

A brute-force solution to problem “beam”

As noted in the “Five example optimization problems” handout, problem `beam` is intrinsically infinite-dimensional.

The set of possible inputs to the functional $I[h]$ is

$$\mathcal{X} = \{f : f'' \text{ is square-integrable on } [0, \pi] \text{ and also } f(0) = f(\pi) = 0\}.$$

This is a real vector space of functions.¹ Why is \mathcal{X} infinite-dimensional, you say? The answer is that you cannot specify each element using a fixed, finite number of coefficients.²

For example, and as a hint about the solution method adopted below, the following infinite list of functions live in \mathcal{X} :

$$S = \{\sin x, \sin 2x, \sin 3x, \sin 4x, \dots\} \subset \mathcal{X}.$$

This set is linearly-independent; that is, one cannot write one element of S , say $\sin kx$, exactly as a finite linear combination of other elements of the set S . In the appropriate senses, S is a basis for \mathcal{X} and it is an orthogonal set. For example—this is an instance of Fourier series—the function $f(x) = x(\pi - x)$ is in \mathcal{X} and, on the other hand, there are coefficients a_k so that³

$$f(x) = x(\pi - x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \sin kx \in \mathcal{X}.$$

But one cannot (exactly) write this $f(x)$ without an infinite sum.

Despite being infinite-dimensional, this kind of beam problem is completely standard in the engineering and physics literature; it is a problem in the *calculus of variations*. Because of the infinite-dimensionality, only an approximation of the solution can be computed in a finite amount of solution time.⁴

The problem is constrained, however, so the solution cannot be just anywhere in the infinite-dimensional vector space \mathcal{X} . The solution lives in an infinite-dimensional convex subset of \mathcal{X} :

$$\mathcal{K} = \{f \in \mathcal{X} : 0.9 \leq f(1) \leq 1.1 \text{ and } 1.2 \leq f(2) \leq 1.4 \text{ and } 0.4 \leq f(3) \leq 0.6\}.$$

This is the *feasible set*. It is like a polyhedron; it is a *polytope* in \mathcal{X} .

¹So that, for example, given any pair of functions $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, and any real numbers a_1, a_2 , the linear combination $a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2$ is also in \mathcal{X} .

²If it were possible, the number of such coefficients would be the dimension of \mathcal{X} .

³A few points extra credit will be given to anyone who computes the coefficients a_k exactly, and then plots a finite Fourier sum $f_N(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k \sin kx$ showing that the computed coefficients are likely to be correct.

⁴Actually, this approximate-only status already holds for problem `calcone`, which is in 1D. In theory the exact solutions of `fit`, `salmon`, and `tsp` are all possible in finite time.

For now we just want a method that finds an acceptable approximate solution, even if by brute-force. So we restrict our functions to a five-dimensional (5D)⁵ space of truncated Fourier sine series:

$$\mathcal{X}_5 = \mathbb{R}^5 = \{[c_1 \ c_2 \ c_3 \ c_4 \ c_5]\},$$

where $c \in \mathcal{X}_5$ represents the function $h(x) = \sum_{k=1}^5 c_k \sin kx \in \mathcal{X}$. Using trigonometry we can *exactly* compute $I[h]$ for a function $h(x)$ corresponding to $c \in \mathcal{X}_5$:

$$\begin{aligned} I[h] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi |h''(x)|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \left(-\sum_{k=1}^5 k^2 c_k \sin kx \right)^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{k=1}^5 c_j c_k j^2 k^2 \int_0^\pi \sin jx \sin kx dx \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{k=1}^5 c_j c_k j^2 k^2 \int_0^\pi \cos((j-k)x) - \cos((j+k)x) dx = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{k=1}^5 c_j c_k j^2 k^2 (\pi \delta_{jk} - 0) = \frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{k=1}^5 k^4 c_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

(This calculation, which uses the identity $\sin \alpha \sin \beta = \frac{1}{2} \cos(\alpha - \beta) - \frac{1}{2} \cos(\alpha + \beta)$, will not surprise those who have used Fourier series.)

