

School of Mathematics



Linear Algebra in IPMs

Jacek Gondzio

Email: `J.Gondzio@ed.ac.uk`

URL: `http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/~gondzio`

Outline

- **Linear Algebra in IPMs for LP, QP and NLP**
- **Definite, Indefinite and Quasidefinite Systems**
- **Cholesky factorization**
- **Exploiting Sparsity in Gaussian Elimination**
 - Minimum degree ordering
 - Nested dissection
- **Very Large Scale Optimization**
 - implicit inverse representation
 - from sparsity to block-sparsity
 - structured optimization problems
 - **OOPS**: Object-Oriented Parallel Solver
- **Applications**
 - financial planning problems (nonlinear risk measures)
 - data mining (nonlinear kernels in SVMs)

Summary: From LP to QP

Newton direction

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & 0 \\ -Q & A^T & I \\ S & 0 & X \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \\ \Delta s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_p \\ \xi_d \\ \xi_\mu \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_p &= b - Ax, \\ \xi_d &= c - A^T y - s + Qx, \\ \xi_\mu &= \mu e - XSe. \end{aligned}$$

Augmented system

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q & -\Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_d - X^{-1}\xi_\mu \\ \xi_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Conclusion:

QP is a natural extension of LP.

IPMs: LP vs QP

Augmented system in **LP**

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_d - X^{-1}\xi_\mu \\ \xi_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Eliminate Δx from the first equation and get normal equations

$$(A\Theta A^T)\Delta y = g.$$

IPMs: LP vs QP

Augmented system in **QP**

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q & -\Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_d - X^{-1}\xi_\mu \\ \xi_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Eliminate Δx from the first equation and get normal equations

$$(A(Q + \Theta^{-1})^{-1}A^T)\Delta y = g.$$

One can use normal equations in LP, but not in QP. Normal equations in QP may become almost completely dense even for sparse matrices A and Q . Thus, in QP, usually the indefinite augmented system form is used.

KKT systems in IPMs for LP, QP and NLP

$$\mathbf{LP} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{QP} \quad \begin{bmatrix} Q + \Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{NLP} \quad \begin{bmatrix} Q(x, y) + \Theta_P^{-1} & A(x)^T \\ A(x) & -\Theta_D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$

Cholesky factorization

Compute a decomposition

$$LDL^T = A\Theta A^T.$$

where:

L is a lower triangular matrix; and

D is a diagonal matrix.

Cholesky factorization is simply the **Gaussian Elimination** process that exploits two properties of the matrix:

- symmetry;
- positive definiteness.

Use of Cholesky factorization

Replace the **difficult** equation

$$(A\Theta A^T) \cdot \Delta y = g,$$

with a sequence of **easy** equations:

$$\begin{aligned} L \cdot u &= g, \\ D \cdot v &= u, \\ L^T \cdot \Delta y &= v. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} g &= Lu \\ &= L(Dv) \\ &= LD(L^T \Delta y) \\ &= (LDL^T) \Delta y \\ &= (A\Theta A^T) \Delta y. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetric Gaussian Elimination

Let $H \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} & \cdots & h_{1m} \\ h_{21} & h_{22} & \cdots & h_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_{m1} & h_{m2} & \cdots & h_{mm} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By applying Gaussian Elimination to it, we can represent it in the following form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ l_{21} & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ l_{m1} & l_{m2} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & d_{22} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & l_{21} & \cdots & l_{m1} \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & l_{m2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Symmetric GE: Examples

Example 1:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 2 \\ -1 & 3 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 9 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 2:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 5 & 7 \\ -1 & 7 & 22 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Existence of LDL^T factorization

Lemma: The decomposition $H = LDL^T$ with $d_{ii} > 0, \forall i$ exists iff H is positive definite (PD).

Proof:

Part 1 (\Rightarrow)

Let $H = LDL^T$ with $d_{ii} > 0$. Take any $x \neq 0$ and let $u = L^T x$. Since L is a unit lower triangular matrix it is nonsingular so $u \neq 0$ and

$$x^T H x = x^T L D L^T x = u^T D u = \sum_{i=1}^m d_{ii} u_i^2 > 0.$$

Proof (cont'd):Part 2 (\Leftarrow)Proof by induction on dimension of H .For $m = 1$. $H = h_{11} = d_{11} > 0$ iff H is PD.Assume the result is true for $m = k - 1 \geq 1$.

