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Hyperthermia treatment

- Regional hyperthermia is a cancer therapy that aims at heating large and deeply seated tumors by means of radio wave adsorption
- Results in the killing of tumor cells and makes them more susceptible to other accompanying therapies; e.g., chemotherapy
Hyperthermia treatment planning

- Computer modeling can be used to help plan the therapy for each patient, and it opens the door for numerical optimization.
- The goal is to heat the tumor to the target temperature of 43°C while minimizing damage to nearby cells.
Hyperthermia treatment as an optimization problem

The problem is to

$$\min_{y,u} \int_{\Omega} (y - y_t)^2 dV \quad \text{where} \quad y_t = \begin{cases} 37 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_0 \\ 43 & \text{in } \Omega_0 \end{cases}$$

subject to the bio-heat transfer equation (Pennes (1948))

$$- \nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla y) + \omega (y) \pi (y - y_b) = \frac{\sigma}{2} \left| \sum_i u_i E_i \right|^2 , \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

thermal conductivity \hspace{1cm} \text{effects of blood flow} \hspace{1cm} \text{electromagnetic field}

and the bound constraints

$$37.0 \leq y \leq 37.5, \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega$$

$$41.0 \leq y \leq 45.0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_0$$

where $\Omega_0$ is the tumor domain
Consider

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x)$$

s.t. $c_{E}(x) = 0$

$\quad c_{I}(x) \geq 0$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $c_{E} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^p$ and $c_{I} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^q$ are smooth functions.

The best contemporary methods are limited by problem size; e.g.,

- sequential quadratic programming (small to moderate sizes)
- interior-point methods (moderate to large sizes)

We want the fast solution of problems with millions of variables.
Challenges in large-scale optimization

- Computational issues:
  - Large matrices may not be stored
  - Large matrices may not be factored

- Algorithmic issues:
  - The problem may be nonconvex
  - The problem may be ill-conditioned

- Computational/Algorithmic issues:
  - No matrix factorizations makes difficulties more difficult
Main contributions

▶ ALGORITHMS: Inexact Newton methods for constrained optimization, broadening the potential application of fast optimization algorithms
▶ THEORY: Global convergence and the potential for fast local convergence
▶ SOFTWARE: new release of Ipopt (Wächter) with Pardiso (Schenk)
▶ ARTICLES:
  ▶ “An Interior-Point Algorithm for Large-Scale Nonlinear Optimization with Inexact Step Computations,” submitted to *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, with O. Schenk and A. Wächter
## Outline

Motivational Example

Algorithm development and theoretical results

Experimental results

Conclusion and final remarks

---

An Inexact Newton Method for Optimization

Frank E. Curtis
Equality constrained optimization

Consider

\[
\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \\
\text{s.t. } c(x) = 0
\]

The Lagrangian is

\[
\mathcal{L}(x, \lambda) \triangleq f(x) + \lambda^T c(x)
\]

so the first-order optimality conditions are

\[
\nabla \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x) + \nabla c(x) \lambda \\ c(x) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) = 0
\]
Inexact Newton methods

- Solve
  \[ \mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \min \varphi(x, \lambda) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \| \mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) \|^2 \]

- Inexact Newton methods compute
  \[ \nabla \mathcal{F}(x_k, \lambda_k) d_k = -\mathcal{F}(x_k, \lambda_k) + r_k \]

  requiring (Dembo, Eisenstat, Steihaug (1982))
  \[ \| r_k \| \leq \kappa \| \mathcal{F}(x_k, \lambda_k) \|, \quad \kappa \in (0, 1) \]
A naïve Newton method for optimization

Consider the problem

\[
\min f(x) = x_1 + x_2, \quad \text{s.t. } c(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 = 0
\]

that has the first-order optimality conditions

\[
\mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + 2x_1 \lambda \\ 1 + 2x_2 \lambda \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0
\]

