A Second-Order Cone Based Approach for Solving the Trust Region Subproblem and Its Variants

Nam Ho-Nguyen[1] and Fatma K l nc-Karzan [1]

[1]Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213, USA.

March 2016

Abstract

We study the trust region subproblem (TRS) of minimizing a nonconvex quadratic function over the unit ball with additional conic constraints. Despite having a nonconvex objective, it is known that the TRS and a number of its variants are polynomial-time solvable. In this paper, we follow a second-order cone based approach to derive an exact convex formulation of the TRS, and under slightly stronger conditions, give a low-complexity characterization of the convex hull of its epigraph without any additional variables. As a result, our study highlights an explicit connection between the nonconvex TRS and smooth convex quadratic minimization, which allows for the application of cheap iterative methods to the TRS. We also explore the inclusion of additional hollow constraints to the domain of the TRS, and convexi cation of the associated epigraph.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the polynomial-time solvable variants of the *trust region subproblem* (TRS) [15] given by

$$\mathrm{Opt}_h := \min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n} \quad h(y) := y^\top Qy + 2g^\top y : \quad \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \end{array} \quad ; \tag{1}$$

where $\|y\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of y, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a closed convex cone. We assume that the minimum eigenvalue of Q, $_{\min}(Q)$, is negative. This problem (1) is equivalent to the classical TRS when there are no additional conic constraints, i.e., $A = I_n$, $b = 0$, and $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^m$.

The classical trust region subproblem is an essential ingredient of the trust region methods that are commonly used to solve continuous nonconvex optimization problems (see [15, 30, 32] and references therein). In each iteration of a trust region method, a quadratic approximation of the objective function is built and then optimized over a ball, called trust region, (or intersection of a ball with linear constraints) to nd the new search point. Trust region subproblems are also encountered in the context of robust optimization under matrix norm or polyhedral uncertainty (see [4, 6] and references therein), nonlinear optimization problems with discrete variables [10, 12], least-squares problems [40], constrained eigenvalue problems [20], and more.

As stated above, the optimization problem in (1) is nonlinear and nonconvex when $_{\min}(Q) < 0$. Nevertheless, it is well-known that classical TRS and a number of its variants can be solved

in polynomial time via semide nite programming [33] or using specialized nonlinear algorithms [22, 27]. Speci cally, the semide nite programming (SDP) relaxation for the classical TRS is known to be exact [33].

Several variants of the TRS that enforce additional constraints on the trust region have been proposed. Among these the most commonly studied is the case when $\mathcal{K}$ is taken to be a nonnegative orthant, i.e., additional linear constraints are modeled via the polyhedral set $P := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}$ intersected with the unit ball. TRS with additional linear inequalities arises in nonlinear programming and robust optimization (see [11, 25] and references therein) and is studied in [9, 11, 12, 14, 25, 37, 39] under a variety of assumptions. Speci cally, [12, 37] give a tight semide nite formulation when there is a single linear constraint $a^\top y \leq b$ based on an additional constraint derived from second-order reformularization linerazitation technique (SOC-RLT). This approach was extended to two linear constraints in [12, 39] and the tightness of the SDP relaxation is shown when the linear constraints are parallel. More recently, Burer and Yang [14] give a tight SDP relaxation with additional SOC-RLT constraints for an arbitrary number of linear constraints, under the condition that these additional linear inequalities do not intersect on the interior of the unit ball. We refer the readers to Burer [11] for a recent survey and related references for the results on tight SDP relaxations associated with these variants. Recently, Jeyakumar and Li [25] prove convexity of the joint numerical range, exactness of the SDP relaxation, and strong Lagrangian duality for the TRS with additional linear and SOC constraints. A key tool in their analysis is to recast the TRS as a convex quadratic minimization problem under a dimensionality condition. Following a di erent approach and without relying on a convex reformulation of the problem, Bienstock and Michalka [9] show that TRS with linear inequality constraints is polynomial-time solvable under the milder condition that the number of faces of the linear constraints P intersecting with the unit ball is polynomially bounded. Hollow constraints de ned by a single ellipsoid [5, 8, 32, 36, 39] or several ellipsoids [9, 38] or arbitrary quadratics constraints [7] have also attracted some attention in the literature. These approaches are once again either SDP based convexi cation schemes or customized algorithms.

While the SDP reformulations of the TRS and its variants can be solved using interior-point methods in polynomial time [1, 29], this approach is not practical because the worst-case complexity of these methods for solving SDPs is a relatively large polynomial and these methods do not exploit the sparsity of the data. That said, the classical TRS is closely connected to eigenvalue problems. In the speci c case of classical TRS where the objective is convex, i.e., when Q is positive semide nite, this problem becomes simply the minimization of a smooth convex function over the Euclidean ball; and thus it can be solved e ciently via iterative methods such as Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm [28]. Moreover, in the nonconvex case with $_{\min}(Q) < 0$, when the problem is purely quadratic, i.e., when $g = 0$ as well, the TRS reduces to nding the minimum eigenvalue of Q. This can be approximated in linear time by the well-known Power iteration method [21, Chapter 8.2] and can be found e ciently via the Lanczos method [21, Chapter 10.1] in practice. When $g \neq 0$, even though the problem is no longer equivalent to an eigenvalue problem and these methods cannot be applied directly, this observation has lead to the development of e cient, matrix-free algorithms that are based solely on matrix-vector products. The dual-based algorithms of [27], [33] and [35], the generalized Lanczos trust-region method of [22], and the more recent developments of [17, 18, 23, 24, 34] are examples of such iterative algorithms. In most cases, these algorithms are presented together with their convergence proofs. Nevertheless, to the best of our knowledge, the theoretical runtime evaluation of these algorithms lacks formal guarantees with the

exception of [24]. In addition, in most of these iterative methods, numerical di culties are reported in the so-called the \hard case" [27]. The hard case occurs when the linear component vector g is nearly orthogonal to the eigenspace of the smallest eigenvalue of Q. In many cases, the lack of provable worst-case convergence bounds for the TRS is attributed to the hard case. As a result, most research on speci c algorithms for the TRS thus far focuses on addressing this issue.

Recently, Hazan and Koren [24] suggested a linear-time algorithm for approximately solving the TRS within a given tolerance . Their approach relies on an e cient, linear-time solver for a speci c SDP relaxation of a feasibility version of the TRS and reduces the TRS into a series of eigenvalue computations. In their approach, they exploit the special structure of the dual problem, a one-dimensional problem for which bisection techniques can be applied, to avoid using interior-point solvers. Each dual step of their algorithm requires a single approximate maximal eigenvalue computation which takes $O\ \frac{N}{\sqrt{\ }}\log\ \frac{n}{\ }$ time, where N is the number of nonzero entries in Q and is the desired accuracy to which the maximal eigenvalue is computed. Their overall algorithm converges in $O\ \log\ \frac{\Gamma}{\ }$ iterations, where $:= \max\{2(\|Q\| + \|b\|); 1\}$ and $\|Q\|$ stands for the spectral norm of the matrix Q, i.e. the maximum absolute eigenvalue. Then a primal solution is recovered by solving a small linear program formed by the dual iterates. Finally, they provide an e cient and accurate rounding procedure for converting the SDP solution into a feasible solution to the TRS. As a consequence, their approach does not require the use of interior-point SDP solvers, bypasses the di culties noted for the hard-case of the TRS, and can exploit data sparsity (runs in time linear in the number of nonzero entries of the input). The overall complexity of their algorithm is $O\ \frac{N}{\sqrt{\ }}\log\ \frac{n}{\ }\log\ \frac{\Gamma}{\ }\ \log\ \frac{\Gamma}{\ }$.

