



Equivalent formulations of the minnum peak problem and applications

Emilio Molina, Alain Rapaport, Hector Ramirez Cabrera

► To cite this version:

Emilio Molina, Alain Rapaport, Hector Ramirez Cabrera. Equivalent formulations of the minnum peak problem and applications. French German Portuguese Conference on Optimization - FGP22, May 2022, Porto, Portugal. hal-03694722

HAL Id: hal-03694722

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03694722v1>

Submitted on 25 Jul 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Equivalent formulations of the minimum peak problem and applications

E. Molina^{1,2}, A. Rapaport¹, H. Ramirez²


¹MISTEA research unit, Montpellier, France

² DIM & CMM, Univ. Chile

FGP 2022, Porto

Motivation of the work

$$\begin{cases} \dot{S} = -\beta SI \\ \dot{I} = \beta SI - \gamma I \\ \dot{R} = \gamma I \end{cases} \quad \blacktriangleright$$



$$\begin{cases} \dot{S} = -\beta(1-u)SI \\ \dot{I} = \beta(1-u)SI - \gamma I \\ \dot{R} = \gamma I \end{cases} \quad \text{with} \quad \int_0^\infty u(\tau) d\tau \leq Q$$

How to reduce at best $\max_i I(t)$?

Optimal control with L^∞ criterion

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u) \quad \rightarrow \quad \inf_{u(\cdot)} \max_{t \in [0, T]} h(x(t))$$

is not in the classical form of a Mayer or Bolza problem...

- Characterization of the value function (Barron, Ishii, Jensen, Liu, Gonzalez, Aragone...) in terms of a variational inequality :

$$\min \left(\partial_t V + \inf_u \partial_x V \cdot f(x, u) , V - h(x) \right) = 0 .$$

- Approximation of the L^∞ norm by the L^p norm.

Optimal control with L^∞ criterion

$$(\mathcal{D}) : \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, y, u) \end{cases} \quad \text{with} \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} x \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ y \in \mathbb{R} \\ u \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^p \end{array} \right.$$

Assumptions. U is compact; f and g are C^1 with linear growth.

$$\mathcal{P} : \quad \inf_{u(\cdot)} \max_{t \in [0, T]} y(t)$$

Question. Is it possible to write an equivalent problem in Mayer or Bolza form (and use numerical tools such as Bocop) ?

$$\text{Remark : } \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, u) \\ y = h(x) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, u) := \nabla h(x)^T \cdot f(x, u) \end{cases}$$

A first formulation with state constraint

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, y, u) \\ \dot{z} = 0 \end{cases}$$

The problem

$$\mathcal{P}_0 : \quad \inf_{u(\cdot)} z(T)$$

under the state constraint

$$z(t) \geq y(t), \quad t \in [0, T]$$

and the two boundaries condition

$$z(T) = z(0)$$

is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}$.

Remark. Here $z(0)$ is free.

Another formulation as a Cauchy problem

$$(\mathcal{D}_a) : \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, y, u) \\ \dot{z} = \max(g(x, y, u), 0)(1 - v) \end{cases} \quad v \in [0, 1]$$

Proposition. With $z_0 = y_0$, the problem

$$\mathcal{P}_1 : \quad \inf_{u(\cdot), v(\cdot)} z(T)$$

under the state constraint

$$\mathcal{C} : \quad z(t) \geq y(t), \quad t \in [0, T]$$

admits an optimal solution, and is equivalent to problem $\mathcal{P}$.


Sketch of proof

$$I := \{t \in (0, T); y(t') > y(t) \text{ for some } t' < t\}.$$

Sun Rising Lemma : $I \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \text{int } I = \bigcup_n (a_n, b_n)$ with

- i) $y(a_n) = y(b_n)$ if $b_n \neq T$,
- ii) if $b_n = T$, then $y(a_n) \geq y(y(b_n))$.

Then, the control $v(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \in \text{int } I \\ 0, & t \notin \text{int } I \end{cases}$ is optimal



A formulation with mixed constraint

$$(\mathcal{D}_a) : \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, y, u) \\ \dot{z} = \max(g(x, y, u), 0)(1 - v) \end{cases} \quad v \in [0, 1]$$

Proposition. For $z_0 = y_0$, the problem

$$\mathcal{P}_2 : \quad \inf_{u(\cdot), v(\cdot)} z(T)$$

under the mixed constraint

$$\mathcal{C}_m : \quad \max(y(t) - z(t), 0)(1 - v(t)) + z(t) - y(t) \geq 0, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}$.

