

# A global method for mixed categorical optimization with catalogs

Charlie Vanaret

*Chair of Software and Algorithms for Discrete Optimization  
Technische Universität Berlin, 10623 Berlin, Germany*

---

## Abstract

In this article, we propose an algorithmic framework for globally solving mixed problems with continuous variables and categorical variables whose properties are available from a catalog. It supports catalogs of arbitrary size and properties of arbitrary dimension, and does not require any modeling effort from the user. Our tree search approach, similar to spatial branch and bound methods, performs an exhaustive exploration of the range of the properties of the categorical variables ; branching, constraint programming and catalog lookup phases alternate to discard inconsistent values. A novel catalog-based contractor guarantees consistency between the categorical properties and the existing catalog items. This results in an intuitive generic approach that is exact and easy to implement. We demonstrate the validity of the approach on a numerical example in which a categorical variable is described by a two-dimensional property space.

*Keywords:* Global optimization, Categorical variables, Branch and bound, Constraint programming, Catalog lookup

---

## 1. Motivation

Categorical variables – discrete variables that take values from a finite set of non-numerical values and thus have no natural ordering – arise in numerous structural optimization applications: optimal truss design [16], design of optical systems [2], tyre selection [21], aircraft design [5], product family design [19], optimization of thermal insulation systems [1], etc. While problems with discrete variables are noticeably harder to solve than continuous problems, categorical variables add another level of complexity, since the core technique for solving discrete optimization problems (relaxation of the integrity constraints) does not hold.

---

*Email address:* [vanaret@math.tu-berlin.de](mailto:vanaret@math.tu-berlin.de) (Charlie Vanaret)

### 1.1. Problem definition

We start by making two assumptions:

- A.1 all catalog items are represented by the same set of properties ;
- A.2 catalog items are not mutually exclusive (that is, there are no forbidden combinations of items) ;

and consider the following mixed categorical optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x,y} \quad & f(x,y) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \underline{c} \leq c(x,y) \leq \bar{c} \\ & u(y) \in C \\ & x \in [\underline{x}, \bar{x}], \quad y \in [\underline{y}, \bar{y}] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where

- $x \in [\underline{x}, \bar{x}]$  is a vector of continuous variables ;
- $u(y)$  is a categorical variable described by a vector of properties  $y \in [\underline{y}, \bar{y}]$  ;
- $f$  is the (possibly nonlinear) objective function ;
- $\underline{c} \leq c(x,y) \leq \bar{c}$  are (possibly nonlinear) constraints ;
- $u(y) \in C$  is a catalog constraint: the categorical variable  $u$  described by its properties  $y$  should be assigned an item from the finite catalog  $C$ .

For the sake of clarity and without loss of generality, we describe the problem with a single categorical variable.

### 1.2. Literature on methodology

Evolutionary and genetic algorithms have been among the first techniques to automatize catalog-based optimization in industrial applications. While some authors adopted a generic approach [9, 10], others tailored the encoding (a hierarchical structure), crossover (a trial-and-error selection of breakpoints) and mutation operators to catalog design [11].

Recently, modern approaches based on exhaustive search tree methods and model reformulation have proven efficient. [1] described mixed-integer nonlinear (MINLP) models by replacing the assignments of categorical variables with binary variables and used standard branch and bound methods via the AMPL modeling language. [19] combined a local search and a global search for categorical optimization: a pattern search technique that iteratively improves the current point by visiting its categorical neighborhood is embedded within a discrete global descent framework. [5] presented a branch-and-bound approach that instantiates a categorical variable at each level of the search tree. It evaluates lower bounds by relaxing the constraints that depend on undecided categorical variables and progressively inserts them back into the problem when the

corresponding categorical variables are assigned a value. In [16], the authors interpreted the categorical properties as points in a high-dimensional metric space. They performed dimensionality reduction by using a manifold learning technique that preserves geodesic distances. They then defined new operators for genetic algorithms based on shortest paths in the resulting low-dimensional graph. [21] described a splitting strategy for simulation-based optimization that exploits convex relaxations of the discrete search space to evaluate approximate lower bounds. The bounds are then used in a branching heuristic within a multilevel coordinate search.