In this paper, as opposed to the previous specialized algorithms or the SDP based approaches, we suggest a second-order cone (SOC) based approach to solve the trust region subproblem and its various variants. That is, under easy-to-verify conditions, we derive tight SOC-based convex reformulations and convex hull characterizations of sets associated with the TRS with additional constraints. Our results on convex hull representations are based on the recent developments of Burer and K l nc-Karzan [13] for representing certain nonconvex sets de ned by the intersection of SOC constraints and constraints involving general nonconvex quadratics. In particular, [13] studies nonconvex sets obtained as the intersections of the form $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q} \cap H$ where the cone $\mathcal{F}^+$ is second-order-cone representable (SOCr), $\mathcal{Q}$ is a nonconvex cone de ned by a single homogeneous quadratic, and H is an a ne hyperplane. For such sets, under several easy-to-verify conditions, [13] suggests a simple, computable convex relaxation $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is an additional SOC representable cone, and identi es several stronger conditions guaranteeing the tightness of these relaxations, i.e., $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{S} = \overline{\text{cone}}(\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q})$ and $\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{S} \cap H = \overline{\text{conv}}(\mathcal{F}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q} \cap H)$, where $\overline{\text{cone}}$ indicates the closed conic hull, and $\overline{\text{conv}}$ indicates the closed convex hull. These conditions have been further veri ed in many speci c cases; and it was shown in [13] that the classical TRS can be solved via the optimization of two second-order conic programs. Similar convex hull descriptions of SOCs intersected with general nonconvex quadratics are also studied recently in [26] under di erent assumptions.

Our contributions in this paper can be summarized as follows.

(i) We give a tight SOC-based low-complexity convex relaxation of the TRS with additional conic constraints (1). Under an easily checkable and general structural condition on the conic constraints, our Theorem 2.4 states that the convex relaxation of problem (1) obtained by simply replacing the nonconvex objective function $h(y)$ in (1) with the convex objective

$f(y) := y^\top (Q - \ _{\min}(Q) I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ _{\min}(Q)$ is tight.

(ii) Consequently, we show that our convex reformulation of the classical TRS can be solved via a single minimum eigenvalue computation and then minimizing a smooth convex quadratic over the unit ball. Thus, the overall complexity of solving the classical TRS using rst-order methods is

$$O \quad N \quad \log \quad \frac{1}{-} \quad + \frac{\ _{\max}(Q) - \ _{\min}(Q)}{\sqrt{\ }} \quad ;$$

where $\ _{\max}(Q)$ is the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix Q. In addition, we discuss implications of approximating the minimum eigenvalue computation in this scheme.

(iii) Finally, we study the convex hull of the epigraph of the TRS given by

$$X := \left\{ \begin{array}{c} y \\ t \end{array} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \\ h(y) & \leq & t \end{array} \right\} ;$$

In Theorem 3.3, under a slightly stronger condition, we provide an explicit characterization of $\mathrm{conv}(X)$ in the space of original variables. We also examine the inclusion of additional hollow constraints $y \in \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{P}$ to the TRS; and in Theorem 3.8 we give a more general condition on the hollow set $\mathcal{H}$ than the existing ones from the literature for which we can derive the convex hull.

The papers [25] and [13] are closely related to our approach due to their SOC based approaches. In particular, our convex reformulation result of the TRS is a generalization of a result in [25]. We show that the conditions from [25] imply our condition and we provide an example where our condition is satis ed but the ones in [25] are not. We also provide an example to demonstrate the necessity of our condition. In the context of the classical TRS with no additional constraints, our structural assumption is immediately satis ed. We note that [13] also give a scheme to solve the classical TRS via SOC programming. The scheme suggested in [13] is in a lifted space with one additional variable and requires solving two related SOC optimization problems. In contrast, our convex reformulation is in the space of original variables and requires only a single minimization of a smooth convex quadratic function over the unit ball.

On the algorithmic side, our transformation of the TRS requires mainly the computation of a minimum eigenvalue of Q which can be done in linear time with $O(N)$ arithmetic operations per iteration, for instance by using the Power iteration method [21, Chapter 8.2]. Due to the fact that $f(x)$ is a convex quadratic function, our convex reformulation for the classical TRS can simply be cast as a conic optimization problem. Speci cally, when there are no additional constraints, this problem becomes minimizing a smooth convex function over the Euclidean ball; and thus it is readily amenable to e cient rst-order methods. In particular, for this class of problems, given a desired accuracy level of > 0, Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm [28] involves only elementary operations such as addition, multiplication, and matrix-vector product computations and achieves the optimal iteration complexity of $O \ \frac{\ _{\max}(Q) - \ _{\min}(Q)}{\sqrt{\ }}$. In the speci c case where the problem is convex (i.e., when Q is positive semide nite), the same complexity guarantees can be obtained by applying Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent [28] to the problem. Thus, our approach can be seen as an analog of the latter algorithm to the general nonconvex case. To the

best of our knowledge, this connection with iterative methods in the context of the classical TRS has not been made before.

Moreover, convexi cation based approaches bypass the so-called `hard case' because they work directly with a convex formulations. Among these the ones more amenable to iterative methods are [5, 25, 24] and ours. This is so for our approach, as well as that of Jeyakumar and Li [25], because we work with an SOC based reformulation of the problem and it only requires the computation of a minimum eigenvalue. To the best of our knowledge iterative algorithms for SDP based relaxations of the TRS have not been studied in the literature with the exception of Hazan and Koren [24]. As compared to the approach in [24], we believe our approach is straightforward and easy to implement while it achieves a slightly better convergence guarantee in the worst case. In particular, our approach directly solves the TRS, as opposed to only solving a feasibility version of the TRS; thus we save an extra logarithmic factor. Also, the convex reformulation given by Ben-Tal and Teboulle [5] requires a full eigenvalue decomposition which is more expensive, i.e., $O(n^3)$ time, and due to its speci c structure can be solved at a slower rate by iterative methods.

Our convex hull results on the epigraph of the TRS is inspired by the recent work of Burer and K l nc-Karzan [13] on convex hulls of general quadratic cones. While the convex hull results in [13] are applicable to many problems, including a set associated with the classical TRS, we present a much more direct analysis for the TRS. There are two main bene ts of our approach. Firstly, the convex hull result for the classical TRS in [13] requires the assumption that the optimal value is nonpositive. While this is not an issue for the classical TRS since the optimal value is always negative, with the existence of additional constraints, this may no longer be true. In contrast, our analysis does not require any nonpositivity assumptions; and hence we are able to include additional conic constraints in our convex hull results under only minor conditions. Secondly, our direct analysis of the TRS allows us to bypass verifying several conditions from [13] and to work directly with a single condition which is always satis ed in the case of the classical TRS.

