

# A Graph Theory Based Approach to MDAO Problem Formulation

David Pate, \*Dr. Brian German <sup>†</sup>Justin Gray,<sup>‡</sup>

blah blah blah

## Nomenclature

AAO	All-At-
MDAO	Multidisciplinary Design Analysis and Optimization
FPF	Fundamental Problem Formulation

## I. Introduction

The number of analysis tools required in multidisciplinary design optimization (MDO) studies is growing in parallel with the increasing scope of typical MDO problems. An example of this growth in scope can be observed in the historical evolution of the disciplines involved in MDO problems in aircraft design. Multidisciplinary optimization emerged as a separate field from structural optimization through the need to introduce formal techniques for managing the coupling of aerodynamic loads and structural deformations, through the linking of aerodynamic vortex lattice or panel methods with structural finite element models [[REF]]. Subsequently, flight performance and life cycle economics tools were integrated into MDO analysis workflows for conceptual and preliminary design studies [[REF]]. Currently, MDO problems for aircraft design also often include tools for aircraft noise and emissions. In sum, it is now commonplace for 5-10 analysis tools to be employed for typical aircraft design optimization studies [[REF]].

The number of analysis tools is expected to grow in the future as the scope of MDO problems continues to evolve, and as computing is increasingly commoditized. This expansion of scope will be driven, in part, by consideration of additional disciplines. Current trends on the horizon for aircraft MDO studies include incorporation of manufacturing analyses [[REF]], subsystem performance [[REF]], and fleet-level aggregate models of emissions, noise, or economics [[REF]].

As the size and complexity of engineering systems grow, the time and expense for setting up analysis models grow with them. Multidisciplinary Design Analysis and Optimization (MDAO) frameworks such as OpenMDAO<sup>1</sup> and ModelCenter have enabled a new level of analysis tool integration and paved the way for models with more analyses and increasing numbers of interdisciplinary couplings. That new capability has created a new challenge. Even for models with 10's of analyses there could be hundreds or thousands of variables that need to be linked together. Commonly different analyses will provide competing values for the same physical quantity, and these conflicts need to be resolved somehow. To make matters worse, the competing values may not even be in the same format. These occurrences are particularly acute when analysis tools have differing fidelities. For example, an abstracted aerodynamic analysis such as an empirical drag buildup model may return only integrated drag, whereas a CFD tool may return pressure and shear stress distributions across the entire surface grid. If an analysis downstream of the aerodynamics tool needs only integrated drag as an input, then the designer has a free choice of which of the two possible aerodynamics analysis tools to select to provide the drag estimate (presuming that drag can be computed from surface distributions by a simple integration algorithm). On the other hand, if a downstream analysis needs a pressure distribution in order to compute pitching moment, for example, then any feasible MDO problem

---

\*Georgia Tech

<sup>†</sup>Georgia Tech...

<sup>‡</sup>Aerospace Engineer, MDAO Branch, Mail Stop 5-11, AIAA Member

formulation must include CFD or similar analysis in the data flow, regardless of whether the empirical drag buildup model is also included.

With all the added complexity from larger models it is not hard to imagine that the task of combining all the analyses into a consistent system model capable of solving a relevant engineering design problem could easily become much more costly than creating the discipline analyses themselves. Just as for a large system the couplings between the disciplines begin to dominate the design space, the couplings between the analyses begin to dominate the job of setting up the model. It is this problem of determining sets of analysis tools and their interconnectivities to form realistic multidisciplinary problems that is the subject of this paper. We are motivated by the following notional but real problem of organizing an MDO study for a complex system:

A new system is being designed for which there is little or no historical precedent. The system is complex, as measured by the number of disciplines and/or components involved in the analysis. A general optimization problem statement has been formulated based on system-level objectives and constraints; however, it is unclear which engineering analysis tools should be interconnected in order to solve the optimization problem. A team of disciplinary and/or component design engineers has been formed in which each engineer has expertise in a particular analysis tool or component model. The engineers meet to discuss the approach to interconnecting their tools to achieve the required system-level MDO model.

Our goal is to develop formalism for expressing analysis interconnectivity and for determining feasible data flows to assist an engineering team conducting this task. Because the problem deals with interconnectivity, we base our approach on the representations and techniques of graph theory. The proposed graph syntax is closely related to the REMS system proposed by Alexandrov and Lewis.<sup>2</sup> The approach taken here should be viewed as an extension of the concepts proposed in REMS with the goal of allowing the graphs to more closely interact with existing design processes and MDAO frameworks. The approach begins by constructing the *maximal connectivity graph (MCG)* describing all possible interconnections between the analysis tools proposed by the engineers. Graph operations are then conducted to reduce the MCG down to a *fundamental problem graph (FPG)* that describes the minimum set of analysis tools needed to solve the specified system-level design problem. The FPG does not predispose any particular solution procedure for the problem; any relevant MDO solution architecture, e.g. MDF, IDF, CO, BLISS, could be selected *post facto* to implement the system-level optimization by constructing a *problem solution graph (PSG)* and the corresponding problem solution approach. The concept of the FPG and the identification of feasible FPGs are the main contributions of the paper.

