Journal of Global Optimization (2005) 33: 435–464
DOI 10.1007/s10898-005-0936-y

A Global Optimization Method, QBB, for Twice-Differentiable Nonconvex Optimization Problem

YUSHAN ZHU[1,2,*] and TAKAHITO KUNO[1]
[1]*Institute of Information Sciences and Electronics, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8573, Japan*
[2]*Department of Chemical Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (e-mail: yszhu@tsinghua.edu.cn).*

(Received 2 August 2001; accepted in final form 16 January 2005)

Abstract. A global optimization method, QBB, for twice-differentiable NLPs (Non-Linear Programming) is developed to operate within a branch-and-bound framework and require the construction of a relaxed convex problem on the basis of the quadratic lower bounding functions for the generic nonconvex structures. Within an exhaustive simplicial division of the constrained region, the rigorous quadratic underestimation function is constructed for the generic nonconvex function structure by virtue of the maximal eigenvalue analysis of the interval Hessian matrix. Each valid lower bound of the NLP problem with the division progress is computed by the convex programming of the relaxed optimization problem obtained by preserving the convex or linear terms, replacing the concave term with linear convex envelope, underestimating the special terms and the generic terms by using their customized tight convex lower bounding functions or the valid quadratic lower bounding functions, respectively. The standard convergence properties of the QBB algorithm for nonconvex global optimization problems are guaranteed. The preliminary computation studies are presented in order to evaluate the algorithmic efficiency of the proposed QBB approach.

Key words: branch-and-bound algorithm, Global optimization, interval Hessian matrix, QBB, simplicial division

1. Introduction

The vast majority of the chemical process design and control problems is determined by the optimal solutions, however those problems are mainly characterized by the existence of multiple minima and maxima, as well as first, second, and higher order saddle points. Those nonconvex optimization problems always frustrate the chemical engineers in their search to arrive at better designs for novel or existing processes. These problems arise in many sorts of engineering chemistry field, such as heat exchange network design, chemical and phase equilibrium, and reaction-separation sequencing. Despite the importance of identifying the global minimum

solution or valid bound on that solution, this can rarely reached rigorously. Contributions from the chemical engineering community to the area of global optimization can be traced to the work of Stephanopoulos and Westerberg (1975), and Westerberg and Shah (1978). Renewed interest in seeking global solution was motivated by the work of Floudas et al. (1989). Thereofore, in the last decade we have experienced a resurgence of interest in chemical engineering for new methods of global optimization as well as the application of available global optimization algorithms to important engineering field (Ryoo and Sahinidis, 1995, 1996, 2003; Grossmann, 1996; Sahinidis, 1996; Smith and Pantelides, 1999; Floudas, 2000; Parthasarathy and El-Halwagi, 2000; Tawarmalani and Sahinidis, 2001, 2002, 2004; Zhu and Kuno, 2003). This recent surge of interest is attributed to three main reasons. First, a large number of engineering chemistry and computational chemistry problems are indeed global optimization problems (Wales and Scheraga, 1999). Second, the existing local nonlinear optimization approaches may fail to obtain even a feasible solution or are trapped to a local optimum solution, which may differ in value significantly from the global solution. Third, the global optimum solution may have a very different physical interpretation when it is compared to local solution, the chemical and phase equilibrium problem is a very real one since in equilibrium a local solution may provide incorrect prediction of types of phases at equilibrium, as well as the compositions in each phase (McDonald and Floudas, 1994; Zhu and Xu, 1999; Zhu and Inoue, 2001).

One of the major difficulties with global optimization problems is the lack of practical criteria, which decide when a local solution is global. Then, many iterative schemes (Horst and Tuy, 1990; Horst and Pardalos, 1995; Tuy, 1998) are developed which require some global information in each step. The branch-and-bound framework is one of the most promising methods for solving multiextremal global optimization problems. The main idea of this framework consists of two basic operations: successively refined partitioning of the feasible region and estimation of lower and upper bounds for the optimal value of the objective function over each subset generated by the partitions. Most often, lower bounding procedures are established using suitable types of underestimation of the functions involved in the problem under consideration. As a result, lower bounds are computed by solving relaxed problems in the same space of variables as the original problems. In particular, the GOP algorithm for biconvex problems (Floudas and Visweswaran, 1990, 1993) and the branch-and-bound algorithm for bilinear problem (Al-Khayyal and Falk, 1983) rely on mathematical properties specific to the problem solved to obtain a tight lower bounding problem. Phillips et al. (1996) proposed a convex quadratic function underestimator for general nonconvex function with numerous local minima, which was fitted by using a set of distinct local minima of

the nonconvex function computed by an unconstrained minimizer. Since there is no any guarantee that such set contains all local minima and the global minimum, then it is not a deterministic global underestimator. Floudas and his coworkers (Floudas, 2000) suggested an approach which necessitates the identification of the minimum eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix of the functions to be convexified over a rectangular domain. The αBB algorithm, developed on the basis of this technique, converges with mathematical rigor for the class of twice-differentiable nonconvex programs. Recently, in order to locate the global solutions of the nonconvex phase stability analysis problems (Zhu and Xu, 1999; Zhu and Inoue, 2001), a quadratic underestimation function based branch and bound algorithm (QBB) is developed for twice-differentiable NLPs in terms of the simplicial partition of the constrained region.

The determination of phase stability, i.e. whether or not a given mixture will split into multiple phases, is a key step in any separation process. Its results can facilitate the search for the true equilibrium solution if a postulated solution is thermodynamically unstable with respect to perturbations in any or all of the phases, which can be evaluated by minimizing the tangent plane distance function (TPDF). Zhu and Xu (1999) developed a novel branch and bound algorithm for TPDF described by UNIQUAC equation on the basis of compact partition of the feasible region, where the separable assumption is no longer needed for the construction of the valid underestimation function. However, the nonconvexity is only caused by the concave function in the D.C. (Difference of two Convex functions) formulation of the TPDF. Further, QBB algorithm (Zhu and Inoue, 2001) is developed for the minimization of the stability analysis problem on the basis of a rigorous underestimator constructed by interval analysis, which is a method to expand the application of the QBB algorithm from the special D.C. structure of the stability analysis problem described by UNIQUAC model to the generic nonconvex function structure. However, a systematic investigation of the QBB algorithm, especially its convergence proof, is indispensable so as to show that it can converge asymptotically on the global solution to the general twice-differentiable NLPs with theoretical guarantee. In this paper, the relaxed convex programming problem is constructed based on the quadratic underestimation function under a branch-and-bound framework. The lower bound computed by solving this relaxed problem is monotonic with the refined division of the optimal region. The algorithm convergences are developed by virtue of the exhaustiveness of the simplicial bisection if the QBB algorithm does not terminate after finite iterations since it generates infinite sequences of feasible and/or infeasible points converging to one of the optimal solutions.

The organization of this paper follows that Section 2 contributes to the main development of the QBB algorithm and its convergence proof,

while Section 3 presents the preliminary numerical experiments of the QBB algorithm.

2. The QBB Global Optimization Algorithm

The nonconvex optimization problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{array}{lll}(P) & \min\limits_{\mathbf{x}} & f(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \\ & & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^0 \subset \Re^n \end{array}$$

where, f and $\mathbf{g}_i$ belong to C^2, the set of twice-differentiable functions, and $\mathbf{S}^0$ is a simplex defined by

$$\mathbf{S}^0 = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Re^n : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{n}+1} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}^i, \lambda_i \geqslant 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{n}+1} \lambda_{\mathrm{i}} = 1 \right\}$$

where $\mathbf{V}^i \in \mathbf{V} \subset \Re^n$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n+1$ are the $n+1$ vertices of the simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$, and $\mathbf{V}$ is the set of its vertices. Note that functions f and $\mathbf{g}_i$ may take some simpler forms, such as linear. And if the equality constraint appears, it can be transformed equivalently to two inequality constraints. Then the above formulation does not lose the generality to be any twice-differentiable NLP. And an initial simplex can be obtained by an outer approximation method done only on the polyhedral constraints of this problem, which is introduced in the latter section. Let D_g be a subset of $\Re^n$ defined by

$$D_g = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Re^n : \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0, \mathrm{i} = 1, 2, \ldots, m \right\}.$$

In general, the set D_g is nonconvex and even disconnected. W assume throughout the paper that Problem (P) has an optimal solution, unless otherwise stated. For any nonconvex optimization problem, i.e. (P), the QBB algorithm proposed in this paper belongs to a branch and bound scheme. During each iteration of this framework, a branching step and a bounding step must be finished simultaneously. Then, we start to develop this algorithm with the basic operations needed in this scheme.