Let $H = \begin{bmatrix} W & a \\ a^T & q \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{R}^{k \times k}$ be given $k \times k$ positive definite matrix with $W \in \mathcal{R}^{(k-1) \times (k-1)}$, $a \in \mathcal{R}^{k-1}$ and $q \in \mathcal{R}$. Note first that since H is PD, W is also PD. Indeed for any $(x, 0) \in \mathcal{R}^k$ we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} x^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W & a \\ a^T & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = x^T W x > 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{R}^{k-1}, x \neq 0.$$

From inductive hypothesis we know that $W = LDL^T$ with $d_{ii} > 0$.

Let

$$\begin{bmatrix} W & a \\ a^T & q \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ l^T & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L^T & l \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where l is the solution of equation $(LD)l = a$ (it is well defined since L and D are nonsingular) and d is given by $d = q - l^T D l$.

Hence matrix $H = \begin{bmatrix} W & a \\ a^T & q \end{bmatrix}$ has an $\bar{L}\bar{D}\bar{L}^T$ decomposition.

It remains to prove that $d > 0$. Consider the vector

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} -L^{-T}l \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since H is positive definite, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< x^T H x \\ &= [-l^T L^{-1}, 1] \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ l^T & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L^T & l \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -L^{-T}l \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= [0, 1] \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = d, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

Definite & Indefinite Systems

Cholesky factorization fails for indefinite matrix.

Example 1: Negative pivot $d_{22} < 0$.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2/3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 2: $d_{11} = 0$. Can't even start the elimination.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 5 \end{bmatrix} = ???$$

Definite & Indefinite Systems (cont'd)

IPMs:

For indefinite *augmented system*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r \\ h \end{bmatrix}.$$

one needs to use some **special tricks**.

For positive definite *normal equations*

$$(A\Theta A^T)\Delta y = g.$$

one can compute the **Cholesky factorization**.

Major Cholesky



Andre-Louis Cholesky (1875-1918)

Major of French Army,
descendant from the Cholewski family of Polish immigrants.

Read: **M. A. Saunders**, Major Cholesky would feel proud,
ORSA Journal on Computing, vol 6 (1994) No 1, pp 23–27.

Symmetric Factorization

Two step solution method:

- factorization to LDL^T form,
- backsolve to compute direction Δy .

A symmetric nonsingular matrix H is **factorizable** if there exists a diagonal matrix D and unit lower triangular matrix L such that $H = LDL^T$.

A symmetric matrix H is **strongly factorizable** if for any permutation matrix P a factorization $PHP^T = LDL^T$ exists.

The general symmetric indefinite matrix **is not factorizable**.

Factoring Indefinite Matrix

Two options are possible:

1. Replace diagonal matrix D with a block-diagonal one and allow 2×2 (indefinite) pivots

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & a \\ a & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a \\ a & d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence obtain a decomp. $H = LDL^T$ with **block-diagonal** D .

2. Regularize indefinite matrix to produce a **quasidefinite** matrix

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} -E & A^T \\ A & F \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$E \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive definite,

$F \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ is positive definite, and

$A \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ has full row rank.

Quasidefinite (QDF) Matrices

Symmetric matrix is called **quasidefinite** if

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} -E & A^T \\ A & F \end{bmatrix},$$

where $E \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ and $F \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ are positive definite, and $A \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ has full row rank.

QDF matrices are **strongly factorizable**. For any quasidefinite matrix there exists a **Cholesky-like** factorization

$$K = LDL^T,$$

where

D is **diagonal** but **not positive definite**:
 n negative pivots; and m positive pivots.

From Indefinite to Quasidefinite

Indefinite matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} -Q - \Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

in IPMs can be converted to a quasidefinite one.

Regularize indefinite matrix to produce a **quasi-definite** matrix.

Use **dynamic regularization**

$$\bar{H} = \begin{bmatrix} -Q - \Theta^{-1} & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -R_p & 0 \\ 0 & R_d \end{bmatrix},$$

where $R_p \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ and $R_d \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times m}$ are the *primal* and *dual* regularizations. For any quasidefinite matrix there exists a Cholesky-like factorization

$$\bar{H} = LDL^T,$$

where D is **diagonal** but **not positive definite**:
 n negative pivots and m positive pivots.

