

# Convex Functions

Andrew D Smith  
University College Dublin

25 January 2020

## 1 Definitions

### 1.1 Dyadic Convexity

IF we know the value of a function at  $x$  and  $y$ , what can we say about the value at the midpoint,  $(x + y)/2$ ? We are interested in cases where the value at the midpoint is systematically lower than the values at the ends:

Suppose we have a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that, for all  $x, y, \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{f(x) + f(y)}{2}$$

Examples of such functions include:

- $f(x)$  is linear (equality holds)
- $f(x) = x^2$
- $f(x) = 10^x$
- $f(x) = |x|$  (equality holds if  $x$  and  $y$  have the same sign)

### 1.2 Convex Function Definition

A function  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is *convex* if for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ :

$$f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y) \leq (1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y) \quad (1)$$

The left hand side is the function evaluated at a point between  $x$  and  $y$ . The right hand side is the linear interpolation between  $f(x)$  and  $f(y)$ .

A function  $f(x)$  is *concave* if  $-f(x)$  is convex. Linear functions (and only linear functions) are both concave and convex.

### 1.3 Adding the Point at Infinity

Sometimes we want to consider a convex function only on a particular range. For example, we might consider  $f(x) = 1/x$  on  $x > 0$  or  $f(x) = -\sqrt{x}$  on  $x \geq 0$ . These are both convex functions, but over smaller ranges.

In these cases, we define  $f(x) = +\infty$  for values of  $x$  where  $f(x)$  would not otherwise be defined.

## 1.4 Examples of Convex Functions

### 1.4.1 Powers

$y = x^n$  on  $x > 0$  is:

- Convex if  $n \geq 1$  or if  $n \leq 0$
- Concave if  $0 \leq n \leq 1$ .

### 1.4.2 Exponents

The function  $f(x) = 10^x$  is convex.

### 1.4.3 Logarithms

For  $y > 0$ , the *logarithm* of  $y$ , written  $\log_{10}(y)$  is the value of  $x$  such that  $10^x = y$ .

The number of decimal digits in  $y$  is  $1 + \lfloor \log_{10}(y) \rfloor$ .

The logarithm is not a convex function, but this function is:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & x \leq 0 \\ -\log_{10}(x) & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

### 1.4.4 Piecewise Linear Functions

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & x < 0 \\ 0 & 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ x - 1 & x \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

## 2 Combining Convex Functions

### 2.1 Sums of Convex Functions are Convex

### 2.2 Maximum of Convex Functions are Convex

### 2.3 Minimum of Convex Functions

True or False: the minimum of two convex functions is convex.

False: Consider  $(x + 1)^2$  and  $(x - 1)^2$ .

### 2.4 Increasing function of a Convex Function

$f(x)$  convex,  $g(y)$  increasing.

True or False:  $g(f(x))$  is convex?

False: Try  $\sqrt{|x|}$  for example.

### 2.5 Convex Function of a Convex Function

$f(x)$  convex,  $g(y)$  convex.

True or False:  $g(f(x))$  is convex?

False. Try  $\frac{1}{1+|x|}$ .

## 2.6 Increasing Convex Function of a Convex Function

Suppose  $f(x)$  is convex and  $g(y)$  is both increasing and convex.

Then  $f(g(x))$  is convex.

**Proof** As  $f$  is convex,

$$f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y) \leq (1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y)$$

Now as  $g$  is an increasing function, we can apply  $g$  to each side of the inequality and the result still holds:

$$g[f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y)] \leq g[(1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y)]$$

But now we use the convexity of  $g(x)$  to get an upper bound for the right hand side:

$$g[(1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y)] \leq (1-\lambda)g(f(x)) + \lambda g(f(y))$$

Putting the last two inequalities together,

$$g[f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y)] \leq (1-\lambda)g(f(x)) + \lambda g(f(y))$$

This is exactly the definition of the convexity of  $g(f(x))$ .

**Corollary:** If  $f(x)$  is convex, then so is  $10^{f(x)}$ .

However, if  $f(x)$  is convex it does NOT follow that  $\log_{10}(f(x))$  is convex. It might be, or it might not.

## 3 Jensen's Inequality

### 3.1 Extending from Pairs to Multiples

Consider the situation where:

- $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a convex function
- $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j &\geq 0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Then Jensen's inequality states that

$$f\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j f(x_j)$$

## 3.2 Proof of Jensen's Inequality

Proof by induction on  $n$ .