2.1. SIMPLICIAL PARTITION

For the branching procedure, the simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$ will be divided into refined subregions by using the well-known simplicial partition often used in global optimization algorithm. For such kind of branching, it is a simple matter to check that for every $i \in I$, where I is the vertex set of $\mathbf{S}^0$, the

points $\mathbf{V}^1, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{i-1}, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}^{i+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{n+1}$ are vertices of a simplex $\mathbf{S}_i \subset \mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{S}$ is the current simplex, and that

$$(\text{int } \mathbf{S}_i) \cap (\text{int } \mathbf{S}_j) = \phi \quad \forall j \neq i; \quad \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbf{S}_i = \mathbf{S}.$$

Then, the simplexes $\mathbf{S}_i$, $i \in I$, form a subdivision of the simplex $\mathbf{S}$ via $\mathbf{U}$. Each $\mathbf{S}_i$ will be referred to as a subsimplex of $\mathbf{S}$. Clearly, this partition is proper since it consists of at least two members if and only if $\mathbf{U}$ does not coincide with any $\mathbf{V}^i$. An important special case is the bisection where the $\mathbf{U}$ is a point of the longest edge of the simplex $\mathbf{S}$, for example $\mathbf{U} \in [\mathbf{V}^m, \mathbf{V}^n]$, i.e.

$$\|\mathbf{V}^m - \mathbf{V}^n\| = \max_{\substack{i<j \\ i,j=1,\ldots,n+1}} \{\|\mathbf{V}^i - \mathbf{V}^j\|\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes any given norm in $\Re^n$, and $\mathbf{U} = a\mathbf{V}^m + (1-a)\mathbf{V}^n$ with $0 < a \leqslant 1/2$. It should be noted here that a means the simplex V is divided into two subsimplexes such that the ratio of the volume of the smaller subsimplex to that of $\mathbf{S}$ is equal to a. Zhu and Inoue (2001) used an exact bisection method since the a is equal to 1/2. Obviously, in an infinite filter of simplexes $\mathbf{S}_1 \supset \mathbf{S}_2 \ldots \supset \mathbf{S}_k \supset \ldots$, the diameter of the simplex $\mathbf{S}_k$, i.e. $\delta(\mathbf{S}_k)$, the length of the longest edge of $\mathbf{S}_k$, will monotonically decrease. For the convergence proofs of the branch and bound algorithm, the most useful concept is the exhaustiveness of a partition process (Horst et al., 1995). A nested subsequence of partition sets $\{\mathbf{S}^j\}$, i.e. $\mathbf{S}^j \supset \mathbf{S}^{j+1}$, $\forall j$, is called exhaustive if $\mathbf{S}^j$ shrinks to an unique point, i.e.,

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{S}^j = \{\mathbf{x}\}$$

A partition process in a branch and bound algorithm is called exhaustive if every nested subsequence of partition sets generated throughout the algorithm is exhaustive. Konno et al. (1997) proved that the above mentioned exact simplicial bisection is exhaustive since $\delta(\mathbf{S}_k) \to 0$ as $k \to +\infty$.

2.2. QUADRATIC UNDERESTIMATION FUNCTION FOR GENERAL NONCONVEX STRUCTURES

In the bounding step of a branch and bound algorithm, a lower bound is always obtained by constructing a valid convex underestimation problem for the original one appeared in the problem (P), and solving the relaxed convex NLP to global optimality. For current simplex given by

$$\mathbf{S}=\left\{x\in\Re^n : x=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\lambda_i\mathbf{V}^i,\ \lambda_i\geqslant 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\lambda_i=1\right\} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{V}^i\in\mathbf{V}\subset\Re^n$, $i=1,2,\ldots,n+1$ are the $n+1$ vertices of the current simplex $\mathbf{S}$, and $\mathbf{V}$ is the set of these vertices. Then, we intend to compute a lower bound $\mu(S)$ of the objective function f on $\mathbf{S}\cap D_g$. In other words, we compute a lower bound for the optimal value of the problem

$$\begin{array}{lll}(\mathrm{P(S)}) & \min\limits_{\mathbf{x}} & f(\mathbf{x})\\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x})\leqslant 0 \quad i=1,2,\ldots,\mathrm{m}\\ & & \mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}\subset\Re^n.\end{array}$$

As mentioned above, f and $\mathbf{g}_i$ are generic nonconvex functions belonging to C^2, then the main idea for computing a lower bound $\mu(S)$ is to construct from Problem (P(S)) a convex problem by replacing all those nonconvex functions with their respective convex underestimation functions, then solving the resulting relaxed convex problem. In order to reach this purpose, we see the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.2.1. Given any nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x}):S\to\Re, \mathbf{x}\in S\subseteq\Re^n$ belonging to C^2, the following quadratic function is defined by:

$$F(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i\mathbf{x}_i^2+\sum_{i=1}^{n}b_i\mathbf{x}_i+c \tag{2}$$

where, $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}\subseteq\Re^n$ and $F(\mathbf{x})=f(\mathbf{x})$ holds at all vertices of $\boldsymbol{S}$. a_i's are nonnegative scalars and large enough such that $F(\mathbf{x})\leqslant f(\mathbf{x}), \forall\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}$.

It is trivial to see that $F(\mathbf{x})$ is convex since all quadratic coefficients, i.e. a_i's, are nonnegative. Then, the following theorem (Zhu and Inoue, 2001) can be used to ensure that it is indeed a rigorous underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$, i.e. $F(\mathbf{x})\leqslant f(\mathbf{x}), \forall\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}$.

THEOREM 2.2.1. *$F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by Definition 2.2.1 is a convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$ if the difference function between them, i.e. $D(\mathbf{x})=F(\mathbf{x})-f(\mathbf{x})$, is a convex function.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{x}^1$ and $\mathbf{x}^2$ are two arbitrary points in the current simplex $\mathbf{S}$ defined by Equation (1), then there exists $2(n+1)$ real values, $\alpha_i,\beta_i\in\Re$ satisfying $0\leqslant\alpha_i,\beta_i\leqslant 1, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\alpha_i=1, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\beta_i=1$, such that $\mathbf{x}^1=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\alpha_i\mathbf{V}^i$ and $\mathbf{x}^2=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\beta_i\mathbf{V}^i$. Since $D(\mathbf{x})=F(\mathbf{x})-f(\mathbf{x})$ is a convex function, we have the following inequality according to the definition of the

convex function:

$$D\left(\lambda \mathbf{x}^1 + (1-\lambda)\,\mathbf{x}^2\right) \leqslant \lambda D\left(\mathbf{x}^1\right) + (1-\lambda)\,D\left(\mathbf{x}^2\right)$$

where, λ is an arbitrary real value, and $0 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant 1$. Substituting the convex combinations of $\mathbf{x}^1$ and $\mathbf{x}^2$ into the above equation, and by virtue of Jensen's inequality (Rockafellar, 1972) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\lambda \mathbf{x}^1 + (1-\lambda)\,\mathbf{x}^2\right) &\leqslant \lambda D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{V}^i\right) + (1-\lambda)\,D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \beta_i \mathbf{V}^i\right) \\ &\leqslant \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \alpha_i D\left(\mathbf{V}^i\right) + (1-\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \beta_i D\left(\mathbf{V}^i\right) \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \alpha_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \beta_i = 1$. According to Definition 2.2.1, we know that $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ holds at all vertices of $\mathbf{S}$, i.e. $F(\mathbf{V}^i) = f(\mathbf{V}^i)$. Then $D(\mathbf{V}^i) = 0$ at each vertex $\mathbf{V}^i, i = 1, \ldots, n+1$. Following above inequality, we have:

$$D\left(\lambda \mathbf{x}^1 + (1-\lambda)\,\mathbf{x}^2\right) \leqslant 0.$$

Since $\mathbf{x}^1$ and $\mathbf{x}^2$ are two arbitrary points in simplex $\mathbf{S}$, and $0 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant 1$, then $\mathbf{x} = \lambda \mathbf{x}^1 + (1-\lambda)\mathbf{x}^2$ is also an arbitrary point in this simplex, and $D(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \mathbf{0}$. Then, $F(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant f(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$. It means that $F(\mathbf{x})$ is a rigorous underestimator of the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$ for any point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$. □

It is well known that $D(\mathbf{x})$ is convex if and only if its Hessian matrix $H_D(\mathbf{x})$ is positive semi-definite in the current simplex. A useful convexity condition is derived by noting that $H_D(\mathbf{x})$ is related directly to the Hessian matrix $H_f(\mathbf{x})$ of $f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$ by the following equation:

$$\mathbf{H}_D(\mathbf{x}) = 2\Delta - \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x})$$

where Δ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are a_i's defined in Definition 2.2.1. Analogous to "*diagonal shift matrix*" defined by Adjiman et al. (1998a), Δ here is refereed to as the *diagonal underestimation matrix*, since these parameters guarantee that $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by Equation (2) is a rigorous underestimator of the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$. Evidently, the following Theorem will help to guarantee that $D(\mathbf{x})$, as defined in Theorem 2.2.1, is convex

THEOREM 2.2.2. *$D(x)$, as defined in Theorem 2.2.1, is convex if and only if $2\Delta - H_f(\mathbf{x}) = 2\ diag(a_i) - H_f(\mathbf{x})$ is positive semi-definite for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$.*

In order to simplify the parameter calculation, the underestimator $F(\mathbf{x})$ is reformulated by using a single nonnegative a value, as following:

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = a\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i x_i + c. \tag{3}$$

Then, all diagonal elements of the diagonal underestimation matrix Δ are therefore equal to the uniform quadratic coefficient a defined by Equation (3). On the basis of the Theorem 2.2.2, the following theorem (Zhu and Inoue, 2001), derived similar to that done by Maranas and Floudas (1992) and Adjiman et al. (1998), can then be used to ensure that $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by Equation (2) or (3) is indeed a rigorous convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$.