A Newton method applied to this problem yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( \frac{1}{2} | \mathcal{F}(x_k, \lambda_k) |^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5358e+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9081e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8884e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9028e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1235e-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A naïve Newton method for optimization

Consider the problem

$$\min f(x) = x_1 + x_2, \quad \text{s.t. } c(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 = 0$$

that has the first-order optimality conditions

$$\mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + 2x_1 \lambda \\ 1 + 2x_2 \lambda \\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

A Newton method applied to this problem yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\frac{1}{2} | \mathcal{F}(x_k, \lambda_k) |^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3.5358e+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+2.9081e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+4.8884e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+7.9028e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+2.1235e-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$f(x_k)$</th>
<th>$| c(x_k) |$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1.3660e+00</td>
<td>+1.1102e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1.3995e+00</td>
<td>+8.3734e-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1.4358e+00</td>
<td>+3.0890e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1.4143e+00</td>
<td>+2.4321e-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1.4142e+00</td>
<td>+1.7258e-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A naïve Newton method for optimization fails easily

- Consider the problem

\[
\min f(x) = x_1 + x_2, \quad \text{s.t. } c(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 1 = 0
\]
## Merit function

- Simply minimizing

\[
\varphi(x, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \| \mathcal{F}(x, \lambda) \|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x) + \nabla c(x) \lambda \\ c(x) \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2
\]

is generally inappropriate for optimization.

- We use the **merit function**

\[
\phi(x; \pi) \triangleq f(x) + \pi \| c(x) \|
\]

where \( \pi \) is a penalty parameter.
Algorithm 0: Newton method for optimization

(assume the problem is convex and regular)
for \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Solve the primal-dual (Newton) equations} \\
\left[ \begin{array}{cc}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
\end{array} \right] \\
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
d_k \\
\delta_k
\end{array} \right] = - \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\
c(x_k)
\end{array} \right]
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{Increase } \pi_k, \text{ if necessary, so that } \pi_k \geq \| \lambda_k + \delta_k \| \text{ (yields } D\phi_k(d_k; \pi_k) \ll 0) \]

\[ \text{Backtrack from } \alpha_k \leftarrow 1 \text{ to satisfy the Armijo condition} \]

\[ \phi(x_k + \alpha_k d_k; \pi_k) \leq \phi(x_k; \pi_k) + \eta \alpha_k D\phi_k(d_k; \pi_k) \]

\[ \text{Update iterate } (x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) \leftarrow (x_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha_k (d_k, \delta_k) \]
Newton methods and sequential quadratic programming

If $H(x_k, \lambda_k)$ is positive definite on the null space of $\nabla c(x_k)^T$, then

$$\begin{bmatrix} H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\ \nabla c(x_k)^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d \\ \delta \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)\lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

is equivalent to

$$\min_{d \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x_k) + \nabla f(x_k)^T d + \frac{1}{2} d^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) d$$

s.t. $c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T d = 0$
Minimizing a penalty function

Consider the penalty function for

$$\min (x - 1)^2, \text{ s.t. } x = 0 \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \phi(x; \pi) = (x - 1)^2 + \pi |x|$$

for different values of the penalty parameter $\pi$.

**Figure: $\pi = 1$**

**Figure: $\pi = 2$**
Convergence of Algorithm 0

Assumption

The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) is contained in a convex set \( \Omega \) over which \( f \), \( c \), and their first derivatives are bounded and Lipschitz continuous. Also,

1. **(Regularity)** \( \nabla c(x_k)^T \) has full row rank with singular values bounded below by a positive constant
2. **(Convexity)** \( u^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) u \geq \mu \|u\|^2 \) for \( \mu > 0 \) for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfying \( u \neq 0 \) and \( \nabla c(x_k)^T u = 0 \)

Theorem

(Han (1977)) The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) yields the limit

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 0
\]
Incorporating inexactness

