

The goal of this method is to evenly sample the near-optimal feasible decision space of a linear optimization model using a version of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling named the hit and run algorithm [1, 2].

1 Model

The model under consideration is linear and convex and can be written on the standard form:

$$\text{minimize } \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{x}) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to } \mathbf{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \quad i = 1 \dots m \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad j = 1 \dots p \quad (3)$$

With $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Besides from the constraints contained in the original optimization problem, an additional constraint is introduced, to separate the near-optimal feasible space, from the entire feasible space.

$$f_0(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_0(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (1 + \epsilon) \quad (4)$$

Where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is an optimal solution to the original problem and $f_0(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is the objective value for the optimal solution. The slack on optimality is given by the slack variable θ .

As the constraints are linear they can be written as matrix products on the form:

$$\mathbf{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0 \Rightarrow A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \Rightarrow H\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c} \quad (6)$$

The set containing all feasible near-optimal solutions then become:

$$F = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^n | A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \wedge H\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}\} \quad (7)$$

2 Presolve

In order to apply the hit and run sampling algorithm, a fully dimensional space is required. As several equalities are included in the definition of F and hidden equalities might be found among the inequality constraints, the fully dimensional subspace of F must be found. Hidden equalities occur when two inequalities limit the range of a variable to zero.

The goal of the presolve process is to define the fully dimensional subspace Z of F .

2.1 Step 1

Initially all linearly dependent constraints/rows in the augmented matrix $[A|\mathbf{b}]$ are identified. Linearly dependent constraints/rows, span parallel hyper-planes in F . If two such hyper-planes were to coincide, and have normal vectors pointing in opposite directions, they constrain a dimension of F and can be represented as an equality rather than two inequalities. For all such inequality constraints constraining a dimension of F , their given row in A are moved from the matrix A to the H matrix.

2.2 Step 2

From [3] (p. 523) we know that the problem can be reformulated as:

$$\text{minimize } \mathbf{f}_0(\hat{\mathbf{x}} + N\mathbf{z}) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{subject to } A(\hat{\mathbf{x}} + N\mathbf{z}) \leq \mathbf{b} \quad i = 1 \dots m \quad (9)$$

$$\text{span}(N) = \mathcal{N}(H) \quad (10)$$

Where the span of N is the null space of H and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is any particular solution contained in F . As all equalities have been eliminated from the problem, the fully dimensional subspace of F can be defined as:

$$Z = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^{n-p} | A(\hat{\mathbf{x}} + N\mathbf{z}) \leq \mathbf{b}\} \quad (11)$$

Using this the optimization problem can be reformulated as:

$$\text{minimize } \mathbf{f}_0(\hat{\mathbf{x}} + N\mathbf{z}) \quad (12)$$

$$\text{subject to } \hat{A}\mathbf{z} \leq \hat{\mathbf{b}} \quad (13)$$

With \hat{A} and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$:

$$\hat{A} = A \cdot N \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{b} - A\hat{\mathbf{x}} \quad (15)$$

By validating that the matrix \hat{A} has full rank, we know that the subspace Z is fully dimensional.

2.3 Calculating the Null space N

Using QR decomposition the Null space of a matrix can be calculated.

Given the $(m \times n)$ matrix H , it can be decomposed to the orthogonal $(m \times m)$ matrix Q , and R which is a $(m \times n)$ upper triangular matrix.

$$H = QR = [Q_1 Q_2] \begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

Where Q_1 is $(m \times r)$ and Q_2 $(m \times m - r)$, with r being the rank of H .
The null space of H is can then by found as $Q_2 = N(H^T)$
For proof see [4]

3 Hit and run sampling

A version of the hit and run algorithm [5], is used to sample the subspace Z . The algorithm consist of an iterative process of drawing random directions, and taking steps of random lengths within the space Z .

Initially a point \mathbf{z}_0 inside the space Z must be provided. Random steps inside Z are then taken by generating a random direction θ and taking a random step t that will not violate the boundaries of Z .

$$\mathbf{z}_{i+1} = \mathbf{z}_i + \theta t \quad (17)$$

θ must be a unit vector pointing in a random direction evenly distributed on a unit hyper sphere \mathbf{S}^{n-p} . I will elaborate on how to do so!!! But this is easy.

