

# Stochastic geometric programming with joint probabilistic constraints

Liu Jia

<sup>a</sup> LRI, Université Paris Sud, France

<sup>b</sup> Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

TEL:033-0668777866, E-mail: liujia@lri.fr

Joint work with Abdel Lisser<sup>a</sup>, and Zhiping Chen<sup>b</sup>

(ICSP 2016, Búzios)

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Piecewise linear approximation
- 3 Sequential convex approximation
- 4 Numerical experience
- 5 Conclusions

# Geometric programs

A geometric program can be formulated as

$$(GP) \quad \min_t g_0(t) \text{ s.t. } g_k(t) \leq 1, k = 1, \dots, K, t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M$$

with

$$g_k(t) = \sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}}, k = 0, \dots, K.$$

$\{I_k, k = 0, \dots, K\}$  is the disjoint index sets of  $\{1, \dots, Q\}$ .

We call  $c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}}$  a monomial and  $g_k(t)$  a posynomial.

# Geometric programs (Cont'd)

Geometric programs have a number of practical problems, such as

- shape optimization problems (Boyd et al., 2007)
- electrical circuit design problems (Boyd et al., 2007)
- mechanical engineering problems (Wiebking, 1977)
- economic and managerial problems (Luptáček, 1981)
- nonlinear network problems (Kim et al., 2007)

# Stochastic geometric programs

Usually,  $c_i$  are preset non-negative coefficients.

In practice use,  $c_i$  is not known deterministically but **randomly**.

Considering the randomness of  $c_i$ , one can formulate stochastic geometric programs.

Probabilistic constraints are frequently used to control the uncertainty of posynomial constraints.

# Stochastic geometric programs (Cont'd)

Stochastic geometric programs with individual probabilistic constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\text{SGPIPC}) \quad & \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M} E \left[ \sum_{i \in I_0} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \right] \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & P \left( \sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \leq 1 \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon_k \in (0, 0.5]$  is the tolerance probability for the  $k$ -th posynomial constraint.

# Stochastic geometric programs (Cont'd)

Stochastic geometric programs with joint probabilistic constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (SGPJPC) \quad & \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M} E \left[ \sum_{i \in I_0} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \right] \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & P \left( \sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \leq 1, k = 1, \dots, K \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon \in (0, 0.5]$  is the tolerance probability for all the posynomial constraints.

# Literature reviews

- Dupačová (2009) discussed the (SGPIPC) problem.
- They find a deterministic formulation of the probabilistic constraint when  $c_i$  are normally distributed and independent of each other
- However, as far as we know, there is no in-depth research works on the (SGPJPC) problem.



# Literature reviews (Cont'd)

(SGPJPC) problem are a generalization of stochastic linear program with joint probabilistic constraints

- Miller and Wagner (1965) showed that joint probabilistic constrained problems are equivalent to concave deterministic problems under some independence assumptions
- For some specific cases, such as the right hand side random vector being multivariate normally distributed, Prékopa (1995) showed that the joint probabilistic constraint problems are convex.
- Cheng and Lisser (2012) propose some approximations for linear programs with joint probabilistic constraints.

# Our work

We work on stochastic geometric program with joint probabilistic constraints.

- We suppose that  $a_{ij}$  is deterministic and  $c_i$  is normally distributed and independent of each other, i.e.,  $c_i \sim N(E_{c_i}, \sigma_i^2)$ .

The following techniques are used:

- standard variable transformation from geometric programming
- piecewise linear approximation
- Sequential convex approximation

# Equivalent formulation

As  $c_i$  are independent of each other, we have

$$P\left(\sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \leq 1, k = 1, \dots, K\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

is equivalent to

$$\prod_{k=1}^K P\left(\sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \leq 1\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

# Equivalent formulation (Cont'd)

By introducing auxiliary variables  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , (SGPJPC) problem can be equivalently transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M, y \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & E \left[ \sum_{i \in I_0} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P \left( \sum_{i \in I_k} c_i \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \leq 1 \right) \geq y_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \\ & \prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad y_k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

## Equivalent formulation (Cont'd)

As  $c_i \sim N(E_{c_i}, \sigma_i^2)$ , (SGPJPC) problem is further equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M, y \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_0} E_{c_i} \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_k} E_{c_i} \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} + \Phi^{-1}(y_k) \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{2a_{ij}}} \leq 1, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \\ & \prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad y_k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

$\Phi^{-1}(y_k)$  is the quantile of standard normal distribution  $N(0, 1)$ .