THEOREM 2.2.3. *$F(\mathbf{x})$ as defined by Equation (2) is a rigorous convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$ if and only if*

$$a_i \geqslant \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}}\left\{\mathbf{H}_{ii}^{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i}\left|\mathbf{H}_{ij}^{f}(\mathbf{x})\right|\right\}\right\} \tag{4}$$

or, if $F(\mathbf{x})$ is defined by Equation (3), we have

$$a \geqslant \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\max_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}}\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\right\} \tag{5}$$

where the $\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$'s are the eigenvalues of $H_f(x)$, the Hessian matrix of the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}$.

Proof. As $H_f(x)$, the Hessian matrix of the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$, is symmetric, so that all its eigenvalues are real values. According to Theorems 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, $F(\mathbf{x})$ as defined by Equation (2) is a convex (or linear) underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$ if and only if $D(\mathbf{x})$ defined in Theorem 2.2.1 is convex. $D(\mathbf{x})$ is convex if for every $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}$, all eigenvalues $\lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x})$ of $D(\mathbf{x})$ are nonnegative.

In the second case, since the uniform quadratic coefficient is used, the eigenvalue of $D(\mathbf{x})$ can be directly related to that of $f(\mathbf{x})$. The above nonnegative condition, i.e., Equation (5), is equivalent with requiring the minimum eigenvalue of $D(\mathbf{x})$ over x to be nonnegative

$$\min_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}}\lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0.$$

After substituting $\lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) = 2a - \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $a \quad \max\{0, \frac{1}{2}\max_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) &= \min_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} (2a - \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\geqslant \min_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \max\{0, \max_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\} - \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\} \\ &\geqslant \min_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \max_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \{0, \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\} - \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}}\{0, \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\} - \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0$ by considering the two cases for the sign of $\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$, so $\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0$, that is, $D(\mathbf{x})$ is convex for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$. Therefore, $F(\mathbf{x})$ as defined by Equation (3) is a rigorous convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$.

In the first case, by virtue of Gerschgorin's theorem (Gerschgorin, 1931), the eigenvalue lower bound of a real symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is given as

$$\min \lambda_i \geqslant \min \left(a_{ii} - \sum_{j\neq i} |a_{ij}| \right)$$

After substituting Equation (4) to $\mathbf{H}_D(\mathbf{x}) = 2\Delta - \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x})$, its lower bound can be given as

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) &\geqslant \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left(2\max \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{2} \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right\} \right\} - \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right) \\ &\geqslant \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left(\max \left\{ 0, \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right\} \right\} - \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right\} \right) \\ &\geqslant \min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left(\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \left\{ 0, \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right\} \right\} - \left\{ \mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left| \mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x}) \right| \right\} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\min_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}} \lambda_i^D(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant 0$ by considering the two cases for the sign of $\mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} |\mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x})|$. So $D(\mathbf{x})$ is convex for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$. Therefore, $F(\mathbf{x})$ as defined by (2) is a rigorous convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$. □

The following proposition states the relationship between the linear and constant coefficients of $F(\mathbf{x})$ and its quadratic coefficients, and that the former ones can be determined uniquely by the latter and all vertices of the current simplex.

PROPOSITION 2.2.1. *The linear and constant coefficients of $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by Equation (2) or (3), i.e. b_i's and c can be given by the quadratic coefficients a_i's known by Theorem 2.2.3 and the current simplex.*

Proof. In view of the Definition 2.2.1, we know $F(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})$ holds at all vertices of S, then the following linear equation group can be obtained as:

$$\mathbf{V}^{k^T} \Delta \mathbf{V}^k + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{V}^k + c = f(\mathbf{V}^k) \quad k = 1, \ldots, n+1$$

where $\Delta \in \Re^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal underestimation matrix whose diagonal elements are the quadratic term coefficients, a_i's defined in Equation (2) or (3). $\mathbf{b} \in \Re^n$ is the linear coefficient vector whose elements are b_i's defined in Equation (2) or (3), and c is a scalar

$$\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{V}^k + c = f(\mathbf{V}^k) - \mathbf{V}^{k^T} \Delta \mathbf{V} \quad k = 1, \ldots, n+1.$$

The vector $\mathbf{b} \in \Re^n$ is augmented as $(\mathbf{b}, c) \in \Re^{n+1}$, in order to include the scalar c. In the same way, the matrix $\mathbf{V} \in \Re^{(n+1) \times n}$ is augmented as $(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{1}) \in \Re^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a column unity matrix of $\Re^n$. $(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{1}) \in \Re^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ is a regular square matrix since $\mathbf{V} \in \Re^{(n+1) \times n}$ is the coordinate matrix of the simplex which is linearly independent. Then we have

$$(\mathbf{b}, c)^T = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{1})^{-1} \left[f(\mathbf{V}) - \mathbf{V}^T \Delta \mathbf{V} \right]$$

where, $[f(\mathbf{V}) - \mathbf{V}^T \Delta \mathbf{V}] \in \Re^{n+1}$ is a column vector for the $n+1$ vertices of the current simplex. By virtue of this equation, it is obvious that the linear and constant coefficients defined by Equation (2) or (3) are determined uniquely by the quadratic coefficients and the current simplex. □

By replacing all the nonconvex functions in Problem (P(S)) with their corresponding quadratic function based convex underestimators described by Equation (3), we have the following relaxed convex programming Problem (QP(S)):

$$\begin{array}{lll} (QP(S)) & \min\limits_{\mathbf{x}} & \mathrm{F}(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \\ & & x \in \mathbf{S} \subset \Re^n \end{array}$$

where,

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^f x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^f x_i + c^f$$

$$\mathbf{G}_j(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^{\mathbf{g}_j} x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^{g_j} x_i + c^{g_j} \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m}.$$

Let $D_{\mathbf{G}}$ be a subset of $\Re^n$ defined by

$$D_{\mathbf{G}} = \left\{ x \in \Re^n : \mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0, i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \right\}.$$

Obviously, the set $D_{\mathbf{G}}$ is convex and compact. Then, the Problem (QP(S)) has an optimal solution according to the well-known Weierstrass Theorem.

It should be noted that only additional $m+1$ quadratic parameters, i.e. a^f and $a^{\mathbf{g}_i}$ for $i=1,2,\ldots,m$, are introduced during the above transforming process if the uniform underestimation function is used, since all other linear and constant coefficients can be calculated by those quadratic parameters and the current simplex consequently. The following theorem states that the optimal solution F^* of the convex programming Problem (QP(S)) is a valid lower bound of the primal Problem (P(S)).

THEOREM 2.2.4. *For each simplex* $\mathbf{S} = \{x \in \Re^n : x = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}^i, \lambda_i \geqslant 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i = 1\} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^0$, *a lower bound* $\mu(\mathbf{S})$ *of* f *over* $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}}$ *can be computed by* $\mu(\mathbf{S}) = F^*$, *where* F^* *is the optimal solution of* F *over* $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}}$.

Proof. First, we show $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}} \subseteq \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}}$. Since $\mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x})$ is a convex underestimator of $\mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x})$, i.e. $\mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x})$, we have $\mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in D_{\mathbf{g}}$, then $\mathbf{x} \in D_{\mathbf{G}}$. Finally we have $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}} \subseteq \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}}$ by noting $D_{\mathbf{g}} \subseteq D_{\mathbf{G}}$. Second, by virtue of $F(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant f(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}}$ and $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}} \subseteq \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}}$, we have

$$F^* = \min\{F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}}\} \leqslant F(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{G}} \leqslant f(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}}.$$

It shows that $\mu(\mathbf{S}) = F^*$ is a valid lower bound of f over $\mathbf{S} \cap D_{\mathbf{g}}$. □

The next proposition shows that the lower bound obtained by Theorem 2.2.4 is always bounded from below and has a monotonic property which is useful within a branch and bound framework.

PROPOSITION 2.2.2.

(a) *Let* $\mathbf{S}^1$ *and* $\mathbf{S}^2$ *be two simplexes satisfying* $\mathbf{S}^2 \subset \mathbf{S}^1$. *Then,* $\mu(\mathbf{S}^2) \mu(\mathbf{S}^1)$.
(b) *If Problem (P) has a feasible solution, then* $\mu(\mathbf{S}) > -\infty$ *for each* $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^0$.

Proof. (**a**) Let $F^1(\mathbf{x})$ and $F^2(\mathbf{x})$ be the quadratic underestimation functions of $f(\mathbf{x})$ generated in $\mathbf{S}^1$ and $\mathbf{S}^2$ satisfying $\mathbf{S}^2 \subset \mathbf{S}^1$, respectively. Then, we will show $F^1(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant F^2(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^2$. According to Equation (2), we have

$$F^1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^1 x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^1 x_i + c^1$$
$$F^2(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^2 x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^2 x_i + c^2.$$

Then,

$$F^1(\mathbf{x}) - F^2(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(a_i^1 - a_i^2\right) x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(b_i^1 - b_i^2\right) x_i + c^1 - c^2.$$

Since $\mathbf{S}^2 \subset \mathbf{S}^1$, then we have $\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}^1} \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}^2} \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}^1} \left\{\mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left|\mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x})\right|\right\} \geqslant \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}^2} \left\{\mathbf{H}_{ii}^f(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{j\neq i} \left|\mathbf{H}_{ij}^f(\mathbf{x})\right|\right\}$. By virtue of Theorem 2.2.3, we have $a_i^1 \geqslant a_i^2$. Then the difference function $D_F(\mathbf{x}) = F^1(\mathbf{x}) - F^2(\mathbf{x})$ is convex.