Large Problems are Sparse

Suppose a large LP is solved: $m, n \sim 10^4 - 10^6$.

Can all variables be linked at the same time?

No, usually only a subset of them is linked.

There are usually only *several* nonzeros per row in an LP.

Large problems are always **sparse**.

Exploiting sparsity in computations leads to huge savings.

Exploiting sparsity means mainly avoiding doing useless computations: the computations for which the result is known, as for example multiplications with zero.

Exploiting sparsity: Example

$$Ax = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 5 & -1 \\ 3 & 0 & 3 & 8 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 5 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It requires computing

$$2 \cdot A_{.1} + 5 \cdot A_{.3} - 2 \cdot A_{.6}$$

and involves only five multiplications and five additions.

We say that this matrix-vector multiplication needs 5 flops.

A **flop** is a *floating point operation*:

$$x := x + a \cdot b.$$

General Sparse Systems

Single step in Gaussian Elimination

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p} & v^T \\ u & A_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

produces the following Schur complement

$$A_1 - p^{-1}uv^T.$$

Markowitz Pivot Choice

Let r_i and $c_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be numbers of nonzero entries in row and column i , respectively. The elimination of the pivot a_{ij} needs

$$f_{ij} = (r_i - 1)(c_j - 1)$$

flops to be made. This step creates at most f_{ij} new nonzero entries in the Schur complement.

General Sparse Systems

The effect of pivot elimination on the sparsity pattern

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	p			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
2		<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
3	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>				
4			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>			
5	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>			
6				<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>		
7		<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>			
8	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	

pivot : **p**
nonzero : *x*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1	p			x	x		x	x	
2		<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
3	x	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	f	f		f	f	
4			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>			
5	x			f	f	<i>x</i>	f	f	
6				<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>		
7		<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>			
8	x			f	f		f	f	

pivot : **p**
nonzero : *x*
fill – in : **f**

Markowitz Pivot Choice: Example

Markowitz: Choose the pivot with $\min_{i,j} f_{ij}$.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
2		<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
3	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>			
4			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>		
5	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		
6				p				<i>x</i>
7		<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		
8	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	<i>x</i>			x	<i>x</i>		f	<i>x</i>
2		<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
3	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>			
4			<i>x</i>	x		<i>x</i>	f	
5	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		
6				p				x
7		<i>x</i>			<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		
8	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>

Exploiting Sparsity in Cholesky Factorization

Matrix H and its Cholesky Factor

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} & x & & \\ \mathbf{x} & & x & \\ \mathbf{x} & & & x \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} x & & & \\ x & x & & \\ x & x & x & \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix}$$

Reordered Matrix H and its Cholesky Factor

$$PHP^T = \begin{bmatrix} x & & & \\ & x & & \\ & & x & x \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} x & & & \\ & x & & \\ & & x & \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix}$$

From Sparsity to Block-Sparsity:

Sparse Matrix

Block-Sparse Matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} & x & & \\ \mathbf{x} & & x & \\ \mathbf{x} & & & x \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} x & & & \\ x & x & & \\ x & x & x & \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & \\ \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \\ \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}$$

$$PHP^T = \begin{bmatrix} x & & x & \\ & x & x & \\ & & x & x \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} x & & & \\ & x & & \\ & & x & \\ x & x & x & x \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow L = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \\ & \blacksquare & & \\ & & \blacksquare & \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}$$

Minimum Degree Ordering (MDO)

In symmetric positive definite case:

pivots are chosen from the diagonal and $r_i = c_i$

hence choose the pivot with $\min_i r_i$

Minimum degree ordering:

choose an element with the minimum number of nonzeros in a row,

that is, choose a node with the minimum number of neighbours

(a node with the *minimum degree*)

in a graph related to sparsity pattern of the matrix.

