

Diabetes Prediction with Incomplete Patient Data

Hao Yi Ong, Dennis Wang, Xiao Song Mu

CS 221: Introduction to Artificial Intelligence Class Project

Introduction

- Given a set of electronic health records, we want to have a smart predictor that prompts high-risk patients to obtain diabetes testing
- Inspired by the Kaggle Practice Fusion Diabetes Classification challenge, with the important exception that we do not have full medical records
- Traditional approaches:
 - Discretize the space for nodes: $\hat{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathbf{Z}^2$ (e.g., Ben-Tal & Nemirovski)
 - Introduce complicated domain-specific heuristics (e.g., Wang et. al.)

Truss Topology Optimization

Produce

- Set of sized bars \mathcal{B} that constitute a truss
- Set of attachment points or nodes \mathcal{X} for the bars

Given

- Set of fixed nodes $\mathcal{X}^{\text{fixed}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ representing the truss foundation
- Set of loading forces \mathcal{F} that the truss is to be designed to support
- Physical space \mathcal{D} that limits where \mathcal{X} can be placed
- Maximum allowable weight of truss W^{max}
- Structural symmetry constraints

To maximize the truss stiffness, which is related to the elastic stored energy $\Theta(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$, where \mathcal{U} is the set of node deflections under load forces

Problem Formulation

The design variables for our truss optimization are:

- Cross sectional areas $a \in \mathbf{R}^m$, where $a_i \in \mathbf{R}$ is the area of the i^{th} bar
- Coordinates $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, where $x_j \in \mathbf{R}^2$ are the coordinates of the j^{th} node

Our problem data are:

- Loading forces $F \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, where $F_j \in \mathbf{R}^2$ is the load on the j^{th} node
- Material densities $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m \in \mathbf{R}$ of bars
- Young's moduli $E_1, \dots, E_m \in \mathbf{R}$ characterizing the elasticities of the bars
- Bar lengths $L_1, \dots, L_m \in \mathbf{R}$, which are dependent on node coordinates x

(Cont'd)

- Force mapping matrix $P(\mathcal{X}) \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times 2n}$, which relates loads F to the internal stresses experienced by the bars, $f \in \mathbf{R}^m$; implicit in P is an adjacency matrix relating each bar to its attachment points
- Stiffness matrix $K(\mathcal{X}, a, L)$, which determines the amount of flex in the truss

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{E_i a_i}{L_i^2} p_i p_i^T,$$

where p_1, \dots, p_m are the columns of the force mapping matrix P

Our truss design optimization is further characterized by the following variables, whose relations contain all of the physics of the problem:

- Node deflections $u \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ due to the truss flexing under loads F , where $u_j \in \mathbf{R}^2$ is the deflection of the j^{th} node; by Hooke's Law, we have the force balance $F = Ku$
- Internal stress $f_i \in \mathbf{R}$ experienced by each bar due to the node deflections

$$f_i = -\frac{E_i a_i}{L_i^2} p_i^T u, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

- Stored elastic energy $\Theta = \frac{1}{2} F^T u$, which we minimize in order to maximize the truss stiffness

An Alternating Convex Optimization Approach

The minimization of Θ in (a, x) that follows from our formulation above is non-convex. As a heuristic to solve the optimization problem, we first optimize over the bar sizes a , and then over the node coordinates x :

- We perform a linear change of coordinates to cast the bar sizing problem as a second-order cone program (SOCP) in $w, v \in \mathbf{R}^m$:

$$w_i + v_i = -\frac{1}{2} \left(u^T P \right)_i f_i,$$

$$w_i - v_i = a_i$$

The value of $w_i + v_i$ is therefore the spring energy stored in the i^{th} bar

- Holding x constant, find the bar cross sectional areas a that minimize Θ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} \quad \Theta = 1^T (w + v) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad Pf + F = 0 \\ &\quad \quad \quad M(w - v) \leq d \\ &\quad \quad \quad \left\| \left(v_i, \frac{L_i}{\sqrt{E_i}} f_i \right) \right\|_2 \leq w_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad \quad \quad 1^T (w - v) \leq W^{\text{max}} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

- We then perform an affine change of coordinates to cast the node positioning problem as an SOCP in $w, v \in \mathbf{R}^m$ (different from above):

$$w_i + v_i = -\frac{1}{2} \left(u^T P \right)_i f_i,$$

$$w_i - v_i = \frac{2p_i^T y_i}{L_i} + 1$$

(Cont'd)

- Holding a constant, find a set of displacements $y \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ that "shift" the node coordinates x from their original positions and minimize Θ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} \quad \Theta = 1^T (w + v) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad Pf + F = 0 \\ &\quad \quad \quad \frac{1}{2} ((w_i - v_i) - 1) = \frac{p_i^T y_i}{L_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad \quad \quad \left\| \left(v_i, \frac{L_i}{\sqrt{E_i}} f_i \right) \right\|_2 \leq w_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad \quad \quad \|y_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad \quad \quad g(y) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $g(y) = 0$ enforces truss symmetry, and $\|y_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon_i$ restrict node shifts.

In our heuristic, we first discretize the physical space as in traditional approaches to obtain $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$, and alternate between solving (1) and (2) in each iteration:

```
given  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{fixed}}, \mathcal{F}, \hat{\mathcal{D}}$ 
Generate set of node coordinates  $x^0$  from  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ , set  $x := x^0$ 
repeat
  1. Given  $x$ , obtain  $a$  and  $\Theta_1$  as the solution to and objective of (1)
  2. Given  $a$ , obtain  $y$  and  $\Theta_2$  as the solution to and objective of (2), set  $x := x + y$ 
  3. break if  $\Theta_1$  and  $\Theta_2$  converge
return  $a, x$ 
```

Example: Bridge Design

This problem has 791 variables and 219 constraints. Out of several solvers, SCS was the fastest at 0.3 s per iteration (vs. 2.0 s with SeDuMi at comparable accuracy requirements). SCS's speed advantage scales with problem size (~100 times faster than SeDuMi with 16000 variables, 4000 constraints).

Conclusion

Our alternating convex optimization approach presents a promising tool to solving the non-convex truss design problem. Future work should extend the model to 3-D and compare this approach to other existing methods.

Acknowledgments

We thank Professor Liang and the instructor team, as well as fellow classmates for their help on our project.