## Equivalent formulation (Cont'd)

The standard variable transformation  $r_j = \log(t_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, M$  and  $x_k = \log(y_k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$  leads to the equivalent formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}^M, x \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_0} E_{c_i} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M a_{ij} r_j \right\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_k} E_{c_i} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M a_{ij} r_j \right\} + \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M (2a_{ij} r_j + \log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)) \right\}} \\ & \leq 1, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \\ & \sum_{k=1}^K x_k \geq \log(1 - \epsilon), \quad x_k \leq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned}$$

# Property of $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$

$\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$  is also called the probit function:

$$\Phi^{-1}(z) = \sqrt{2} \operatorname{erf}^{-1}(2z - 1), \quad z \in (0, 1).$$

The inverse error function is a nonelementary function which can be represented by the Maclaurin series:

$$\operatorname{erf}^{-1}(z) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_p}{2p+1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} z \right)^{2p+1},$$

where  $\lambda_0 = 1$  and

$$\lambda_p = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_{p-1-i}}{(i+1)(2i+1)} > 0, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots$$

# Property of $\log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)$

- $\log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)$  is convex for  $1 > y_k \geq 1 - \epsilon \geq 0.5$ .
- Moreover,  $\log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)$  is always monotonic increasing.
- We can approximate  $\log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)$  by a piecewise linear function from below:

$$F_s(x_k) = d_s x_k + b_s, \quad s = 1, \dots, S,$$

such that

$$F_s(x_k) \leq \log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2), \quad \forall x_k \in [\log(1 - \epsilon), 0], \quad s = 1, \dots, S.$$



# Piecewise linear approximation

- For a practical use, we can choose the tangent lines of  $\log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{x_k})^2)$  at different points in  $[\log(1 - \epsilon), 0)$ , say  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_S$ .
- Then, we have

$$d_s = \frac{2e^{\xi_s}(\Phi^{-1})^{(1)}(e^{\xi_s})}{\Phi^{-1}(e^{\xi_s})}$$

and

$$b_s = -d_s \xi_s + \log(\Phi^{-1}(e^{\xi_s})^2), \quad s = 1, \dots, S.$$

## Theorem

Using the piecewise linear function  $F(x_k)$ , we can found an approximation of (SGPJPC) problem:

(SGP<sub>A</sub>)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}^M, x \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_0} E_{c_i} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M a_{ij} r_j \right\} \\ & \sum_{i \in I_k} E_{c_i} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M a_{ij} r_j \right\} + \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \exp \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M (2a_{ij} r_j + d_s x_k + b_s) \right\}} \\ & \leq 1, \quad s = 1, \dots, S, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \\ & \sum_{k=1}^K x_k \geq \log(1 - \epsilon), \quad x_k \leq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal value is a lower bound of the (SGPJPC) problem.  
When  $S$  goes to infinity, the approximation is tight.

# Sequential convex approximation

- Sequential convex approximation  $\Rightarrow$  upper bound
- Basic idea: decomposing into subproblems where a subset of variables is fixed alternatively.
- We first fix  $y = y^n$  and update  $t$  by solving

$$\begin{aligned}
 (SQ_1) \quad & \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^M} \sum_{i \in I_0} E_{c_i} \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in I_k} E_{c_i} \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{a_{ij}} + \Phi^{-1}(y_k^n) \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \prod_{j=1}^M t_j^{2a_{ij}}} \leq 1, \\
 & k = 1, \dots, K
 \end{aligned}$$

## Sequential convex approximation (Cont'd)

- and then fix  $t = t^n$  and update  $y$  by solving

$$\begin{aligned}
 (SQ_2) \quad & \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^K} \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_k y_k \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & y_k \leq \Phi \left( \frac{1 - \sum_{i \in I_k} E_{c_i} \prod_{j=1}^M (t_j^n)^{a_{ij}}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \prod_{j=1}^M (t_j^n)^{2a_{ij}}}} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \\
 & \prod_{k=1}^K y_k \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad y_k \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
 \end{aligned}$$

- $\phi_k$  is a chosen searching direction.