Since $F^1(\mathbf{x})$ is the underestimation function of $f(\mathbf{x})$, then we have $F^1(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^1$. According to the Definition 2.2.1, we know $F^2(\mathbf{V}_i^2) = f(\mathbf{V}_i^2)$ for all vertices of simplex $\mathbf{S}^2$, i.e. $\mathbf{V}_i^2$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}+1$. Since $\mathbf{S}^2 \subset \mathbf{S}^1$, we have $F^1(\mathbf{V}_i^2) \leqslant F^2(\mathbf{V}_i^2)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}+1$. It means

$$D(\mathbf{V}_i^2) = F^1(\mathbf{V}_i^2) - F^2(\mathbf{V}_i^2) \leqslant 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}+1.$$

For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^2$, and $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}_i^2$ with $\lambda_i \geqslant 0 \forall \mathrm{i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i = 1$, by the convex function characteristic of the difference function $D(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$D(\mathbf{x}) = D\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}_i^2\right) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i D(\mathbf{V}_i^2) \leqslant 0.$$

Then, we obtain $F^1(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant F^2(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^2$.

By the same way, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^2$ we have

$$G_i^1(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant G_i^2(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m}$$

Then, we have

$$D_G^1 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Re^n : G_i^1(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0, \mathrm{i} = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{m}\} \cap \mathbf{S}^1 \supseteq D_G^2 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Re^n : G_i^2(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0, \mathrm{i} = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{m}\} \cap \mathbf{S}^2.$$

Since $D_G^2 \cap \mathbf{S}^2 \subset D_G^1 \cap \mathbf{S}^1$, finally we have

$$\mu(\mathbf{S}^2) = \min\{F^2(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in D_G^2 \cap \mathbf{S}^2\} \geqslant \min\{F^1(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in D_G^1 \cap \mathbf{S}^1\} = \mu(\mathbf{S}^1)$$

(b) Since the problem is assumed to be feasible, then from (**a**), we need only to show that $\mu(\mathbf{S}^0) > -\infty$. This bounded property follows from the fact that the relaxed programming problem of Problem (P(S)) over the initial simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$, i.e. Problem (QP($\mathbf{S}^0$)) is convex. Then, this problem has an optimal solution, which implies that $\mu(\mathbf{S}^0) > -\infty$. □

2.3. UPPER BOUND

For a simplex $\mathbf{S}$, if the function value of Problem (P(S)) is unbounded from above, i.e. $\mu(\mathbf{S}) = +\infty$, then it follows that:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = +\infty \quad \text{for all } x \in S.$$

In this case, the partition set $\mathbf{S}$ can be removed from further consideration. Otherwise, one tries to find a set $F(\mathbf{S})$ of feasible solutions in $\mathbf{S}$ and uses it for computing an upper bound of the optimal value of Problem (QP(S)). Throughout the algorithm, more and more feasible solutions can be found, then the upper bound of the optimal value can be improved iteratively. A set $F(\mathbf{S})$ can be obtained by checking a finite set in $\mathbf{S}$ including, e.g. the set of all vertices and the center of the simplex $\mathbf{S}$, or some local solution of the Problem (P) over $\mathbf{S}$ by any convex optimizer. If all of them are infeasible, the current upper bound has to be kept until the new feasible set is found in the further iterations with new branches. It should be noted that the assumption that a feasible point known *a priori* is not necessary for the convergence of the algorithm, since a subsimplex $\mathbf{S}$ in which the solution of QP(S) becomes feasible for P(S) can be found during the solution of the problem.

2.4. RIGOROUS CALCULATION OF THE QUADRATIC COEFFICIENTS BY USING INTERVAL ANALYSIS

For generic nonconvex functions, the elements of its Hessian matrix $H_f(\mathbf{x})$ are likely to be nonlinear and nonconvex functions of variables, so that the derivation of the *diagonal underestimation matrix*, i.e. Δ, valid over the entire simplex is a very challenging task. However, satisfying the convexity condition of Theorem 2.2.2 is essential for the preservation of the guarantee that $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined by Equation (2) is a rigorous convex underestimator of the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$. The complexity arising from the presence of the variables in the convexity condition can become tractable by using the transformation of the exact $\mathbf{x}$-dependent Hessian matrix, i.e. $H_f(\mathbf{x})$, to an interval Hessian matrix $[H_f(\mathbf{x})]$ (Neumaier, 1990, 1996; Hansen, 1992; Kearfott, 1996; Adjiman et al., 1998a,b), such that $H_f(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq [H_f], \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}$. The current simplex $\mathbf{S}$ can be replaced with a more general interval box, described by $[\mathbf{x}^L, \mathbf{x}^U]$. $\mathbf{x}^L$ and $\mathbf{x}^U$ are the lower and upper bounds of the current simplex, respectively. Obviously, $\mathbf{S} \subseteq [\mathbf{x}^L, \mathbf{x}^U]$. Then the interval Hessian matrix can be calculated in above interval box, which will not affect the rigorousness of the estimation of the Hessian matrix, $H_f(\mathbf{x})$, in the current simplex. The elements of the original Hessian matrix, i.e. $H_f(\mathbf{x})$, are treated as independent when computing their general interval boundaries according to the interval arithmetic. The following theorem

similar to that described by Adjiman et al. (1998), will tell us how to use the interval Hessian matrix family $H_f(\mathbf{x})$ to calculate quadratic parameters a_i's defined by Equation (2).

THEOREM 2.4.1. *Consider the generic nonconvex function $f(\mathbf{x})$ with continuous second-order derivatives and its Hessian matrix $H_f(\mathbf{x})$. Let $D(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})$ be defined in Theorem 2.2.1 and $F(\mathbf{x})$ be defined by Equation (2). Let $[H_f]$ be a symmetric interval matrix such that $H_f(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq [H_f], \forall x \in \mathbf{S}$. If the matrix $[H_D]$ defined by $[H_D] = 2\Delta - [H_f] = 2diag(a_i) - [H_f]$ is positive semi-definite, then $D(\mathbf{x})$ is convex over the current simplex encompassed by $[\mathbf{x}^L, \mathbf{x}^U]$.*

Since the interval Hessian matrix $[H_f] \supseteq H_f(\mathbf{x})$ is obvious, then a valid upper bound of the maximum eigenvalue of $[H_f(\mathbf{x})]$ can be more easily computed by using the interval arithmetic. Then, Equation (5) derived in Theorem 2.2.3 can be replaced with the following interval form, in order to generate a single a value which satisfies the following sufficient condition so that $F(\mathbf{x})$ is indeed a rigorous convex underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$:

$$a \geqslant \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\max}\left([H_f]\right)\right\} \tag{6}$$

where, $\lambda_{\max}([H_f])$ is the maximal eigenvalue of the interval matrix family $[H_f(\mathbf{x})]$. For the non-uniform case, Equation (4) can be transformed into the following equation by replacing the Hessian matrix with its interval form, as

$$a_i \geqslant \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\left\{\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{ii}^f + \sum_{j\neq i}\left|\mathbf{H}^f\right|_{ij}\right\}\right\} \tag{7}$$

where $|\mathbf{H}^f|_{ij} = \max\{|\underline{\mathbf{H}}_{ij}^f|, |\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{ij}^f|\}$. Obviously Equation (7) holds since for interval matrix $[\mathbf{H}_f]$, we have $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_{ii}^f + \sum_{j\neq i}|\mathbf{H}^f|_{ij} \geqslant [\mathbf{H}_{ii}^f] + \sum_{j\neq i}[\mathbf{H}_{ij}^f]$. In the following sections, some commonly used favorable function structures and the generic nonconvex structure are analyzed in this interval way so as to get the tight convex underestimations for them over the current simplex.

2.4.1. *Extended Gerschgorin's Theorem for Uniform Case*

For a real symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, the well-known Gerschgorin's theorem (Gerschgorin, 1931) states that its eigenvalues are bounded, such as $\lambda_{\max}$, by all its elements such that

$$\lambda_{\max} = \max_i \left(a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right).$$

In this paper, a straightforward extension of this theorem is presented for interval matrices, similar to that done by Adjiman et al. (1998) for minimum eigenvalue analysis, in the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.4.2. *For an interval matrix* $[A] = (\bar{a}_{ij}, \bar{a}_{ij})$, *an upper bound on the maximum eigenvalue is given by*

$$\lambda_{\max} = \max_i \left[\bar{a}_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} \max \left(\left| \underline{a}_{ij} \right|, |\bar{a}_{ij}| \right) \right].$$

Proof. By definition of the interval matrix, $\lambda_{\max}([A]) \geqslant \max_{A \in [A]} \lambda_{\max}(A)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max}([A]) &= \max_{A \in [A]} \max_i \left(a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right) \\ &= \max_i \left[\max_{A \in [A]} (a_{ii}) + \max_{A \in [A]} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right) \right] \\ &= \max_i \left[\bar{a}_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} \max \left(\left| \underline{a}_{ij} \right|, |\bar{a}_{ij}| \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Similar to that pointed out by Adjiman et al. (1998a) in their αBB algorithm for the estimation of the minimum eigenvalue of an interval matrix, above computational complexity is $O(n^2)$. The bound it can provide on the eigenvalue is slightly loose since the uniform a value is used. However, it is still very effective if the problem scale is not too large. For the practical applications, when the generic nonconvex function structures are given in analytical form, their interval Hessian matrix can be obtained by interval analysis, such as some widely used interval calculation packages, as INTLIB, a Portable FORTRAN77 Interval Standard Function Library (Kearfott, 1996), and PROFIL, Programmer's Runtime Optimized Fast Interval Library in C/C++ (Knuppel, 1993).