### 1.3. Contributions and outline

The key idea of our approach is to notice that, while  $u$  is a categorical variable, its properties  $y$  are numerical variables. Instead of optimizing the categorical variables  $u$  directly, we suggest to treat the underlying properties  $y$  as optimization variables. We propose a novel tree search approach for mixed categorical optimization, similar to spatial branch and bound methods [23], that manipulates continuous relaxations of the properties  $y$  and alternates between branching and constraint programming phases on both the continuous variables  $x$  and the categorical properties  $y$ .

To ensure consistency between the optimization variables  $y$  and the existing catalog entries, we introduce a new filtering operator (or contractor [12]), CLUTCH (Catalog LookUp Then Convex Hull), that performs a catalog lookup and reduces the current range of  $y$  by considering the union of the existing catalog items within this range.

We highlight the main advantages of our strategy:

1. it is a **generic approach** that can be applied to a wide variety of applications ;
2. it is **exact** and produces the **global optimum** within a given numerical tolerance ;
3. since we directly optimize the properties of the categorical variables, **no modeling effort** (e.g. reformulation with binary variables [1]) is required from the user ;
4. it is intuitive and **easy to implement** ;
5. the exploration of the property space is not limited to branching and bounding phases: **filtering algorithms** (contractors) based on relational logic may be invoked to contract the ranges of the property variables ;
6. **gradients** can be exploited to compute enclosures (e.g. linear under- and overestimators) of the objective function and constraints. Note however that, on account of the discrete nature of categorical optimization, first-order optimality conditions do not hold at the solution ;
7. constraint programming techniques, if implemented using interval arithmetic, are **robust to roundoff errors**.

Section 2 describes our algorithmic framework and the CLUTCH contractor. In Section 3, we present an example with a continuous variable and a categorical variable with a two-dimensional property space, and we demonstrate the validity of our global method on two scenarios.

## 2. A framework for mixed categorical global optimization with catalogs

### 2.1. Description of the framework

We describe the overall framework in Algorithm 1 ; its tree search structure is similar to spatial branch and bound solvers. It essentially transforms the global optimization problem into a numerical constraint satisfaction problem that keeps track of the best known upper bound  $\tilde{f}$  of the global minimum  $f^*$ . The constraint  $f \leq \tilde{f}$  is enforced on each subspace and is dynamically updated whenever  $\tilde{f}$  is improved. If a solution is sought within a tolerance  $\varepsilon > 0$  of the global minimum, the dynamic constraint can be written  $f \leq \tilde{f} - \varepsilon$ .

#### Algorithm 1: Framework for mixed categorical optimization

**Input:** box  $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ , objective function  $f$ , constraints, catalog, tolerance  $\varepsilon$   
**Output:** upper bound  $\tilde{f}$  of the global minimum  $f^*$  such that  $\tilde{f} - f^* \leq \varepsilon$   
Set upper bound  $\tilde{f} \leftarrow +\infty$   
Initialize queue  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \{(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}, -\infty)\}$   
**while**  $\mathcal{L}$  not empty **do**  
    EXPLORATION STRATEGY: extract  $(\mathbf{X}_k \times \mathbf{Y}_k, lb_{k-1})$  from  $\mathcal{L}$   
    **if**  $\tilde{f} - \varepsilon < lb_{k-1}$  **then** discard the subspace  
    LOWER BOUNDING: compute a lower bound  $lb_k$  of the problem  
    **if**  $\tilde{f} - \varepsilon < lb_k$  **then** discard the subspace  
    FILTERING: contract  $\mathbf{X}_k \times \mathbf{Y}_k$  with respect to the constraints  
    CLUTCH: perform catalog lookup and contract  $\mathbf{Y}_k$   
    **if**  $\mathbf{X}_k \times \mathbf{Y}_k$  is empty **then** discard the subspace  
    UPPER BOUNDING: improve the best known upper bound  $\tilde{f}$   
    BRANCHING: split  $\mathbf{X}_k \times \mathbf{Y}_k$  in two subspaces  $(\mathbf{X}_k)_i \times (\mathbf{Y}_k)_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$   
    **for**  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  **do**  
        CLUTCH: perform catalog lookup and contract  $(\mathbf{Y}_k)_i$   
        Insert  $((\mathbf{X}_k)_i \times (\mathbf{Y}_k)_i, lb_k)$  into  $\mathcal{L}$   
**return**  $\tilde{f}$

