An argument for the second-derivative test
We turn our attention now to developing a test to distinguish among local minima, local maxima, and saddle points for critical inputs. The test involves the second partial derivatives of the function $f: \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We assume that $f$ has continuous second partial derivatives, so that the mixed partials are equal.

Let $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ be a critical input for $f$. By definition, the first partial derivatives of $f$ are zero for input $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$. Using this fact, the second-order Taylor polynomial approximation of $f$ based at $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& f(x, y)-f\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \approx \\
& \quad \frac{1}{2}\left[f_{x x}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(x-x_{0}\right)^{2}+2 f_{x y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(x-x_{0}\right)\left(y-y_{0}\right)+f_{y y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(y-y_{0}\right)^{2}\right] . \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

We want to determine the conditions under which the expression on the right side is

- positive for all $(x, y)$ near $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$, in which case $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local maximizer;
- negative for all $(x, y)$ near $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$, in which case $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local minimizer; or
- positive for some $(x, y)$ near $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ and negative for other $(x, y)$ near $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$, in which case $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local "saddlizer."

To simplify the expression on the right side of Equation (1), we introduce the notation

$$
A=f_{x x}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right), \quad B=f_{x y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right), \text { and } \quad C=f_{y y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)
$$

These are constants for a given function and a given critical input. We also let

$$
u=x-x_{0} \quad \text { and } \quad v=y-y_{0} .
$$

We focus on $(u, v)=(0,0)$, because this input in $u$ and $v$ corresponds to the critical input $(x, y)=\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$. We drop the factor of $1 / 2$ because this will not affect the sign of the expression. With this notation, the expression on the right side in Equation (1) gives the outputs of a function

$$
g(u, v)=A u^{2}+2 B u v+C v^{2} .
$$

This is a quadratic function in the input variables $u$ and $v$.
To understand the shape of the graph of $g$ near $(0,0)$, we examine slices with vertical planes containing the $z=g(u, v)$ axis. These planes are defined by lines
throught the origin in the $u v$-plane. Along the line given by $v=m u$, the outputs of $g$ are

$$
g(u, m u)=A u^{2}+2 B u(m u)+C(m u)^{2}=\left(A+2 B m+C m^{2}\right) u^{2} .
$$

From this last expression, we deduce that the concavity of the curve in the section defined by $v=m u$ is determined by the sign of

$$
A+2 B m+C m^{2}
$$

The sign clearly depends on the value of $m$, that is, on which section we have. If the concavity is positive for every value of $m$, then the critical input at $(u, v)=(0,0)$ must be a local minimizer. If the concavity is negative for every value of $m$, then the critical input must be a local maximizer. If the concavity is negative in some sections and positive in others, then the critical input corresponds to a saddle.

Note that the line $u=0$ is not included among the lines $v=m u$. The line $u=0$ is the $v$ cross section. The concavity in this section is given by $C$. Note this is consistent with the fact that the $v=0$ section has concavity given by $A$.

To distinguish among the possible cases, we look at the condition under which the concavity is zero. Let $m_{0}$ be a value for which

$$
A+2 B m_{0}+C m_{0}^{2}=0
$$

The case $C=0$ is a special situation, which you should analyze on your own. Assuming that $C$ is not equal to zero, we use the quadratic formula to solve for $m_{0}$ giving

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{0}=\frac{-2 B \pm \sqrt{4 B^{2}-4 A C}}{2 C}=\frac{-B \pm \sqrt{B^{2}-A C}}{C} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

There are two possibilities, depending on the sign of the quantity $B^{2}-A C$. If $B^{2}-A C>0$, then there are two solutions for $m_{0}$, corresponding to two sections in which the concavity is zero. These lines divide the $u v$-plane into four "wedges," and the concavity alternates from positive to negative in these wedges (see Figure 1). The critical input $(0,0)$ thus corresponds to a saddle. If $B^{2}-A C<0$, then there are no (real-valued) solutions. Hence, the concavity is positive in all sections or negative in all sections. Note that in order for this case to occur, $A$ and $C$ must have the same sign. If the signs are both positive, then all sections are concave up, meaning $(0,0)$ is a local minimizer. If the signs are both negative, then all sections are concave down, meaning $(0,0)$ is a local maximizer.

We summarize the conclusions of the preceding argument in the following theorem. The argument above constitutes a proof of the theorem. For historical reasons, the convention is to define the quantity $A C-B^{2}$ as the discriminant. We denote this as D.

Theorem 1. Suppose $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a critical input for a function $f: \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Also, suppose $f$ has continuous second partial derivatives in some open disk centered at $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$. Let

$$
D=A C-B^{2}=f_{x x}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) f_{y y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)-\left[f_{x y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right]^{2} .
$$

If $D<0$, then $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ corresponds to a saddle point. If $D>0$, then $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local extremizer. In this case, if $A>0$ and $C>0$ then $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local minimizer. If $A<0$ and $C<0$, then $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$ is a local maximizer.

Note that the theorem is silent in the case $D=A C-B^{2}=0$.


Figure 1: For a quadratic saddle there are two sections in which the concavity is zero. These correspond to the two lines through the origin in the $u v$-plane. The concavity is the same sign for all sections in the gray "wedges" and of opposite sign for all sections in the white "wedges."