Several papers [2, 3, 25] exploit convexity results on the joint numerical range of quadratic mappings to explore strong duality properties of the TRS and its variants. These convexity results are based on Yakubovich's $\mathcal{S}$-lemma [19] and Dines [16], see also the survey by Polik and Terlaky [31] for a more detailed discussion. While these results as well as ours both analyze sets associated with the TRS, the actual sets in question are quite di erent. In the context of the TRS, the joint numerical range is a set of the form

$$[h(y);\ \|y\|^2;\ Ay - b] : y \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+2}:$$

Under certain conditions, this set is shown to be convex. In contrast, we study the epigraphical set X, which is nonconvex if $h(y)$ is, and give its convex hull description in the original space of variables.

Our paper is structured as follows. Section 2 details the derivation of our convex reformulation of the TRS with additional conic constraints under a structural assumption on the conic constraints. We then discuss the complexity of solving our reformulation of the classical TRS with iterative methods in Section 2.2, as well as the implications of working with an approximate minimum eigenvalue in our reformulation. In addition to our convex reformulation of the TRS with additional conic constraints, we study exact and explicit low-complexity convex hull results for its epigraph obtained by new SOC constraints in Section 3. Finally, we discuss an extension of our SOC based approach to the TRS to handle additional speci c convex constraints and nonconvex constraints given by hollows in Section 3.1.

We use Matlab notation to denote vectors and matrices. Furthermore, we let I_n be the $n \times n$ identify matrix and denote the minimum eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix Q as $\ _Q := \ _{\min}(Q)$. Our notation is mostly standard; we will de ne any particular notation upon its rst use.

2 Tight Low-Complexity Convex Reformulation of the TRS

In this section, we present an exact convex, SOC based reformulation of the trust region subproblem with additional conic constraints. We then explore algorithmic aspects of the classical TRS implied by our SOC formulation.

2.1 Deriving the Reformulation

In this section, we present an exact convex reformulation the trust region subproblem with additional conic constraints:

$$\mathrm{Opt}_h := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad h(y) := y^\top Q y + 2g^\top y : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a closed convex cone.

We start with the following simple observation about the optimal solutions of (2).

Lemma 2.1. *Any optimal solution y^* of (2) must be on the boundary of the domain $\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}$.*

Proof. Suppose $y^* \in \mathrm{int}(\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\})$. Consider $d \neq 0$ such that $Qd = \ _Q d$ and $(g + \ _Q y^*)^\top d \leq 0$ (one such d always exists since if $(g + \ _Q y^*)^\top d > 0$, we can take the negative instead). Because y^* is in the interior of the domain, there exists a small $\ > 0$ such that $y^* + \ d$ remains feasible. However, the objective function at the point $y^* + \ d$ satis es

$$h(y^* + \ d) = (y^*)^\top Q(y^*) + 2g^\top y^* + 2(g + \ _Q y^*)^\top d \ + \ _Q \|d\|^2 \ ^2 < h(y^*)$$

because $\ _Q < 0$ and d is chosen so that $(g + \ _Q y^*)^\top d \leq 0$. This contradicts the optimality of y^*; and hence any optimal solution to (2) must be on the boundary. □

For nonconvex quadratic objective functions, Lemma 2.1 points out the important role of the boundary of our feasible set $\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}$. In particular, let us examine the situation when there exists a convex function $f(y)$ such that

(i) $f(y) \leq h(y)$ for all $y \in \{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}$,

(ii) $f(y) = h(y)$ for all $y \in \mathrm{bd}(\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\})$, and

(iii) $f(y)$ has a minimizer on $\mathrm{bd}(\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\})$.

Then the convex relaxation given by

$$\mathrm{Opt}_f := \min_y \quad f(y) : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \end{array}$$

is tight. Given these observations, we ideally would like to nd a convex function $f(y) \leq h(y)$ satisfying all of the above properties. In general, this is not possible. An natural alternative is to instead consider

$$f(y) := h(y) + \ _Q(1 - \|y\|^2) = y^\top (Q - \ _Q I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ _Q: \tag{3}$$

Because $Q - \ _Q I_n \succeq 0$, that is, $Q - \ _Q I_n$ is positive semide nite, the function $f(y)$ is convex by construction. Also, $f(y) = h(y)$ if and only if $\|y\| = 1$. However, note that $f(y)$ may not be equal to $h(y)$ on all of $\mathrm{bd}(\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\})$. More precisely, we will have $f(y) < h(y)$ for $y \in \mathrm{bd}(\{y : \|y\| \leq 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}) \cap \{y : \|y\| < 1\}$. Despite this obstacle, we will present conditions for which the convex relaxation with objective $f(y)$ will still be tight.

The function $f(y)$ given in (3) exempli es a speci c way of obtaining convex functions that underestimates $h(y)$ on the domain via aggregation of $h(y)$ with the convex constraints de ning our domain. This type of aggregation based convex functions can be utilized in building convex relaxations of nonconvex optimization problems. In certain cases, such convex relaxations turn out to be tight. We demonstrate these in the following result.

Lemma 2.2. *Let C be a given set and $c_j(x)$ for $j = 1; : : : ; m$ be given functions. Suppose $h(x)$ is a given nonconvex function and $f_j(x)$ is a convex function on the domain $\mathcal{C} := \{x :\ c_j(x) \leq 0;\ \forall j = 1; : : : ; m;\ x \in C\}$ such that $f_j(x) = h(x) + \ _j c_j(x)$ for some $\ _j > 0$. Let $F(x) := \max_{j=1;:::;m} f_j(x)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Opt}_h := \min_x \{h(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\} \geq \min_x \{F(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\} =: \mathrm{Opt}_f :$$

Moreover, the relation between the optimal values of these optimization problems above holds as equality if and only if there exists an optimal solution x^* to the problem on the right-hand-side satisfying $c_j(x^*) = 0$ for some $j \in \{1; : : : ; m\}$.

Proof. First, we note that for any $x \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $c_j(x) \leq 0$ and thus for all $j \in \{1; : : : ; m\}$, $f_j(x) = g(x) + \ _j c_j(x) \leq g(x)$ because $\ _j > 0$. This establishes $\mathrm{Opt}_g \geq \mathrm{Opt}_f$.

Let x^* be an optimal solution to $\min_x \{F(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\}$. When $c_j(x^*) = 0$ for some j, we have $f_j(x^*) = g(x^*)$ which implies that x^* is also optimal to the rst problem. Now consider the case where every optimal solution $x^* \in \arg\min_x \{F(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\}$ satis es $c_j(x^*) < 0$ for all j. Note that for any $x \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying $c_j(x) < 0$ for all j, we have $F(x) < g(x)$. Let $x \in \arg\min_x \{g(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\}$. If $c_j(x) < 0$ for all j, then we have $F(x) < g(x)$ implying $\mathrm{Opt}_f < \mathrm{Opt}_g$. If $c_j(x) = 0$ for some j, then x is not optimal for the second problem; and hence $\mathrm{Opt}_g = g(x) = f_j(x) > F(x^*) = \mathrm{Opt}_f$ holds for any $x^* \in \arg\min_x \{F(x) :\ x \in \mathcal{C}\}$. □

Lemma 2.2 gives us a precise characterization for when the convex relaxation using $f(y)$ is tight.