Our framework invokes a sequence of generic strategies described in Section 2.2: exploration of the search space, lower bounding, filtering of the current subspace, upper bounding and branching. Lower bounding and filtering are performed before upper bounding as they rely on refutation: the current subspace should be discarded as soon as it is proven suboptimal or infeasible. The catalog-based contractor CLUTCH is described in Section 2.3.

### 2.2. Generic strategies

Our framework is described in a generic fashion. In this section, we describe possible strategies for exploration, lower bounding, filtering, upper bounding and branching.

### 2.2.1. Exploration strategy

The priority queue  $\mathcal{L}$  is usually implemented as a binary heap, that is a complete binary tree in which the priority of a node is greater than the priority of its children. Inserting an element or extracting the element with the highest priority is carried out in logarithmic time. The choice of priority determines the exploration strategy of the search space (depth-first search, best-first search, breadth-first search, MaxDist [26], etc.)

### 2.2.2. Lower bounding

The most commonly used technique to evaluate a lower bound of the original problem on a given subspace is the Reformulation Linearization Technique (RLT) [24]. It consists in generating a convex outer approximation (by linearization or convexification) of the problem, then solving the convex relaxed problem. Its interval counterpart X-Newton [4] implements reliable linearizations using interval arithmetic [25] and a cheap duality-based postprocessing step [22] for evaluating rigorous lower bounds even in the presence of roundoff errors.

A much cheaper approach, albeit of coarser quality, is to compute an enclosure of the range of the sole objective function on a given subspace using interval arithmetic. It amounts to computing a lower bound of the unconstrained problem and may therefore largely overestimate the actual range.


### 2.2.3. Filtering

Filtering algorithms (contractors) reduce the domains of the variables with respect to individual constraints (local consistency) or all the constraints simultaneously (global consistency) by discarding inconsistent values. They usually stem from the mixed integer, constraint programming and numerical analysis communities, and may exploit the syntax tree, range or monotonicity of an individual constraint, or perform a linearization/convexification of the whole system of constraints.


One of the most intuitive approaches, called evaluation-propagation algorithm [20], FBBT [6] or HC4Revise [7], draws its inspiration from relational interval arithmetic [13]. It carries out two traversals of the syntax tree of a constraint: the bottom-up phase evaluates each node (an elementary operation) using interval arithmetic, and the top-down phase propagates the constraint downwards by using inverse (or projection) elementary functions. Figure 1 illustrates the approach on the constraint  $2x = z - y^2$ : the procedure contracts the initial range  $[0, 20] \times [-10, 10] \times [0, 16]$  to  $[0, 8] \times [-4, 4] \times [0, 16]$  by removing values that cannot satisfy the constraint.

In order to contract a box with respect to a system of constraints, a fixed-point algorithm (an idempotent propagation loop) handles the constraints individually and propagates range reductions through the system (Algorithm 2).

Convexification techniques, called OBBT [6] or X-Newton [4], generate linear under- and overestimators of all the constraints on a given subspace. The lower (resp. upper) bound of the variable  $x_i$  is reduced by minimizing (resp. maximizing)  $x_i$ . Overall, the ranges of  $n$  variables may be reduced with  $2n$  calls to a linear programming solver. For a comprehensive survey, see [26].