- **Iterative** as opposed to **direct** methods

- Compute

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
d_k \\
\delta_k
\end{bmatrix}
= - \begin{bmatrix}
\nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\
c(x_k)
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
\rho_k \\
r_k
\end{bmatrix}
\]

satisfying

\[
\| \begin{bmatrix}
\rho_k \\
r_k
\end{bmatrix} \| \leq \kappa \left\| \begin{bmatrix}
\nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\
c(x_k)
\end{bmatrix} \right\|, \quad \kappa \in (0, 1)
\]

- If \( \kappa \) is not sufficiently small (e.g., \( 10^{-3} \) vs. \( 10^{-12} \)), then \( d_k \) may be an ascent direction for our merit function; i.e.,

\[
D\phi_k(d_k; \pi_k) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \pi_k \geq \pi_{k-1}
\]
Model reductions

- Define the model of $\phi(\mathbf{x}; \pi)$:

$$m(d; \pi) \triangleq f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f(\mathbf{x})^T d + \pi(\|c(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla c(\mathbf{x})^T d\|)$$

- $d_k$ is acceptable if

$$\Delta m(d_k; \pi_k) \triangleq m(0; \pi_k) - m(d_k; \pi_k) = -\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k + \pi_k(\|c(x_k)\| - \|c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T d_k\|) \gg 0$$

- This ensures $D\phi_k(d_k; \pi_k) \ll 0$ (and more)
Termination test 1

The search direction \((d_k, \delta_k)\) is acceptable if

\[
\|\begin{bmatrix} \rho_k \\ r_k \end{bmatrix} \| \leq \kappa \|\begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)\lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix} \|, \quad \kappa \in (0, 1)
\]

and if for \(\pi_k = \pi_{k-1}\) and some \(\sigma \in (0, 1)\) we have

\[
\Delta m(d_k; \pi_k) \geq \max\left\{ \frac{1}{2} d_k^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) d_k, 0 \right\} + \sigma \pi_k \max\left\{ \|c(x_k)\|, \|r_k\| - \|c(x_k)\| \right\} \\
\geq 0 \text{ for any } d
\]
Termination test 2

The search direction \((d_k, \delta_k)\) is acceptable if

\[
\|\rho_k\| \leq \beta \|c(x_k)\|, \quad \beta > 0
\]

and

\[
\|r_k\| \leq \epsilon \|c(x_k)\|, \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1)
\]

Increasing the penalty parameter \(\pi\) then yields

\[
\Delta m(d_k; \pi_k) \geq \max\{\frac{1}{2} d_k^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) d_k, 0\} + \sigma \pi_k \|c(x_k)\| \geq 0 \text{ for any } d
\]
Algorithm 1: Inexact Newton for optimization
(Byrd, Curtis, Nocedal (2008))
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

- Iteratively solve

$$\begin{bmatrix} H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\ \nabla c(x_k)^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d_k \\ \delta_k \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)\lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

until termination test 1 or 2 is satisfied

- If only termination test 2 is satisfied, increase $\pi$ so

$$\pi_k \geq \max \left\{ \pi_{k-1}, \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k + \max\{\frac{1}{2} d_k^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) d_k, 0\}}{(1 - \tau)(\|c(x_k)\| - \|r_k\|)} \right\}$$

- Backtrack from $\alpha_k \leftarrow 1$ to satisfy

$$\phi(x_k + \alpha_k d_k; \pi_k) \leq \phi(x_k; \pi_k) - \eta \alpha_k \Delta m(d_k; \pi_k)$$

- Update iterate $(x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) \leftarrow (x_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha_k (d_k, \delta_k)$
Convergence of Algorithm 1

Assumption

The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) is contained in a convex set \( \Omega \) over which \( f \), \( c \), and their first derivatives are bounded and Lipschitz continuous. Also,

- **(Regularity)** \( \nabla c(x_k)^T \) has full row rank with singular values bounded below by a positive constant

- **(Convexity)** \( u^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) u \geq \mu \|u\|^2 \) for \( \mu > 0 \) for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfying \( u \neq 0 \) and \( \nabla c(x_k)^T u = 0 \)

