Approximating Quadratic Programs with Positive Semidefinite Constraints

Elad Hazan^{*} Satyen Kale[†]

Abstract

We describe a polynomial time approximation algorithm to the problem of maximizing a quadratic form subject to quadratic constraints specified by PSD matrices. A special case, that has applications for clustering [CW04], is optimizing quadratic forms over the unit cube.

Approximation algorithms with similar guarantees are known [Nes98, NRT99, Meg01, CW04], and there is evidence that this factor is optimal [ABH⁺]. The following analysis is particularly simple.

Consider the following quadratic program:

$$\max x^T A x$$

$$i = 1, \dots, m \quad x^T A_i x \le 1 \tag{1}$$

where, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m are positive semidefinite matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We consider the following semidefinite programming relaxation of the problem:

$$\max A \bullet X$$

 $i = 1, \dots, m$
 $A_i \bullet X \le 1$
 $X \succeq 0$
(2)

Note that the trivial solution x = 0 shows that the optimum of (1) is non-negative. We will assume that the optimum is positive henceforth. We give the following poly-time randomized algorithm to approximate (1) up to a factor of $O(\log(mn))$:

	Procedure ApproximateQP
1.	Solve the SDP relaxation (2) to get optimal solution $X.$
2.	Compute a matrix V such that $X = V^T V$.
3.	Choose a unit vector $u\in \mathbb{R}^n$ uniformly at random.
4.	Compute $x = \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{8\ln(mn)}}\right] V u$.
5.	if $\exists i \text{ s.t. } x^T A_i x > 1$ or $x^T A x < \frac{1}{16 \ln(mn)} A \bullet X$ then
	abort
	else
	return x as a solution to (1).
	end

The second step in the algorithm, namely computing the decomposition $X = V^T V$, can be performed by computing the Cholesky decomposition of X or by finding the square root of X.

Clearly, if the algorithm does not abort, it returns an $O(\log(mn))$ approximate solution to (1). We will show that the algorithm succeeds with non-negligible probability:

^{*}Computer Science Department, Princeton University. ehazan@cs.princeton.edu.

[†]Computer Science Department, Princeton University. satyen@cs.princeton.edu.

Theorem 1 The algorithm succeeds with probability at least 1/4n.

So we can run the algorithm O(n) times to get a constant probability of success. Before we prove Theorem 1, we need the following well-known lemma on the Gaussian nature of projections (see [ARV04]):

Lemma 1 For any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a unit vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ chosen uniformly at random, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[(v^T u)^2] = \frac{||v||^2}{n} \quad and \quad \mathbf{Pr}\left[(v^T u)^2 > \frac{t||v||^2}{n}\right] \leq e^{-t/4}$$

Using this lemma, we can prove that the first condition of failure of line 5 of the algorithm happens with low probability:

Lemma 2 For any *i*, $\Pr[x^T A_i x > 1] < 1/m^2 n$.

PROOF: For convenience, we will work with y = Vu instead of x. Since A_i is positive semidefinite, we can decompose it as $A = \sum_{k} a_k a_k^T$ for vectors $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$y^T A_i y = \sum_k y^T a_k a_k^T y = \sum_k u^T V^T a_k a_k^T V u = \sum_k (a_k^T V u)^2$$

Invoking Lemma 1, we conclude that for any k,

$$\mathbf{Pr}\left[(a_k^T V u)^2 > \frac{8\ln(mn)||V^T a_k||^2}{n}\right] < \frac{1}{m^2 n^2}$$

and so by union bound on all k,

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{k} (a_k^T V u)^2 > \frac{8\ln(mn)\sum_k ||V^T a_k||^2}{n}\right] < \frac{1}{m^2 n}$$

$$a_k^T V^T V a_k = \sum_k a_k a_k^T \bullet X = A_k \bullet X < 1 \text{ Since } x = \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\right] u \text{ we get.}$$

