

d) Gurobi-Python Problem 1

Global Maximum

```
In [ ]: from gurobipy import Model, GRB

# Create a new model
model = Model("Problem_1_max")

# Define continuous variables
x1 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x1")
x2 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x2")
x3 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x3")

# Set the objective function:  $f(x) = 3x_1 + 5x_2 - 3x_3^2$ 
model.setObjective(3*x1 + 5*x2 - 3*x3*x3, GRB.MAXIMIZE)

# Add equality constraints using addQConstr since they are quadratic:
# Constraint 1:  $2x_1^2 - 37x_2^2 + 9x_3 = 18$ 
model.addQConstr(2*x1*x1 - 37*x2*x2 + 9*x3 == 18, name="c1")

# Constraint 2:  $5x_1 + x_2 + 5x_3^2 = 24$ 
model.addQConstr(5*x1 + x2 + 5*x3*x3 == 24, name="c2")

# Optimize the model
model.optimize()

# Print the results
if model.status == GRB.OPTIMAL:
    print("Optimal solution:")
    print(f"  x1 = {x1.x}")
    print(f"  x2 = {x2.x}")
    print(f"  x3 = {x3.x}")
    print(f"Optimal objective value = {model.objVal}")
else:
    print("No optimal solution found.")
```

Gurobi Optimizer version 12.0.1 build v12.0.1rc0 (win64 - Windows 10.0 (19045.2))

CPU model: Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10750H CPU @ 2.60GHz, instruction set [SSE2|AVX|AVX2]
 Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads

Optimize a model with 0 rows, 3 columns and 0 nonzeros
 Model fingerprint: 0x5cc95152
 Model has 1 quadratic objective term
 Model has 2 quadratic constraints
 Coefficient statistics:
 Matrix range [0e+00, 0e+00]
 QMatrix range [2e+00, 5e+00]
 QLMatrix range [1e+00, 4e+01]
 Objective range [3e+00, 5e+00]

CPU model: Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10750H CPU @ 2.60GHz, instruction set [SSE2|AVX|AVX2]
 Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads

Optimize a model with 0 rows, 3 columns and 0 nonzeros
 Model fingerprint: 0x5cc95152
 Model has 1 quadratic objective term
 Model has 2 quadratic constraints
 Coefficient statistics:
 Matrix range [0e+00, 0e+00]
 QMatrix range [2e+00, 5e+00]
 QLMatrix range [1e+00, 4e+01]
 Objective range [3e+00, 5e+00]
 QObjective range [6e+00, 6e+00]
 Bounds range [0e+00, 0e+00]
 RHS range [0e+00, 0e+00]
 QRHS range [2e+01, 2e+01]

Continuous model is non-convex -- solving as a MIP

Presolve time: 0.00s
 Presolved: 6 rows, 4 columns, 18 nonzeros
 Presolved model has 2 bilinear constraint(s)
 Warning: Model contains variables with very large bounds participating
 in product terms.
 Presolve was not able to compute smaller bounds for these variables.
 Consider bounding these variables or reformulating the model.

Variable types: 4 continuous, 0 integer (0 binary)
 Found heuristic solution: objective 2257.5755700

Root relaxation: unbounded, 2 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)

Nodes		Current Node			Objective Bounds			Work	
Expl	Unexpl	Obj	Depth	IntInf	Incumbent	BestBd	Gap	It/Node	Time
	0	0	postponed	0	2257.57557	-	-	-	0s
	0	0	postponed	0	2257.57557	-	-	-	0s
	0	2	postponed	0	2257.57557	-	-	-	0s
*	97	2		19	2257.5755740	-	-	1.1	0s

Explored 129 nodes (111 simplex iterations) in 0.05 seconds (0.00 work units)
 Thread count was 12 (of 12 available processors)

Solution count 2: 2257.58 2257.58

Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)
 Best objective 2.25757573672e+03, best bound 2.25757573961e+03, gap 0.0000%
 Optimal solution:
 x1 = -97.16265952910427
 x2 = 509.8127734171107
 x3 = -0.010244122590746783
 Optimal objective value = 2257.5755736720976

Global Minimum

```
In [ ]: model = Model("Problem_1_min")

# Define continuous variables
x1 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x1")
x2 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x2")
x3 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x3")

# Set the objective function: f(x) = 3*x1 + 5*x2 - 3*x3^2
model.setObjective(3*x1 + 5*x2 - 3*x3*x3, GRB.MINIMIZE)

# Add equality constraints using addQConstr since they are quadratic:
# Constraint 1: 2*x1^2 - 37*x2^2 + 9*x3 == 18
model.addQConstr(2*x1*x1 - 37*x2 + 9*x3 == 18, name="c1")

# Constraint 2: 5*x1 + x2 + 5*x3^2 == 24
model.addQConstr(5*x1 + x2 + 5*x3*x3 == 24, name="c2")

# Optimize the model
model.optimize()

# Print the results
if model.status == GRB.OPTIMAL:
```

```

print("Optimal solution:")
print(f"  x1 = {x1.x}")
print(f"  x2 = {x2.x}")
print(f"  x3 = {x3.x}")
print(f"Optimal objective value = {model.objVal}")
else:
    print("No optimal solution found.")