The paper is organized as follows. First, we describe the differences between a fundamental problem formulation, which is based only on the system-level optimization problem statement that the engineers desire to solve and on the available analysis tools, and a specific problem formulation, which additionally presumes a specific solution to the problem. Next, we survey the literature in applying graph theoretic and formal language approaches to multidisciplinary design problem formulation. We then discuss our graph syntax and representation of MDO problems and describe the procedures for determining the MCG and FPG. Finally, we present an example problem based on an MDO analysis of a commercial aircraft and discuss additional applications enabled by our approach.

## II. Specific vs Fundamental Problem Formulation

The Fundamental Problem Formulation (FPF) for any given problem will be constant regardless of which MDAO framework, optimization algorithm, iterative solver, or solution strategy is used to solve the problem. For example, consider the following notional problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{given } A : x, y \rightarrow m, z \\
&\quad B : x, z \rightarrow y^t \\
&\text{min. } f(m) \\
&\text{w.r.t. } x, y, z \\
&\text{s.t. } g(y^t, y) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$A$  and  $B$  represent analysis tools, and  $f$  and  $g$  are the objective and constraint functions respectively. Equation 1 makes an inherent assumption about the solution strategy for the problem. Analysis  $A$  outputs

$z$ , which is an input to  $B$ . Hence,  $A$  should be run before  $B$  with  $y$  being iterated on to convergence with  $y^t$ . However, a slightly different formulation is equally valid and still represents the exact same problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{given } B : x, z \rightarrow y \\
&\quad A : x, y \rightarrow m, z^t \\
&\text{min. } f(m) \\
&\text{w.r.t. } x, y, z \\
&\text{s.t. } g(z^t, z) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Equation 2 differs only slightly from Eq. 1.  $A$  is now dependent on the output of  $B$ , and  $z$  will be iterated on to convergence with  $z^t$ . Now the problem can be solved by running  $B$  first and then  $A$ . Since the formulations in Eqs. 1 and 2 both describe the same problem and neither can be the FPF. They are both specific versions of the same more fundamental description of the problem that is common between them. We present the FPF as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{given } A : x, y \rightarrow m, z^t \\
&\quad B : x, z \rightarrow y^t \\
&\text{min. } f(m) \\
&\text{w.r.t. } x, y, z \\
&\text{s.t. } g1(z^t, z) = 0 \\
&\quad g2(y^t, y) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The FPF in Eq. 3 differs from both Eq. 1 and Eq. 2 because it has two constraints which both must be met. The presence of both of these constraints fully decouples the problem so that either  $A$  or  $B$  could be run first or both could be run simultaneously. Alexandrov and Lewis investigated problem formulation in this fully decoupled way as part of their work on Reconfigurability in MDO Problem Synthesis (REMS).<sup>2</sup> In this work they show how removing either constraint and replacing it with a direct dependence between the two analyses, a process they term “collapsing”, you could regain the earlier two problem formulations.

### III. Existing Graph-Based Syntax

As shown above, the mathematical language for specifying problem formulations is very general and can be used both for fundamental and specific problem formulations. Tedford and Martins used the above mathematical syntax to specify the FPF for a set of test problems and also to describe specific formulations for solving them with a number of optimization architectures.<sup>3</sup> Their work demonstrates clearly how multiple specific problem formulations can all relate back to a common FPG. The challenge with using this traditional mathematical syntax is that it is not easily manipulated or analyzed. A number of graph-based methods have been used successfully to translate the mathematical syntax into a more useful computational form.

Steward’s Design Structure Matrix (DSM) is a square adjacency matrix which captures the relationship between analysis tools where off diagonal elements of the matrix indicate coupling.<sup>4</sup> Since a DSM describes a square adjacency matrix, it can be represented in an equivalent directed graph where nodes represent analysis tools and edges represent information dependence between those tools. The ordering of elements in a DSM can be used to indicate execution order. For more complex problems, choosing the proper order to run analysis tools is a non-trivial task. Rogers et. al developed DeMAID to manipulate a DSM to find an ordering for analysis tools that reduces the cost of solving highly coupled systems.<sup>5</sup> This re-ordering is done through row operations on the DSM matrix and yields multiple specific problem formulations which all solve the same FPF. In other words, manipulation of the DSM does not fundamentally alter the problem formulation, which makes DSM an excellent foundation for specifying the FPF itself.

Despite it’s attractive properties, a DSM by itself is insufficient to describe complete problem formulations. Traditional DSM only captures information about data dependency between analyses. Objective and constraint information is missing from the description of the problem. An alternative matrix-based syntax, called a Functional Dependency Table (FDT), was proposed by Wagner and Papalambros. FDT represents

the relationship between functions, including objectives and constraints, and specific variables that affect them.<sup>6</sup> Similar to DSM, FDT also describes an adjacency matrix of a graph. Unlike the DSM graph, however, the graph is undirected and nodes can represent analysis tools, objectives, or constraints. Edges between nodes represent a dependence on the same variable. Michelena and Papalambros made use of the FDT to solve a graph partitioning problem that yielded more efficient optimization problem decompositions.<sup>7</sup> While FDT succeeds at capturing the information about objectives and constraints, it can not capture the coupled data dependency that DSM captures. For instance, we know from the FPF in Eq. 3 that the objective,  $f$ , is dependent on the output,  $m$ , of analysis  $A$ . You could not determine that from the FDT in Fig. 1 alone. This missing information means that, while FDT is very useful for partitioning problems, it is also not sufficient to contain a complete problem formulation.