Trivial (equality holds) if  $n = 1$ .

Suppose we now have the situation as described for some  $n \geq 2$  and we have proved the relation for  $n - 1$  points.

For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ , define:

$$\mu_j = \frac{\lambda_j}{1 - \lambda_n}$$

These satisfy the same conditions as the  $\lambda$ 's, but there are only  $n - 1$  of them rather than  $n$ .

Of course we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j = (1 - \lambda_n) \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j x_j \right] + \lambda_n x_n$$

So applying the convexity of  $f$  to the mixture on the right hand side, we have:

$$f \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j \right) \leq (1 - \lambda_n) f \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j x_j \right) + \lambda_n f(x_n)$$

Now we can apply the inductive hypothesis:

$$f \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j x_j \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j f(x_j)$$

Substituting this back gives:

$$\begin{aligned} f \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j \right) &\leq (1 - \lambda_n) \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j f(x_j) \right] + \lambda_n f(x_n) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j f(x_j) \end{aligned}$$

Thus then proves the result claimed.

## 4 Convex Functions and Optimisation

### 4.1 Unique Minimum

A convex function

True or False: If a convex function has a minimum, then that minimum is unique.

False: the minimum might be in a range of constant values.

## 5 Harmonic - Arithmetic - Geometric Means

### 5.1 Definitions

Positive numbers  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ .

$$\text{arithmetic mean} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j$$

$$\text{geometric mean} = \sqrt[n]{\prod_{j=1}^n x_j}$$

$$\text{harmonic mean} = \left[ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{x_j} \right]^{-1}$$

### 5.2 Numerical Example

With observations 18, 20, 75 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{18 + 20 + 75}{3} &= \frac{113}{3} &&= 37\frac{2}{3} \\ \sqrt[3]{18 \times 20 \times 75} &= \sqrt[3]{27000} &&= 30 \\ \frac{3}{\frac{1}{18} + \frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{75}} &= \frac{2700}{107} &&= 25\frac{25}{107} \end{aligned}$$

### 5.3 Ordering

We observe that  $HM \leq GM \leq AM$ . Trial and error suggests this often holds. Equality applies if all the observations are equal.

Can we prove this?

### 5.4 Jensen Implies $GM \leq AM$

Proof: given  $n$  positive observations  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , let

$$y_j = \log_{10} x_j$$

Then applying Jensen's inequality to the convex function  $10^y$  we have:

$$10^{\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n y_j\right)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n 10^{y_j}$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\sqrt[n]{\prod_{j=1}^n x_j} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j$$

This is the famous arithmetic-geometric mean inequality.

## 5.5 General Weighted Results

We can use the same methodology to show the  $GM \leq AM$  inequality when the weights are  $\lambda_j$  (with  $\sum \lambda_j = 1$ ) rather than necessarily being equal to  $1/n$ . In that case, the  $GM \leq AM$  inequality takes the form:

$$\prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{\lambda_j} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j$$

## 5.6 $GM \leq AM$ implies $GM \geq HM$

To prove this, apply  $GM \leq AM$  to the reciprocals of the observations.

# 6 Convex Conjugates

## 6.1 Definition

Suppose we have an arbitrary function  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . The *convex conjugate* function, written  $f^*(y)$  is defined as:

$$f^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{xy - f(x)\}$$

This immediately implies *Fenchel's Inequality*

$$xy \leq f(x) + f^*(y)$$

**Remark:** The Convex Conjugate  $f^*(y)$  is always a convex function, regardless of whether  $f(x)$  is convex. This follows because  $f^*(y)$  is the maximum of a set of convex (indeed, linear) functions of  $y$ .

## 6.2 Examples

### 6.2.1 Quadratic

Suppose  $f(x) = x^2$ .

To find  $f^*(y)$  we need to maximise (over  $x$ )

$$xy - x^2 = \frac{y^2}{4} - \left(\frac{y}{2} - x\right)^2$$

Obviously maximised when  $y = 2x$  and the maximum is

$$f^*(y) = \frac{y^2}{4}$$

### 6.2.2 Square Root

We know that  $f(x) = -\sqrt{x}$  is convex on  $x \geq 0$ .