Corollary 2.3. *Consider the convex relaxation for problem (2) given by*

$$\mathrm{Opt}_f = \min_y \quad f(y) : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \end{array} \quad ; \tag{4}$$

where $f(y)$ is defined in (3). This convex relaxation is tight if and only if there exists an optimal solution y^* to (4) such that $\|y^*\| = 1$.

Based on Corollary 2.3, we next provide a condition that guarantees us nd minimizers of the convex function $f(y)$ de ned in (3) on the boundary of the unit ball.

Condition 2.1. There exists a vector $d \neq 0$ such that $Qd = \ _Q d$, $Ad \in \mathcal{K}$ and $g^\top d \leq 0$.

Note that Condition 2.1 can be checked by solving the conic program

$$\min_d \left\{ g^\top d :\ (Q - \ _Q I_n)d = 0;\ Ad \in \mathcal{K} \right\} :$$

Remark 2.1. From the de nition of $_Q$, Condition 2.1 is immediately satis ed when $A = I_n$, $b = 0$, and $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., for the classical TRS without additional constraints. ♢

Moreover, Condition 2.1 has an immediate application in giving tight convex relations as follows.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds for the TRS given in* (2)*. Then the convex relaxation given by* (4) *is tight.*

Proof. Let y^* be an optimum solution for (4). If $\|y^*\| = 1$, then from Corollary 2.3, the result follows immediately. Hence, we assume $\|y^*\| < 1$.

Let $d \neq 0$ be the vector from Condition 2.1, thus $Qd = \ _Q d$, $Ad \in \mathcal{K}$ and $g^\top d \leq 0$. Then for any $\ > 0$, $A(y^* + \ d) - b = (Ay^* - b) + Ad \ \in \mathcal{K}$ because $\mathcal{K}$ is a convex cone and $Ad' \in \mathcal{K}$ by assumption. Because $\|y^*\| < 1$, we may increase $\ $ until $\|y^* + \ d\| = 1$ and the vector $y^* + \ d'$ is still feasible. Note $(Q - \ _Q I_n)d = 0$, so for any $\ > 0$,

$$f(y^* + \ d) = f(y^*) + 2(g^\top d) \ \leq f(y^*):$$

If $g^\top d < 0$, this violates optimality of y^* since $\ > 0$, thus $g^\top d = 0$. Then the vector $y^* + \ d$ is an alternative optimum solution to (4) satisfying $\|y^* + \ d\| = 1$. Hence, the tightness of the relaxation (4) follows from Corollary 2.3. □

We note that a similar result was implicitly proven by Jeyakumar and Li [25] under a dimensionality condition for the case of linear and conic quadratic constraints. We state the linear version of their condition below; the conic quadratic one is very similar.

Condition 2.2. Consider the case of nonnegative orthant, i.e., $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^m_+$. Suppose that the system of linear inequalities, i.e., the constraint $Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}$ satis es the requirement that $\dim(\text{Null}(Q - \ _Q I_n)) \geq n - \dim(\text{Null}(A)) + 1$.

Observation 2.5. *Condition 2.1 generalizes the dimensionality Condition 2.2 stated for linear and conic quadratic constraints.*

Proof. Suppose Condition 2.2 holds. Then $\dim(\text{Null}(A)) + \dim(\text{Null}(Q - \ _Q I_n)) \geq n+1$; thus, there must exist $d \neq 0$ which is in the intersection. This means that $Qd = \ _Q d$ and $Ad = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m_+ = \mathcal{K}$. If $g^\top d \leq 0$, then Condition 2.1 holds with the vector d. If $g^\top d > 0$, then Condition 2.1 holds with the vector $d' = -d$. □

Jeyakumar and Li [25] demonstrates that Condition 2.2 is satis ed in a number of cases related to the robust least squares and robust SOC programming problems. As a consequence of Observation 2.5, our Condition 2.1 is satis ed in these cases as well.

Remark 2.2. In contrast to the results given in [25], Theorem 2.4 holds for general conic constraints when Condition 2.1 holds. Note that such general conic constraints can be a variety of convex restrictions, and in particular, include positive semide niteness requirements. In addition, for problem data given by

$$Q = \begin{matrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{matrix} \ ; \quad g = \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{matrix} \ ; \quad A = \begin{matrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{matrix} \ ; \quad b = \begin{matrix} \frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{matrix} \ ; \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^2_+;$$

Condition 2.1 is satis ed with $d = [0; -1]$; but Condition 2.2 is not. ♢

We next discuss the necessity of Condition 2.1 via the following example.

Example 2.6. *Suppose we are given the problem data:*

$$Q = \begin{matrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{matrix} \; ; \quad g = \begin{matrix} -3 \\ 0 \end{matrix} \; ; \quad A = \begin{matrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{matrix} \; ; \quad b = \begin{matrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \end{matrix} \; ; \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^2_+ :$$

Condition 2.1 is violated. To see this, note that any d *satisfying* $Qd = \;\; {}_Q d$ *is of the form* $d = [0; d_2]$. *However,* $Ad = [d_2; -d_2]$, *so if* $d_2 \neq 0$, $Ad \notin \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^2_+$. *For this problem data,* $h(y) = y_1^2 - 2y_2^2 - 3y_1$ *and* $f(y) = 3y_1^2 - 3y_1 - 2$. *It is easy to compute the minimizers of* $f(y)$ *to be the line* $y_1 = 1{=}2$, *with value* $\mathrm{Opt}_f = -11{=}4$. *The constraints* $Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}$ *are equivalent to* $-1{=}2 \leq y_2 \leq 1{=}2$.



(a) $h(y) \leq -11{=}4 = \mathrm{Opt}_f$ (b) $h(y) \leq (1 - 6\sqrt{3}){=}2 = \mathrm{Opt}_h$

Figure 1: Contour plots of $h(y)$ over the feasible set.

Figure 1 shows that the minimizers of $h(y)$ *over the unit ball* $\|y\| \leq 1$ *lie on the boundary at* $y = [1{=}2; \pm\sqrt{3}{=}2]$. *Due to the linear constraints* $-1{=}2 \leq y_2 \leq 1{=}2$, *these points are cut off from the feasible region. As a result, any minimizer of* $f(y)$ *inside the feasible region has norm strictly less than 1. By Corollary 2.3, the relaxation* (4) *is not tight. We note that while our relaxation is not tight for this example, the SDP relaxation of [39, 12] strengthened with additional SOC-RLT inequalities is tight.* ♢

A generalization of Condition 2.1 is instrumental in giving exact convex hull characterization of the sets associated with the TRS. We discuss these further in Section 3.