Figure 1: Functional Dependency Table (FDT) for Eq. 3

Lamb and Martins also included objectives and constraint functions as nodes in an Extended DSM (XDSM) in order to capture a more complete description of solution strategies for MDAO problems.<sup>8</sup> Unlike REMS, XDSM also includes nodes for solvers and optimizers to enable complete definition of MDAO architectures. Martins uses XDSM to describe 13 different optimization architectures in a survey paper that provides a novel classification of the different techniques.<sup>9</sup> With the additional information included in an XDSM, Lu and Martins applied both ordering and partitioning algorithms on an MDAO test problem named the Scalable Problem.<sup>10</sup>

Figure 2: XDSM for Eq. 1, with a gauss-siedel iteration and MDF solution architecture.

Although XDSM captures part of the functional aspects of FDT, it leaves out the variables themselves. As a result, all variable information is aggregated so that for the problem from Eq. 3 you can say that  $A$  depends on  $B$  or vice versa, but you can't identify which individual variables are interacting in the dependency cycle. Without the detailed variable information, you can't construct the compatibility constraints necessary to implement the problem. Additionally, XDSM requires the use of solver and optimizer blocks to represent the relationship between design variables and objectives/constraints. By introducing solver or optimizer blocks XDSM automatically provides some kind of solution strategy. The XDSM for Eq. 1 is given in Figure 2. This diagram is shown with an assumed gauss-siedel iteration scheme and a MDF solution architecture. Hence XDSM is too specific for use with a fundamental problem formulation.

Of all the methods, REMS comes the closest to fully describing a problem formulation, but lacks the ability to represent optimizers and solvers in more specific problem formulations. While XDSM does include optimizers and constraints, it relies on their presence and can't be used for a more fundamental problem statement. We propose a new graph syntax that combines the key features of REMS and XDSM and provides new language to enable more complete description of MDAO problems.

## IV. Requirements for New Graph Syntax

The ultimate goal of the new graph-based syntax presented here is to be able to fully describe the general structure of an MDAO problem independently of any solution information, while still being able to accommodate the more specific case when a solution strategy is applied. In order to achieve that goal the graph needs to accommodate a number of constructs of MDAO problems:


- Analysis tools and connections between them
- Design variables, objectives, and constraints
- Local and global properties
- Coupling between analyses
- Multi-fidelity analyses

Beyond those basic constructs, there are also three phases of a design process that all need to be representable with the new syntax. Firstly there is the initial problem definition phase where the specific analysis tools and design goals are identified. At the end of this phase, a single formal problem formulation is selected specifying design variables, constraints, objectives, analysis tools, etc. Lastly some specific procedure for solving the problem is selected, for example picking an MDAO optimization architecture. Using the proposed graph syntax, each of these phases can be represented with a related graph.

- Maximal Connectivity Graph (MCG)
- Fundamental Problem (FPG)
- Problem Solution Graph (SPG)

The *maximal connectivity graph* represents the first phase with all analysis codes being considered and all possible connections between them also present. The second graph is *fundamental problem formulation graph*, which is the smallest possible graph that still fully defines a given problem formulation. Finally, a *specific problem formulation* may be represented by including additional edges and node types to represent the solution strategy being employed to solve the problem.


The relationship between these three graphs is depicted in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b). The tree diagram demonstrates the fact that it is generally possible to obtain multiple FPGs from a single maximal connectivity graph. This may correspond to different down-selections of analysis codes, different connections between them, or both. Each down-selection shrinks the number of possible FPGs that could be reached until only one is remaining. Then, from a single FPG, different PSGs may be obtained by implementing different solution strategies. If you consider the size of a graph to be the sum of all its edges and nodes then the hourglass shape in Fig. 3(b) illustrates how the MCG gets reduced to a single FPG, then multiple possible PSGs exist to solve the problem. In other words the FPG is obtained from the MCG by removing nodes and edges, and the PSG is obtained from the FPG by adding nodes and edges.



**Figure 3: The relationship between the MCG, FPG, and PSG.**

## V. Syntax Definition

In the rest of this section we present the necessary graph theory fundamentals to construct any of the different graphs discussed above. The notation used in this work is adapted from Diestel.<sup>11</sup> A *graph* is a pair  $G = (V, E)$  of sets such that  $E \subseteq V \times V$ , which means that the elements of  $E$  are 2-element subsets of  $V$ . The set  $V$  contains the *vertices* or *nodes* and the set  $E$  contains the *edges*. For a *directed graph*<sup>\*</sup> we construct  $E$  as a set of ordered pairs instead of a set of sets. Each ordered pair represents an edge starting at the node indicated by the first entry and directed to the node indicated by the second entry. Edge  $e = (x, y)$  may be referred to simply as  $xy$ . For node  $v \in V$  the edges directed out are given by  $E(v)$  and the edges directed into  $v$  are given by  $E^{-1}(v)$ ;  $E(E(v))$  is denoted as  $E^2(v)$ , and likewise for additional levels.



