Math 16B – S06 – Supplementary Notes 3 The Lagrange Multiplier Method

The method of Lagrange multipliers is often effective in finding solutions of constrained extremum problems. In the two-variable version of such a problem, one is given a function f(x, y), and one wishes to maximize it or minimize it under the constraint that another function g(x, y)vanishes (i.e., one wishes to find a maximum or minimum of f on the level curve g(x, y) = 0). As explained in our textbook (where you will also find examples), Lagrange's method proceeds as follows. One introduces a third variable λ (traditionally called a Lagrange multiplier), and one defines a function $F(x, y, \lambda)$ of three variables by

$$F(x, y, \lambda) = f(x, y) + \lambda g(x, y).$$

The basic theorem underlying the method states that if f(x, y) attains a maximum or a minimum at the point (a, b) under the constraint g(x, y) = 0, then there is a value c of λ such that (a, b, c) is a critical point of F:

(1)
$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(a,b,c) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(a,b,c) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda}(a,b,c) = 0$$

Thus, in principle, one can find the candidates for the desired constrained extremum of f by solving the three simultaneous equations (1) for a, b, c. In the nicest situations there will be only one solution, which gives immediately the sought-for extremum (a, b) of f.

The aim here is to explain the geometric underpinning of the method. So assume f(x, y) does have a maximum or a minimum at (a, b) under the constraint g(x, y) = 0. We shall assume further that (a, b) is a critical point of neither f nor g, the most common case. Note first that the partial derivatives of F are given by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + \lambda \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} + \lambda \frac{\partial g}{\partial y}, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda} = g.$$

The third equality in (1), therefore, just says that g(a, b) = 0, i.e., that (a, b) satisfies the constraint. The other two equalities in (1) can be written as

(2)
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(a,b) = -c\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(a,b), \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(a,b) = -c\frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(a,b).$$

What do these mean?

To shorten the notation, let's define

$$\alpha = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(a,b), \quad \beta = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(a,b), \quad \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(a,b), \quad \tilde{\beta} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(a,b),$$

Rewritten in the new notation, (2) becomes

(3)
$$\alpha = -c\tilde{\alpha}, \quad \beta = -c\tilde{\beta}$$

Suppose for definiteness that (a, b) is a maximum of f(x, y) under the constraint g(x, y) = 0, and let m = f(a, b). Consider the level curve f(x, y) = m (see Figure 3.1). It separates the region where f is larger than m from the region where f is smaller than m. On the level curve g(x, y) = 0 the function f takes no value larger than m, so that curve, although it touches the level curve f(x, y) = m at (a, b), cannot pass through the latter curve; it must stay in the region where $f(x, y) \leq m$. From this it follows that the two curves f(x, y) = m and g(x, y) = 0 share a common tangent line at the point (a, b) (see the figure).

The tangent lines at (a, b) to the curves f(x, y) = m and g(x, y) = 0 have the respective equations

(4)
$$\alpha(x-a) + \beta(y-b) = 0, \quad \tilde{\alpha}(x-a) + \tilde{\beta}(y-b) = 0$$

(see Supplementary Notes 1). Now simple algebraic reasoning (left to the reader) shows that the two equations (4) define the same line if and only if the coefficients α, β are proportional to the coefficients $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}$, i.e., there is a number γ such that $\alpha = \gamma \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\beta = \gamma \tilde{\beta}$. This gives (3) with $c = -\gamma$.

To summarize, the first two equalities in (1) just say that the level curves f(x, y) = f(a, b) and g(x, y) = 0 have a common tangent line at the point (a, b).