

Chapter 7 Multivariable Unconstrained Optimization: Applications

7.1 Competitive Firm Input Choices: Cobb-Douglas Technology The profit function of a firm with Cobb-Douglas production function in a competitive product and inputs markets is given by

$$f(L, K) = \cancel{A} L^\alpha K^\beta$$

$$\max \pi = pL^\alpha K^\beta - wL - rK$$

First-Order Sufficient Condition:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial L} &= \alpha p L^{\alpha-1} K^\beta - w = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial K} &= \beta p L^\alpha K^{\beta-1} - r = 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} VMP_L = w \\ VMP_K = r \end{cases}$$

where VMP_L and VMP_K are the values of marginal product of labor and capital, respectively.

Second-Order Sufficient Condition: The Hessian at the critical point (L^*, K^*) is negative definite.

$$H(L^*, K^*) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha(\alpha-1)pL^{\alpha-2}K^{\beta} & \alpha\beta pL^{\alpha-1}K^{\beta-1} \\ \alpha\beta pL^{\alpha-1}K^{\beta-1} & \beta(\beta-1)pL^\alpha K^{\beta-2} \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

Test the negative definiteness:

$$\begin{aligned} |H_1| &= \alpha(\alpha-1)pL^{\alpha-2}K^{\beta} < 0, \\ |H_2| &= |H| = \alpha(\alpha-1)pL^{\alpha-2}K^{\beta} \beta(\beta-1)pL^\alpha K^{\beta-2} \\ &\quad - (\alpha\beta pL^{\alpha-1}K^{\beta-1})^2 \\ &= \alpha(\alpha-1)\beta(\beta-1)p^2 L^{2\alpha-2} K^{2\beta-2} \\ &\quad - \alpha^2 \beta^2 p^2 L^{2\alpha-2} K^{2\beta-2} > 0, \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\alpha-1)(\beta-1) - \alpha\beta > 0, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \alpha\beta - \alpha - \beta + 1 - \alpha\beta = 1 - \alpha - \beta > 0. \end{aligned}$$


$\alpha - 1 < 0 \Rightarrow \alpha$ has to be less than 1
 if $\alpha > 1$, we do not have 2nd order suffice.


$$f(L, K) = L^\alpha K^\beta$$

$\alpha + \beta < 1$ - homog. degree < 1
 - decreasing return to scale

- That is, $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha + \beta < 1$. The production function has to be homogeneous of degree less than 1.
- That means the production function is decreasing returns to scale, and by Microeconomics, the marginal cost is positively sloped.

Comparative Static Analysis: The optimal solution (L^*, K^*) can be solved as functions of parameters α, β, w, r , and p . That is, assuming α and β are unchanged, at a given particular (w_0, r_0, p_0) the first-order sufficient conditions can be written as an implicit functions of (L^*, K^*) as follows.





$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) &= \begin{bmatrix} f^1(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \\ f^2(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0} - w_0 \\ \beta p_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-1} - r_0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

The Implicit Function Theorem applies here because *neg def ⇒ nonsingular*.

$$\nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} L \\ K \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) = \mathbf{H}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0),$$

is nonsingular because the Hessian is negative definite. We have

- a) there are functions $L(w, r, p)$ and $K(w, r, p)$ such that

$$\mathbf{f}(L(w, r, p), K(w, r, p); w, r, p) = \mathbf{0},$$

(w - w_0) < ε
|r - r_0| < ε
|p - p_0| < ε
- for $|w - w_0| < \varepsilon$, $|r - r_0| < \varepsilon$, and $|p - p_0| < \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.
- b) $L(w_0, r_0, p_0) = L^*$ and $K(w_0, r_0, p_0) = K^*$
- c) The gradient

exof. $\nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \begin{bmatrix} L(w_0, r_0, p_0) \\ K(w_0, r_0, p_0) \end{bmatrix} = - \left[\nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} L \\ K \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \right]^{-1} \nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0)$