**Figure 4: Example directed graph.**

As an example, for the directed graph shown in Fig. 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \\ E &= \{(1, 2), (3, 2), (1, 3), (3, 4)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $I$  be a nonempty set of counting numbers such that for each  $i \in I$  there is a corresponding set  $A_i$ . The set of sets  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i \mid i \in I\}$  is called an indexed family of sets with index  $i$  and indexing set  $I$ .<sup>12</sup> The union over this family of sets can be described in a few different ways:

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A = \{x \mid x \in A \text{ for some } A \in \mathcal{A}\}. \quad (4)$$

Lastly, the cardinality of a set  $B$  is the number of elements in  $B$  and is denoted as  $|B|$ .

### A. Node and Edge Types

There are four node types:

**variable:** represents scalar or array data

**model:** responsible for mapping inputs to outputs

**expression:** simple algebraic combinations of variables (such as for constraint of objective functions)

**driver:** control logic capable of managing iteration

In addition to the four node types, there are three edge types:

**fixed edge:** Fundamental, non-changeable property of a problem, such as connections between related variable nodes. These edges can never be removed from a graph.

**explicit edge:** Explicit exchange of information between two nodes. No node can have more than a single incoming explicit edge. These edges are free and can be added or removed from the graph.

**implicit edge:** Implicit passing of information from a driver node to a variable node. A single variable node can have many incoming implicit edges. These edges are free and can be added or removed from the graph.

[[Insert legend for node and edge types]]

## B. Rules for Nodes and Edges

The driver node and the implicit edge are only allowed to be present in PSGs. All other node and edge types can be present in any of the three graphs, subject to a few restrictions:

1. A model node can only have one edge directed to or from another model node.
2. A model node can only have fixed edges directed in or out.
3. A model node must have at least one edge directed in and at least one edge directed out.
4. If a variable node has an outgoing edge to a model node then it may not have any other outgoing edges.
5. If a variable node has any incoming explicit edges, it may not have any incoming implicit edges.

## C. In-degree and Out-degree

The *in-degree* of a node is the number of fixed or explicit edges directed in and is denoted as  $\deg^-(v)$ , and the *out-degree* is the number of fixed or explicit edges directed out and it is denoted as  $\deg^+(v)$ . We also define the *upper in-degree limit*

$$\deg_u^-(v) : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \quad (5)$$

and the *lower in-degree limit*

$$\deg_l^-(v) : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

These user-specified limits govern the number of explicit edges that may be directed into a node for a valid graph. Consider a variable node  $v$  with  $\deg_u^-(v) = \deg_l^-(v) = 1$ . In this case, that node must have exactly one incoming explicit edge or the graph is invalid. Two possibilities exist for violating the limit conditions:

**hole:** The number of incoming edges is less than  $\deg_l^-(v)$ .

$$\deg^-(v) < \deg_l^-(v) \quad (7)$$


**collision:** The number of incoming edges is greater than  $\deg_u^-(v)$ .

$$\deg^-(v) > \deg_u^-(v) \quad (8)$$

## VI. Graph Representation of MDAO Constructs

### A. Analysis Blocks and Connections

Analysis tools take in a number input variables, then perform some work to calculate the values for their respective outputs. In an MDAO graph, this process is represented by an group of nodes and edges called an *analysis block*, shown in Fig. 5. Within an analysis block each variable node represents a single input or output and is connected to a single model node via a fixed edge. Note that in Fig. 5, the analysis block contains two model nodes, with a single edge connecting them. This edge represents the necessary calculations to map given inputs to proper output values. If constructing a weighted graph, the weight calculation edge provides the opportunity to computational cost. However, it is also allowed to skip this edge and have both incoming and outgoing edges to variables through a single model node for a given analysis block. Although analysis blocks are comprised of multiple nodes and edges, since all the edges within them are fixed, they become fixed sub-graphs within a graph.



**Figure 5: Example analysis block. The each node type and edge type is labeled in *italics* and annotated parenthetically.**

Via the analysis block structure, we can also distinguish between input and output variable nodes. Inputs are any variable nodes that have an outgoing edge into a model node. Conversely, outputs are any variable nodes that have an incoming edge from a model node. Note that by this definition, inputs and outputs can only exist when variable nodes poses an edge joining them to a model node. In Fig. 5 these are labeled out as local inputs and local outputs. The variables are local because they are explicitly tied to the analysis block and have no relevance without it.

MDAO problems require that information be passed between sets of analyses. When information from the output of one analysis block is passed, or connected, to the input of another analysis block, a new explicit edge is added connecting the two variable nodes involved in the exchange. Explicit edges are free because, unlike the edges within an analysis block, they could be added or removed depending on the demands of the specific problem. In other words, explicit edges are created by engineers linking the output of one tool to the input of another one. Note that it is allowed for a single output to have outgoing explicit edges to multiple other inputs. In Fig [insert ref], an output from analysis block A is connected to the inputs for both blocks B and C.