Minimum Degree Ordering (MDO)

Sparse Matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} x & x & x & x \\ & x & & x \\ x & x & & x \\ x & & x & x \\ x & x & & x \\ & x & x & x \end{bmatrix}$$

Pivot h_{11}

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x} \\ & x & & x \\ \mathbf{x} & x & \mathbf{f} & \mathbf{f} & x \\ \mathbf{x} & & \mathbf{f} & x & \mathbf{f} & x \\ \mathbf{x} & x & \mathbf{f} & \mathbf{f} & x \\ & & x & x & & x \end{bmatrix}$$

Pivot h_{22}

$$\begin{bmatrix} x & x & x & x \\ & \mathbf{p} & & \mathbf{x} \\ x & x & & x \\ x & & x & x \\ x & \mathbf{x} & & x \\ & & x & x & & x \end{bmatrix}$$

Minimum degree ordering:

choose a diagonal element corresponding to a row with the minimum number of nonzeros.

Permute rows and columns of H accordingly.

MDO is simply the symmetric version of Markowitz pivot rule.


From Sparsity to Block-Sparsity:

Apply minimum degree ordering to **(sparse) blocks**:

Block-Sparse Matrix

Pivot Block H_{11}


Pivot Block H_{22}



Choose a diagonal block-pivot corresponding to a block-row with the *minimum* number of blocks.

Permute block-rows and block-columns of H accordingly.

Nested Dissection:



Original Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>						
2	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>				
3	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>						
4		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	
5	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>						
6				<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	
7		<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>				<i>x</i>
8						<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
9								<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
10				<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>
11							<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>

Reordered Matrix

	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	11	4	7
1	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>							
2	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>						x	x
3	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>						x	
5	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>						x	
6					<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		<i>x</i>		x	x
8						<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>		
9							<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	
10							<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	x
11								<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>x</i>	x
4										x	x
7										x	x

Structured Problems

Observation:

Truly large scale problems are not only sparse...
→ such problems are structured

Structure is displayed in:

- Jacobian matrix A
- Hessian matrix Q

Structure can be exploited in:

- IPM Algorithm
- Linear Algebra of IPM → (focus of this lecture)

Primal Block-Angular Structure:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & \\ & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & \\ & \blacksquare \\ \color{red}\blacksquare & \color{red}\blacksquare \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A^T = \begin{bmatrix} \color{blue}\blacksquare & & \color{red}\blacksquare \\ & \color{blue}\blacksquare & \\ & & \color{red}\blacksquare \end{bmatrix}$$

Reorder blocks: $\{1, 3; 2, 4; 5\}$.

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & \color{blue}\blacksquare & & \color{red}\blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & & \color{blue}\blacksquare & \color{red}\blacksquare \\ \color{blue}\blacksquare & & & & \\ \color{red}\blacksquare & \color{red}\blacksquare & & & \end{bmatrix}, \quad PHP^T = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & \color{blue}\blacksquare & & & \color{red}\blacksquare \\ \color{blue}\blacksquare & & & & \\ & & \blacksquare & \color{blue}\blacksquare & \color{red}\blacksquare \\ & & \color{blue}\blacksquare & & \\ \color{red}\blacksquare & & \color{red}\blacksquare & & \end{bmatrix}$$

Dual Block-Angular Structure:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \\ & \blacksquare & & \\ & & \blacksquare & \\ & & & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A^T = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & \\ & \blacksquare & \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \end{bmatrix}$$

Reorder blocks: $\{1, 4; 2, 5; 3\}$.

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare & & \\ \hline & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}, \quad PHP^T = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & & \\ \blacksquare & & & & \blacksquare \\ \hline & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \\ & & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ \hline & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}$$

Row & Col Bordered Block-Diag Structure:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & & \\ & \blacksquare & & \\ & & \blacksquare & \\ & & & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A^T = \begin{bmatrix} \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \end{bmatrix}$$

Reorder blocks: $\{1, 4; 2, 5; 3, 6\}$.

$$H = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \\ \hline & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \end{array} \right], \quad PHP^T = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & & & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & & & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ & & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \hline & \blacksquare & & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare \\ \blacksquare & \blacksquare & \blacksquare & & & \blacksquare \end{array} \right]$$

Example: Bordered Block-Diagonal Structure

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_1 & & & B_1^\top \\ & \dots & & \vdots \\ & & \Phi_n & B_n^\top \\ B_1 & \dots & B_n & \Phi_0 \end{pmatrix}}_{\Phi} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} L_1 & & & \\ & \dots & & \\ & & L_n & \\ L_{1,0} & \dots & L_{n,0} & L_0 \end{pmatrix}}_L \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} D_1 & & & \\ & \dots & & \\ & & D_n & \\ & & & D_0 \end{pmatrix}}_D \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} L_1^\top & & & L_{1,0}^\top \\ & \dots & & \vdots \\ & & L_n^\top & L_{n,0}^\top \\ & & & L_0^\top \end{pmatrix}}_{L^\top}$$

The blocks Φ_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ are KKT systems.