2x3 $= - \mathbf{H}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0)^{-1} \nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0)$

$$= - \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0(\alpha_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-2} K^{*\beta_0} & \alpha_0\beta_0 p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0-1} \\ \alpha_0\beta_0 p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0-1} & \beta_0(\beta_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-2} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & \alpha_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0} \\ 0 & -1 & \beta_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and by Cramer's Rule

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L(w_0, r_0, p_0)}{\partial w} &= - \frac{\begin{vmatrix} -1 & \alpha_0\beta_0 p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0-1} \\ 0 & \beta_0(\beta_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-2} \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} \alpha_0(\alpha_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-2} K^{*\beta_0} & \alpha_0\beta_0 p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0-1} \\ \alpha_0\beta_0 p_0 L^{*\alpha_0-1} K^{*\beta_0-1} & \beta_0(\beta_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-2} \end{vmatrix}} \\ &= \frac{\beta_0(\beta_0 - 1)p_0 L^{*\alpha_0} K^{*\beta_0-2}}{|\mathbf{H}|} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

We can similarly find all other partial derivatives.

HW Baldani, p. 216, #8.2, 8.3, 8.4

7.2 Competitive Firm Input Choices: General Production Technology

The same firm as in 7.1 but

now with a generic production function $f(L, K)$ will maximize the profit function

$$\max \pi = pf(L, K) = wL - rK.$$

First-Order Sufficient Condition:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial L} = pf_L(L^*, K^*) - w = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial K} = pf_K(L^*, K^*) - r = 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} VMP_L = w \\ VMP_K = r \end{cases}$$

Second-Order Sufficient Condition:

$$\mathbf{H}(L^*, K^*) = \begin{bmatrix} pf_{LL} & pf_{LK} \\ pf_{KL} & pf_{KK} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{H}_1| &= pf_{LL} < 0 \\ |\mathbf{H}_2| &= |\mathbf{H}| = p^2(f_{LL}f_{KK} - f_{LK}^2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

H is nonsingular.

By Implicit Function Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \begin{bmatrix} L(w_0, r_0, p_0) \\ K(w_0, r_0, p_0) \end{bmatrix} \\ = - \left[\nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} L \\ K \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \right]^{-1} \nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \\ = -\mathbf{H}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0)^{-1} \nabla_{\begin{bmatrix} w \\ r \\ p \end{bmatrix}} \mathbf{f}(L^*, K^*; w_0, r_0, p_0) \\ = - \begin{bmatrix} p_0 f_{LL} & p_0 f_{LK} \\ p_0 f_{KL} & p_0 f_{KK} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & f_L \\ 0 & -1 & f_K \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and by Cramer's Rule

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L(w_0, r_0, p_0)}{\partial w} &= - \frac{\begin{vmatrix} -1 & p_0 f_{LK} \\ 0 & p_0 f_{KK} \end{vmatrix}}{\begin{vmatrix} p_0 f_{LL} & p_0 f_{LK} \\ p_0 f_{KL} & p_0 f_{KK} \end{vmatrix}} \\ &= \frac{p_0 f_{KK}}{|\mathbf{H}|} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

- The demand for labor has a negative slope with respect to wage rate if the capital exhibits diminishing returns-- $f_{KK} < 0$ means the slope of the marginal product is negative.

HW Determine the signs of $\frac{\partial L(w_0, r_0, p_0)}{\partial r}$ and $\frac{\partial L(w_0, r_0, p_0)}{\partial p}$.

HW Baldani, p. 216, #8.5.