Now $\sum_k ||V^T a_k||^2 = \sum_k a_k^T V^T V a_k = \sum_k a_k a_k^T \bullet X = A_i \bullet X \le 1$. Since $x = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\frac{n}{8\ln(mn)}} \right\rfloor y$, we get the required bound. \Box

Now we bound the probability of failure from the second condition of line 5 of the algorithm:

Lemma 3 $\Pr[x^T A x < \frac{1}{16 \ln(mn)} A \bullet X] < 1 - 1/2n.$

PROOF: As before, it is more convenient to work with y = Vu rather than x. We will show the equivalent bound $\mathbf{Pr}[y^T A y < A \bullet X/2n] < 1 - 1/2n$. First, we note that $\mathbf{E}[y^T A y] = A \bullet X/n$: by Lemma 1.

$$\mathbf{E}[y_k y_\ell] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[y_k^2 + y_\ell^2 - (y_k - y_\ell)^2] = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{||v_k||^2}{n} + \frac{||v_\ell||^2}{n} - \frac{||v_k - v_\ell||^2}{n} \right] = \frac{v_k^T v_\ell}{n}$$

Using the facts $A \bullet X = \sum_{k\ell} A_{k\ell} v_k^T v_\ell$; $y^T A y = \sum_{k\ell} A_{k\ell} y_k y_\ell$ and linearity of expectation, the claim follows. Next, we claim that for any direction u and the corresponding y, $y^T A y \leq A \bullet X$. We prove this showing that $\tilde{X} = yy^T$ is a feasible solution for (2) and hence $y^T A y = A \bullet \tilde{X} \leq A \bullet X$. For this, we show that $A_i \bullet \tilde{X} \leq 1$ for all i. As in Lemma 2, let $A_i = \sum_k a_k a_k^T$, and then

$$A_{i} \bullet \tilde{X} = y^{T} A_{i} y = \sum_{k} (a_{k}^{T} V u)^{2} \leq \sum_{k} ||V^{T} a_{k}||^{2} = A_{i} \bullet X \leq 1$$

The first inequality uses the fact that u is a unit vector, and the last equality follows as in Lemma 2.

Let $t = \mathbf{Pr}[y^T A y < A \bullet X/2n]$. Then we have the following averaging argument:

$$t \cdot \frac{A \bullet X}{2n} + (1-t) \bullet A \bullet X \ge \mathbf{E}[y^T A y] = \frac{A \bullet X}{n}$$

Simplifying, we get $t \le 1 - 1/(2n - 1) < 1 - 1/2n$. \Box

PROOF: [Theorem 1]

Using lemmas (2), (3) and the union bound, we conclude that the probability of failure is bounded by (assuming $m \ge 4$)

$$m \cdot \frac{1}{m^2 n} + 1 - \frac{1}{2n} \ \le \ 1 - \frac{1}{4n}$$

References

- [ABH⁺] S. Arora, E. Berger, E. Hazan, G. Kindler, and M. Safra. On non-approximability for quadratic programs. To appear in FOCS 2005.
- [ARV04] Sanjeev Arora, Satish Rao, and Umesh V. Vazirani. Expander flows, geometric embeddings and graph partitioning. In *36th ACM STOC*, pages 222–231, 2004.
- [CW04] Moses Charikar and Anthony Wirth. Maximizing quadratic programs: Extending grothendieck's inequality. In FOCS '04: Proceedings of the 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'04), pages 54–60, Washington, DC, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
- [Meg01] A. Megretski. Relaxation of quadratic programs in operator theory and system analysis. Systems, Approximation, Singular Integral Operators, and Related Topics (Bordeaux, 2000), (3):365–392, 2001.
- [Nes98] Y. Nesterov. Global quadratic optimization via conic relaxation. Working paper CORE, 1998.
- [NRT99] A. Nemirovski, C. Roos, and T. Terlaky. On maximization of quadratic form over intersection of ellipsoids with common center. *Mathematical Programming*, 86(3):463–473, 1999.