```

Gurobi Optimizer version 12.0.1 build v12.0.1rc0 (win64 - Windows 10.0 (19045.2))

CPU model: Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10750H CPU @ 2.60GHz, instruction set [SSE2|AVX|AVX2]
Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads

Optimize a model with 0 rows, 3 columns and 0 nonzeros

Model fingerprint: 0x3e262e42

Model has 1 quadratic objective term

Model has 2 quadratic constraints

Coefficient statistics:

```

Matrix range      [0e+00, 0e+00]
QMatrix range     [2e+00, 5e+00]
QLMatrix range    [1e+00, 4e+01]
Objective range   [3e+00, 5e+00]
QObjective range  [6e+00, 6e+00]
Bounds range      [0e+00, 0e+00]
RHS range         [0e+00, 0e+00]
QRHS range        [2e+01, 2e+01]

```

Continuous model is non-convex -- solving as a MIP

Presolve time: 0.00s

Presolved: 6 rows, 4 columns, 18 nonzeros

Presolved model has 2 bilinear constraint(s)

Warning: Model contains variables with very large bounds participating
in product terms.

Presolve was not able to compute smaller bounds for these variables.
Consider bounding these variables or reformulating the model.

Variable types: 4 continuous, 0 integer (0 binary)

Found heuristic solution: objective -51.9570140

Root relaxation: unbounded, 2 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)

Nodes		Current Node		Objective Bounds			Work	
Expl	Unexpl	Obj	Depth	IntInf	Incumbent	BestBd	Gap	It/Node Time
0	0	postponed	0		-51.95701	-	-	0s
0	0	postponed	0		-51.95701	-	-	0s
0	2	postponed	0		-51.95701	-	-	0s

Explored 45 nodes (70 simplex iterations) in 0.06 seconds (0.00 work units)

Thread count was 12 (of 12 available processors)

Solution count 1: -51.957

Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)

Best objective -5.195701399667e+01, best bound -5.195719131412e+01, gap 0.0003%

Optimal solution:

```

x1 = -10.14600494474171
x2 = 4.1641099413894915
x3 = -3.756751649559144

```

Optimal objective value = -51.95701399667372

Results Discussion

The Gurobi Solver returns the global optima for the problems. As we stated in the previous questions, points x_B and x_D were global optima, and these Gurobi solutions directly correspond to them.

- **Global Maximum:**

$$x_1 = -97.16, \quad x_2 = 509.81, \quad x_3 = -0.01024$$

- **Global Minimum:**

$$x_1 = -10.15, \quad x_2 = 4.164, \quad x_3 = -3.7568$$

This demonstrates the consistency of both approaches (symbolic analysis via MATLAB and numerical optimization via Gurobi) in identifying the correct optimal solutions. Nevertheless, in the Gurobi-Python approach, constraint qualifications are assumed to hold (or are enforced implicitly).

c) Gurobi-Python Problem 2

```

In [ ]: # Create a new model
model = Model("Problem_2_max")

# Define continuous variables
x1 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x1")
x2 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x2")
x3 = model.addVar(lb=-GRB.INFINITY, name="x3")

# Set the objective function: f(x) = 3*x1 + 5*x2 - 3*x3^2

```

```

model.setObjective(x1*x1 + x2*x2 - x3*x3, GRB.MAXIMIZE)

# Add equality constraints using addQConstr since they are quadratic:
# Constraint 1:  $2x_1^2 - 37x_2^2 + 9x_3 = 18$ 
model.addQConstr(8*x1*x1 + 24*x2 - 15*x3 <= 129, "c1")

# Constraint 2:  $5x_1 + x_2 + 5x_3^2 = 24$ 
model.addQConstr(-x1*x1 - 2*x2*x2 - 4*x3*x3 <= -15, "c2")

# Optimize the model
model.optimize()

# Print the results
if model.status == GRB.OPTIMAL:
    print("Optimal solution:")
    print(f"  x1 = {x1.x}")
    print(f"  x2 = {x2.x}")
    print(f"  x3 = {x3.x}")
    print(f"Optimal objective value = {model.objVal}")
else:
    print("No optimal solution found.")

```

Gurobi Optimizer version 12.0.1 build v12.0.1rc0 (win64 - Windows 10.0 (19045.2))

CPU model: Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10750H CPU @ 2.60GHz, instruction set [SSE2|AVX|AVX2]
Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads

Optimize a model with 0 rows, 3 columns and 0 nonzeros

Model fingerprint: 0x2382531e

Model has 3 quadratic objective terms

Model has 2 quadratic constraints

Coefficient statistics:

Matrix range [0e+00, 0e+00]

QMatrix range [1e+00, 8e+00]

QLMatrix range [2e+01, 2e+01]

CPU model: Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10750H CPU @ 2.60GHz, instruction set [SSE2|AVX|AVX2]

Thread count: 6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads

Optimize a model with 0 rows, 3 columns and 0 nonzeros

Model fingerprint: 0x2382531e

Model has 3 quadratic objective terms

Model has 2 quadratic constraints

Coefficient statistics:

Matrix range [0e+00, 0e+00]

QMatrix range [1e+00, 8e+00]

QLMatrix range [2e+01, 2e+01]

Objective range [0e+00, 0e+00]

QObjective range [2e+00, 2e+00]

Bounds range [0e+00, 0e+00]

RHS range [0e+00, 0e+00]

QRHS range [2e+01, 1e+02]

Continuous model is non-convex -- solving as a MIP

Presolve time: 0.00s

Presolved: 10 rows, 8 columns, 24 nonzeros

Presolved model has 3 bilinear constraint(s)

Warning: Model contains variables with very large bounds participating
in product terms.