2.2 Complexity of Solving the Classical TRS

We note that all of the variants of the TRS that we can provide a convex reformulation are solvable via interior point methods and standard software as long as the cone $\mathcal{K}$ has an explicit barrier function. In this section, we explore the classical TRS given by

$$\mathrm{Opt}_h = \min_y \left\{ h(y) := y^\top Q y + 2g^\top y : \; \|y\| \leq 1 \right\} \tag{5}$$

and its solution via iterative methods. The problem (5) is equivalent to the TRS with conic constraints given in (2) where $A = I_n$, $b = 0$, and $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^m$. Then by Remark 2.1, Condition 2.1

is satis ed immediately. Consequently, we have the following theorem as a simple corollary of Theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.7. *A tight convex relaxation of* (5) *is given by*

$$\mathrm{Opt}_f = \min_y \left\{ f(y) := y^\top (Q - \ _Q I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ _Q : \ \|y\| \le 1 \right\} : \tag{6}$$

The reformulation (6) is a second-order conic program and can easily be solved whenever we have $_Q$. However, computing the minimum eigenvalue of Q, $_Q$, itself is a TRS with no linear term because

$$_Q = \min_y \left\{ y^\top Q y : \ \|y\| \le 1 \right\} :$$

This computation of $_Q$ can be done in linear time via the power iteration method [21, Chapter 8.2]. Each iteration of Power method involves a matrix-vector multiplication and requires $O(N)$ time, where N is the number of nonzero entries in Q. Thus, computing $_Q$ can be done in $O \ N \log \frac{1}{}$ time.

Given $_Q$, the problem

$$\min_y \{ f(y) : \ \|y\| \le 1 \}$$

is simply minimizing a smooth convex quadratic function over the unit ball. This can be done e ciently using Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm [28]. For this class of problems, Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm achieves the optimal convergence rate of $O \ \frac{\max(Q) - \ _Q}{\sqrt{}}$. Nesterov's algorithm is a classical rst-order method; and the major computational burden in each iteration is the evaluation of the gradient of objective function. For a quadratic function, this involves simply a matrix-vector product; and hence each iteration costs $O(N)$ time. The only other main operation in each iteration of Nesterov's algorithm applied to this problem is the projection onto the Euclidean ball; and this can be done in $O(n)$ time. Consequently, Nesterov's algorithm runs in time $O \ \frac{N(\ \max(Q) - \ _Q)}{\sqrt{}}$. Thus, the total complexity of solving (6) is

$$O \ N \ \log \frac{1}{} + \frac{\max(Q) - \ _Q}{\sqrt{}} :$$

Remark 2.3. Theorem 2.7 shows that the classical TRS decomposes into two special TRS problems: one without a linear term, i.e., $g = 0$, making it a pure minimum eigenvalue problem; and the other one with a convex quadratic objective function. This once again highlights the connection between the TRS and eigenvalue problems. Furthermore, our analysis demonstrates that the notorious `hard case' reported in much of the existing TRS literature, i.e., when g is orthogonal to the eigenspace of $_Q$, is no longer an issue for our exact reformulation. ♢

2.2.1 Working with Approximate Eigenvalues

In practice, we will actually form the objective $y^\top (Q - \ I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ $ where $\ \approx \ _Q$ is an approximation. Due to this imprecision, we must ensure that the objective remains convex. To do this, suppose that we solve the minimum eigenvalue problem of Q to within -accuracy, and obtain an approximate solution $_Q - \ < \ < \ _Q + \ $. Subtracting from the inequality, we obtain $_Q - 2 \ < \ - \ < \ _Q$. To ensure the convexity of the objective, we set $\ := \ - \ < \ _Q$ which is an underestimate of $_Q$, ensuring that $Q - \ I_n \succ 0$. Let $\ := \ _Q - \ $ which satis es $0 < \ < 2$, and

$$f \ (y) := y^\top (Q - \ I_n) y + 2g^\top y = y^\top (Q - (\ _Q - \ ) I_n) y + 2g^\top y = f(y) + \ \|y\|^2 :$$

Based on this scheme, we next explore the e ects of solving

$$\min_{y} \{ f\ (y) : \ \|y\| \le 1 \} \tag{7}$$

instead of (6). Let y^* be an optimal solution to the true convex reformulation (6). Let y be an optimal solution to (7) and y be an approximate optimal solution. Then we can bound the objective value $f(y\ )$ as

$$f(y\ ) - f(y^*) = f\ (y\ ) - f\ (y^*) + \ (\|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2) \le f\ (y\ ) - f\ (y\ ) + \ ;$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|y^*\| \le 1$ and $\|y\ \| \le 1$. Thus, the convergence rate of y to the optimum of (6) is controlled by the size of and the convergence rate for solving (7).

We can also control the distance between y and y^*. Because $f\ (y)$ is a strongly convex function with parameter 2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^* - y\ \|^2 &\le f\ (y^*) - f\ (y\ ) + \nabla f\ (y\ )^\top (y\ - y^*) \\ &= f(y^*) - f(y\ ) + \nabla f\ (y\ )^\top (y\ - y^*) + \ (\|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2) \\ &\le \ (\|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2); \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the optimality of y for the problem (7), i.e., $\nabla f\ (y\ )^\top (y\ - y^*) \le 0$, and the optimality of y^* for the problem (6). Then $\|y\ \| \le \|y^*\|$. Also, from $\|y^*\| \le 1$, we deduce that if $\|y\ \| = 1$, then $y^* = y$. When $\|y\ \| < 1$, the only constraint in our domain is inactive; and thus we conclude that y is also optimum for the unconstrained minimization problem. Then the optimality conditions leads to $\nabla f\ (y\ ) = 0$. This implies that $y\ = -(Q + (\ - \ _Q) I_n)^{-1} g$. Moreover, y^* satis es the optimality condition $\nabla f(y^*)^\top (y^* - y) \le 0$ for all y such that $\|y\| \le 1$. Since our domain is the unit ball, this is true if and only if $\nabla f(y^*) = - \ y^*$, for some $\ \ge 0$. Therefore, $y^* = -(Q + (\ - \ _Q) I_n)^\dagger g$, where $A^\dagger$ denotes the pseudo-inverse of a matrix A. If we denote the ordered eigenvalues of Q by q_i and their corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors by u_i, we obtain

$$\|y\ \|^2 = \sum_{i=1} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ )^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|y^*\|^2 = \sum_{i=1} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ )^2}.$$

Note that it is possible to have $\ = 0$ and $q_i - q_n = 0$. However, this happens only when $u_i^\top g = 0$, so we follow the convention $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. After some simple algebra, we have the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2 &= \sum_{i=1} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ )^2} - \sum_{i=1} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ )^2} \\ &= (\ - \ ) \sum_{i=1} (u_i^\top g)^2 \frac{2q_i - 2q_n + \ + }{(q_i - q_n + \ )^2 (q_i - q_n + \ )^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|y^*\| \ge \|y\ \|$ and $\ > 0$, we must have $\ \ge \ $. Also, $\ \le \ $ is possible only if $y\ = y^*$. Hence,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2 &= (\ \ -\ \ )_+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (u_i^\top g)^2 \frac{2q_i - 2q_n + (\ \ -\ \ )_+ + 2}{(q_i - q_n + \ \ )^2 (q_i - q_n + (\ \ -\ \ )_+ + \ \ )^2} \\
&\le (\ \ -\ \ )_+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (u_i^\top g)^2 \frac{2q_i - 2q_n + (\ \ -\ \ )_+ + 2}{(q_i - q_n + \ \ )^4} \\
&= 2(\ \ -\ \ )_+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ \ )^3} + (\ \ -\ \ )_+^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(u_i^\top g)^2}{(q_i - q_n + \ \ )^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2 \le C\ \ + o(\ \ )$, where $C = 2(y^*)^\top (Q + (\ \ -\ \ _Q) I_n)^\dagger y^*$. Therefore,

$$\|y\ \ - y^*\|^2 \le \|y^*\|^2 - \|y\ \|^2 \le C\ \ + o(\ \ ).$$

3 Convexi cation of the Epigraph of the TRS

As opposed to the convex reformulation of the TRS and its variants discussed in Section 2.1, in this section, we employ an SOC based approach to explore stronger results on exact convex hull representation results for the epigraph of the TRS and its variants.