Formulation without constraint

Consider $Z = (x, y, z)^\top$, $\dot{Z} \in F(Z) := \bigcup_{(u,v) \in U \times [0,1]} \begin{bmatrix} f(x, y, u) \\ g(x, y, u) \\ h(x, y, z, u, v) \end{bmatrix}$

with $h(x, y, u, v) = \max(g(x, y, u), 0)(1 - v\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^+}(z - y))$

Let $\mathcal{S} := \{Z(\cdot) \text{ a.c. ; } \dot{Z}(t) \in F(Z(t)) \text{ a.e. and } Z(0) = (x_0, y_0, y_0)\}$

Remark. F is only upper semi-continuous.

Proposition. Assume $G(x, y) := \bigcup_{u \in U} \begin{bmatrix} f(x, y, u) \\ g(x, y, u) \end{bmatrix}$ is convex. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_3 : \inf_{Z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}} z(T)$$

admits a solution $Z^*(\cdot)$ and $(x^*(\cdot), y^*(\cdot))$ is optimal for problem $\mathcal{P}$.

Sketch of proof

1. Consider the augmented dynamics :

$$\dot{Z} \in F^\dagger(Z) := \bigcup_{(u,v,\alpha) \in U \times [0,1]^2} \begin{bmatrix} f(x, y, u) \\ g(x, y, u) \\ h^\dagger(x, y, z, u, v, \alpha) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$h^\dagger(x, y, z, u, v, \alpha) = (1 - \alpha)h(x, y, z, u, v) + \alpha \max_{w \in U} h(x, y, z, w, 0)$$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{S}^\dagger$ compact $\Rightarrow \exists (x^*(\cdot), y^*(\cdot), z^*(\cdot))$ optimal.

2. Any $Z(\cdot)$ sol. of $\mathcal{D}_a$ with $\mathcal{C}_m$ belongs to $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}^\dagger$

$\Rightarrow z^*(T) \leq \inf\{z(T); (x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot)) \text{ sol. of } \mathcal{D}_a \text{ with } \mathcal{C}_m\}.$

Sketch of proof

3. If $E := \{t \in (0, T); z(t) < y(t)\} \neq \emptyset$, then one has $\dot{z}(t) - \dot{y}(t) \geq 0$ for a.e. $t \in E \Rightarrow z(0) - y(0) < 0$: contradiction.

$$\Rightarrow z(T) \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} y(t)$$

4. Filippov's Lemma applied to G :

$$\Rightarrow z^*(T) \geq \max_{t \in [0, T]} y^*(t) \geq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left\{ \max_{t \in [0, T]} y(t); (x(\cdot), y(\cdot)) \text{ sol. of } \mathcal{D} \right\}$$

where $(x^*(\cdot), y^*(\cdot))$ is solution of $\mathcal{D}$ for a certain $u^*(\cdot)$.

Approximation from below

$$(\mathcal{D}_a^\theta) : \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, y, u) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, y, u) \\ \dot{z} = h_\theta(x, y, z, u, v) \end{cases}$$

with $h_\theta(x, y, z, u, v) = \max(g(x, y, u), 0) \left(1 - v e^{-\theta \max(y-z, 0)}\right)$

Proposition. For any increasing sequence $\theta_n \rightarrow +\infty$, the problem

$$\mathcal{P}_3^{\theta_n} : \quad \inf_{Z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}^{\theta_n}} z(T)$$

admits an optimal solution $(x_n(\cdot), y_n(\cdot), z_n(\cdot))$.

$(x_n(\cdot), y_n(\cdot))$ converges (up to a sub-sequence) uniformly to an optimal solution $(x^*(\cdot), y^*(\cdot))$ of problem $\mathcal{P}$, and $(\dot{x}^*(\cdot), \dot{y}^*(\cdot))$ converges weakly to $(\dot{x}^*(\cdot), \dot{y}^*(\cdot))$ in L^2 .

Moreover, $z_n(T)$ is an increasing sequence that converges to $\max_{t \in [0, T]} y^*(t)$.