The method to estimate the lower bound of the minimum eigenvalue of an interval matrix proposed by Adjiman et al. (1998a) is given by

$$\lambda_{\min} = \min_i \left[\underline{a}_{ii} - \sum_{j \neq i} \max\left(\left| \underline{a}_{ij} \right|, \left| \bar{a}_{ij} \right| \right) \right].$$

If the calculated $\lambda_{\min}$ of the interval Hessian matrix $[\mathbf{H}_f]$ of the nonconvex function structure $f^{NC}(\mathbf{x})$ is nonnegative, then it is certain that $f(\mathbf{x})$ is convex over the current simplex. So, the tightest underestimator, or the convex envelope, of $f(\mathbf{x})$ is itself, and it is used as the underestimator of $f(\mathbf{x})$ over the current simplex. Otherwise, $\lambda_{\max}$ of the interval Hessian matrix $[\mathbf{H}_f]$ of the nonconvex function structure $f^{NC}(\mathbf{x})$ is calculated according to Theorem 2.4.2, and the quadratic convex function based underestimator is constructed by virtue of Theorem 2.2.3 and Proposition 2.2.1.

2.4.2. *Underestimator for the Convex (Linear) Function Structure*

For the convex (linear) function structures, denoted by $f^C(\mathbf{x})$ or $f^L(\mathbf{x})$, obviously their convex envelopes are themselves. Then, they will preserve their original forms in the final underestimators for the objection function or the constraints.

2.4.3. *Underestimator for the Concave Function Structure*

For the concave function structure, denoted by $f^{CA}(\mathbf{x})$, whose eigenvalues are all nonpositive, i.e. $\lambda_{i,\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0$. Then, the quadratic coefficient of its underestimator defined by Equation (2) is zero according to the Theorem 2.2.3, so that the valid lower bound of the concave function structure over the current simplex is a linear function whose linear and constant coefficients are given by Proposition 2.2.1. This conclusion is also completely consistent with that presented by Horst et al. (1995, p.19). That is to say, the valid bound constructed by Equation (2) is equivalent to the convex envelope of the concave function over a simplex, which can be constructed as an affine function given in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 2.4.3. *Let* $\mathbf{S}$ *be a simplex generated by the vertices* $\mathbf{V}^1, \mathbf{V}^2, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{n+1}$, *i.e.* $\mathbf{S} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Re^n : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}^i, \lambda_i \geqslant 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i = 1 \right\}$, *and let* $f^{CA}(\mathbf{x})$ *be a concave function defined on* $\mathbf{S}$. *Then the convex envelope of* $f^{CA}(\mathbf{x})$ *over* $\mathbf{S}$ *is the affine function* $L^{CA}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{x} + c$ *which is uniquely determined by the system of linear equations* $f^{CA}(\mathbf{V}^i) = \mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{V}^i + c$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, n+1$.

2.4.4. *Underestimator for the General Quadratic Function*

The general quadratically-constrained quadratic programming plays an important role in the engineering field. For an arbitrary bilinear function structure, denoted by $\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_j$ and $i \neq j$, McCormick (1976) and Al-Khayyal and Falk (1983) presented the tightest convex lower bound, i.e. convex envelope, over the rectangular domain $[\mathbf{x}_i^L, \mathbf{x}_i^U] \times [\mathbf{x}_j^L, \mathbf{x}_j^U]$. Here a valid convex underestimation function is easily derived for any general quadratic function, since the eigenvalues of its Hessian matrix are known. The general quadratic function is presented as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T\mathbf{x}.$$

Obviously, the above bilinear structure is just a special case of this general function. Since $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{Q}$, we have the *diagonal underestimation matrix*, Δ, constructed on the basis of Theorem 2.2.3, as

$$a = \max_i \left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\lambda_i^{\mathbf{Q}}\right\}$$

for the uniform case, or for the nonuniform case, we get

$$a_i = \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{ii} + \sum_{j\neq i}|\mathbf{Q}_{ij}|\right)\right\}.$$

Then, we have the quadratic underestimation function as

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T\Delta\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{x} + c$$

where, the linear and constant coefficients, i.e. $(\mathbf{b}, c)$, can be determined uniquely by virtue of Proposition 2.2.1.

2.4.5. *Comparison with the* αBB *Underestimator for General Nonconvex Function*

For an arbitrary nonconvex function $f \in C^2 : [x^L, x^U] \to \Re$, a convex lower bounding function L of f in αBB algorithm (Adjiman et al., 1998a; Floudas, 2000) can be described as

$$L(x) = f(x) + \sum_i \alpha_i (x_i - x_i^L)(x_i - x_i^U)$$

where, α_i is a nonnegative parameter over rectangle $[x^L, x^U]$. In order to compare the underestimators generated by QBB method and αBB method conveniently, we choose a simplex S and a rectangle $[x^L, x^U]$ which is the

smallest one containing the former. The following proposition states that the underestimator generated by QBB method for a nonconvex function f is always tighter than or the same as that by the αBB method over a subsimplex where the uniform convexity or concavity of f can be judged by the interval method.

PROPOSITION 2.4.4. *If a function f can be shown to be convex or concave over the current simplex, then the underestimator generated by QBB for f is always the same as or tighter than that by the αBB method over that simplex.*

Proof. The feasibility of the simplicial partition stated in the above assumption is based on Theorem 18.2 of Rockafellar (1972), so we can compare the underestimators generated by QBB and αBB, respectively, over each subsimplex. If f is judged by the interval method to be uniformly convex over the subrectangle containing a subsimplex, then the parameters α_i's in αBB underestimator are obtained to be zero. So, the αBB underestimator over the subsimplex is f itself. By virtue of the statements made in Section 2.4.1, the QBB underestimator for f is also f itself in this case, so, the underestimators generated by QBB and αBB are the same as each other. In the case that f is judged by the interval method to be uniformly concave over a subsimplex, the QBB underestimator for f is the convex envelope of f over the subsimplex by virtue of the Proposition 2.4.3. But, the αBB underestimator for f is given by $L(x) = f(x) + \sum_i \alpha_i (x_i - x_i^L)(x_i - x_i^U)$ which is a convex function and different from the convex envelope of f over the subsimplex since the latter is always an affine function. Due to the definition of the convex envelope, we have that the QBB underestimator is tighter than that of the αBB in this case. Summarize the above two cases, the underestimator generated by QBB method for f is always the same as or tighter than that by the αBB method over each subsimplex. □

Remarks

(1). When f is neither convex nor concave over a subsimplex, it is difficult to evaluate the qualities of the QBB underestimator and that of αBB.

(2). The QBB algorithm calculates not only the quadratic coefficients, where two eigenvalue calculations for the minimum and maximum of the interval Hessian matrix are needed, but also the linear and constant ones of its quadratic underestimator by solving a linear system described by Proposition 2.2.1.

(3). When f itself is not used as the underestimator in the QBB algorithm, a property of the QBB algorithm is that the quadratic function based underestimator is always convex throughout the

problem space, but the αBB algorithm can only guarantee the convexity of its underestimator over the current rectangle $[x^L, x^U]$. A potential benefit of this property in terms of the algorithm in Section 2.5 is that it allows the convex solver applied to get the solution to the underestimator to have feasible or infeasible convergence path.

Geometrically speaking, αBB method uses a convex quadratic function to compensate the concave parts of a general nonconvex function, but it overestimates the convex parts simultaneously. The QBB algorithm uses a convex quadratic function to approximate the convex part of a general nonconvex function directly, which can bypass the concave parts and avoid the above overestimation. However, it is difficult to compare the algorithmic performances quantitatively for QBB and αBB methods based on the remarks (1) and (2).

2.4.6. *Generalized QBB Underestimator*

It should be noted here, that the relaxed convex programming Problem (QP(S)) contains not only the quadratic underestimation functions for the generic nonconvex terms, but also the convex function terms which are not necessarily transformed into the quadratic underestimators. Than, the final underestimation strategy of the relaxed Problem (QP(S)) can be slightly revised into the following convex programming formulation, as

$$\begin{array}{lll} (QP(S)') & \min\limits_{\mathbf{x}} & \mathrm{F}'(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{G}'_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \\ & & x \in \mathbf{S} \subset \Re^n \end{array}$$

where,

$$F'(\mathbf{x}) = f^L(\mathbf{x}) + f^C(\mathbf{x}) + L_f^{CA}(\mathbf{x}) + F^{NC}(\mathbf{x})$$
$$G'_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_i^L(\mathbf{x}) + g_i^C(\mathbf{x}) + L_{g_i}^{CA}(\mathbf{x}) + G_i^{NC}(\mathbf{x}) \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m}$$

and $f^L(\mathbf{x})$, $f^C(\mathbf{x})$, $L_f^{CA}(\mathbf{x})$, $g_i^L(\mathbf{x})$, $g_i^C(\mathbf{x})$, $L_{g_i}^{CA}(\mathbf{x})$ represent the linear terms, convex terms, and the linear underestimation functions for the concave terms in the objective function and the constraints, respectively. While $F^{NC}(\mathbf{x})$ and $G_i^{NC}(\mathbf{x})$ represent the quadratic convex underestimation functions for the generic nonconvex terms. Compared with the relaxed problem (QP(S)), the relaxed problem (QP(S)′) contains not only quadratic function terms, but also the generic convex terms of the original problem. But, it should be noted here, such kind of relaxation does not affect the monotonicity of the valid convex underestimators given in Proposition 2.2.2, so it will also keep the algorithmic convergences presented in the following sections.

