Mixed Integer Convex Programming

Computational Intelligence, Lecture 11

by Sergei Savin

Spring 2022

Content

Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP)

General form

A general form of a mixed-integer linear program is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\underset{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \mathbf{f}_1^\top \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{f}_2^\top \mathbf{y}, \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \begin{cases}
\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{b}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\
\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{C}_{12} \\ \mathbf{C}_{21} & \mathbf{C}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_1 \\ \mathbf{d}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^n.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

In other words, the only difference is that some of the variables (denoted above as $\mathbf{y}$) are only allowed to assume pure integer values.

Mixed Integer Quadratic Programming (MIQP)

General form

A general form of a mixed-integer quadratic program is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underset{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{H}_{11} & \mathbf{H}_{12} \\ \mathbf{H}_{21} & \mathbf{H}_{22}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{f}_1 & \mathbf{f}_2\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix}, \\
&\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases}
\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{b}_2\end{bmatrix}, \\
\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{C}_{12} \\ \mathbf{C}_{21} & \mathbf{C}_{22}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y}\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{d}_1 \\ \mathbf{d}_2\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^n.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Other mixed-integer convex programs can be constructed likewise from their pure convex counterparts.

Remarks

- Mixed-integer convex programs are not convex, even if the name seems to suggest otherwise.
- The "convex program" in the phrase "mixed-integer convex program" should be understood as "if we fix values of the integer variables, or relax them into reals, the result will be a convex program".
- Mixed integer programs are usually solved using *branch and bound algorithms*; in worse case scenario, the algorithms performs exhaustive search.
- In robotics applications, integer variables in mixed integer programs are often restricted to binary values, i.e. $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.. It is still called "mixed-integer" in the literature, although phrases such as "mixed-binary" or "binary constraints" are not rare.

Given N convex regions defined by linear inequalities $\{\mathbf{x} : \ \mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_i\}$ (which is called H-polytope representation), find a sequence of K points (footsteps) from the given starting point to the given goal point, such that all footsteps lie in one of the convex regions.

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{x}_1,\ ...,\ \mathbf{x}_K}{\text{minimize}} \quad & ||\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_{\text{start}}|| + ||\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_{\text{goal}}||, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \exists\{\mathbf{A}_j, \mathbf{b}_j\} \in \Omega \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{A}_j\mathbf{x}_i \leq \mathbf{b}_j \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\Omega = \{\{\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{b}_1\},\ \{\mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{b}_2\},\ ...,\ \{\mathbf{A}_N, \mathbf{b}_N\}\}$. This is not a convex program.

One of the key methods associated with the use of mixed-integer programming in robotics is the big-M method.

Assume you have two inequalities, $\mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_2$, and you are happy if at least one of them holds. Define a new binary variables $c_1, c_2 \in \{0,\ 1\}$ and find a big enough constant M, such that $\mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_1 + M$ and $\mathbf{a}_2^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_2 + M$ holds for all of your domain (of the part of it you are interested in). Then you write your constraints as:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_1 + M \cdot c_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2^\top \mathbf{x} \leq b_2 + M \cdot c_2 \\ c_1 + c_2 = 1 \\ c_i \in \{0,\ 1\} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

It works the same way for the case when you have three (or two or more) systems of inequalities $\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_1$, $\mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_2$, $\mathbf{A}_3\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_3$ and are happy if at least one holds:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_1 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_1) \\ \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_2 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_2) \\ \mathbf{A}_3\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_3 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_3) \\ c_1 + c_2 + c_3 = 1 \\ c_i \in \{0,\ 1\} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of all ones. Notice that constraint $c_1 + c_2 + c_3 = 1$ can be replaced with $c_1 + c_2 + c_3 >= 1$, allowing avoid relaxing more than one region.

Big-M method relaxation

Illustration, part 1

Below are two H-polytops (convex regions represented by systems of inequalities):



As we can see, their union represents a non-convex domain, and they have no intersection.

Now, one of them is relaxed as described above. Notice that the intersection of the two polytopes is non-relaxed polytope.