Presolve was not able to compute smaller bounds for these variables.

Consider bounding these variables or reformulating the model.

Variable types: 8 continuous, 0 integer (0 binary)

Found heuristic solution: objective 47.4102564

Root relaxation: unbounded, 7 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)

Nodes		Current Node			Objective Bounds		Work	
Expl	Unexpl	Obj	Depth	IntInf	Incumbent	BestBd	Gap	It/Node Time
	0	0	postponed	0	47.41026	-	-	0s
	0	0	postponed	0	47.41026	-	-	0s
	0	2	postponed	0	47.41026	-	-	0s
*	3	6		2	625000.00000	-	-	4.7 0s
*	8	8		3	750000.00000	-	-	3.1 0s
*	9	8		3	1125000.0000	-	-	2.8 0s
*	13	12		4	1250000.0000	-	-	2.8 0s
*	19	12		5	2250000.0000	-	-	1.9 0s
*	21	12		6	4250000.0000	-	-	1.7 0s
*	26	12		6	8125000.0000	-	-	1.4 0s
*	40	14		7	8250000.0000	-	-	0.9 0s
*	42	14		8	1.625000e+07	-	-	0.9 0s
*	44	14		9	3.225000e+07	-	-	0.8 0s
*	49	14		9	6.412500e+07	-	-	0.8 0s
*	67	26		10	6.425000e+07	-	-	0.6 0s
*	69	26		11	1.282500e+08	-	-	0.5 0s
*	74	26		11	2.561250e+08	-	-	0.5 0s
*	106	40		12	2.562500e+08	-	-	0.4 0s
*	108	40		13	5.122500e+08	-	-	0.4 0s
*	110	40		14	1.024250e+09	-	-	0.4 0s
*	112	40		15	2.048250e+09	-	-	0.4 0s
*	114	40		16	4.096250e+09	-	-	0.4 0s
*	149	40		19	4.098000e+09	-	-	0.4 0s
*	165	40		19	8.193000e+09	-	-	0.3 0s
*	193	38		24	8.224000e+09	-	-	0.3 0s
*	195	38		25	1.641600e+10	-	-	0.3 0s
*	230	38		22	3.277000e+10	-	-	0.3 0s
*	232	38		23	6.553800e+10	-	-	0.3 0s
*	234	38		24	1.310740e+11	-	-	0.3 0s
*	236	38		25	2.621460e+11	-	-	0.3 0s
*	278	44		29	2.621760e+11	-	-	0.2 0s
*	280	44		30	5.243200e+11	-	-	0.2 0s
*	282	44		31	1.048608e+12	-	-	0.2 0s
*	284	44		32	2.097184e+12	-	-	0.2 0s
*	359	44		33	2.097216e+12	-	-	0.3 0s
*	361	44		33	4.194336e+12	-	-	0.3 0s
*	363	44		34	8.388640e+12	-	-	0.3 0s
*	365	44		35	1.677725e+13	-	-	0.2 0s
*	367	44		36	3.355446e+13	-	-	0.2 0s
*	369	44		37	6.710890e+13	-	-	0.2 0s
H	371	44			4.551109e+14	-	-	0.2 0s
*	547	94		44	5.113881e+14	-	-	0.2 0s
*	592	94		42	5.368710e+14	-	-	0.2 0s
*	749	66		45	5.368719e+14	-	-	0.3 0s
H	1017	46			6.710886e+19	-	-	0.2 0s

Explored 2249 nodes (235 simplex iterations) in 0.12 seconds (0.01 work units)
Thread count was 12 (of 12 available processors)

Solution count 10: 6.71089e+19 5.36872e+14 5.36871e+14 ... 2.56125e+08

Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)

Best objective 6.710886188749e+19, best bound 6.710886188749e+19, gap 0.0000%

Optimal solution:

x1 = -32000.0

x2 = -8191999871.0

x3 = 0.0

Optimal objective value = 6.710886188748802e+19

Results Discussion

The enormous solution returned by Gurobi confirms what we observed in MATLAB. The problem is unbounded.

Our MATLAB analysis showed that there is no finite maximum since the objective can be increased without bound over the feasible set. There is no point at which all the 1st-order conditions (KKT) and 2nd-order conditions hold in such a way that a maximum is reached; rather, you can always find a feasible direction along which $f(x)$ increases. Consequently, Gurobi, when solving the model without imposing artificial bounds, returns an enormous solution as it essentially drives the objective value toward infinity, thereby demonstrating that no finite optimal solution exists.