Example: Bordered Block-Diagonal Structure

- Cholesky-like factors obtained by Schur-complement:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i &= L_i D_i L_i^\top \\ L_{i,0} &= B_i L_i^{-\top} D_i^{-1}, \quad i = 1..n \\ C &= \Phi_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n L_{i,0} D_i L_{i,0}^\top = L_0 D_0 L_0^\top\end{aligned}$$

- And the system $\Phi x = b$ is solved by

$$\begin{aligned}z_i &= L_i^{-1} b_i \\ z_0 &= L_0^{-1} (b_0 - \sum L_{i,0} z_i) \\ y_i &= D_i^{-1} z_i \\ x_0 &= L_0^{-\top} y_0 \\ x_i &= L_i^{-\top} (y_i - L_{i,0}^\top x_0)\end{aligned}$$

- Operations (Cholesky, Solve, Product) performed on sub-blocks

Abstract Linear Algebra for IPMs

Execute the operation

“solve (reduced) KKT system”

in IPMs for LP, QP and NLP.

It works like the **“backslash”** operator in MATLAB.



Assumptions:

Q and A are block-structured


Linear Algebra of IPMs

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -Q - \Theta_P^{-1} & A^T \\ A & \Theta_D \end{bmatrix}}_{\Phi(NLP)} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ d \end{bmatrix}$$


Tree representation of matrix A:



Structures of A and Q imply structure of Φ :




$$\begin{pmatrix} Q & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$



$$P \begin{pmatrix} Q & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}$$

OOPS: Object-oriented linear algebra for IPM

- Every node in the *block elimination tree* has its own linear algebra implementation (depending on its type)
- Each implementation is a realisation of an abstract linear algebra interface.
- Different implementations are available for different structures



⇒ Rebuild *block elimination tree* with matrix interface structures

OOPS: Matrix Revolutions, Matrix Reloaded




Structured Problems

... are present everywhere.

Sources of Structure

Dynamics \rightarrow Staircase structure




$$x_{t+1} = A_t x_t + B_t u_t$$


$$x_{t+1} = A_t^{t+1} x_t + \dots + A_{t-p}^{t+1} x_{t-p} + B_t u_t$$

Sources of Structure

Uncertainty \rightarrow Block-angular structure



$$T_i x^1 + W_i y_i = b_i$$




$$T_{l_t} x_{a(l_t)} + W_{l_t} x_{l_t} = b_{l_t}$$

Sources of Structure

Common resource constraint


$$\sum_{i=1}^k B_i x_i = b \rightarrow \text{Dantzig-Wolfe structure}$$



Sources of Structure

Other types of **near-separability**


→ **Row and column bordered block-diagonal structure**



Sources of Structure

(low) **rank-corrector**

$$A + VV^T = C$$



and networks, ODE- or PDE-discretizations, etc.

Example Applications:

- financial planning problems
(nonlinear risk measures)
- machine learning (nonlinear kernels in SVMs)

Financial Planning Problems (ALM)

- A set of assets $\mathcal{J} = \{1..J\}$ given (bonds, stock, real estate)
- At every stage $t = 0..T-1$ we can buy or sell different assets
- The return of asset j at stage t is *uncertain*

Investment decisions: **what to buy or sell, at which time stage**

Objectives:


- maximize the final wealth
 - minimize the associated risk
- \Rightarrow Mean Variance formulation:
 $\max \mathbb{E}(X) - \rho \text{Var}(X)$

\Rightarrow Stochastic Program: \Rightarrow formulate deterministic equivalent


- standard QP, but huge
- extensions: **nonlinear risk measures** (log utility, skewness)