(a) Bottom-up evaluation phase



(b) Top-down propagation phase

Figure 1: FBBT/HC4Revise on the constraint  $2x = z - y^2$

**Algorithm 2: Fixed-point algorithm**

**Input:** box  $\mathbf{X}$ , constraints  $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$

**Output:** contracted box  $\mathbf{X}$

Initialize the set of awake constraints  $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$

**while**  $\mathcal{A}$  is not empty **do**

    Extract a constraint  $c_i$  from  $\mathcal{A}$

$\mathbf{X}' \leftarrow$  contraction of  $\mathbf{X}$  with respect to  $c_i$

**if**  $\mathbf{X}' \neq \mathbf{X}$  **then**

        Add to  $\mathcal{A}$  the constraints that involve contracted variables of  $\mathbf{X}'$

$\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}'$

**end**

**end**

**return**  $\mathbf{X}$

#### 2.2.4. Upper bounding

The objective value of any feasible point of the problem (provided that the feasible set is not empty) is an upper bound of the global minimum. The best known upper bound  $\tilde{f}$  of the global minimum can be improved by local search algorithms or metaheuristics in an integrated [27] or cooperative manner [15, 8, 14, 3, 26]. A cheaper strategy consists in systematically updating  $\tilde{f}$  with the objective value of the midpoint of the current subspace, provided that it is feasible [17].

#### 2.2.5. Branching

Branching consists in partitioning the current subspace into several (usually two) subspaces. There exist a variety of strategies, among which three stand out:

- the variable with the largest domain is partitioned ;
- the variables are partitioned one after the other in a round-robin fashion ;
- the smear heuristic picks the variable that has the largest estimated impact (a measure based on the interval gradient) on the objective function [18].

#### 2.3. CLUTCH catalog-based contractor

CLUTCH (Catalog LookUp Then Convex Hull) is a novel catalog-based contractor that enforces local consistency with respect to the individual catalog constraint  $u(y) \in C$ . Recall that in our framework, the range of the categorical properties  $y$  is reduced by the spatial branch and bound approach. CLUTCH should therefore be invoked whenever the range of  $y$  is reduced (upon branching and filtering) to guarantee that the range of  $y$  is consistent with existing catalog items. This ensures that subspaces  $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$  that satisfy the standard constraints  $c(x, y)$  or the dynamic constraint  $f(x, y) \leq \tilde{f}$  but cannot contain a catalog item ( $u(y) \notin C$ ) are discarded by refutation.

More formally, given a box  $\mathbf{Y}$  and a catalog  $C$ , CLUTCH returns a box  $\mathbf{Y}_{clutch}$  that satisfies the *correction property*:

$$\mathbf{Y} \cap C \subset \mathbf{Y}_{clutch} \subset \mathbf{Y} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  are the catalog items that are in  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Since our framework manipulates compact boxes whose faces are parallel to the axes, the best possible relaxation of  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  is the smallest box that contains all items of  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$ :

$$\mathbf{Y}_{clutch} = \square(\mathbf{Y} \cap C) \quad (3)$$

where  $\square$  is the convex hull operation. The procedure is described in Algorithm 3.

