

**16.888/ESD.77J Multidisciplinary System Design Optimization (MSDO)
Spring 2010**

Assignment 3

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Instructors: | Prof. Olivier de Weck Prof. Karen Willcox Dr. Anas Alfaris Dr. Douglas Allaire |
| TAs: | Andrew March Kaushik Sinha |
| Issued: | Lecture 9 |
| Due: | Lecture 14 |

You are expected to solve **Part (a)** individually and **Part (b)** in your project team. Each person must submit their own Part (a) but you should submit Part (b) as a group. Please indicate the name(s) of your teammate(s).

Topics: sensitivity analysis, gradient based search algorithms, comparison of algorithm performance, single objective optimization of team design projects

Part (a)

Sensitivity Analysis

Part A1

In lecture 9, numerous methods of estimating derivatives were discussed. You are going to test their accuracy on a set of given functions. You should estimate the first-derivative using (1) a first-order finite-difference, (2) a second-order central-difference, and (3) a complex step estimate. In addition you should estimate the second-derivative using (1) a second-order estimate, and (2) a complex step second-derivative estimate. Note for the complex step, the second derivative estimate is: $f''(x) = \frac{2}{\Delta x^2} [f(x) - \Re e(f(x + i \cdot \Delta x))]$.

Please plot the error between the analytical first-derivatives and your approximations on one plot and the error between the analytical second-derivative and your approximations on a second plot both using a log-scale (the command `loglog()` in MATLAB®). Please use step sizes from 1×10^{-15} to 10 (the command `logspace()` in MATLAB may help).

- (a) For the function $f(x)=x^2$, at $x=1$.
- (b) For the function $f(x)=x^3$, at $x=1$.
- (c) For the function $f(x)=e^x$, at $x=1$.

- (d) Please comment about the change in the accuracy of the central-difference and the complex step between (a) and (b).
- (e) Does any step size appear to estimate the first-derivative well, the second-derivative?

Caution: if the error is zero it will not be shown on a log-scale so please take care in plotting your results.

Part A2

This problem is to use sensitivity analysis on revenue management for a very simplified airline pricing model. We will assume that an airline has one flight per day from Boston to Atlanta and they use an airplane that seats 150 people. The airline wishes to determine three prices, p_i ($i=1,2,3$), one for seats in each of the three fare buckets it will use. The fare buckets are designed to maximize revenue by separating travelers into groups, for instance 14 day advance purchase, leisure travelers, and business travelers. The airline models demand for seats in each group using the formula:

$$D_i = a_i \exp\left(-\frac{1}{a_i} p_i\right).$$

Where D_i is the people that want to fly given price p_i , the remaining parameters are $a_1=100$, $a_2=150$, and $a_3=300$. Please note, for simplicity you may assume that each D_i is a continuous variable.

- (a) Formulate the revenue maximization problem for this flight as an optimization problem.
- (b) What are the optimal prices and how many people are expected to buy a ticket in each fare bucket?
- (c) Using sensitivity analysis, if the airline were to squeeze three additional seats onto this flight,
 - a. How much do you expect revenue to change?
 - b. By how much should the airline change each price?

Comparison of Optimization Algorithms

Part A3

Consider the following three optimization problems:

The Banana (Rosenbrock) Function

This function is known as the “banana function” because of its shape; it is described mathematically in Equation (1). In this problem, there are two design variables with lower and upper limits of $[-5, 5]$. The Rosenbrock function has a known global minimum at $[1, 1]$ with an optimal function value of zero.

$$\text{Minimize } f(\mathbf{x}) = 100(x_2 - x_1^2)^2 + (1 - x_1)^2 \quad (1)$$

The Eggcrate Function

This function is described mathematically in Equation (2). In this problem, there are two design variables with lower and upper bounds of $[-2\pi, 2\pi]$. The Eggcrate function has a known global minimum at $[0, 0]$ with an optimal function value of zero.

$$\text{Minimize } f(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 25(\sin^2 x_1 + \sin^2 x_2) \quad (2)$$

Golinski's Speed Reducer

This hypothetical problem represents the design of a simple gearbox such as might be used in a light airplane between the engine and propeller to allow each to rotate at its most efficient speed.