The convex conjugate is:

$$f^*(y) = \sup_{x \geq 0} \{xy + \sqrt{x}\}$$

This is obviously unbounded if  $y \geq 0$ . So we look at the less obvious case  $y < 0$ . Here, we complete the square:

$$\begin{aligned} xy + \sqrt{x} &= - \left( (-y)x - \sqrt{x} + \frac{1}{-4y} \right) + \frac{1}{-4y} \\ &= - \left( \sqrt{x}\sqrt{-y} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-y}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{-4y} \end{aligned}$$

Once again, we use the fact that a square is at least zero to complete the maximisation, which finally gives:

$$f^*(y) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4y} & y < 0 \\ +\infty & y \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

### 6.2.3 Reciprocal

The function  $f(x) = 1/x$  is convex on  $x > 0$ . Then:

$$f^*(y) = \sup_{x>0} \left\{ xy - \frac{1}{x} \right\}$$

It is clear that for  $y \geq 0$  we have  $f^*(y) = \infty$ , while if  $f^*(0) = 0$ .

So we focus on the non-trivial case when  $y < 0$ . Once again, we look for a square; this time we note:

$$-(-y)x - \frac{1}{x} = - \left( \sqrt{-y}\sqrt{x} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \right)^2 - 2\sqrt{-y}$$

Putting the pieces together, we have:

$$f^*(y) = \begin{cases} -2\sqrt{-y} & y \leq 0 \\ \infty & y > 0 \end{cases}$$

## 6.3 Guessing Duality

There seems to be some kind of duality here: the convex conjugate of a square root on the positive axis is a reciprocal on the negative axis, while the convex conjugate of a reciprocal on the positive axis is a square root on the negative axis.

We also saw that the convex conjugate of a quadratic function is another quadratic function. Indeed, if  $f(x) = \frac{x^2}{2}$  then  $f^*(y) = y^2/2$  so  $f$  is self-conjugate.

True or False: The only self-conjugate function is  $f(x) = x^2/2$ .

Hint for solution: try Fenchel's inequality with  $x = y$ .

## 6.4 Piecewise Linear Example

Let us define  $f(x)$  by:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & x < 0 \\ 0 & 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ x - 1 & x \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

To find the convex conjugate  $f^*(y)$  we consider separately three cases in the maximisation of  $xy - f(x)$ .

- If  $y < 0$  then the objective function (the thing you're trying to optimise) is decreasing for  $x \geq 0$  so the maximum is at  $x = 0$ , whence  $f^*(y) = 0$ .
- If  $0 < y < 1$  then the objective function is increasing on  $0 \leq x \leq 1$  and decreasing on  $x \geq 1$  so the maximum is attained at  $x = 1$  and so  $f^*(y) = y$ .
- If  $y > 1$  then the objective function is increasing for all  $y$  and so  $f^*(y) = \infty$ .
- If  $y = 0$  or  $y = 1$  then there is a range of  $x$  for which the objective function is flat.

Putting these together, we have:

$$f^*(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & y \leq 0 \\ y & 0 \leq y \leq 1 \\ \infty & y > 1 \end{cases}$$

## 7 Convex Bi-Conjugate

### 7.1 Definition

Define  $f^{**}(x)$  to be the convex conjugate of the convex conjugate of  $f$ .

### 7.2 Bi-Conjugate Does not Exceed $f$

Fenchel's inequality implies:

$$xy - f^*(y) \leq f(x)$$

Taking the supremum of the left hand side over values of  $y$ :

$$f^{**}(x) \leq f(x)$$

### 7.3 The Case of a Tangent

Suppose  $f(x)$  has a supporting line with gradient  $y_0$  at a single point  $x_0$ , so that:

$$f(x) \geq f(x_0) + y_0(x - x_0); x \in \mathbb{R}$$

This works for continuous convex functions - take this on trust for now as the proof is tricky. Obviously if such a tangent exists then equality holds at  $x = x_0$ .

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(y_0) &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{xy_0 - f(x)\} \\ &= x_0y_0 - f(x_0) + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{f(x_0) + y_0(x - x_0) - f(x)\} \\ &= x_0y_0 - f(x_0) \end{aligned}$$

Taking a specific value  $y = y_0$  in the sup defining  $f^{**}(y)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{**}(x_0) &= \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x_0y - f^*(y)\} \\ &\geq x_0y_0 - f^*(y_0) \\ &= f(x_0) \end{aligned}$$



As we already know  $f^{**}(x) \leq f(x)$ , we deduce that in the case where a tangent exists at  $x_0$  we have equality and  $f^{**}(x_0) = f(x_0)$ .