2.5. STEPS OF THE GLOBAL OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM QBB

At the start of this section, the Problem (P) is formulated over an initial simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$. However, the practical problem does not necessarily provide such simplex, then a convenient outer approximation method of obtaining this simplex is presented here on a more broad basis, provided that the linear constrains can be separated from those with nonconvex terms, and the lower and upper bounds of the independent variables are known *a priori* in a physical way, as

$$\begin{array}{lll} (P') & \min\limits_{\mathrm{x}} & f(\mathrm{x}) \\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \\ & & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b} \leqslant 0 \\ & & \underline{\mathbf{x}} \leqslant \mathbf{x} \leqslant \bar{\mathbf{x}} \end{array}$$

where, $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ are the lower and upper bounds of $\mathbf{x}$. The polyhedral defined by the linear constraints are given as

$$P = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Re^n, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b} \leqslant \mathbf{0} \right\}.$$

In order to incorporate the lower and upper bounds of the variables into this polytope, the matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are expanded respectively as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ -\underline{\mathbf{x}} \end{pmatrix}$$

where, $\mathbf{1}$ and $-\mathbf{1}$ are diagonal matrices with 1 and -1 as the diagonal elements, respectively. Then, we get a polytope described as

$$\tilde{P} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \Re^n, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\,\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \leqslant \mathbf{0} \right\}.$$

The following linear programming problems will help to produce an initial simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$ as small as possible, as

$$\mu_0 = \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x} \in \tilde{P} \right\}$$
$$\mu_i = \min \left\{ \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x} \in \tilde{P} \right\} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Then, all n+1 vertices of the initial simplex can be computed by

$$\mathbf{V}^i = \left(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{i-1}, \mu_0 - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n} \mu_j, \mu_{i+1}, \ldots, \mu_n \right) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \tag{8}$$

$$\mathbf{V}^{n+1} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n). \tag{9}$$

Obviously we have $\widetilde{P} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^0$. Now, we are in a position to present the proposed algorithm for solving Problem (P) by using the basic operations described in previous sections.

Step 1 – Initialization. A convergence tolerance, ε_c, and a feasibility tolerance, ε_f, are selected and the iteration counter k is set to be zero. The initial simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$ is computed by Equations (8) and (9), as $S^0 = (\mathbf{V}^1, \mathbf{V}^2, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{n+1})$, and the current variable bounds $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ for the first iteration are set to be equal to the solutions to the linear programming problems, i.e. $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_i = \min\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^0\}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \max\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}^0\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The global lower and upper bounds μ_0 and γ_0 of the global minimum of Problem (P) are initialized and an initial current point $\mathbf{x}^{k,c}$ is randomly selected.

Step 2 – Local Solution of Problem (P) and Update of Upper Bound. The nonconvex and nonlinear optimization Problem (P) is solved locally within the current simplex $\mathbf{S}$. If the solution f^k_{local} of Problem (P) is ε_f-feasible, the upper bound γ_k is updated as $\gamma_k = \min(\gamma_k, f^k_{\text{local}})$.

Step 3 – Partitioning of Current Simplex. The current simplex, $\mathbf{S}^k$, is partitioned into the following two simplexes ($r = 1, 2$):

$$\mathbf{S}^{k,1} = \left(\mathbf{V}^{k,0}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k,m}, \ldots, \frac{\mathbf{V}^{k,m} + \mathbf{V}^{k,l}}{2}, \mathbf{V}^{k,n} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{S}^{k,2} = \left(\mathbf{V}^{k,0}, \ldots, \frac{\mathbf{V}^{k,m} + \mathbf{V}^{k,l}}{2}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k,l}, \mathbf{V}^{k,n} \right)$$

where, k, m and k, l correspond to the vertices with the longest edge in the current simplex, i.e. $(k, m), (k, l) = \arg\max_{i<j}\{\|\mathbf{V}^{k,j} - \mathbf{V}^{k,i}\|\}$.

Step 4 – Update of $a^r_{k,f}, b^r_{k,f}, c^r_{k,f}$ and $a^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}, b^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}, c^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}$ Inside Both Subsimplexes $r = 1, 2$. The nonnegative parameters $a^r_{k,f}$ and $a^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}$ of the general nonconvex terms in the objective function and constraints are updated inside both simplexes $r = 1, 2$ according to the methods presented in Section 2.4, and the corresponding linear and constant coefficients, i.e. $b^r_{k,f}, c^r_{k,f}$ and $b^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}, c^r_{k,\mathbf{g_i}}$, are renewed according to Proposition 2.2.1.

Step 5 – Solutions Inside both Subsimplexes $r = 1, 2$. The convex programming Problem (QP(S)′) is solved inside both subsimplexes ($r = 1, 2$) by using

some convex nonlinear solver. If a solution $F_{\text{sol}}^{k,r}$ is feasible and less than the current upper bound, γ_k , then it is stored along with the solution point $\mathbf{x}_{\text{sol}}^{k,r}$.

Step 6 – Update Iteration Counter k and Lower Bound μ_k. The iteration counter increases by one,

$$k \leftarrow k+1$$

and the lower bound μ_k is updated to the minimum solution over the stored ones from the previous iterations. Furthermore, the selected solution is erased from the stored set

$$\mu_k = F_{\text{sol}}^{k',r'}$$

where, $F_{\text{sol}}^{k',r'} = \min_{r,I}\{F_{\text{sol}}^{I,r}, r=1,2, I=1,\ldots,k-1\}$. If the set I is empty, set $\mu_k = \gamma_k$ and go to Step 8.

Step 7 – Update Current Point $\mathbf{x}^{k,c}$ **and current simplex** $\mathbf{S}^k$. The current point is selected to be the solution point of the previously found minimum solution in Step 6

$$\mathbf{x}^{k,c} = \mathbf{x}_{\text{sol}}^{I',r'}$$

and the current simplex becomes the subsimplex containing the previously found solution,

$$\mathbf{S}^k = \left(\mathbf{V}^{k',0}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k',m}, \ldots, \frac{\mathbf{V}^{k',m}+\mathbf{V}^{k',l}}{2}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k',n}\right) \quad \text{if } r'=1$$

$$\mathbf{S}^k = \left(\mathbf{V}^{k',0}, \ldots, \frac{\mathbf{V}^{k',m}+\mathbf{V}^{k',l}}{2}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k',l}, \ldots, \mathbf{V}^{k',n}\right) \quad \text{otherwise}$$

Step 8 – Check for Convergence. If $(\gamma_k - \mu_k) > \varepsilon_c$, then return to Step 2. Otherwise, ε_c-convergence has been reached. The global minimum solution and solution point are given as

$$f^* \leftarrow f^{c,k''}$$
$$\mathbf{x}^* \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^{c,k''}$$

where, $k'' = \arg_I \left\{ f^{c,I} = \gamma_k \right\}, \quad I=1,\ldots,k.$

It should be noted that the current simplex can be deleted in Step 5 when either the Problem (QP(S)′) is infeasible or its solution is greater than the current upper bound. The former is obvious since Problem (P) is infeasible too if the relaxed Problem (QP(S)′) is infeasible. The latter alternative is valid since the global minimum cannot appear in this simplex for

the lower bound computed over this simplex is greater than the current upper bound, which state only local minima or some saddle points can exist there. The mathematical proof that the proposed global optimization algorithm QBB converges to the global minimum is presented in the following section.

2.6. PROOF OF CONVERGENCE TO THE GLOBAL MINIMUM

If the QBB algorithm presented in above section terminates at iteration k, then the point $\mathbf{x}^k$ is an optimal solution of Problem (P). In the case that the algorithm is not finite, it generates at least one infinite sequence of simplexes $\{\mathbf{S}^j\}$ such that $\mathbf{S}^{j+1} \subset \mathbf{S}^j$, for all j. The convergence of the QBB algorithm is stated by means of the following results.

PROPOSITION 2.6.1. *Assume that Problem (P) has a feasible solution. Further, assume that the QBB algorithm generates an infinite subsequence of simplexes* $\{\mathbf{S}^j\}$ *such that* $\mathbf{S}^{j+1} \subset \mathbf{S}^j$, *for all* j, *and* $\lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbf{S}^j = \cap_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{S}^j = \{\mathbf{x}^*\}$. *Then,* $\mathbf{x}^*$ *is an optimal solution of Problem (P).*

Proof. First, we show that the point $\mathbf{x}^*$ is a feasible point of Problem (P). To do this, for each j, let $\mathbf{V}^j$ stand for a vertex of simplex $\mathbf{S}^j$. Further, for each j, let $(\mathbf{x}^j)$ be an optimal solution of the relaxed convex programming Problem (QP(S)) with $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^j$. It should be noted that $(\mathbf{x}^j)$ exists for each j as shown in Proposition 2.2.2(b). Since the edges of the simplex $\mathbf{S}^j$ are bounded and

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbf{S}^j = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{S}^j = \{\mathbf{x}^*\}.$$

Then, we also have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbf{V}^j = \{\mathbf{x}^*\}.$$

We can assume, by passing to subsequence if necessary, that $\mathbf{x}^j \to \mathbf{x}^*$, as $j \to \infty$. From this, we have

$$\mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}^j) \to \mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leqslant 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m \quad \text{and} \quad j \to \infty.$$

Suppose that $\mathbf{x}^*$ is not a feasible solution of Problem (P); that is to say, there exists a number $\varepsilon > 0$ and for some constraint k such that

$$\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{x}^*) \geqslant \varepsilon > 0.$$

Since $\mathbf{x}^*$ is a vertex at the limit simplex, then according to Definition 2.2.1, we have

$$\mathbf{g}_k(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{G}_k(\mathbf{x}^*) \geqslant \varepsilon > 0.$$

which implies that $\mathbf{x}^*$ is not a feasible point to Problem (QP(P)). This contradiction implies that $\mathbf{x}^*$ is a feasible point of Problem (P).