To determine the range of t that ensures that the step t does not cross the boundary of Z , Equation 17 is substituted in to Equation 13.

$$\hat{A}(\mathbf{z}_i + \theta t) \leq \hat{b} \quad (18)$$

Isolating t will result in the upper and lower bounds:

$$t_{max} = \inf \frac{\hat{b} - \hat{A}\mathbf{z}_i}{\hat{A}\theta} \text{ given } \hat{A}\theta > 0 \quad (19)$$

$$t_{min} = \sup \frac{\hat{b} - \hat{A}\mathbf{z}_i}{\hat{A}\theta} \text{ given } \hat{A}\theta < 0 \quad (20)$$

Selecting t to be:

$$t = (t_{max} - t_{min})r + t_{min} \quad (21)$$

Where r is a random number drawn from a uniform distribution between 0-1.

Repeating the process of generating random directions θ and taking random step lengths t , will, if enough samples are drawn, generate a uniform sampling of the near optimal feasible set Z . Storing all samples z_i in the discrete set $Z^* = z_i \forall i = 0..d$ where d is the number of samples.

"The reason that the Markov chain corresponding to the iterates Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_d converges in distribution to a uniform distribution over Z is easily seen from the fact that 1) it is possible to go from any point in Z to a neighborhood of any other point in one step, and 2) the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution of the chain." [6]

The hit and run algorithm is *md* hard [7]. Where *m* is the number of constraints and *d* is the number of variables.

4 Decrush

Having sampled Z , these sample points must be reverted back to the F domain. This is done with a so called decrush algorithm.

$$\mathbf{x}_i = N\mathbf{z}_i + \hat{\mathbf{x}} \quad (22)$$

Repeating this for all samples a set containing d samples in F is obtained.

5 Further work

Figure out if sampling Z evenly, generates evenly distributed samples in F when samples are mapped from Z to F .

As of now, i have had sucess with applying the method on problems with $n \approx 10.000$, and i believe that $n \approx 100.000$ is doable on a better pc. This is however one to two order of magnitude from the 1.000.000+ variables included in most modern energy system optimization models. Therefore i have considered two options. 1) Using decomposition methods, such as Benders decomposition to decompose the problem in to manageable sub-problems. Specifically it is only the non-timedependable variables that are truly of interest, and as these only make up ≈ 1000 of the variables in the energy system model. By decomposing the timedependable variables from the non-timedependable variables, and sampling the non-timedependable subspace, could be a solution. I have, however, not managed to figure out if this is a viable solution, as decomposition methods often require several iterations between the two sub-problems. 2) The largest contributor to the large number of variables in energy system models, is the time-series data used. By generating augmented time-series, using techniques such as self organizing maps [8], one can generate shorter time-series, thereby reducing the problem. This is however, a less favorable option than solution (1) as using augmented time-series

References

- [1] Yuansi Chen et al. “Fast MCMC Sampling Algorithms on Polytopes”. In: (), p. 86.
- [2] Seksan Kiatsupaibul, Robert L. Smith, and Zelda B. Zabinsky. “An analysis of a variation of hit-and-run for uniform sampling from general regions”. In: *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation* 21.3 (Mar. 2011), pp. 1–11. ISSN: 1049-3301, 1558-1195. DOI: 10.1145/1921598.1921600. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1921598.1921600> (visited on 10/01/2020).
- [3] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [4] Scott Hyde. “Orthonormal Basis for the Column Space and the Null Space using the QR Decomposition”. In: (), p. 2. URL: <https://jekyll.math.byuh.edu/courses/m343/handouts/qrbasis.pdf>.
- [5] Robert L. Smith. “Efficient Monte Carlo Procedures for Generating Points Uniformly Distributed over Bounded Regions”. In: *Operations Research* 32.6 (1984), pp. 1296–1308. DOI: 10.1287/opre.32.6.1296. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.32.6.1296>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.32.6.1296>.
- [6] R. L. Smith. “The hit-and-run sampler: a globally reaching markov chain sampler for generating arbitrary multivariate distributions”. In: *Proceedings Winter Simulation Conference*. 1996, pp. 260–264.
- [7] Claude Belisle, Arnon Boneh, and Richard Caron. “Convergence properties of Hit-and-Run samplers”. In: *Communications in Statistics. Stochastic Models* 14 (Jan. 1998). DOI: 10.1080/15326349808807500.
- [8] Hasan Umitcan Yilmaz et al. “Reducing energy time series for energy system models via self-organizing maps”. In: *it - Information Technology* 61.2-3 (1Apr. 2019), pp. 125 –133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/itit-2019-0025>. URL: <https://www.degruyter.com/view/journals/itit/61/2-3/article-p125.xml>.