By de ning a new variable x_{n+2}, and moving the nonconvex function from the objective to the constraints, we can equivalently write (2) as minimizing x_{n+2} over its epigraph

$$\mathrm{Opt}_h = \min_{y; x_{n+1}; x_{n+2}} \left\{ x_{n+2} : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \le & x_{n+1} \\ x_{n+1} & = & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \\ h(y) = y^\top Q y + 2g^\top y & \le & x_{n+2} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{8}$$

Since the objective x_{n+2} is linear, optimizing over the epigraph is equivalent to optimizing over its convex hull. In this section, under slightly stronger assumptions than in Section 2.1, we give an explicit characterization of the convex hull of the following epigraphical set:

$$X := \left\{ x = [y; x_{n+1}; x_{n+2}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \le & x_{n+1} \\ x_{n+1} & = & 1 \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \\ y^\top Q y + 2g^\top y & \le & x_{n+2} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{9}$$

We follow a second-order cone based approach. That is, we focus mainly on the quadratic parts of the TRS, namely the nonconvex quadratic $y^\top Q y + 2g^\top y$ and the SOC unit ball constraint $\|y\| \le 1$ and provide the convexi cation of this set via a single new SOC constraint. Our approach is an adaptation of the one from Burer and K l nc-Karzan [13]. We start with a number of relevant de nitions and conditions and then present their main result.

A cone $\mathcal{F}^+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be *second-order-cone representable* (or $SOCr$) if there exists a matrix $0 \ne R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ and a vector $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the nonzero columns of R are linearly independent, $r \notin \mathrm{Range}(R)$, and

$$\mathcal{F}^+ = \left\{ x : \|R^\top x\| \le r^\top x \right\}; \tag{10}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the usual Euclidean norm.

Given an SOCr cone F^+, the cone $F^- := -F^+$ is also SOCr. Based on F^+ from (10), we define $A := RR^\top - rr^\top$ and consider the union $F^+ \cup (-F^-) = F^+ \cup (-(-F^+)) =: F$. Note that F corresponds to a nonconvex cone defined by the homogeneous quadratic inequality $x^\top Ax \geq 0$:

$$F := F^+ \cup (-F^-) = \left\{ x : \|R^\top x\|^2 - (r^\top x)^2 = x : x^\top Ax \geq 0 \right\};$$

and $\mathrm{apex}(F^+) = \mathrm{apex}(-F^-) = \mathrm{apex}(F) = \mathrm{Null}(A)$ where $\mathrm{Null}(A)$ denotes the nullspace of the matrix A.

The analysis of [13] is mainly based on two cones (not necessarily convex) F_0, F_1 defined by homogeneous quadratic inequalities given by the symmetric matrices A_0, A_1 and relies on the following conditions:

Condition 3.1. A_0 has at least one positive eigenvalue and exactly one negative eigenvalue.

Condition 3.2. There exists x such that $x^\top A_0 x < 0$ and $x^\top A_1 x < 0$.

Condition 3.3. Either (i) A_0 is nonsingular, (ii) A_0 is singular and A_1 is positive definite on $\mathrm{Null}(A_0)$, or (iii) A_0 is singular and A_1 is negative definite on $\mathrm{Null}(A_0)$.

The method of [13] can be roughly described as follows. For any $t \in [0,1]$, define $A_t := (1-t)A_0 + tA_1$. Then the set $F_t = \{x : x^\top A_t x \geq 0\}$ is obtained by linearly aggregating the quadratic constraints from the matrices A_0 and A_1, and immediately gives us a relaxation

$$F_0^+ \setminus F_1^- \subseteq F_0^+ \setminus F_t^-.$$

Conditions 3.1–3.3 ensure the existence of a maximal $s \in [0,1]$ such that A_t has a single negative eigenvalue for all $t \in [0,s]$, A_t is invertible for all $t \in (0,s)$, and A_s is singular—that is, $\mathrm{Null}(A_s)$ is nontrivial whenever $s < 1$. Then, for all A_t with $t \in [0,s]$, SOCr sets $F_t = F_t^+ \cup (-F_t^-)$ can be explicitly characterized (see [13, Section 5.1]). Furthermore, for x of Condition 3.2, noting that $x^\top A_t x = (1-t)\, xA_0x + t\, x^\top A_1 x < 0$, we can choose $x \in F_t^+$ for all such t without loss of generality. Then [13, Theorem 1] asserts that the closed conic hull of $F_0^+ \setminus F_1^-$, that is, $\overline{\mathrm{cone}}(F_0^+ \setminus F_1^-)$, is contained in the convex cone $F_0^+ \setminus F_s^+$ under Conditions 3.1–3.3. Let $\mathrm{int}(\cdot)$ stand for the interior of a given set. Furthermore, [13, Theorem 1] establishes $\overline{\mathrm{cone}}(F_0^+ \setminus F_1^-) = F_0^+ \setminus F_s^+$ under the following condition:

Condition 3.4. When $s < 1$, $\mathrm{apex}(F_s^+) \cap \mathrm{int}(-F_1^-) \neq \emptyset$.

Because the TRS deals with the cross-section of an SOC, the reformulation of the TRS requires a specialization of [13, Theorem 1] for the case when $F_0^+ \setminus F_1^-$ is intersected with an affine hyperplane. For this, let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given; and define the hyperplanes

$$H^0 := \{x : h^\top x = 0\}; \tag{11}$$

$$H^1 := \{x : h^\top x = 1\}. \tag{12}$$

In order to study the closed convex hull of $F_0^+ \setminus F_1^- \cap H^1$, that is, $\overline{\mathrm{conv}}(F_0^+ \setminus F_1^- \cap H^1)$, the following additional condition related to H_0 is introduced in [13]:

Condition 3.5. When $s < 1$, $\mathrm{apex}(F_s^+) \cap \mathrm{int}(-F_1^-) \cap H^0 \neq \emptyset$ or $F_0^+ \setminus F_s^+ \cap H^0 \subseteq -F_1^-$.

In particular, E_i satis es Condition 3.7 if and only if $v_i > 0$. While this is a nonconvex quadratic program, our developments from the previous section give a tight SOC reformulation for it. In addition, the S-lemma ensures that the associated semide nite relaxation is tight. Thus, Condition 3.7 can be veri ed e ciently when $\mathcal{P}$ is a union of ellipsoids.