The constraint " $0.9 \leq h(1) \leq 1.1$ " can be enforced in \mathcal{X}_5 by using the formula $h(x) = \sum_{k=1}^5 c_k \sin kx$ and evaluating at $x = 1$. Thus the approximating 5D optimization problem is now (essentially) in form (1.1) from the textbook:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}^5} I_5(c) & \text{subject to} \\ & 0.9 \leq \sum_{k=1}^5 c_k \sin k \leq 1.1 \\ & 1.2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^5 c_k \sin 2k \leq 1.4 \\ & 0.4 \leq \sum_{k=1}^5 c_k \sin 3k \leq 0.6 \end{array}$$

where

$$I_5(c) = \frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{k=1}^5 k^4 c_k^2.$$

This is called a *quadratic programming problem* because $I_5(c)$ is quadratic in c and the constraints are linear in c ; see textbook Chapter 16. Our problem is now a constrained, 5D version of the unconstrained 3D problem `fit`.

We do not know, however, which of the inequality constraints is active (i.e. the inequality is equality) when c is the solution of the problem. The subset of \mathbb{R}^5 which satisfies the constraints, though it is a 5D polytope, is not clear enough to only look at feasible points. Thus we will solve the our 5D problem by brute force, searching on a grid of points inside a box in \mathbb{R}^5 , in the hope that we cover enough of the constrained set to include points near the minimum. Only trial-and-error can make this possible.

The proposed box, based on trial-and-error, is

$$\mathcal{B}_5 = \{0 \leq c_1 \leq 2, -1 \leq c_2 \leq 1, -0.5 \leq c_3 \leq 0.5, -0.2 \leq c_4 \leq 0.2, -0.2 \leq c_5 \leq 0.2\}.$$

The code below puts a grid with a given spacing on this box. At each grid point c it checks feasibility (i.e. constraints) and, if feasible, it evaluates $I_5(c)$ for that point. Running the code with a grid of sufficient coarseness to give a reasonable execution time, namely a few minutes, looks like

⁵It can be N dimensional for any $N \dots$ but the number of (search) grid points goes up exponentially with N ! The value $N = 5$ represents a trial-and-error-determined compromise between answer quality and execution time. Strategies in Chapter 16 will overcome this difficulty.

```
>> [z h] = beam(0.05)
...
z = 5.8316
h =
1.40000 -0.30000 0.15000 -0.05000 0.05000
```

During the run the code shows characters `./o/*` for progress made so far, indicating when it finds feasible solutions and the best solution so far; this is not shown.

Thus $c_1 = 1.4$, $c_2 = -0.3$, $c_3 = 0.15$, $c_4 = -0.05$, and $c_5 = 0.05$ is the solution from this brute-force search, giving minimum value $I_5(c) = 5.8316$. I have also posted a code `plotbeam.m` which plots the tent pole corresponding to a given $c \in \mathbb{R}^5$. The command `"plotbeam(h)"` plots the figure at the end, which I believe is pretty close to the solution!

`beam.m`

```
function [z h] = beam(cspace)
% BEAM Solve tent pole optimization problem by approximation and brute force.
% The height of the pole is represented by a list of N=5 coefficients in a
% Fourier sine series,
% h(x) = c1 sin(x) + c2 sin(2 x) + c3 sin(3 x) + c4 sin(4 x) + c5 sin(5 x)
% Grid of coefficients c_j, with spacing cspace, in five dimensions, is
% searched. Does integral exactly.
%
% Example run:
% >> [z h] = beam(0.05)
% >> plotbeam(h)
% WARNING: Several minutes run time! This case checks 2.9 million
% = 41*41*21*9*9 points. It runs at least 5 times faster if 0.05 --> 0.1.

N = 5;
bounds = [0.9 1.1;
          1.2 1.4;
          0.4 0.6];

z = 1.0e100;
h = zeros(1,N);
for c1 = 0.0:cspace:2.0
    for c2 = -1.0:cspace:1.0
        fprintf('.')
        for c3 = -0.5:cspace:0.5
            for c4 = -0.2:cspace:0.2
                for c5 = -0.2:cspace:0.2
                    htest = [c1 c2 c3 c4 c5];
                    h1 = evalh(htest,1);
                    p1 = (h1 >= bounds(1,1)) & (h1 <= bounds(1,2));
                    if p1
                        h2 = evalh(htest,2);
                        p2 = (h2 >= bounds(2,1)) & (h2 <= bounds(2,2));
                        if p2
                            h3 = evalh(htest,3);
                            p3 = (h3 >= bounds(3,1)) & (h3 <= bounds(3,2));
                            if p3
                                fval = f(htest);
                                if fval < z
```