Upon completion of CLUTCH, three situations may occur:

1.  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  is empty, that is there are no catalog items that belong to  $\mathbf{Y}$ :  $\mathbf{Y}$  is inconsistent with the catalog constraint and is discarded ;

**Algorithm 3:** CLUTCH contractor

**Input:** box  $\mathbf{Y}$ , catalog  
**Output:** filtered box  $\mathbf{Y}_{clutch}$   
Initialize  $\mathbf{Y}_{clutch} \leftarrow \emptyset$   
**foreach** *item*  $y$  *in* *catalog* **do**  
    **if**  $y$  *is in*  $\mathbf{Y}$  **then**  
        └ Compute the convex hull  $\mathbf{Y}_{clutch} \leftarrow \square(\mathbf{Y}_{clutch}, \{y\})$   
**return**  $\mathbf{Y}_{clutch}$

2.  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  contains a single catalog item and is therefore equal to  $\square(\mathbf{Y} \cap C)$ : the categorical variable is assigned to this item ;
3.  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  contains at least two distinct items:  $\square(\mathbf{Y} \cap C)$  is therefore a relaxation of  $\mathbf{Y} \cap C$  and further branching or filtering of the subspace is required.

The reduction of the range of the categorical properties  $y$  can be propagated to the other constraints  $c(x, y)$  via the use of a fixed-point algorithm (see Algorithm 2). We illustrate in Section 3 how constraint propagation involving CLUTCH (for a catalog constraint) and HC4Revise (for a standard constraint) can iteratively reduce the ranges of the categorical and continuous variables on two scenarios.

### 3. Constraint propagation with CLUTCH: an example

We consider the following example:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{x,y} \quad & y_1^3 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & c_1(x, y) : 2y_1 = x - y_2^2 \\
& c_2(y) : u(y) \in C \\
& x \in [0, 16], y_1 \in [0, 20], y_2 \in [-10, 10],
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

- $x$  is a continuous variable with range  $[0, 16]$  ;
- the categorical variable  $u$  is described by two properties  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  with ranges  $[0, 20]$  and  $[-10, 10]$  ;
- the catalog  $C$  is described by pairs of  $(y_1, y_2)$  properties ;
- we seek the global solution with a tolerance of  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ .

We now introduce two scenarios, each with a different catalog. In **scenario 1** (Section 3.1), the feasible set of the problem contains a single catalog item ; in this case, the assignment of  $u(y)$  to a catalog item does not require the use

of the objective function. In **scenario 2** (Section 3.2), the feasible set of the problem contains two catalog items ; in this case, upper bounding and the use of the dynamic constraint  $f \leq \tilde{f} - \varepsilon$  is required to discard one the two items.

### 3.1. Scenario 1: feasible set with a single catalog item

The catalog (Table 1) contains five items. The catalog items in their initial domain  $[0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$  are represented in Figure 2a.

Table 1: Scenario 1: catalog  $C$


Item	Property $y_1$	Property $y_2$
1	4	-8
2	3	2
3	7	-3
4	14	8
5	19	-8

Table 2 describes the successive filtering and branching phases (second column) that reduce the ranges of  $x$  and  $y$  starting from  $(x, y_1, y_2) \in [0, 16] \times [0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$ : the third column contains for each phase the current ranges of  $x$  and  $y$ , while the fourth column presents the resulting contracted ranges. The first column indicates the corresponding subfigures in Figure 2. The branching phase and the two resulting subspaces are highlighted in red.


Table 2: Scenario 1: alternance of filtering and branching phases

	Phase	Current box	Result
(b)	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[0, 16] \times [0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$	$[0, 16] \times [0, 8] \times [-4, 4]$
(c)	CLUTCH( $c_2$ )	$[0, 16] \times [0, 8] \times [-4, 4]$	$[0, 16] \times [3, 7] \times [-3, 2]$
	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[0, 16] \times [3, 7] \times [-3, 2]$	$[6, 16] \times [3, 7] \times [-3, 2]$
(d)	Branching on $y_1$	$[6, 16] \times [3, 7] \times [-3, 2]$	$[6, 16] \times [3, 5] \times [-3, 2] \cup [6, 16] \times [5, 7] \times [-3, 2]$
	CLUTCH( $c_2$ )	$[6, 16] \times [5, 7] \times [-3, 2]$	$[6, 16] \times [7, 7] \times [-3, -3]$
	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[6, 16] \times [7, 7] \times [-3, -3]$	$\emptyset$
(e)	CLUTCH( $c_2$ )	$[6, 16] \times [3, 5] \times [-3, 2]$	$[6, 16] \times [3, 3] \times [2, 2]$
(f)	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[6, 16] \times [3, 3] \times [2, 2]$	$[10, 10] \times [3, 3] \times [2, 2]$