A number of papers have studied conditions similar to Condition 3.7. Most notably, the *generalized trust region subproblem* corresponds to the case when $\mathcal{H}$ is a single lower bounded, nonconvex quadratic constraint $y^\top Dy \geq l$; this is studied in [5, 8, 32, 36, 39] for example. More recently, Yang et al. [38] study the case when the hollow set $\mathcal{P}$ is the disjoint union of ellipsoids which do not intersect the boundary of the unit ball $\{y : \|y\| \leq 1\}$. A number of these papers [32, 38, 39] show that the natural SDP relaxation is tight. As opposed to these results on tight SDP relaxations, it is shown in [7] that the general quadratic programming problem

$$\min_y \left\{ y^\top Q_0 y + 2g_0^\top y : y^\top Q_i y + 2g_i^\top y + c_i \leq 0;\ i = 1;\cdots;m \right\}$$

is polynomially solvable using a weak feasibility oracle, under the assumption that at least one quadratic constraint $y^\top Q_i y + 2g_i^\top y + c_i \leq 0$ is strictly convex. In a similar vein, [9] also study the TRS with additional ellipsoidal hollow constraints. In [9], instead of giving the convex hull, they explore conditions that allow for polynomial solvability using a combinatorial enumeration technique and thus are able to cover cases where the hollow set $\mathcal{P}$ may not be contained in the unit ball. On a related domain, [8] studies the characterization and separation of valid linear inequalities that convexify the epigraph of a convex, di erentiable function whose domain is restricted to the complement of a convex set de ned by linear or convex quadratic inequalities.

We note that these papers [5, 7, 8, 9, 32, 36, 38, 39] consider the more general case of minimizing an arbitrary quadratic objective, which can be convex, over a domain given by possibly nonconvex quadratic constraints. On the other hand, our result applies to the special case of minimizing a nonconvex quadratic over the unit ball, a convex quadratic constraint. As a result, we are able to relax the assumptions that the hollow set $\mathcal{P}$ is generated by quadratics and the ellipsoidal hollows are disjoint. Speci cally, we show that under Condition 3.7, the original SOC based reformulation of the TRS with additional conic constraints obtained by ignoring $\mathcal{H}$ is tight.

We start with the following lemma on the structure of extreme points of $\mathrm{conv}(X)$. Given a set S, we let $\mathrm{Ext}(S)$ denote the set of extreme points of S and $\mathrm{Rec}(S)$ denote its recession cone.

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be defined as in (9); and suppose that Condition 3.6 holds. Let $x = [y; 1; x_{n+2}]$ be an extreme point of $\mathrm{conv}(X)$. Then x must satisfy $\|y\| = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $\|y\| < 1$. By Corollary 3.4, $x \in \mathrm{conv}(X)$ must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\| &\leq 1 \\ x_{n+2} &\geq y^\top (Q - \ _Q I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ _Q \\ Ay - b &\in \mathcal{K}: \end{aligned}$$

Let $d \neq 0$ be the vector given by Condition 3.6. Since d satis es $Qd = \ _Q d$ and $\pm Ad \in \mathcal{K}$, for any $\in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(y + \ d)^\top (Q - \ _Q I_n)(y + \ d) + 2g^\top (y + \ d) + \ _Q \\ &= [y^\top (Q - \ _Q I_n) y + 2g^\top y + \ _Q] + 2g^\top d \\ &\leq x_{n+2} + 2g^\top d : \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|y\|^2 < 1$, there exists $\quad > 0$ su ciently small such that $\|y \pm \quad d\|^2 \leq 1$. Note that $A(y \pm \quad d) - b \in \mathcal{K}$ since $\pm Ad \in \mathcal{K}$. Now de ne the points

$$x^+ := [y + \quad d; 1; x_{n+2} + 2g^\top d \ ] \quad \text{and} \quad x^- := [y - \quad d; 1; x_{n+2} - 2g^\top d \ ]:$$

Both $x^+; x^-$ satisfy all constraints of $\text{conv}(X)$, and hence $x^+; x^- \in \text{conv}(X)$. In particular, $x^+ \neq x \neq x^-$, but $x = \frac{1}{2}(x^+ + x^-)$; and thus x cannot be an extreme point of $\text{conv}(X)$. □

Theorem 3.8. *Let X be defined in (9) and $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{P}$ be a set satisfying Condition 3.7. Assume Condition 3.6 also holds. Then*

$$\text{conv}\left\{ [y; 1; x_{n+2}] : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ y & \in & \mathcal{H} \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \\ y^\top Qy + 2g^\top y & \leq & x_{n+2} \end{array} \right\} = \text{conv}(X):$$

Proof. De ne $\mathcal{P}^+ = \quad [y; 1; x_{n+2}] : y \in \mathcal{P};\ y^\top Qy + 2g^\top y \leq x_{n+2} \quad$. Then

$$\mathcal{H}^+ = \mathbb{R}^{n+2} \setminus \mathcal{P}^+ = \{[y; 1; x_{n+2}] : y \in \mathcal{H}\} \cup \left\{ [y; 1; x_{n+2}] : y^\top Qy + 2g^\top y > x_{n+2} \right\};$$

and hence

$$X \cap \mathcal{H}^+ = \left\{ [y; 1; x_{n+2}] : \begin{array}{rcl} \|y\| & \leq & 1 \\ y & \in & \mathcal{H} \\ Ay - b & \in & \mathcal{K} \\ y^\top Qy + 2g^\top y & \leq & x_{n+2} \end{array} \right\}:$$

Now by our de nition of $\mathcal{P}^+$ and the fact that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \{y : \|y\| < 1;\ Ay - b \in \mathcal{K}\}$, we have $\text{bd}(\mathcal{P}^+) = \text{bd}(\mathcal{H}^+)$ and $\text{conv}(X) \cap \text{bd}(\mathcal{H}^+) \subseteq X$ because $\text{bd}(\mathcal{P}^+) \subseteq X$. By Lemma 3.6, we have

$$X \cap \mathcal{H}^+ \subseteq \text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+ \subseteq \text{conv}(X \cap \mathcal{H}^+);$$

and taking the convex hull of all sides gives us

$$\text{conv}(\text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) = \text{conv}(X \cap \mathcal{H}^+):$$

It remains to show that $\text{conv}(\text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) = \text{conv}(X)$. We can immediately deduce that $\text{conv}(X) \supseteq \text{conv}(\text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+)$; we next prove the reverse direction.

By Condition 3.7, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \quad y : \|y\|^2 < 1 \quad$, so by Lemma 3.7, we have $\text{Ext}(\text{conv}(X)) \cap \mathcal{P}^+ = \emptyset$; or equivalently

$$\text{Ext}(\text{conv}(X)) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^+:$$

Intersecting both sides with $\text{conv}(X)$, we obtain $\text{Ext}(\text{conv}(X)) \subseteq \text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+$. Note that $\text{conv}(X) = \text{conv}(\text{Ext}(\text{conv}(X))) + \text{Rec}(\text{conv}(X))$; so

$$\text{conv}(X) = \text{conv}(\text{Ext}(\text{conv}(X))) + \text{Rec}(\text{conv}(X)) \subseteq \text{conv}(\text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) + \text{Rec}(\text{conv}(X)):$$

Furthermore, from Corollary 3.4, it is easy to see that

$$\text{Rec}(\text{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) = \{[0; 0; x_{n+2}] : x_{n+2} \geq 0\} = \text{Rec}(\text{conv}(X)):$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{conv}(X) &\subseteq \mathrm{conv}(\mathrm{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) + \mathrm{Rec}(\mathrm{conv}(X)) \\ &= \mathrm{conv}(\mathrm{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) + \mathrm{Rec}(\mathrm{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+) \\ &= \mathrm{conv}(\mathrm{conv}(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^+):\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because $\mathrm{conv}(S) = \mathrm{conv}(S) + \mathrm{Rec}(S)$ for any set S. This gives us the result. □

3.1.2 Additional Convex Constraints

Lemma 3.6 allows us to add further convex constraints $x \in \mathcal{H}$ as long as these new constraints satisfy the following boundary condition.