The gearbox is depicted in Figure 2 and its seven design variables are labeled. The objective is to minimize the speed reducer's weight while satisfying the 11 constraints imposed by gear and shaft design practices. A full problem description can be found in Reference [1]. A known feasible solution obtained by a sequential quadratic programming (SQP) approach (MATLAB's `fmincon`) is a 2994.34 kg gearbox with the following values for the seven design variables: $[3.5000 \ 0.7000 \ 17.0000 \ 7.3000 \ 7.7153 \ 3.3502 \ 5.2867]$.

This is a feasible solution with four active constraints, but is it an optimal solution?




Image by MIT OpenCourseWare.

Figure 2: Golinski's Speed Reducer with 7 design variables

[1] Ray, T., "Golinski's Speed Reducer Problem Revisited," *the AIAA Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 2003, pp. 556 -558.

Numerically find the minimum (=optimal) feasible design vector \mathbf{x} for each of the above three problems using a gradient search technique of your choice (e.g. Steepest Gradient, SQP...). For each run record the starting point you used, the iteration history (objective value on y-axis and iteration number on x-axis), the final point at which the algorithm terminated and whether or not the final solution is feasible. Do at least 10 runs for each problem, but no more than 100.

Discuss the results and insights you get from numerically solving these three nonlinear optimization problems.

Part A4

Repeat the numerical experiments from part A3, but this time using a heuristic technique of your choice (e.g. SA, GA ...). Explain how you “tuned” the heuristic algorithm. Both SA and GA toolboxes for MATLAB can be obtained through the MathWorks® website. (<http://www.mathworks.com/products/global-optimization/index.html>)

Compare your two algorithms (the gradient-search one and the heuristic one) from above quantitatively and qualitatively for the three problems as follows:

- i. Dependence of answers on initial design vector (start point, initial population)
- ii. Computational effort (CPU time [sec] or FLOPS)
- iii. Convergence history
- iv. Frequency at which the technique gets trapped in a local maximum

In order to answer this question you will need to implement your algorithms in some way (e.g. MATLAB). You may also use a commercial tool such as Excel Solver, iSIGHT etc... if you wish, as long as you explain what algorithm is being used. Describe not just your conclusions, but also the process you followed. Do you think your conclusions would still apply for larger, more complex design optimization problems?

Part (b)

In this assignment we want you to take the simulation code that you developed for your project in A2, refine it and couple it with an optimizer. First you should use a gradient-search technique. If you have non-continuous variables keep them at fixed values, or assume that they are continuous. (We will use heuristic techniques on your assignment in a later assignment)

(b1) Simulation completion

Complete the simulation code you started developing under part (b1) in assignment A2. Replace “placeholder” modules with actual code and rerun the entire analysis. Select interesting design points based on what you learned in (b3) of assignment A2. What are remaining open issues in your project?

(b2) Gradient-based optimization

b2.1 Algorithm Selection

Select a gradient-based algorithm based on the characteristics of your project and the properties of the available algorithms. Rationalize in a few sentences, why your selection seems most appropriate for the problem at hand.

b2.2 Single objective optimization

Select a single (scalar) objective function for which to optimize your system. Describe why you selected this objective. Other potential objectives should be turned into equality or inequality constraints or ignored (for now). Using the gradient-based optimization technique identified in (b2.1), try to optimize your system with respect to the one objective function. Can you get the algorithm to converge? Do you obtain an improvement in the design compared to your initial starting point? If not, please give some reasons. You may use Excel, iSight, MATLAB or any other optimization environment of your choice, but please specify in your write-up what you used. What is the optimal solution \mathbf{x}^* ?

b2.3 Sensitivity analysis

Conduct a sensitivity analysis at the optimal point \mathbf{x}^* with respect to \mathbf{x} , and a few of your fixed parameters, p . What design variables seem to be the drivers in your problem? Does this match the intuition you had beforehand? What are the active constraints at \mathbf{x}^* ? How can you tell? Try moving the most important active constraint by some amount. Reoptimize and compare the new optimum with the previous optimum, what do you observe?

b2.4 Global Optimum

How confident are you that you have found the true global optimum? Explain.

Note: Keep all the results from this assignment handy for A4, where we will extend the work on your project by considering multiple objectives.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

ESD.77 / 16.888 Multidisciplinary System Design Optimization
Spring 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.