Theorem

*(Byrd, Curtis, Nocedal (2008))* The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) yields the limit

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 0
\]
Handling nonconvexity and rank deficiency

- There are two assumptions we aim to drop:
  - *(Regularity)* $\nabla c(x_k)^T$ has full row rank with singular values bounded below by a positive constant
  - *(Convexity)* $u^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) u \geq \mu \|u\|^2$ for $\mu > 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $u \neq 0$ and $\nabla c(x_k)^T u = 0$

  e.g., the problem is not regular if it is infeasible, and it is not convex if there are maximizers and/or saddle points

- Without them, Algorithm 1 may stall or may not be well-defined
No factorizations means no clue

- We might not store or factor

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

so we might not know if the problem is nonconvex or ill-conditioned

- Common practice is to perturb the matrix to be

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) + \xi_1 I & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & -\xi_2 I
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \(\xi_1\) convexifies the model and \(\xi_2\) regularizes the constraints

- Poor choices of \(\xi_1\) and \(\xi_2\) can have terrible consequences in the algorithm
Our approach for global convergence

- Decompose the direction $d_k$ into a normal component (toward the constraints) and a tangential component (toward optimality)

- Without convexity, we do not guarantee a minimizer, but our merit function biases the method to avoid maximizers and saddle points
Normal component computation

- (Approximately) solve

\[
\min \frac{1}{2} \| c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T v \|^2 \\
\text{s.t. } \| v \| \leq \omega \| (\nabla c(x_k))c(x_k) \| 
\]

for some \( \omega > 0 \)

- We only require Cauchy decrease:

\[
\| c(x_k) \| - \| c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T v_k \| \\
\geq \epsilon_v (\| c(x_k) \| - \| c(x_k) + \alpha \nabla c(x_k)^T \tilde{v}_k \|)
\]

for \( \epsilon_v \in (0, 1) \), where \( \tilde{v}_k = - (\nabla c(x_k))c(x_k) \) is the direction of steepest descent
Tangential component computation (idea #1)

- Standard practice is to then (approximately) solve
  \[
  \min \left( \nabla f(x_k) + H(x_k, \lambda_k)v_k \right)^T u + \frac{1}{2} u^T H(x_k, \lambda_k) u \\
  \text{s.t. } \nabla c(x_k)^T u = 0, \quad \|u\| \leq \Delta_k
  \]

- However, maintaining
  \[
  \nabla c(x_k)^T u \approx 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\| \leq \Delta_k
  \]
  can be expensive
**Tangential component computation**

- Instead, we formulate the primal-dual system

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
u_k \\
\delta_k
\end{bmatrix}
= -\begin{bmatrix}
\nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)\lambda_k + H(x_k, \lambda_k)v_k \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

- Our ideas from before apply!
Handling nonconvexity

- Convexify the Hessian as in

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_k) + \xi_1 I & \nabla c(x_k) \\
\nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

by monitoring iterates

- Hessian modification strategy: Increase $\xi_1$ whenever

\[
\|u_k\|^2 > \psi \|v_k\|^2, \quad \psi > 0
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} u_k^T (H(x_k, \lambda_k) + \xi_1 I) u_k < \theta \|u_k\|^2, \quad \theta > 0
\]
Inexact Newton Algorithm 2

(Curtis, Nocedal, Wächter (2009))

for \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \)

- Approximately solve
  \[
  \min \frac{1}{2} \|c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T v\|^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|v\| \leq \omega \|\nabla c(x_k)\| c(x_k)
  \]
  to compute \( v_k \) satisfy Cauchy decrease

- Iteratively solve
  \[
  \begin{bmatrix}
  H(x_k, \lambda_k) + \xi_1 I & \nabla c(x_k) \\
  \nabla c(x_k)^T & 0
  \end{bmatrix}
  \begin{bmatrix} d_k \\ \delta_k \end{bmatrix}
  = - \begin{bmatrix}
  \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)\lambda_k \\
  -\nabla c(x_k)^T v_k
  \end{bmatrix}
  \]
  until termination test 1 or 2 is satisfied, increasing \( \xi_1 \) as described

