Inverse optimization

 $\mathrm{Dec}\ 2019$

1 The Model

The original LP model is:

$$\min cx$$

s.t.
$$A'x \ge b$$

The dual of the LP is:

$$\min by$$

s.t.
$$A^{'T}y = c$$

Among this, y is dual variable. Thus, the inverse optimization model can be expressed as the following:

$$\min \|A' - A\|_1$$

$$s.t. \quad A^{'T}y = c \tag{1.1}$$

$$cx^0 \ge by \tag{1.2}$$

$$A'x^0 \ge b \tag{1.3}$$

We can split this into two situations: given the value or given the solution. If we give the solution, just as the model we showed. If we give the value, we don't need the (1.3) constraints. Expand the matrix to the specific elements. We can obtain the corresponding model:

$$\min \sum_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (e_{ij} + f_{ij})$$
s.t.
$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} (e_{ij} - f_{ij} + a_{ij})y_{i} = c_{j}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} (e_{ij} - f_{ij} + a_{ij})x_{j}^{0} \ge b_{i}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_{i}y_{i} \le v_{0}$$

$$e_{ij} \ge 0 \qquad f_{ij} \ge 0$$
(1.4)

Notice that there are (2mn + m) variables but only (m + n + 1) constraints.

The theoretical method is to use the KKT conditions which is usually used to solve the constrained nonlinear programming. Add the lagrangian multiplier:

$$T(e, f, y) = \min \sum_{i} \sum_{j} (e_{ij} + f_{ij}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_{j} g_{j}(e, f, y) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_{i} f_{i}(e, f, y)$$
s.t.
$$g_{j}(e, f, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (e_{ij} - f_{ij} + a_{ij}) y_{i} - c_{j} = 0$$
(God)

$$f_i(e, f, y) = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n (e_{ij} - f_{ij} + a_{ij}) x_j^0 \le 0$$
(1.5)

$$h(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i y_i - v_0 \le 0 \tag{1.6}$$

$$K(e,f) = e_{ij}f_{ij} = 0$$
 (1.7)

$$M(e) = -e_{ij} \le 0 \tag{1.8}$$

$$N(f) = -f_{ij} \le 0 \tag{1.9}$$

The corresponding multipliers are $\lambda_j, \mu_i, \alpha, \beta_{ij}, m_{ij}, n_{ij}$.

Using the KKT constraints, we can obtain the following equations.

$$\frac{\partial T(e, f, y)}{\partial e_{ij}} = 1 + \beta_{ij} f_{ij} - m_{ij} + \lambda_j y_i + \mu_i (-x_j^0) = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial T(e, f, y)}{\partial f_{ij}} = 1 + \beta_{ij} e_{ij} - n_{ij} - \lambda_j y_i + \mu_i x_j^0 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial T(e, f, y)}{\partial y_i} = \sum_{j=1}^n (e_{ij} - f_{ij} + a_{ij}) \lambda_j + \alpha b_i = 0$$

$$g_j(e, f, y) = 0$$

$$\mu_i f_i = 0 \quad \mu_i \ge 0$$

$$K(e, f) = e_{ij} f_{ij} = 0$$

$$\alpha h(y) = 0 \quad \alpha \ge 0$$

$$m_{ij} M(e) = 0 \quad m_{ij} \ge 0$$

$$n_{ij} N(f) = 0 \quad n_{ij} \ge 0$$

If we can solve these equations, we can obtain the solution $(e_{ij}^*, f_{ij}^*, y_i^*)$. And the e_{ij}^*, f_{ij}^* corresponds the optimal adjustment, the y_i^* corresponds the optimal lagrangian multipliers. However, the system of nonlinear equations does not seem to be solved in this case.

Consider the particularity of this problem.

Case 1. All the $f_{ij} = 0, e_{ij} > 0$

The original model is transformed as:

$$G = \min \sum_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_{ij}$$
s.t.
$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} (e_{ij} + aij)y_{i} = c_{j}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} (e_{ij} + aij)x_{j}^{0} \ge b_{i}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_{i}y_{i} \le v_{0}$$

$$e_{ij} \ge 0$$

$$(1.10)$$

If all $a_{ij} > 0$, we can further transform this model as a geometric programming (GP), because the functions are all posynomial function. Let $z_i = \ln x_i \Rightarrow x_i = e^{z_i}$, and $e_{ij} = x_k$, $k = 1, \ldots, i \times j$, $y_i = x_k$, $k = i \times j + 1, \ldots, i \times j + m$

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} c_k x_1^{a_{1k}} x_2^{a_{2k}} \cdots x_n^{a_{nk}} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{a_k^T y + b_k}$$

Then, the model can be written as:

Because the optimal solution satisfies the

And the system is changed as: h(y) = 0 and

$$1 - m_{ij} + \lambda_{j} y_{i} + \mu_{i} (-x_{j}^{0}) = 0$$

$$1 + \beta_{ij} e_{ij} - n_{ij} - \lambda_{j} y_{i} + \mu_{i} x_{j}^{0} = 0$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} (e_{ij} + a_{ij}) \lambda_{j} + \alpha b_{i} = 0$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} (e_{ij} + a_{ij}) y_{i} - c_{j} = 0$$

$$b_{i} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} (e_{ij} + a_{ij}) x_{j}^{0} \leq 0$$

$$\mu_{i} f_{i} = 0 \quad \mu_{i} \geq 0$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_{i} y_{i} = v_{0} \quad \alpha \geq 0$$

$$m_{ij} e_{ij} = 0 \quad m_{ij} \geq 0$$

$$n_{ij} \geq 0$$

Let all $m_{ij} = 0$

Another information is that if x_j^0 satisfies some equation $f_i = 0, i \in I$. For other $i \in \{1, ..., n\} \setminus I, f_i \le 0$ and $\mu_i = 0$.