ALM: Largest Problem Attempted

- Optimization of 21 assets (stock market indices) 7 time stages.
- Using multistage stochastic programming
Scenario tree geometry: 128-30-16-10-5-4 \Rightarrow 16M scenarios.
- 3840 second level nodes with 350.000 variables each.
- Scenario Tree generated using geometric Brownian motion.
- \Rightarrow 1.01 billion variables, 353 million constraints



Sparsity of Linear Algebra

- 
 - ⇒ – $63 + 128 \times 63 = 8127$ columns for Schur-complement
 - Prohibitively expensive

- 
 - ⇒ – Need facility to exploit nested structure
 - Need to be careful that Schur-complement calculations stay sparse on second level

Results (ALM: Mean-Variance QP formulation):

Prob	Stgs	Asts	Scen	Rows	Cols	iter	time	procs	machine
ALM8	7	6	13M	64M	154M	42	3923	512	BlueGene
ALM9	7	14	6M	96M	269M	39	4692	512	BlueGene
ALM10	7	13	12M	180M	500M	45	6089	1024	BlueGene
ALM11	7	21	16M	353M	1.011M	53	3020	1280	HPCx

The problem with

- **353 million of constraints**
- **1 billion of variables**

was solved in 50 minutes using 1280 procs.

Equation systems of dimension **1.363 billion** were solved with the direct (implicit) factorization.

→ One IPM iteration takes less than a minute.

Support Vector Machines:

Formulated as the (dual) quadratic program:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & -e^T y + \frac{1}{2} y^T K y, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & d^T y = 0, \\ & 0 \leq y \leq \lambda e. \end{aligned}$$

Ferris & Munson, *SIOPT* 13 (2003) 783-804.

Kernel function $K(x, z) = \langle \phi(x), \phi(z) \rangle$,

where ϕ is a (nonlinear) mapping from X to feature space F

Matrix K : $K_{ij} = K(x_i, x_j)$

Linear Kernel $K(x, z) = x^T z.$

Polynomial Kernel $K(x, z) = (x^T z + 1)^d.$

Gaussian Kernel $K(x, z) = e^{-\gamma \|x - z\|^2}.$

SVMs with Nonlinear Kernels:


K is very large and dense!

Approximate:

$$K \approx LL^T \quad \text{or} \quad K \approx LL^T + D$$

Introduce $v = L^T y$ and get a separable QP:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & -e^T y + \frac{1}{2}v^T v + \frac{1}{2}y^T D y, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & d^T y = 0, \\ & v - L^T y = 0, \\ & 0 \leq y \leq \lambda e. \end{aligned}$$



Structure can be exploited in:

- Linear Algebra of IPM

Kristian Woodsend: PhD Thesis, Edinburgh 2009.

References

- **Gondzio and Sarkissian**, Parallel interior point solver for structured linear programs, *Math Prog* 96 (2003) 561-584.
- **Gondzio and Grothey**, Reoptimization with the primal-dual IPM, *SIAM J. on Optimization* 13 (2003) 842-864.
- **Gondzio and Grothey**, Parallel IPM solver for structured QPs: application to financial planning problems, *Annals of Oper Res* 152 (2007) 319-339.
- **Woodsend and Gondzio**, Hybrid MPI/OpenMP parallel linear support vector machine training, *J. of Machine Learning Research* 20 (2009) 1937-1953.

Papers available: <http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/~gondzio/>

OOPS: Object-Oriented Parallel Solver

<http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/~gondzio/parallel/solver.html>

Conclusions:

Interior Point Methods

→ are well-suited to Large Scale Optimization

Direct Methods

→ are well-suited to structure exploitation

Use IPMs in your research!

Implementation of IPMs

Andersen, Gondzio, Mészáros and Xu

Implementation of IPMs for large scale LP,
in: *Interior Point Methods in Mathematical Programming*,
T. Terlaky (ed.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, pp. 189–252.

Altman and Gondzio

Regularized symmetric indefinite systems in interior point methods for linear and quadratic optimization, *Optimization Methods and Software*, 11-12 (1999), pp 275–302.

Recent Survey on IPMs (easy reading)

Gondzio

Interior point methods 25 years later,
European J. of Operational Research 218 (2012) 587–601.
<http://www.maths.ed.ac.uk/~gondzio/reports/ipmXXV.html>