- If only termination test 2 is satisfied, increase \( \pi \) so

  \[
  \pi_k \geq \max \left\{ \pi_{k-1}, \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T d_k + \max\left\{ \frac{1}{2} u_k^T (H(x_k, \lambda_k) + \xi_1 I) u_k, \theta \|u_k\|^2 \right\}}{(1 - \tau)(\|c(x_k)\| - \|c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T d_k\|)} \right\}
  \]

- Backtrack from \( \alpha_k \leftarrow 1 \) to satisfy

  \[
  \phi(x_k + \alpha_k d_k; \pi_k) \leq \phi(x_k; \pi_k) - \eta \alpha_k \Delta m(d_k; \pi_k)
  \]

- Update iterate \((x_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) \leftarrow (x_k, \lambda_k) + \alpha_k (d_k, \delta_k)\)
Convergence of Algorithm 2

Assumption

The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) is contained in a convex set \( \Omega \) over which \( f \), \( c \), and their first derivatives are bounded and Lipschitz continuous.

Theorem

\( \text{(Curtis, Nocedal, Wächter (2009))} \) If all limit points of \( \{\nabla c(x_k)^T\} \) have full row rank, then the sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_k)\} \) yields the limit

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \\ c(x_k) \end{bmatrix} \right\| = 0.
\]

Otherwise,

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \| (\nabla c(x_k)) c(x_k) \| = 0
\]

and if \( \{\pi_k\} \) is bounded, then

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \| \nabla f(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k) \lambda_k \| = 0
\]
Handling inequalities

- **Interior point methods** are attractive for large applications
- Line-search interior point methods that enforce

\[ c(x_k) + \nabla c(x_k)^T d_k = 0 \]

may fail to converge globally (Wächter, Biegler (2000))
- Fortunately, the trust region subproblem we use to regularize the constraints also saves us from this type of failure!
Algorithm 2 (Interior-point version)

- Apply Algorithm 2 to the logarithmic-barrier subproblem

\[
\min f(x) - \mu \sum_{i=1}^{q} \ln s^i, \quad \text{s.t. } c_{\mathcal{E}}(x) = 0, \quad c_{\mathcal{I}}(x) - s = 0
\]

for \( \mu \to 0 \)

- Define

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H(x_k, \lambda_{\mathcal{E},k}, \lambda_{\mathcal{I},k}) & 0 & \nabla c_{\mathcal{E}}(x_k) & \nabla c_{\mathcal{I}}(x_k) \\
0 & \mu I & 0 & -S_k \\
\nabla c_{\mathcal{E}}(x_k)^T & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\nabla c_{\mathcal{I}}(x_k)^T & -S_k & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
d_k^x \\
d_k^s \\
S_k d_k^s \\
\delta_{\mathcal{E},k} \\
\delta_{\mathcal{I},k} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

so that the iterate update has

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x_{k+1} \\
s_{k+1}
\end{bmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix}
x_k \\
s_k
\end{bmatrix} + \alpha_k \begin{bmatrix}
d_k^x \\
S_k d_k^s
\end{bmatrix}
\]

- Incorporate a fraction-to-the-boundary rule in the line search and a slack reset in the algorithm to maintain \( s \geq \max\{0, c_{\mathcal{I}}(x)\} \)
Convergence of Algorithm 2 (Interior-point)

Assumption

The sequence \( \{(x_k, \lambda_{\mathcal{E},k}, \lambda_{\mathcal{I},k})\} \) is contained in a convex set \( \Omega \) over which \( f \), \( c_{\mathcal{E}} \), \( c_{\mathcal{I}} \), and their first derivatives are bounded and Lipschitz continuous.