Next, since $\mu(\mathbf{S}^{j+1}) \geqslant \mu(\mathbf{S}^j) > -\infty$, for all j, by Proposition 2.2.2, there exists a limit μ^* of $\{\mu(\mathbf{S}^j)\}$ bounded by the optimal value of Problem (P). Moreover, in view of the QBB algorithm, we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \mu(\mathbf{S}^j) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \gamma(\mathbf{S}^j) \geqslant f(\mathbf{x}^*)$$

which implies that $\mathbf{x}^*$ is an optimal solution of Problem (P). □

Note that the finite ε-convergence for this case could be obtained by truncating the above infinite sequence at ε-tolerance between the upper and lower bounds in the enumeration tree (Maranas and Floudas, 1994). We observe that the accumulation point of the upper bound set also exists because of the compactness of the initial simplex $\mathbf{S}^0$, and is an optimal solution of the Problem (P), then Proposition 2.6.1 trivially leads to the following useful properties of the algorithm.

PROPOSITION 2.6.2. (*a*) *Assume that Problem* (*P*) *has a feasible solution, and that the simplicial partition process of the QBB algorithm presented in Section 2.1 is exhaustive, then the QBB algorithm has the following convergence property: If the QBB algorithm generates an infinite subsequence of simplexes* $\{\mathbf{S}^j\}$ *such that the upper bound set* $F(\mathbf{S}^j) \neq \phi$ *for each j, then each accumulation point of the corresponding subsequence* $\{\mathbf{x}^j\}$ *is an optimal solution of the Problem* (*P*).
(*b*) *The QBB algorithm terminates after finitely many iterations whenever the feasible set of Problem* (*P*) *is empty.*

For the proof of (a), we can see that a subsequence of the upper bound set exists with the limit as the optimal solution of the Problem (P). Moreover, if the QBB algorithm does not terminate after finitely many iterations, it must generate a subsequence of points converging to an optimal solution of Problem (P) by seeing the argument of Proposition 2.6.1. This contradiction implies that the QBB algorithm terminates finitely.

It is well known that the general nonconvex optimization problem is NP-hard (Vavasis, 1991). Then, we can expect that some large problems are difficult for the QBB algorithm. However, this definitely does not mean that the QBB algorithm is unable to solve the large problem in a reasonable amount of time. As we have described in the QBB algorithmic steps, it is possible to

obtain a good feasible solution and show this feasible solution is within a specified tolerance of being optimal, especially for the problems with some favorable structures. But, if we analyze the branch and bound tree structure generated from the partition process, the finite upper bound on the total number of required iterations for ε-convergence is exponential function of the initial simplex and the global convergence tolerance.

3. Preliminary Computation Studies of QBB Algorithm

The computation studies of QBB algorithm for the chemical and phase equilibrium (CPE) problems described by UNIQUAC or NRTL equations, respectively, for liquid–liquid systems were presented formerly in Zhu and Xu (1999) and Zhu and Inoue (2001). Owing to the space limitation, a typical nonconvex optimization problem consisting of a nonconvex quadratic objective function subjected to six inequality constraints, which are all nonconvex quadratic functions, is applied to evaluate the algorithmic efficiency of the QBB method. Since the quadratic coefficients of the underestimation function constructed in this paper for any bilinear term are known *a priori*, i.e. 0.5 or 0, so that we can use some quadratic coefficients of the underestimation functions for the bilinear terms which are rigorously valid but appointed to be much greater than their accurate values obtained by the strict eigenvalue analysis in order to check the complicated situations where the accurate upper bound of the maximal eigenvalues of the interval Hessian matrix is difficult to be determined by the analytical methods. The problem is formulated underlying, where ten linear inequalities represent the upper and lower bounds of the five variables. This problem is taken from Colville's collection (1970), also chosen by Floudas and Pardalos (1990) as a typical test for the constrained global optimization problem.

$$\text{Min}$$

$$37.293239\,\mathbf{x}_1 + 0.8356891\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_5 + 5.3578547\,\mathbf{x}_3^2 - 40792.141$$

$$\text{Subject to}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
-0.0022053\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_5 + 0.0056858\,\mathbf{x}_2\,\mathbf{x}_5 + 0.0006262\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_4 - 6.665593 &\leqslant 0\\
0.0022053\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_5 - 0.0056858\,\mathbf{x}_2\,\mathbf{x}_5 - 0.0006262\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_4 - 85.334407 &\leqslant 0\\
0.0071317\,\mathbf{x}_2\,\mathbf{x}_5 + 0.00218133\,\mathbf{x}_3^2 + 0.0029955\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_2 - 29.48751 &\leqslant 0\\
-0.0071317\,\mathbf{x}_2\,\mathbf{x}_5 - 0.00218133\,\mathbf{x}_3^2 - 0.0029955\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_2 + 9.48751 &\leqslant 0\\
0.0047026\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_5 + 0.0019085\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_4 + 0.0012547\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_3 - 15.699039 &\leqslant 0\\
-0.0047026\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_5 - 0.0019085\,\mathbf{x}_3\,\mathbf{x}_4 - 0.0012547\,\mathbf{x}_1\,\mathbf{x}_3 + 10.699039 &\leqslant 0\\
78 \leqslant \mathbf{x}_1 &\leqslant 102\\
33 \leqslant \mathbf{x}_2 &\leqslant 45\\
27 \leqslant \mathbf{x}_3 &\leqslant 45\\
27 \leqslant \mathbf{x}_4 &\leqslant 45\\
27 \leqslant \mathbf{x}_5 &\leqslant 45.
\end{aligned}$$

The nonlinearities of the above problem arise from the bilinear terms $\pm \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_j$ for $i \neq j$, and $-\mathbf{x}_i^2$, in the cost and constrained functions. For the latter bilinear term, since it belongs to the concave function structure, then its convex envelope described in Proposition 2.4.3., i.e. an affine function over the current simplex, can be easily constructed. For the former one, we can see its Hessian matrix is constant, as

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

whose, two eigenvalues are 1 and -1, respectively. According to the analyzes in Section 2.4.4 for the general quadratic function, we get the uniform quadratic underestimation coefficient, i.e. $a = 0.5$. Consequently, the linear and constant coefficients of the quadratic underestimation function can be computed by the Proposition 2.2.1 over the current simplex. After all nonconvex bilinear terms are replaced by their quadratic underestimation functions, the valid underestimation functions for the cost and constrained functions of the above problem are obtained. Then, a relaxed convex programming problem is obtained and solved by a convex optimizer in order to locate a valid lower bound for the original problem, and the current simplex can be described by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{6} \lambda_i \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{i}} \\ &0 \leqslant \lambda_i \leqslant 1 \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Note that six additional linear variables are introduced in Equation (10). The convex NLP optimizer LSGRG2C (Smith and Lasdon, 1992; Lasdon, 2000) is used to solve each convex underestimation problem over the current simplex, and a package cQBB is implemented in C language. For the above generally quadratical programming problem, all the computational runs by cQBB package were performed on a Pentium III/800 machine. In this paper, all CPU seconds reported represent the total time taken to solve the above problem with different valid quadratic coefficients by the proposed algorithm, where the global convergence is 0.001 and the feasible tolerance is 0.001. The initial simplex is generated by the outer approximation method on 10 linear inequality constraints representing the upper and lower bounds of the five variables, presented as {78.0, 33.0, 27.0, 27.0, 27.0}, {168.0, 33.0, 27.0, 27.0, 27.0}, {78.0, 123.0, 27.0, 27.0, 27.0}, {78.0, 33.0, 117.0, 27.0, 27.0}, {78.0, 33.0, 27.0, 117.0, 27.0}, {78.0, 33.0, 27.0, 27.0, 117.0}. Obviously, this simplex is looser than the hypercube in the original problem, i.e. {[78, 102], [33, 45], [27, 45], [27, 45], [27, 45]}. The preliminary calculation results are shown in Tables 1–3, where the quadratic

Table I. Calculation results of QBB algorithm for Colville's Problem when $a = 0.5$

Variable x_i	Upper bound	Upper bound solution	Lower bound	Lower bound solution	Iteration number	Number of unfathomed subsimplexes	CPU time (s)
1		78.0		78.0			
2		33.0		33.0			
3	−30665.58848	29.99506	−30665.60118	29.99503	1090	0	20.59
4		45.0		45.0			
5		36.77602		36.77601			

Table II. Calculation results of QBB algorithm for Colville's Problem when $a = 1.0$

Variable x_i	Upper bound	Upper bound solution	Lower bound	Lower bound solution	Iteration number	Number of unfathomed subsimplexes	CPU time (s)
1		78.0		78.0			
2		33.0		33.0			
3	−30665.58848	29.99506	−30665.77273	29.99445	2078	0	42.21
4		45.0		45.0			
5		36.77602		36.77628			

coefficients of the underestimation function for any bilinear term $\pm \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_j$ for $i \neq j$ in the above problem are assigned to be 0.5, i.e. the accurate one, 1.0, and 2.0, respectively. It turns out that the CPU running time increases and the solution quality deteriorates when the quadratic coefficients are estimated loosely. However, the algorithmic convergence is guaranteed even when the quadratic coefficients are assigned to be four times of the accurate one, see in Table 3. It should be noted that the number of the unfathomed simplexes is zero irrespective of the assigned quadratic coefficients for the underestimation function, since this constrained problem has only one global solution and the infeasible subsimplexes and those containing only local minima have been removed with the algorithm progress, see the remarks stated in Section 2.5.