If you have multiple variables $\mathbf{x}_1$, ..., $\mathbf{x}_K$, and each should belong to at least one of the H-polytopes $\{\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{b}_i\}$, this can also be represented using big-M method:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{x}_k \leq \mathbf{b}_1 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_{1,k}) \\ \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{x}_k \leq \mathbf{b}_2 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_{2,k}) \\ \mathbf{A}_3\mathbf{x}_k \leq \mathbf{b}_3 + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_{3,k}) \\ c_{1,k} + c_{2,k} + c_{3,k} = 1 \\ c_{i,k} \in \{0,\ 1\} \\ k = 1, ..., K \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Notice that the only difference from the previous example is that now we have K sets of binary variables $c_{1,k}$, $c_{2,k}$ and $c_{3,k}$.

Using big-M relaxation we can now formulate the problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\mathbf{x}_1,\ ...,\ \mathbf{x}_K}{\text{minimize}} && ||\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_{\text{start}}|| + ||\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_{\text{goal}}||, \\ &\text{subject to} && \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x}_k \leq \mathbf{b}_i + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_{i,k}),\ i = 1, ..., N \\ \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{i,k} = 1 \\ c \in \{0,\ 1\}^{N,\ K} \\ k = 1, ..., K \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In order to make the footsteps evenly spaced we add cost on the distance between consequent steps:

$$\underset{\mathbf{x}_1,\ ...,\ \mathbf{x}_K}{\text{minimize}} \quad ||\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_{\text{start}}|| + ||\mathbf{x}_K - \mathbf{x}_{\text{goal}}|| + w \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} ||\mathbf{x}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i||,$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}_k \leq \mathbf{b}_i + M \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot (1 - c_{i,k}),\ \ i = 1, ..., N \\ \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{i,k} = 1 \\ c \in \{0,\ 1\}^{N,\ K} \\ k = 1, ..., K \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where w is a weight, a coefficient we can tune to adjust relative importance of our primary objective (starting from the point $\mathbf{x}_{\text{start}}$ and finishing at the point $\mathbf{x}_{\text{goal}}$ and our secondary objective (making the footsteps evenly spaced).

Example: Footstep planning

Code, part 1

```
n = 2;
shift_1 = 1*rand(n, 1);
shift_2 = 1*rand(n, 1);
V1 = randn(n, 6);
V2 = randn(n, 6) + shift_1;
V3 = randn(n, 6) + shift_1 + shift_2;

indices_convhull = convhull(V1');
V1 = V1(:, indices_convhull);
indices_convhull = convhull(V2');
V2 = V2(:, indices_convhull);
indices_convhull = convhull(V3');
V3 = V3(:, indices_convhull);

[A1, b1] = vert2con(V1');
[A2, b2] = vert2con(V2');
[A3, b3] = vert2con(V3');
```

Example: Footstep planning

Code, part 2

```
number_of_steps = 7;
start_point = sum(V1, 2) / size(V1, 2);
finish_point = sum(V3, 2) / size(V3, 2);
weight_goal = 5;
bigM = 15;

cvx_begin
    variable x(n, number_of_steps)
    binary variable c(3, number_of_steps);

    cost = 0;
    for i = 1:(number_of_steps-1)
        cost = cost + norm(x(:, i) - x(:, i+1));
    end
    cost = cost + norm(x(:, 1) - start_point)*
    weight_goal;
    cost = cost + norm(x(:, number_of_steps) -
    finish_point)*weight_goal;
    minimize( cost )
```

Example: Footstep planning

Code, part 3

```
    subject to
        for i = 1:number_of_steps
            A1*x(:, i) <= b1 + (1 - c(1, i))*bigM;
            A2*x(:, i) <= b2 + (1 - c(2, i))*bigM;
            A3*x(:, i) <= b3 + (1 - c(3, i))*bigM;
            c(1, i) + c(2, i) + c(3, i) == 1;
        end
cvx_end

plot(x(1, :)', x(2, :)', '^', 'MarkerEdgeColor', 'k', '
    MarkerSize', 10, 'LineWidth', 2); hold on;
```

Homework

Implement footstep planning for a biped, making sure every pair of steps lands in the same H-polytope.

Lecture slides are available via Moodle.

You can help improve these slides at:
github.com/SergeiSa/Computational-Intelligence-Slides-Spring-2022

Check Moodle for additional links, videos, textbook suggestions.