SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

MAST30013 Techniques in Operations Research

Semester 1, 2021

Assignment 2 Solutions

```
a. function val = f(x)
val = x(1)^4 + x(2)^4 + x(3)^4 + x(1)^2 + x(2)^2 - 4^*x(1)^3 - 12^*x(1)^*x(2)^2 \dots
-x(1)*x(2)*x(3)+12*x(1)*x(3)-4*x(3)+1;
end
function grad = gradf(x)
                                                                                              1mark
\operatorname{grad}(1) = 4 \times (1)^3 - 12 \times (1)^2 + 2 \times (1) \times (2)^2 - 12 \times (2)^2 \dots
-x(3)*x(2)+12*x(3);
\operatorname{grad}(2) = 2 \cdot x(1)^2 \cdot x(2) - 24 \cdot x(1) \cdot x(2) - x(3) \cdot x(1) + 4 \cdot x(2)^3;
grad(3) = 4*x(3)^3 + 12*x(1) - x(1)*x(2) - 4;
end
function hess = hessf(x)
hess(1,1) = 12*x(1)^2-24*x(1) + 2*x(2)^2;
                                                                                                1mark
hess(1,2) = 4*x(1)*x(2)-x(3)-24*x(2);
hess(1,3) = 12 - x(2);
hess(2,1) = 4*x(1)*x(2)-x(3)-24*x(2);
                                                                               No need for Matlab notation
hess(2,2) = 2*x(1)^2 - 24*x(1) + 12*x(2)^2;
                                                                               here
hess(2,3) = -x(1);
hess(3,1) = 12 - x(2);
hess(3,2) = -x(1);
hess(3,3) = 12*x(3)^2;
end
```

b.

i. The aggregated results for the steepest descent, Newton's, and the BFGS methods are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

| f-value | Minimiser | No. of times | Av. iter. per search | Ave. time per search (sec) |
|---------|------------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| -373.42 | (4.32, -4.15, -2.54) | 490.00 | 13.90 | - |
| -296.15 | (4.11, 3.96, -1.94) | 430.00 | 19.44 | - |
| -13.25 | (-1.09, -0.0620, 1.63) | 80.00 | 8.00 | - |

Table 1: Steepest Descent

3 marks

| f-value | Minimiser | No. of times | Av. iter. per search | Ave. time per search (sec) | |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| (4.32, -4.15, -2.54) | -373.42 | 450.00 | 5.33 | _ | |
| (4.11, 3.96, -1.94) | -296.15 | 540.00 | 5.19 | _ | |
| (-1.09, -0.0620, 1.63) | -13.25 | 10.00 | 3.00 | _ | |

Table 2: Newton's method

3 marks

| f-value | Minimiser | No. of times | Av. iter. per search | Ave. time per search (sec) |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| (4.32, -4.15, -2.54) | -373.42 | 530.00 | 10.92 | - |
| (4.11, 3.96, -1.94) | -296.15 | 430.00 | 11.72 | - |
| (-1.09, -0.0620, 1.63) | -13.25 | 40.00 | 7.50 | - |

Table 3: BFGS

3 marks

ii. There are three local minima which the algorithms found, with objective values -13.2455, -296.1545, and -373.4173, the last being the best attained when $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (4.3234 - 4.1541 - 2.5437)$. Most of the iterations converged to one of the two best minima in all methods, but the Steepest descent algorithm, for example, found -13.2455 about eighty times over the 1000 runs.

6 marks

Newton's method took the smallest number of iterations for any particular run compared with the BFGS method which was next best and steepest descent which was the worst, but this came at the cost of larger iteration costs (i.e., more calculations per iteration).