[[insert graph fig here]]

### B. Design Variables, Objectives, and Constraints

Design variables, objectives, and constraints all require external decisions to be made about a given system to identify them. Consider a notional problem given by the graph in Fig. 6 There are three input variables which, could potentially become design variables:  $w$ ,  $x$ , and  $y$ . Because the output,  $x$ , of  $A$  is connected to the input,  $x$ , of  $B$   $x$  can't actually be a design variable. The inputs  $w$  and  $y$  have no incoming edges and could each be selected as design variables.

More formally, any input variable that can be defined as a hole by Eqn. 7 would be considered a design variable in the graph. When working with a MCG or FPG, only fixed and explicit edges are allowed, in






**Figure 6: Notional graph with two potential design variables**

which case a design variable is simply a variable node with no incoming edges. For a valid PSG any design variable node would have at least one (but possible multiple) incoming implicit edge from a driver node.

Objective and constraints are also constructs that need to be identified by engineers as part of the design process. In the case of objective functions single output values could be selected, but commonly multiple values are assembled together via simple arithmetic operations to form the final objective function. For example, the problem from Fig. 6 might have an objective function of  $z^2$  or  $2y + z$ . Constraints are always given in the form of either an inequality or an equality, e.g.  $\frac{2y}{10} - 1 < 0$  or  $3x + 2y - 5 = 0$ . In both cases, an engineer explicitly identifies variables or groups of variables and assigns a simple, explicit relationship between them.

For the proposed syntax, objectives and constraints are represented through the use of expression nodes. These nodes contain the actual mathematical expression used to define the objective or constraint value. Objective or constraint nodes are distinguished via the presence of a simple expression (objective) vs an inequality/equality (constraint). Fig. 7 shows the notional problem graph augmented with objective and constraint values.



**Figure 7: Notional graph with and objective and constraint nodes**

### C. Local vs Global Nodes

A simple definition of a global node is any node that involves information from more than one analysis block. Likewise, a local node is any node that involves information from only a single analysis block. As stated before, variable nodes with fixed edges directed to model nodes (as part of an analysis block) are inherently local and similarly model nodes are also local. Expression and driver nodes are not inherently local or global though. For these, their locality is determined by the incoming and outgoing edges they possess. Consider the graph in Fig [insert ref], where the expression node  $g$  represents some kind of constraint for the optimization problem. Since  $g$  only had edges coming from analysis block  $B$ , it would be considered a local constraint on block  $B$ .

[[insert graph here]]

Although we’ve already established that variable nodes in an analysis block are local to that block, global design variables are a part of many MDAO problems. We’ve previously defined a design variable as any

While this simple definition is valid, it glosses over a more subtle aspect of some MDAO problems. Consider the graph in Fig. [insert ref], with three analysis blocks A, B, and C. The expression node,  $g$ , is a constraint that requires information from A and B, so it would be considered global by the previous definition. Since  $g$  has incoming edges from block C, it would not be global with respect to C. You could say that  $g$  is local to the group A, B. In this sense, locality becomes a relative term. A given node can be local to a specific sub-graph of a large problem. This subtle structure can become significant when determining how to partition an MDAO problem for use with certain MDAO architectures. Martins and Marriage demonstrate how Collaborative Optimization outperforms MultiDisciplinary Feasible when they separated a problem into two sub-problems with variables, objectives, and constraints local to each one.<sup>13</sup>

#### D. Coupling Between Analyses

#### E. Multi-fidelity Analyses

### VII. Building MCG, FPG, and PSG

#### A. Maximal Connectivity Graph

To construct the maximal connectivity graph, we assume that a set of codes, global inputs, and objectives and constraints (collectively called global outputs) are provided. The codes are represented by analysis block graphs ((ABGs?))  $A_i = (V_{A_i}, E_{A_i})$ ,  $i \in I$ , where  $m$  is the number of codes and  $I = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . The global inputs are represented as a set of variable nodes  $V_{\text{in}}$ , and the global outputs are represented by a set of variable nodes  $V_{\text{out}}$ . We assume that  $V_{\text{in}}$ ,  $V_{\text{out}}$ , and each  $A_i$  are given, and that any potential connection between variables is given in the form of explicit edges in the set  $C_M$ . Then we may construct the maximal connectivity graph  $M = (V_M, E_M)$  as

$$V_M = V_{\text{in}} \cup V_{\text{out}} \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} V_{A_i} \right),$$

$$E_M = C_M \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} E_{A_i} \right),$$

The MCG  $M$  is uniquely determined by the given set of analysis blocks, the required outputs, and the given global inputs. In the cases where the set of global inputs is not known a priori, the process of obtaining the FPG will reveal the required inputs, as discussed subsequently.