Condition 3.8. The new set $\mathcal{H}$ satis es $\mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathrm{bd}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$.

Corollary 3.9. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is convex and Conditions 3.6 and 3.8 are satisfied. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{conv}(\mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}:$$

Proof. From Theorem 3.3, we have $\mathrm{conv}(\mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1) = \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1$. When $\mathcal{H}$ is convex, this immediately implies $\mathrm{conv}(\mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}$. Condition 3.8 gives us $\mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathrm{bd}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$. Then by selecting $F = \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1$, we satisfy the premise $\mathrm{conv}(F) \cap \mathrm{bd}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq F \cap \mathcal{H}$ of Lemma 3.6. From Lemma 3.6, we deduce

$$\mathrm{conv}\ \ \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}\ \ \supseteq \mathcal{F}_0^+ \cap \mathcal{F}_s \cap \mathcal{K}^+ \cap H^1 \cap \mathcal{H}:$$

□

Acknowledgments

This research is supported in part by NSF grant CMMI 1454548.

References

[1] F. Alizadeh. Interior point methods in semide nite programming with applications to combinatorial optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 5(1):13{51, 1995.

[2] A. Beck. Convexity properties associated with nonconvex quadratic matrix functions and applications to quadratic programming. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 142(1):129, 2009.

[3] A. Beck and Y. C. Eldar. Strong duality in nonconvex quadratic optimization with two quadratic constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17(3):844{860, 2006.

[4] A. Ben-Tal, L. El Ghaoui, and A. Nemirovski. *Robust Optimization*. Princeton University Press. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2009.

[5] A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. Hidden convexity in some nonconvex quadratically constrained quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 72(1):5163, 1996.

[6] D. Bertsimas, D. B. Brown, and C. Caramanis. Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM review*, 53(3):464{501, 2011.

[7] D. Bienstock. A note on polynomial solvability of the CDT problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(1):488{498, 2016.

[8] D. Bienstock and A. Michalka. Cutting-planes for optimization of convex functions over non-convex sets. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(2):643{677, 2014.

[9] D. Bienstock and A. Michalka. Polynomial solvability of variants of the trust-region subproblem. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 380{390, 2014.

[10] C. Buchheim, M. De Santis, L. Palagi, and M. Piacentini. An exact algorithm for nonconvex quadratic integer minimization using ellipsoidal relaxations. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(3):1867{1889, 2013.

[11] S. Burer. A gentle, geometric introduction to copositive optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 151(1):89{116, 2015.

[12] S. Burer and K. M. Anstreicher. Second-order-cone constraints for extended trust-region subproblems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(1):432{451, 2013.

[13] S. Burer and F. K l nc-Karzan. How to convexify the intersection of a second order cone and a nonconvex quadratic. Technical report, June 2014. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_FILE/2014/06/4383.pdf.

[14] S. Burer and B. Yang. The trust region subproblem with non-intersecting linear constraints. *Mathematical Programming*, 149(1):253{264, 2014.

[15] A. R. Conn, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint. *Trust-Region Methods*. MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2000.

[16] L. L. Dines. On the mapping of quadratic forms. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 47(6):494{498, 06 1941.

[17] J. B. Erway and P. E. Gill. A subspace minimization method for the trust-region step. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(3):1439{1461, 2010.

[18] J. B. Erway, P. E. Gill, and J. D. Gri n. Iterative methods for nding a trust-region step. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(2):1110{1131, 2009.

[19] A. L. Fradkov and V. A. Yakubovich. The S-procedure and duality relations in nonconvex problems of quadratic programming. *Vestn. LGU, Ser. Mat., Mekh., Astron*, (1):101{109, 1979.

[20] W. Gander, G. H. Golub, and U. von Matt. A constrained eigenvalue problem. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 114115:815 { 839, 1989. Special Issue Dedicated to Alan J. Ho man.

[21] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. Johns Hopkins studies in the mathematical sciences. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, London, 1996.

[22] N. I. M. Gould, S. Lucidi, M. Roma, and P. L. Toint. Solving the trust-region subproblem using the Lanczos method. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 9(2):504{525 (electronic), 1999.

[23] N. I. M. Gould, D. P. Robinson, and H. S. Thorne. On solving trust-region and other regularized subproblems in optimization. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 2(1):21{57, 2010.

[24] E. Hazan and T. Koren. A linear-time algorithm for trust region problems. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1{19, 2015.

[25] V. Jeyakumar and G. Y. Li. Trust-region problems with linear inequality constraints: Exact SDP relaxation, global optimality and robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 147(1):171{206, 2013.

[26] S. Modaresi and J. Vielma. Convex hull of two quadratic or a conic quadratic and a quadratic inequality. Technical report, November 2014. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2014/11/4641.html.

[27] J. J. More and D. C. Sorensen. Computing a trust region step. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 4(3):553{572, 1983.

[28] Y. Nesterov. A method for solving a convex programming problem with rate of convergence $O(1=k^2)$. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 27(2):372{376, 1983.

[29] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovski. *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.

[30] J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer New York, 2000.

[31] I. Polik and T. Terlaky. A survey of the s-lemma. *SIAM Review*, 49(3):371{418, 2007.

[32] T. K. Pong and H. Wolkowicz. The generalized trust region subproblem. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 58(2):273{322, 2014.

[33] F. Rendl and H. Wolkowicz. A semide nite framework for trust region subproblems with applications to large scale minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 77(2):273{299, 1997.

[34] M. Rojas, S. A. Santos, and D. C. Sorensen. A new matrix-free algorithm for the large-scale trust-region subproblem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(3):611{646, 2001.

[35] D. C. Sorensen. Minimization of a large-scale quadratic function subject to a spherical constraint. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 7(1):141{161, 1997.

[36] R. J. Stern and H. Wolkowicz. Inde nite trust region subproblems and nonsymmetric eigenvalue perturbations. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 5(2):286{313, 1995.

[37] J. F. Sturm and S. Zhang. On cones of nonnegative quadratic functions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28(2):246{267, 2003.

[38] B. Yang, K. Anstreicher, and S. Burer. Quadratic programs with hollows. Technical report, January 2016. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_FILE/2016/01/5277.pdf.

[39] Y. Ye and S. Zhang. New results on quadratic minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 14(1):245{267, 2003.

[40] H. Zhang, A. R. Conn, and K. Scheinberg. A derivative-free algorithm for least-squares minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):3555{3576, 2010.