# Sequential convex approximation (Cont'd)

---

◦ **Algorithm 1** Sequential convex approximation

---

**Initialization:**

Choose an initial point  $y^0$  of  $y$  feasible for (8). Set  $n = 0$ .

**Iteration:**

**while**  $n \geq 1$  and  $\|y^{n-1} - y^n\|$  is small enough **do**

- Solve problem  $(SQ_1)$ ; let  $t^n$ ,  $\theta^n$  and  $v^n$  denote an optimal solution of  $t$ , an optimal solution of the Lagrangian dual variable  $\theta$  and the optimal value, respectively.
- Solve problem  $(SQ_2)$  with  $\phi_k = \theta_k^n \cdot (\Phi^{-1})'(y_k^n) \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I_k} \sigma_i^2 \prod_{j=1}^M (t_j^n)^{2a_{ij}}}$ ; let  $\tilde{y}$  denote an optimal solution.
- $y^{n+1} \leftarrow y^n + \tau(\tilde{y} - y^n)$ ,  $n \leftarrow n + 1$ . Here,  $\tau \in (0, 1)$  is the step length.

**end while**

**Output:**  $t^n, v^n$

---

# Sequential convex approximation (Cont'd)

## Theorem

*Algorithm 1 converges in a finite number of iterations and the returned value  $v^n$  is an upper bound for problem (SGP).*

- Problems  $(SQ_1)$  and  $(SQ_2)$  are both geometric programs, hence they can be transformed into a convex programming problem, and solved by interior point methods.

# Shape optimization problem

Consider a joint probabilistic constrained shape optimization problem,

$$\min_{h,w,\zeta} h^{-1}w^{-1}\zeta^{-1}$$

$$\text{s.t. } P\left(\left(2/A_{\text{wall}}\right)hw + \left(2/A_{\text{wall}}\right)h\zeta \leq 1, \left(1/A_{\text{flr}}\right)w\zeta \leq 1\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon,$$

$$\alpha h^{-1}w \leq 1, \left(1/\beta\right)hw^{-1} \leq 1,$$

$$\gamma w\zeta^{-1} \leq 1, \left(1/\delta\right)w^{-1}\zeta \leq 1.$$

- maximize the volume of a box-shaped structure with height  $h$ , width  $w$  and depth  $\zeta$
- with constraint on total wall area  $2(hw + h\zeta)$ , and floor area  $w\zeta$

# Settings

- Set  $\alpha = \gamma = 0.5, \beta = \delta = 2, \epsilon = 5\%$ ,
- Assume  $1/A_{wall} \sim N(0.005, 0.01)$  and  $1/A_{flr} \sim N(0.01, 0.01)$ .
- By using CVX software, we solve the approximation problems with Matlab R2012b, on a PC with a 2.6 Ghz Intel Core i7-5600U CPU and 12.0 GB RAM.
- We solve five groups of approximation problems with different number of segments,  $S$ .



# Computational results

Table 1: Computational results

S	Var. Num.	Con. Num.	Low. bound	CPU(s)	Upp. bound	CPU(s)	Gap(%)
1	133	60	0.232	0.5955	0.256	5.5274	9.655
2	184	91	0.234	0.6272	0.256	5.5274	8.789
5	283	153	0.241	0.9480	0.256	5.5274	6.044
10	513	273	0.252	1.3554	0.256	5.5274	1.713
20	973	513	0.256	1.9986	0.256	5.5274	0

Sequential convex approximation algorithm converges within 7 outer iterations

## Conclusions

- We discussed (SGPJPC) problem under normal distribution
- We find an upper bound and a lower bound for (SGPJPC) problem

## Further work

- (SGPJPC) problem under elliptical distributions, log-normal distribution et al.
- (SGPIPC) and (SGPJPC) problems with random  $a_{ij}$ .
- Distributional robust (SGPIPC) and (SGPJPC) problems with distribution uncertainty.

*Thank you!*