7.3 Multi-plant Firm A firm with n plants. *- one market.*

$TC_i(q_i) = C_i(q_i)$, q_i = quantity produced at plant i .

$$TR = R(Q) = P(Q)Q$$

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i$$

$$\pi(\mathbf{q}) = R(Q) - \sum_{i=1}^n C_i(q_i) = P(Q)Q - \sum_{i=1}^n C_i(q_i)$$

$\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial q_i}$ → $\pi_i(\mathbf{q}^*) = \underbrace{P'(Q^*)Q^* + P(Q^*)}_{MR} - \underbrace{C'_i(q_i^*)}_{MC_i} = 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$

The last equality is the first-order sufficient condition and it implies that the marginal cost of each plant is equal to the marginal revenue, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} C'_1(q_1^*) &= C'_2(q_2^*) = \dots = C'_n(q_n^*) \\ &= P'(Q^*)Q^* + P(Q^*) \\ &= R'(Q^*) = MR(Q^*) \end{aligned}$$

The Hessian is given by

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*) = \begin{bmatrix} R'' - C''_1 & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' - C''_2 & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & \dots & R'' & R'' - C''_n \end{bmatrix}$$

where $R'' = P''(Q^*)Q^* + 2P'(Q^*)$. The Hessian is negative definite if,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{H}_1| &= R'' - C''_1 < 0 \\ |\mathbf{H}_2| &= (R'' - C''_1)(R'' - C''_2) - R''^2 \\ &= C''_1 C''_2 - R''(C''_1 + C''_2) > 0 \\ (-1)^i |\mathbf{H}_i| &> 0, i = 3, 4, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

$R = TR = P(Q) \cdot Q.$

$= P \cdot Q$

$R' = MR = P \checkmark$

$R'' = 0.$

For perfect competition, $R'' = 0$ and

P is given constant.

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*) = \begin{bmatrix} -C''_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -C''_2 & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -C''_n \end{bmatrix}$$

which is negative definite if $C''_i > 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$

For monopoly, this is not necessarily true if the plants have increasing return to scale where $(C''_i < 0).$

$C''_i > 0$

$\frac{d MC_i}{dq_i} > 0.$
 MC_i is strictly increasing

HW Show that the Hessian \

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*) = \begin{bmatrix} R'' - C_1'' & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' - C_2'' & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & \dots & R'' & R'' - C_n'' \end{bmatrix}$$


neg def.
 $\Leftrightarrow -\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*)$ pos def.
 $d\mathbf{l}^T \mathbf{H} d\mathbf{l} < 0 \quad \forall d\mathbf{l} \neq \mathbf{0}$
 $d\mathbf{l}^T (-\mathbf{H}) d\mathbf{l} > 0$ is $-\mathbf{H}$ pos def.

is not necessarily negative definite if $C_i'' < 0$, for some $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. (Hint: Show for $n = 2$)

HW Show that the Hessian $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*)$ above is negative definite if $R_i'' < 0$ and $C_i'' > 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Solution: If we assume instead that $R_i'' > 0$ and $C_i'' > 0$ then we can equivalently show that

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*) = \begin{bmatrix} R'' + C_1'' & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' + C_2'' & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & \dots & R'' & R'' + C_n'' \end{bmatrix}$$



is positive definite. We will prove by induction. If $n = 2$, then $|\mathbf{H}_1| = R'' + C_1'' > 0$ and

$$|\mathbf{H}_2| = (R'' + C_1'')(R'' + C_2'') - R''^2 = C_1''C_2'' + R''(C_1'' + C_2'') > 0.$$

Note that $|\mathbf{H}_2| > 0$ even when $C_1'' > 0$. We can then state the induction hypothesis that $|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*)_{n \times n}| > 0$ when $R_i'' > 0, C_i'' > 0, i = 2, 3, \dots, n$. We need to prove

$$|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*)_{(n+1) \times (n+1)}| = \begin{vmatrix} R'' + C_1'' & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' + C_2'' & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & \dots & R'' & R'' + C_{n+1}'' \end{vmatrix} > 0$$

By a property of determinant,

$$|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}^*)_{(n+1) \times (n+1)}| = \begin{vmatrix} C_1'' & R'' & \dots & \dots & R'' \\ -C_2'' & R'' + C_2'' & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & R'' & \ddots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & R'' + C_n'' & R'' \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & R'' & R'' + C_{n+1}'' \end{vmatrix} > 0$$