## 8 Non-Integer Factorials

### 8.1 Definition

The factorial  $n!$  for integers  $n \geq 1$  is defined by the product:

$$n! = 1 \times 2 \times 3 \times \dots \times (n-1) \times n$$

In more formal terms we define  $n!$  inductively:

$$n! = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 0 \\ n \times (n-1)! & n \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

### 8.2 Log Factorials are Convex

I claim the log factorial is convex, at least when measured on non-negative integers.

**Proof:** Let  $0 \leq a < b < c$  be non-negative integers. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{b!}{a!} &= (a+1)(a+2)\dots(b-1)b \\ &\leq b^{b-a} \\ \frac{c!}{b!} &= (b+1)(b+2)\dots(c-1)c \\ &> b^{c-b} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\left(\frac{b!}{a!}\right)^{\frac{c-b}{c-a}} \leq b^{\frac{(b-a)(c-b)}{c-a}} < \left(\frac{c!}{b!}\right)^{\frac{b-a}{c-a}}$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{b-a}{c-a} \\ 1-\lambda &= \frac{c-b}{c-a} \end{aligned}$$

Then the inequality we proved is:

$$\left(\frac{b!}{a!}\right)^{1-\lambda} < \left(\frac{c!}{b!}\right)^{\lambda}$$

Cross-multiplying, and taking logs, this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} b &= (1-\lambda)a + \lambda c \\ \log_{10} b! &\leq (1-\lambda)\log_{10} a! + \lambda\log_{10} c! \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that  $\log_{10}(n!)$  is convex.

### 8.3 Extending Factorials to Non-Integers

The factorial function is defined for non-negative integers  $n$ . Can we extend it in a logical way for non-integers? We want to preserve:

- The recurrence relation  $n! = n \times (n - 1)!$
- The log convex property.

Let us try, for example, to devise a logical value of  $(-\frac{1}{2})!$ . The recurrence relation implies:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)! = \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!$$

Expressing 0 as the average of  $-1/2$  and  $1/2$ , the log convexity of factorials would imply:

$$1 = (0!)^2 \leq \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)! \times \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)! = \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2$$

But then also as  $1/2$  is the average of 0 and 1, logarithmic convexity gives:

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \leq 0! \times 1! = 1$$

Combining these two inequalities, we have:

$$2 \leq \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \leq 4$$

We can strengthen the inequality by applying the same techniques for larger  $n$ .

Expressing  $n$  as the average of  $n - \frac{1}{2}$  and  $n + \frac{1}{2}$ , logarithmic convexity implies:

$$(n!)^2 \leq \left(n - \frac{1}{2}\right)! \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)!$$

Substituting the recurrence relation for factorials, we have:

$$(n!)^2 \leq \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \prod_{j=1}^n \left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right)$$

Likewise, expressing  $n + \frac{1}{2}$  as the average of  $n$  and  $n + 1$ , logarithmic convexity implies:

$$\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \leq (n)!(n + 1)!$$

We can expand the left side by the recurrence relation, to give:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \prod_{j=0}^n \left(j + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \leq (n)!(n + 1)!$$

Combining those equations, we have upper and lower bounds:

$$\frac{(n!)^2}{\prod_{j=1}^n \left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right)} \leq \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)!^2 \leq \frac{n!(n + 1)!}{\prod_{j=0}^n \left(j + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2}$$

Let us evaluate both sides of this inequality:

$n$	Lower	Upper
0	2.0000	4.0000
1	2.6667	3.5556
2	2.8444	3.4133
3	2.9257	3.3437
4	2.9722	3.3024
5	3.0022	3.2751
10	3.0677	3.2138
20	3.1035	3.1792
50	3.1261	3.1570
100	3.1338	3.1494
200	3.1377	3.1455
500	3.1400	3.1432
1000	3.1408	3.1424

We guess the limit is  $\pi$  (this is hard to prove, but true). That implies:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)! = \sqrt{\pi}$$

We haven't proved that  $n!$  admits a logarithmically convex extension to reals (at least those exceeding -1), although that also turns out to be true.