#### B. Fundamental Problem Formulation Graph

We now define the fundamental problem formulation graph  $F = (V_F, E_F)$  as a directed graph meeting the following conditions, which are explained subsequently,

- (1)  $I_F \subset I$  such that the remaining conditions hold
- (2)  $\forall i \in I_F, \exists v \in V_{A_i}$  with  $t_{\text{node}}(E^{-1}(v)) = \text{‘model’}$  and  $\deg^+(v) > 0$
- (3)  $V_{\text{in},F} = \{v \in V_{\text{in}} \mid \deg^+(v) > 0\}$  ((maybe this should be 1 instead of 0 to match the previous definition of global input))
- (4)  $V_F = V_{\text{in},F} \cup V_{\text{out}} \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I_F} V_{A_i} \right)$
- (5)  $E_F = C_F \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I_F} E_{A_i} \right)$ ,  $C_F \subset C_M$
- (6)  $\forall v \in V_F$  with  $t_{\text{node}}(v) = \text{‘variable,’}$   $\deg_l^-(v) \leq \deg^-(v) \leq \deg_u^-(v)$

The set  $I_F$  is an index set containing the indices of the analysis blocks in  $F$  and it may only include the analysis blocks  $A_i$  that meet requirements (2) and (6). Requirement (2) stipulates that each analysis blocks in  $F$  must have at least one local output that is being used. Requirement (3) stipulates that only the global inputs that are being used should be included. Requirements (4) and (5) provide the construction of the sets of nodes and edges, respectively. Lastly, requirement (6) stipulates that the number of edges directed into the variable nodes must be within the lower and upper in-degree limits; if  $\deg^-(v) < \deg_l^-(v)$  the node is called a *hole*, and if  $\deg^-(v) > \deg_u^-(v)$  the node is called a *collision*.

The set  $C_F$  is a set containing explicit edges representing connections. Since  $C_M$  is the set of all potential connections, we must have  $C_F \subset C_M$ . While no other conditions are explicitly stated for  $C_F$ , requirement (6) is actually a requirement on both  $I_F$  and  $C_F$ .

### C. Obtaining the Fundamental Problem Graph

In general, there may be multiple different graphs that satisfy the FPG conditions, though there may be none at all. Here, we describe a process for obtaining an FPG by starting with the MCG and disconnecting explicit edges until the FPG conditions are met. Then the problem is reduced to deciding which explicit edges to remove.

Then, mathematically, the FPG starts with  $C_{F,0} = C_M$ ,  $E_{F,0} = E_M$ ,  $V_{F,0} = V_M$ . The nodes where  $\deg^-(v) < \deg_l^-(v)$  are considered first.

1. The first step is to detect holes and disconnect the explicit edges following them. These explicit edges are removed because they represent variables which cannot be determined because the analysis function does not have adequate inputs. The set of variable nodes which are holes is created as

$$H = \{v \in V_M \mid t_{\text{node}}(v) = \text{'variable'} \text{ and } \deg^-(v) < \deg_l^-(v)\}, \quad (9)$$

which is the set of variable nodes with fewer incoming edges than are allowed by the lower in-degree limit. Then the updated set of edges is created by removing the first set of explicit edges following the hole:

$$C_{F,1} = C_{F,0} \setminus \{(x, y) \in E_M \mid x = E_M^3(v) \text{ for } v \in H\}, \quad (10)$$

and this step is demonstrated by Fig. 8. Because removing these edges can create new holes, this step must be repeated until no more holes are found.




Figure 8: Example variable node indicating a hole.

2. The second step is to detect collisions and to then disconnect enough explicit edges so that the collisions are resolved. The set of variable nodes which contain collisions is created as

$$S_{\text{nodes}} = \{v \in V_M \mid t_{\text{node}}(v) = \text{'variable'} \text{ and } \deg^-(v) > \deg_u^-(v)\}. \quad (11)$$

For each collision node we can construct a set contained the edges directed in. The set containing all of these sets is constructed as

$$S_{\text{edges}} = \{\{(x, y) \in E_M\} \mid y \in S_{\text{nodes}}\} \quad (12)$$

Let  $J = \{1, 2, \dots, |S_{\text{edges}}|\}$  be an indexing set for  $S_{\text{edges}}$  such that each  $S_{\text{edges},j}$  corresponds to a set in  $S_{\text{edges}}$  for  $j \in J$ . An example collision is shown in Fig. 9 to indicate the definition of  $S_{\text{edges},j}$ . We can assume that  $J$  also indexes  $S_{\text{nodes}}$  because there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements in  $S_{\text{nodes}}$  and the elements in  $S_{\text{edges}}$  (which are sets). Then we may construct sets of edges as

$$B_j = \{e_k \in S_{\text{edges},j} \mid k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\} \text{ with } K \leq \deg_u^-(v_j)\}, \quad j \in J, \quad (13)$$


which means that each set  $B_j$  is constructed from the set  $S_{\text{edges},j}$  by taking only as many edges as are allowed by the upper in-degree limit of  $v_j$ . The construction of each  $B_j$  corresponds to making a decision on which edges to include and which edges not to include. Then let

$$C_{F,2} = \{e \in C_{F,1} \mid e \in B_j \text{ for some } j \in J\}, \quad (14)$$

$$E_{F,2} = E_M \setminus (C_M \setminus C_{F,2}) \quad (15)$$

and

$$F_2 = (V_M, E_{F,2}) \quad (16)$$



**Figure 9: Example variable node indicating a collision.**

3. The third and final step is to remove any unused nodes and edges. The indexing set for only the analysis blocks with at least one used local output may be constructed as

$$I_F = \{i \in I \mid \exists v \in V_{A_i} \text{ such that } t_{\text{node}}(E_{F,2}^{-1}(v)) = \text{'model'} \text{ and } \deg^+(v) > 0\}, \quad (17)$$

where the degree is calculated with respect to  $F_2$ . This set excludes both the analysis blocks that were unused in the original MCG and those that became unused in step 1 or step 2.