- Induction**
- 3 Steps.
- 1) Show the easiest case of $n=1$ $n=2$
 - 2) State Induction Hypothesis.
 - 3) Show the case of $n+1$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= C_1'' \begin{vmatrix} R'' + C_2'' & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' + C_3'' & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' & R'' + C_{n+1}'' & \dots \end{vmatrix} \\
 &+ (-1)^{2+1} (-C_2'') \begin{vmatrix} R'' + C_3'' & R'' & \dots & R'' \\ R'' & R'' + C_3'' & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & R'' \\ R'' & \dots & R'' & R'' + C_{n+1}'' \end{vmatrix}
 \end{aligned}$$

Handwritten notes: $n \times n$, > 0 , still positive.

which is positive by the induction hypothesis $n \times n$.

- If we assume the functional forms of TR and TC explicitly with parameters, we can perform the sensitivity analysis using the Implicit Function Theorem.

HW Baldani, p. 217, #8.9

7.4 Multi-Market Monopoly A monopoly has two separate markets with similar demands $D_1(q_1) = \alpha P(q_1)$ and $D_2(q_2) = P(q_2)$, where q_1 and q_2 are quantities sold in the two markets. Assume that $\alpha > 1$ so that market 1 is more important. The total revenues earned are:

$$\begin{cases} R_1(q_1) = \alpha P(q_1)q_1 \\ R_2(q_2) = P(q_2)q_2 \end{cases}$$

The total cost of output $Q = q_1 + q_2$ is

$$TC(Q) = C(Q) + tq_2$$

Handwritten note: transportation cost to mkt 2.

where t is the extra cost per unit to sell in market 2. The profit function is thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi(q_1, q_2) &= R_1(q_1) + R_2(q_2) - C(Q) - tq_2 \\
 &= \alpha P(q_1)q_1 + P(q_2)q_2 - C(Q) - tq_2
 \end{aligned}$$

First-order Sufficient Condition:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_1(q_1^*, q_2^*) &= R_1'(q_1^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) \\
 &= \alpha P'(q_1^*)q_1^* + \alpha P(q_1^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) = 0 \\
 \pi_2(q_1^*, q_2^*) &= R_2'(q_2^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) - t \\
 &= P'(q_2^*)q_2^* + P(q_2^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) - t = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

We have $q_1^* > q_2^*$. (Why?)

Second-order Sufficient Condition: The Hessian is given by

$$\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*) = \begin{bmatrix} R_1'' - C'' & -C'' \\ -C'' & R_2'' - C'' \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1'' &= \alpha P''(q_1^*)q_1^* + 2\alpha P'(q_1^*) \\ R_2'' &= P''(q_2^*)q_2^* + 2P'(q_2^*). \end{aligned}$$

Test of negative definiteness of the Hessian: If $R_1'' < 0$, $R_2'' < 0$ and $C'' > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{H}_1(q_1^*, q_2^*)| &= R_1'' - C'' < 0 \\ |\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*)| &= (R_1'' - C'')(R_2'' - C'') - C''^2 \\ &= R_1''R_2'' - R_1''C'' - R_2''C'' > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Comparative Static Analysis: Write the first-order condition as implicit functions.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\pi(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0) &= \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0) \\ \pi_2(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 P'(q_1^*)q_1^* + \alpha_0 P(q_1^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) \\ P'(q_2^*)q_2^* + \alpha_0 P(q_2^*) - C'(q_1^* + q_2^*) - t_0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming $\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}^2\pi(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0) = \mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)$ being a nonsingular matrix, the Implicit Function Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{[\alpha, t]} \mathbf{q}(\alpha_0, t_0) &= -[\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}^2\pi(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)]^{-1} \nabla_{[\alpha, t]} (\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}\pi(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)) \\ &= -\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} P'(q_1^*)q_1^* + P(q_1^*) & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= -\begin{bmatrix} R_1'' - C'' & -C'' \\ -C'' & R_2'' - C'' \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_1'/\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

