r}}{r_{0}}-1\right) .
$$

Finally, we arrive at

$$
r_{k}=\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{\bar{r} r_{0}}{\bar{r}-r_{0}}\left(1-\frac{2 \ell}{L+3 \ell}\right)^{k} .
$$

### 5.4 The Newton Method

Example 5.13 Let us apply the Newton method to find the root of the following function

$$
\phi(t)=\frac{t}{\sqrt{1+t^{2}}}
$$

Clearly $t^{*}=0$.
The Newton method will give:

$$
t_{k+1}=t_{k}-\frac{\phi\left(t_{k}\right)}{\phi^{\prime}\left(t_{k}\right)}=t_{k}-t_{k}\left(1+t_{k}^{2}\right)=-t_{k}^{3} .
$$

Therefore, the method converges if $\left|t_{0}\right|<1$, it oscillates if $\left|t_{0}\right|=1$, and finally, diverges if $\left|t_{0}\right|>1$.

## Assumption 5.14

1. $f \in \mathcal{C}_{M}^{2,2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$;
2. There is a local minimum $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ of the function $f(\boldsymbol{x})$;
3. The Hessian is positive definite at $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ :

$$
f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) \succeq \ell \boldsymbol{I}, \quad \ell>0
$$

4. Our starting point $\boldsymbol{x}_{0}$ is close enough to $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$.

Theorem 5.15 Let the function $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ satisfy the above assumptions. Suppose that the initial starting point $\boldsymbol{x}_{0}$ is close enough to $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}$ :

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}<\bar{r}:=\frac{2 \ell}{3 M} .
$$

Then $\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}<\bar{r}$ for all $k$ of the Newton method and it converges quadratically:

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{M\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}^{2}}{2\left(\ell-M\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}\right)} .
$$

Proof:
Let $r_{k}=\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{k}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}$. From Lemma 3.6 and the assumption, we have for $k=0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right) \succeq f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)-M r_{0} \boldsymbol{I} \succeq\left(\ell-M r_{0}\right) \boldsymbol{I} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $r_{0}<\bar{r}=\frac{2 \ell}{3 M}<\frac{\ell}{M}$, we have $\ell-M r_{0}>0$ and therefore, $f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)$ is invertible.
Consider the Newton method for $k=0, \boldsymbol{x}_{1}=\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)$.
Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{x}_{1}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*} & =\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}-\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} f^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right) \\
& =\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}-\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} \int_{0}^{1} f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right)\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right) d \tau \\
& =\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)\right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{G}_{0}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{G}_{0}=\int_{0}^{1}\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right)\right] d \tau$.

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\boldsymbol{G}_{0}\right\|_{2} & =\left\|\int_{0}^{1}\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right)\right] d \tau\right\|_{2} \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{1}\left\|f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)-f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^{*}+\tau\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right)\right\|_{2} d \tau \\
& \leq \int_{0}^{1} M|1-\tau| r_{0} d \tau=\frac{r_{0}}{2} M .
\end{aligned}
$$

From (8),

$$
\left\|\left[f^{\prime \prime}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}\right)\right]^{-1}\right\|_{2} \leq\left(\ell-M r_{0}\right)^{-1}
$$

Then

$$
r_{1} \leq \frac{M r_{0}^{2}}{2\left(\ell-M r_{0}\right)}
$$

Since $r_{0}<\bar{r}=\frac{2 \ell}{3 M}, \quad \frac{M r_{0}}{2\left(\ell-M r_{0}\right)}<1$, and $r_{1}<r_{0}$.
One can see now that the same argument is valid for all $k$ 's.

- Comparing this result with the rate of convergence of the steepest descent, we see that the Newton method is much faster.
- Surprisingly, the region of quadratic convergence of the Newton method is almost the same as the region of the linear convergence of the gradient method.

$$
\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}<\frac{2 \ell}{M} \quad\left(\text { steepest descent method) } \quad\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\|_{2}<\frac{2 \ell}{3 M} \quad\right. \text { (Newton method) }
$$

- This justifies a standard recommendation to use the steepest descent method only at the initial stage of the minimization process in order to get close to a local minimum and then perform the Newton method to refine.


### 5.5 The Conjugate Gradient Methods

The conjugate gradient methods were initially proposed for minimizing convex quadratic functions. Consider the problem

$$
\min _{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}} f(\boldsymbol{x})
$$

with $f(\boldsymbol{x})=\alpha+\langle\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle$ and $\boldsymbol{A} \succ \boldsymbol{O}$. Since its minimal solution is $\boldsymbol{x}^{*}=-\boldsymbol{A}^{-1} \boldsymbol{a}$, we can rewrite $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(\boldsymbol{x}) & =\alpha-\left\langle\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}, \boldsymbol{x}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}\rangle \\
& =\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}, \boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\boldsymbol{A}\left(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right), \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $f^{*}=\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{x}^{*}, \boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right\rangle$ and $f^{\prime}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{A}\left(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)$.
Definition 5.16 Given a starting point $\boldsymbol{x}_{0}$, the linear Krylov subspaces is defined as

$$
\mathcal{L}_{k}:=\operatorname{Lin}\left\{\boldsymbol{A}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right), \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}^{k}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{0}-\boldsymbol{x}^{*}\right)\right\}, \quad k \geq 1
$$