The set of used global inputs is constructed as

$$V_{\text{in},F} = \left\{v \in V_{\text{in}} \mid |\{(x,y) \in E_{F,2}(v) \mid y \in V_{A_i} \text{ for } i \in I_F\}| > 1\right\}, \quad (18)$$

which requires that at least two edges directed out of the nodes in  $V_{\text{in},F}$  must be to the analysis blocks indexed by  $I_F$ .

Finally, the set of nodes and edges describing a fundamental problem formulation is given by

$$V_F = V_{\text{in},F} \cup V_{\text{out}} \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I_F} V_{A_i} \right), \quad (19)$$

$$C_F = \{(x,y) \in C_{F,2} \mid x,y \in V_F\}, \quad (20)$$

$$E_F = C_F \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I_F} E_{A_i} \right), \quad (21)$$

$$F = (V_F, E_F). \quad (22)$$

## D. Solution Graph Syntax

What is the difference between a problem formulation and a problem solution method? Convert from a cyclic graph, to an acyclic graph

- Cycles indicate convergence loops or design variable loops
- Problem can't be solved until all loops are \*removed\* by adding solvers/optimizers
- \*Special\* nodes for solvers and optimizers that \*break\* loops (from an algorithmic point of view)
- FPG represents the minimal amount of information necessary to define a problem
- Any solution path grows the graph complexity by adding edges and nodes (or possibly have an empty solution graph, which you build up as you remove edges from problem formulation graph?)

## VIII. Example Problem

This section presents an example problem to demonstrate the process of obtaining the FPG and the advantages of doing so. The task is the conceptual sizing of a single-aisle subsonic transport using an MDAO framework with objectives for performance and total weight for a required mission. The full set of analysis codes available for use is given in Table 1. Each of these analysis codes contribute individual

**Table 1: Analysis codes for subsonic transport sizing**

analysis code	description
VSP	parametric geometry
PDCYL	wing and fuselage weight estimation
NPSS	engine sizing and performance
VORLAX	aerodynamics using the vortex lattice method
PMARC	aerodynamics using a low-order panel method
WATE	engine weight estimation
FLOPSa	mission performance and engine sizing and weight estimation
FLOPSb	mission performance only

disciplinary analysis but they are not mutually exclusive. For example, VORLAX and PMARC are both aerodynamics codes that predict inviscid drag but with different levels of fidelity. The Flight Optimization System (FLOPS) is included twice to represent two different uses. FLOPSa denotes FLOPS being executed for both mission performance and engine analysis, while FLOPSb indicates that FLOPS is executed for only mission performance analysis.


In this example, the MCG is formed using a consistent naming convention and then connecting every variables with the same name, though this is not the only way to form an MCG. Table 2 presents the full list of variables in the leftmost column and then indicates whether the variable is an input or an output of each analysis code. Some of the variables, such as geometry and performance, represent many different variables which have been bundled together due to their similarity. This bundling is not necessary and does not limit the generality of this example, it is done to simplify the presentation.

**Table 2: Analysis code input and output description**

variable	analysis code							
	VSP	PDCYL	NPSS	VORLAX	PMARC	WATE	FLOPSa	FLOPSb
geometry	in	in		in	in	in	in	in
number of engines			in				in	in
mission							in	in
fuselage weight		out					in	in
wing weight		out					in	in
engine weight						out	out	in
wetted area	out						in	in
inviscid drag				out	out			in
drag			in				out	out
engine performance			out			in	out	in
performance							out	out
total weight		in					out	out

The MCG  $M$  is formed in four steps:

1. An analysis block is created for each analysis code using the information in each column of Table 2. Each analysis block is formed by creating variable nodes for each input and directing them into a single model node. This model node is then directed into another model node, which is then directed into a variable node for each output. A sample analysis block is shown for analysis code FLOPSb in Fig. 10.



**Figure 10: Sample analysis block for analysis code FLOPSb using Table 2**

2. Variable nodes are created to represent the objectives for performance and total weight.
3. Variable nodes are created to represent the geometry variable and mission variable global inputs.
4. Explicit edges are created from each variable node to every other variable node representing variables with the same name.


The resulting MCG is shown in Fig. 13. Emerging cycles are shown in yellow and indicate potential cycles that may exist when an FPG is formed.

### A. Obtaining an FPG


As presented in Sec.(), the first step to obtaining an FPG is to detect holes and, to start, we set the lower indegree limit for every node to be one. In this case, it turns out that the variable nodes representing the number of engines is a hole for NPSS, FLOPSa, and FLOPSb. This implies that an FPG cannot be obtained from the given MCG. Therefore, we may now create another variable node to represent the number of engines as a global input and also create explicit edges to supply this new input. Now this step is repeated with the new MCG and no holes are found.