By Cramer's Rule, if $P'(q_1^*)q_1^* + P(q_1^*) > 0$ and $C'' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial q_1^*}{\partial \alpha} &= -\frac{\begin{vmatrix} R_1' & -C'' \\ \alpha & R_2'' - C'' \end{vmatrix}}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|} = -\frac{R_1' (R_2'' - C'')}{\alpha |\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|} > 0, \\ \frac{\partial q_1^*}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\begin{vmatrix} 0 & -C'' \\ -1 & R_2'' - C'' \end{vmatrix}}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|} = \frac{C''}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$dq_1^* = \frac{\partial q_1^*}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha + \frac{\partial q_1^*}{\partial t} dt$$

$$= \frac{-\frac{R'_1}{\alpha}(R''_2 - C'')d\alpha + C''dt}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|}$$

and similarly,

$$dq_2^* = \frac{\partial q_2^*}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha + \frac{\partial q_2^*}{\partial t} dt = \frac{\frac{R'_1}{\alpha} C'' d\alpha + (R''_1 - C'') dt}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|}$$

We have

$$dQ^* = dq_1^* + dq_2^* = \frac{-\frac{R'_1}{\alpha} R''_2 + R''_1 dt}{|\mathbf{H}(q_1^*, q_2^*; \alpha_0, t_0)|}$$

HW Baldani, p. 217, #8.10, 8.11

7.5 Statistical Estimation: Linear Regression

Recall matrix differentiation,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{c}}^T \mathbf{x} &= \mathbf{c} \\ \nabla_{\alpha} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} &= 2\alpha \mathbf{x} \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} &= 2\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{A} is a symmetric matrix.

Linear regression model: *Least Squares* The dependent variable y is determined linearly by the independent variables $x_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, with some random error ε . Suppose there are n observations, we have for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i^1 + \beta_2 x_i^2 + \dots + \beta_k x_i^k + \varepsilon_i$$

where $\beta_j, j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$, are unknown parameters. In matrix form,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$$

\mathbf{y} is $n \times 1$, \mathbf{X} is $n \times (k+1)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is $(k+1) \times 1$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is $n \times 1$.
 $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}}$

where $\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k+1)}$. If we estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by some $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, the estimate of \mathbf{y} is thus $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}$, and the error of estimation of \mathbf{y} is $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}$. The determination of \mathbf{b} by the Least Squares Method is the choice of \mathbf{b} such that the sum of squares of the error of

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}}$$

estimation $SSR = \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{e} = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2$ is minimized. The minimization problem is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}} f(\mathbf{b}) &= \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})^T (\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}^1 \\ &= (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b})^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}) \\ &= \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - 2\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}. \end{aligned}$$

By the first-order sufficient condition, the critical solution is the solution that

$$\nabla f(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) = -2\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} + 2\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{0}$$

and thus the critical solution is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y},$$

and the second-order sufficient condition requires that

$$\nabla^2 f(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) = 2\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}, \text{ - pos def.}$$

be positive definite. The square symmetric matrix $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is always positive semidefinite. Why? Now, if it is also positive definite, the solution $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$, as given by the first-order sufficient condition is uniquely defined because $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1}$ exists (Why?), is a strict local minimum point. Can we say that is a strict global minimum?

$\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} = [\]$
($k+1$) \times n $n \times (k+1)$ ($k+1 \times k+1$)
pos def?

We can show that if $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is nonsingular $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1}$ exists and is unique.

HW What will happen if one of the independent variable is just a linear combination of some of the other independent variable? For example, what if $x^1 = 1.5x^2$?

H.w. Show that for any matrix $\mathbf{X}_{n \times (k+1)}$

$\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is positive semidefinite.

Under what condition $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is pos def.