Theorem

(Curtis, Schenk, Wächter (2009))

- For a given \( \mu \), Algorithm 2 yields the same limits as in the equality constrained case.
- If Algorithm 2 yields a sufficiently accurate solution to the barrier subproblem for each \( \{\mu_j\} \rightarrow 0 \) and if the linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ) holds at a limit point \( \bar{x} \) of \( \{x_j\} \), then there exist Lagrange multipliers \( \bar{\lambda} \) such that the first-order optimality conditions of the nonlinear program are satisfied.
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Implementation details

- Incorporated in IPOPT software package (Wächter)
- Linear systems solved with PARDISO (Schenk)
  - Symmetric quasi-minimum residual method (Freund (1994))
- PDE-constrained model problems
  - 3D grid $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$
  - Equidistant Cartesian grid with $N$ grid points
  - 7-point stencil for discretization
## Boundary control problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\min & \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (y(x) - y_t(x))^2 dx, \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad -\nabla \cdot (e^{y(x)} \cdot \nabla y(x)) = 20, \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
& \quad y(x) = u(x), \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\
& \quad 2.5 \leq u(x) \leq 3.5, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{y}}(x) &= 3 + 10x_1(x_1 - 1)x_2(x_2 - 1) \sin(2\pi x_3) \\
\text{\textit{u}}(x) &\text{ defined on } \partial\Omega
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(q)</th>
<th># nnz</th>
<th>(f^*)</th>
<th># iter</th>
<th>CPU sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>95561</td>
<td>1.3368e-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27000</td>
<td>21952</td>
<td>10096</td>
<td>339871</td>
<td>1.3039e-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>139.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>64000</td>
<td>54872</td>
<td>18256</td>
<td>827181</td>
<td>1.2924e-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>406.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>125000</td>
<td>110592</td>
<td>28816</td>
<td>1641491</td>
<td>1.2871e-2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>935.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>216000</td>
<td>195112</td>
<td>41776</td>
<td>2866801</td>
<td>1.2843e-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1987.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{\textit{(direct)}})</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64000</td>
<td>54872</td>
<td>18256</td>
<td>827181</td>
<td>1.2924e-2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hyperthermia Treatment Planning

\[ \min \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (y(x) - y_t(x))^2 \, dx, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad -\Delta y(x) - 10(y(x) - 37) = u^* M(x) u, \quad \text{in } \Omega \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial y(x)}{\partial x} &\leq 37.5, \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega \\
42.0 &\leq y(x) \leq 44.0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_0,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
// y_t(x) = \begin{cases} 
37 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_0 \\
43 & \text{in } \Omega_0
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
u_j &= a_j e^{i\phi_j} \\
M_{jk}(x) &= \langle E_j(x), E_k(x) \rangle \\
E_j &= \sin(jx_1 x_2 x_3 \pi)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
// \Omega_0 = [3/8, 5/8]^3
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(q)</th>
<th># nnz</th>
<th>(f^*)</th>
<th># iter</th>
<th>CPU sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>20701</td>
<td>2.3037</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8020</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td>4626</td>
<td>212411</td>
<td>2.3619</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>564.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27020</td>
<td>21952</td>
<td>10822</td>
<td>779121</td>
<td>2.3843</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4716.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>64020</td>
<td>54872</td>
<td>20958</td>
<td>1924831</td>
<td>2.6460</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9579.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(direct)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27020</td>
<td>21952</td>
<td>10822</td>
<td>779121</td>
<td>2.3719</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample solution for $N = 40$
Numerical experiments (currently underway)

Joint with Andreas Wächter (IBM) and Olaf Schenk (U. of Basel)

- Hyperthermia treatment planning with real patient geometry (with Matthias Christen, U. of Basel)
- Image registration (with Stefan Heldmann, U. of Lübeck)
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- Inexact Newton method for optimization with theoretical foundation
- Convergence guarantees are as good as exact methods, sometimes better
- Numerical experiments are promising so far, and more to come