While Sec.() indicated the process for obtaining an FPG, it did not specify how to decide which edges to keep when resolving a collision, that freedom is left to the specific implementation. The benefit of this approach is that standard graph theory algorithms can be used to make these decisions. The first example of this is to obtain an FPG with the fewest possible number of cycles, which are found using the implementation of Johnson's algorithm<sup>7</sup> in the Python package NetworkX. The resulting FPG is shown in Fig. 12 and the only cycle is shown in yellow. A similar alternative would be to minimize the number of analysis blocks involved in cycles, counting multiplicity. While resulting graph has only one cycle, it may be more desirable to include the higher fidelity codes, such as NPSS.

One method to ensure that the edges directed from certain analysis blocks are the ones chosen to resolve the conflicts is to use a ranking system. For this case, consider the rankings for each analysis code given in Table 3. Step two in Sec.() (the resolution of collisions) is now conducted by selecting the edges directed



**Figure 11: Maximal connectivity graph for the subsonic transport example problem**



**Figure 12: FPG with the fewest number of cycles.**

from the analysis blocks with the highest rank for each collision. The resulting FPG is shown in Fig. 13 and this graph has four cycles, which are enumerated in Table 4.

Finally, now consider the case where it is desired to have the inviscid drag input into FLOPSb be a multi-fidelity input. This is done simply by setting the upper indegree limit for that node to two and repeating the (automated) process. In this case, both VORLAX and PMARC are retained, resulting in an FPG that omits only FLOPSa.

Table 3: Example ranking of importance

analysis code	rank
VSP	5
PDCYL	5
NPSS	4
PMARC	4
FLOPSb	4
VORLAX	3
WATE	3
FLOPSa	2




Figure 13: Simple notional problem with two potential design variables

Table 4: Cycles for the FPG obtained using ranking

output/input	analysis code	output/input	analysis code	output/input	analysis code	output/input
engine weight	FLOPSb	drag	NPSS	engine performance	WATE	engine weight
engine performance	FLOPSb	drag	NPSS	engine performance		
fuselage weight	FLOPSb	total weight	PDCYL	fuselage weight		
wing weight	FLOPSb	total weight	PDCYL	wing weight		



## IX. Applications

## X. Conclusions

## References

- <sup>1</sup>Gray, J., Moore, K. T., Hearn, T. A., and Naylor, B. A., “A Standard Platform for Testing and Comparison of MDAO Architectures,” *8th AIAA Multidisciplinary Design Optimization Specialist Conference (MDO)*, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2012, pp. 1–26.
- <sup>2</sup>Alexandrov, N. and Lewis, R., “Reconfigurability in MDO Problem Synthesis, Part 1 and Part 2,” Tech. rep., Papers AIAA-2004-4307 and AIAA-2004-4308, 2004.
- <sup>3</sup>Tedford, N. P. and Martins, J. R. R. a., “Benchmarking multidisciplinary design optimization algorithms,” *Optimization and Engineering*, Vol. 11, No. 1, March 2009, pp. 159–183.
- <sup>4</sup>Steward, D. V., “The Design Structure System: A Method for Managing the Design of Complex Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, Vol. EM-28, No. 3, 1981, pp. 71–74.
- <sup>5</sup>Rogers, J., McCulley, C., and Bloebaum, C., *Integrating a genetic algorithm into a knowledge-based system for ordering complex design processes*, NASA Technical Memorandum, Hampton Virginia, 1996.
- <sup>6</sup>Wagner, T. C. and Papalambros, P. Y., “A general framework for decomposition analysis in optimal design,” *Advances in Design Automation*, Vol. 2, 1993, pp. 315–325.
- <sup>7</sup>Michelena, N. F. and Papalambros, P. Y., “A Hypergraph Framework for Optimal Model-Based Decomposition of Design Problems,” *Mechanical Engineering*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1997, pp. 173–196.
- <sup>8</sup>Lambe, A. B. and Martins, J. R. R. A., “Extensions to the Design Structure Matrix for the Description of Multidisciplinary Design, Analysis, and Optimization Processes,” *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 2012.
- <sup>9</sup>Martins, J. R. R. A. and Lambe, A. B., “Multidisciplinary Design Optimization: Survey of Architectures,” *AIAA Journal*, 2012, pp. 1–46.
- <sup>10</sup>Lu, Z. and Martins, J., “Graph Partitioning-Based Coordination Methods for Large-Scale Multidisciplinary Design Optimization Problems,” *ISSMO Multidisciplinary Analysis Optimization Conference*, No. September, Indianapolis, Indiana, 2012, pp. 1–13.
- <sup>11</sup>Diestel, R., *Graph Theory*, Springer, 2010.
- <sup>12</sup>Smith, D., Eggen, M., and Andre, R. S., *A Transition to Advanced Mathematics*, Brooks/Cole Pub Co, 2006.
- <sup>13</sup>Marriage, C. J. and Martins, J. R. R. A., “Reconfigurable Semi-Analytic Sensitivity Methods and MDO Architectures within the  $\pi$ MDO Framework,” *12th AIAA/ISSMO Multidisciplinary Analysis and Optimization Conference*, No. September, 2008.