A particular class of dynamics

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x) \\ \dot{y} = g(x, u) \end{cases} \quad u \in U$$

Proposition A feedback control $x \mapsto \phi^*(x)$ such that

$$g(x, \phi^*(x)) = \min_{u \in U} g(x, u), \quad x \in X$$


is optimal for problem $\mathcal{P}$.

An example


$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = 1, & x(0) = 0 \\ \dot{y} = (1-x)(2-x)(4-x)(1+u/2), & y(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad u \in [-1, 1]$$

$\Rightarrow \phi^*(x) = -\text{sign}((1-x)(2-x)(4-x))$ is optimal

Optimal solution for $T = 5$:







$y(\cdot)$



$u(\cdot)$

Numerical resolutions with Bocop



Comparison of the methods

Problems $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$: Bocop (direct method) with 500 time steps

Problems $\mathcal{P}_3$: BocopHJB with 500 time steps on a 200×200 grid

problem	$\max_{t \in [0, T]} y(t)$	error	computation time
$\mathcal{P}$	2.24985	0	—
$\mathcal{P}_1$	2.24989	0.001%	1.5 s
$\mathcal{P}_2$	2.24986	0.0004%	4.8 s
$\mathcal{P}_3$	2.26778	0.8%	248 s

The SIR problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{S} = -(1-u)\beta SI \\ \dot{I} = (1-u)\beta SI - \gamma I \end{cases} \quad u \in [0, \bar{u}] \text{ with } \bar{u} \leq 1$$

$\rightarrow \inf_{u(\cdot)} \max_{t \in [0, T]} I(t)$ under the budget constraint $\int_0^T u(t) dt \leq Q$

Consider the augmented dynamics

$$\begin{cases} \dot{S} = -(1-u)\beta SI \\ \dot{I} = (1-u)\beta SI - \gamma I \\ \dot{q} = u, \quad q(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{with the target } q(T) = Q$$

The SIR problem

Posit $\mathcal{R}_0 = \beta/\gamma$ and $S_h = \mathcal{R}_0^{-1}$.




Proposition.¹ The "0-singular-0" feedback control

$$\psi(I, S) := \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{S_h}{S} & \text{if } I = \bar{I} \text{ and } S > S_h \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with

$$\bar{I} := \frac{I_0 + S_0 - S_h - S_h \log\left(\frac{S_0}{S_h}\right)}{Q\beta S_h + 1}$$


is optimal.




1. MOLINA, E. AND RAPAPORT, A., *An optimal feedback control that minimizes the epidemic peak in the SIR model under a budget constraint*. Preprint hal-03604958.

Numerical illustrations with Bocop

$$\beta = 0.21, \gamma = 0.07, Q = 28, I(0) = 10^6$$



$I(\cdot)$



$u(\cdot)$


Numerical resolutions with Bocop

	$\mathcal{P}_1$	$\mathcal{P}_3^{65}$	$\mathcal{P}_3^{84}$	$\mathcal{P}_3^{233}$	$\mathcal{P}_3^{460}$	$\mathcal{P}_3^{1200}$
l_{max}	0.101508	0.0684	0.0823	0.09542	0.0993	0.101028

- ▶ direct method with 500 time steps
- ▶ $\max(\dot{y}, 0) \simeq \log(\exp(\lambda_1 \dot{y}) + 1) / \lambda_1$
- ▶ $\exp(-\theta \max(y - z, 0)) \simeq \exp(-\theta \log(\exp(\lambda_2(y - z)) + 1) / \lambda_2)$


$$\lambda_2 = \frac{\log\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\log(2)}{\log(1-\varepsilon)}} - 1\right)}{\varepsilon^2}$$

$$\theta = -\frac{\log(1-\varepsilon)}{\log(2)} \lambda_2$$




Numerical illustrations with Bocop

$$\beta = 0.21, \gamma = 0.07, Q = 28, I(0) = 10^6$$




$I(\cdot)$




$z(\cdot)$

Comparison with L^p approximation



$I(\cdot)$



$u(\cdot)$

Conclusions

We have proposed equivalent formulations that allow to use existing numerical methods, but...

- ▶ with state constraint : not qualified...
 - ▶ without state constraint : discontinuous differential inclusion...
- ▶ one cannot use (available) Maximum Principles...

Open problem : How to derive necessary optimality conditions ?