4. Conclusion

A QBB algorithm is developed to solve problems belonging to the broad class of twice-differentiable NLPs. For any such problem, the ability to generate progressively tighter convex lower bounding problems at each iteration guarantees the convergence of this algorithm to within epsilon of the global optimum solution under the exhaustive division framework of the initial simplex. The different methods are presented for the construction

Table III. Calculation results of QBB algorithm for Colville's Problem when $a = 2.0$

Variable x_i	Upper bound	Upper bound solution	Lower bound	Lower bound solution	Iteration number	Number of unfathomed subsimplexes	CPU time (s)
1		78.0		78.0			
2		33.0		33.0			
3	−30665.58848	29.99506	−30665.68263	29.99471	4472	0	96.05
4		45.0		45.0			
5		36.77602		36.77646			

of the convex valid underestimators for special function structures and the general nonconvex function structures, where the maximal eigenvalue analysis of the interval Hessian matrix provides the rigorous guarantee for the QBB algorithm to converge to the global solution. The convergence properties of this algorithm for the nonconvex problems are obtained, and the preliminary calculation results for a general quadratic programming problem are reported to show the efficiency of the proposed algorithm for the practical applications.

Acknowledgement

Y. Zhu is a JSPS Fellow during his stay at University of Tsukuba, and the financial support from JSPS for this Project is gratefully appreciated. Prof. N.V. Thoai provided Y. Zhu with invaluable suggestions for his research in the field of deterministic global optimization. The enormous improvements of this paper made according to the excellent comments of three anonymous reviewers are sincerely acknowledged.

References

Adjiman, C.S., Dallwig, S., Floudas, C.A. and Neumaier, A. (1998a), A global optimization method, αBB, for general twice-differentiable constrained NLPs - I. Theoretical advances, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 22, 1137–1158.

Adjiman, C.S., Androulakis, I.P. and Floudas, C.A. (1998b), A global optimization method, αBB, for general twice-differentiable constrained NLPs - II. Implementation and computational results, *Computers Chemical Engineering* 22, 1159–1179.

Al-Khayyal, F.A. and Falk, J.E. (1983), Jointly constrained biconvex programming, *Mathematics of Operational and Research* 8, 273–286.

Colville, A.R. (1970), A comparative study of nonlinear programming codes. In: Kuhn, H.W. (ed.), *Princeton Symposium on Mathematical Programming*, Princeton Univ. Press, New Jersy.

Floudas, C.A., Aggarwal, A. and Ciric, A.R. (1989), Global optimum search for non-convex NLP and MINLP problems, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 13, 1117–1132.

Floudas, C.A. and Visweswaran, V. (1990), A global optimization algorithm (GOP) for certain classes of nonconvex NLPs: I. Theory, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 14, 1397–1417.

Floudas, C.A. and Pardalos, P.M. (1990), *A Collection of Test Problems for Constrained Global Optimization Algorithms*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 455, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Floudas, C.A. and Visweswaran, V. (1993), A primal-relaxed dual global optimization approaches, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Application* 78, 187–225.

Floudas, C.A. (2000), *Deterministic Global Optimization: Theory, Methods and Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht.

Gerschgorin, S. (1931), Uber die abgrenzung der eigenwerte einer matrix, *Izv.Akademii Nauk SSSR, Ser.fiziku-material* 6, 749–754.

Grossmann, I.E. (ed.) (1996), *Global Optimization in Engineering Design*, Kluwer book series in nonconvex optimization and its applications, Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht.

Hansen, E.R. (1992), *Global Optimization using Interval Analysis*, Marcel Dekker, New York.

Horst, R. and Tuy, H. (1990), *Global Optimization : Deterministic Approaches*, Springer-Verlag. Berlin.

Horst, R. and Pardalos, P.M. (1995), *Handbook of Global Optimization*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York.

Horst, R., Pardalos, P.M. and Thoai, N.V. (1995), *Introduction to Global Optimization*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Kearfott, R.B. (1996), *Rigorous Global Search: Continuous Problems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Knuppel, O. (1993), *Programmer's Runtime Optimized Fast Interval Library. Technische Informatik III*, Technische Universitat Hamburg-Harburg.

Konno, H., Thach, P.T. and Tuy, H. (1997), *Optimization on Low Rank Nonconvex Structures, Nonconvex Optimization and its Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Lasdon, L. (2000), *LSGRG Version 3.0 Release Notes*. MSIS Department, College of Business Administration, the University of Texas at Austin.

Maranas, C.D. and Floudas, C.A. (1992), A global optimization approach for Lennard-Jones microclusters, *Journal of Chemical Physics* 97, 7667–7678.

Maranas, C.D. and Floudas, C.A. (1994), Global minimum potential-energy conformations of small molecules, *Journal of Global Optimization* 4, 135–170.

McCormick, G.P. (1976), Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part I – Convex underestimating problems, *Mathematical Programming* 10, 147–175.

McDonald, C.M. and Floudas, C.A. (1994), Decomposition based and branch and bound global optimization approaches for the phase equilibrium problems, *Journal of Global Optimization* 5, 205–251.

Neumaier, A. (1990), *Interval Methods for Systems of Equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England.

Neumaier, A. (1996), Second-order sufficient optimality conditions for local and global nonlinear programming, *Journal of Global Optimization* 9, 141–151.

Parthasarathy, G. and El-Halwagi, M.M. (2000), Optimum mass integration strategies for condensation and allocation of multicomponent VOCs, *Chemical Engineering Science* 55, 881–895.

Rockafellar, R.T. (1972), *Convex Analysis*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.

Ryoo, H.S. and Sahinidis, N.V. (1995), Global optimization of nonconvex NLPs and MINLPs with application in process design. *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 19, 551–566.

Ryoo, H.S. and Sahinidis, N.V. (1996), A branch-and-reduce approach to global optimization, *Journal Global Optimization* 8(2), 107–138.

Ryoo, H.S. and Sahinidis, N.V. (2003), Global optimization of multiplicative programs. *Journal of Global Optimization* 26 (4), 387–418.

Sahinidis, N.V. (1996), BARON: A general purpose global optimization software package, *Journal of Global Optimization* 8, 201–205.

Smith, E.M.B. and Pantelides, C.C. (1999), A symbolic reformulation/spatial branch-and-bound algorithm for the global optimisation of nonconvex MINLPs, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 23, 457–478.

Smith, S. and L. Lasdon, (1992), Solving large sparse nonlinear programs using GRG, *ORSA Journal on Computing* 4(1), 2–15.

Stephanopoulos, G. and Westerberg, A.W. (1975), The use of Hestenes' method of multipliers to resolve dual gaps in engineering system optimization, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Application* 15, 285.

Tuy, H. (1998). *Convex Analysis and Global Optimization*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Tawarmalani, M. and Sahinidis, N.V. (2001), Semidefinite relaxation of fractional programs via novel convexification techniques, *Journal of Global Optimization* 20, 137–158.

Tawarmalani, M. and Sahinidis, N.V. (2002), Convex extensions and envelopes of lower semi-continuous functions, *Mathematical Programming* 93(2), 247–263.

Tawarmalani, M. and Sahinidis, N.V. (2004), Global optimization of mixed-integer nonlinear programs: A theoretical and computational study, *Mathematical Programming* 99(3): 563–591.

Vavasis, S. (1991), *Nonlinear Optimization: Complexity Issues*, Oxford University Press. New York, N.Y.

Wales D.J. and Scheraga, H.A. (1999), Global optimization of clusters, crystals, and Biomolecules, *Science* 285, 1368–1372.

Westerberg, A.W. and Shah, J.V. (1978), Assuring a global optimum by the use of an upper bound on the lower (dual) bound, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 2, 83.

Zhu, Y. and Xu, Z. (1999), Calculation of liquid-liquid equilibrium based on the global stability analysis for ternary mixtures by using a novel branch and bound algorithm: Application to UNIQUAC equation, *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research* 38, 3549–3556.

Zhu, Y. and Inoue, K. (2001), Calculation of chemical and phase equilibrium based on stability analysis by QBB algorithm: Application to NRTL equation, *Chemical Engineering Science* 56, 6915–6931.

Zhu, Y. and Kuno, T. (2003), Global optimization of nonconvex MINLP by a hybrid branch-and-bound and revised general Benders decomposition method, *Industrial and Engineering Chemical Research* 42, 528–539.