In Figure 2, the blue domain is the feasible set of  $c_1$  on the current box  $X \times Y_1 \times Y_2$  (that is the set  $\{2y_1 = x - y_2^2 \mid (x, y_1, y_2) \in X \times Y_1 \times Y_2\}$ ) projected on the  $(y_1, y_2)$  plane, the current box is represented as a black rectangle, boxes contracted by HC4Revise or CLUTCH as red rectangles, boxes partitioned during branching as green rectangles and discarded catalog items as gray points.




(a) Initial range of properties  $y_1$  and  $y_2$




(b) HC4Revise with respect to  $c_1$




(c) CLUTCH with respect to  $c_2$



(d) Branching on  $y_1$



(e) CLUTCH with respect to  $c_2$



(f) HC4Revise with respect to  $c_1$

Figure 2: Scenario 1: alternance of filtering and branching phases

These results show that the first contraction step discards three of the five catalog items ; convergence to the optimal (and only feasible) point  $(x^*, y_1^*, y_2^*) = (10, 3, 2)$  is achieved using constraint propagation between HC4Revise (for  $c_1$ ) and CLUTCH (for  $c_2$ ) and a single branching step on  $y_1$ . The first subspace  $[6, 16] \times [5, 7] \times [-3, 2]$  generated by branching is quickly discarded, while the second  $[6, 16] \times [3, 5] \times [-3, 2]$  is subsequently reduced to the optimal solution.

### 3.2. Scenario 2: feasible set with several catalog items

In this scenario, we consider the catalog of the first scenario with an additional item described by properties  $y = (1, -1)$  (Table 3). The catalog items in their initial domain  $[0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$  are represented in Figure 3a.

Table 3: Scenario 2: catalog  $C$

Item	Property $y_1$	Property $y_2$
1	4	-8
2	3	2
3	7	-3
4	14	8
5	19	-8
6	1	-1

Table 4 describes the successive filtering and upper bounding phases (second column) that reduce the ranges of  $x$  and  $y$  starting from  $(x, y_1, y_2) \in [0, 16] \times [0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$ : the third column contains for each phase the current ranges of  $x$  and  $y$ , while the fourth column presents the resulting ranges. The first column indicates the corresponding subfigures in Figure 3. The shortcut  $3^-$  stands for  $\sqrt[3]{27 - \varepsilon}$ , a quantity close to but strictly smaller than 3.

Table 4: Scenario 2: alternance of filtering and upper bounding phases

	Phase	Current box	Result
(b)	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[0, 16] \times [0, 20] \times [-10, 10]$	$[0, 16] \times [0, 8] \times [-4, 4]$
(c)	CLUTCH( $c_2$ )	$[0, 16] \times [0, 8] \times [-4, 4]$	$[0, 16] \times [1, 7] \times [-3, 2]$
	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[0, 16] \times [1, 7] \times [-3, 2]$	$[2, 16] \times [1, 7] \times [-3, 2]$
(d)	HC4Revise( $f \leq \tilde{f} - \varepsilon$ )	$[2, 16] \times [1, 7] \times [-3, 2]$	$[2, 16] \times [1, 3^-] \times [-3, 2]$
(e)	CLUTCH( $c_2$ )	$[2, 16] \times [1, 3^-] \times [-3, 2]$	$[2, 16] \times [1, 1] \times [-1, -1]$
(f)	HC4Revise( $c_1$ )	$[2, 16] \times [1, 1] \times [-1, -1]$	<b><math>[3, 3] \times [1, 1] \times [-1, -1]</math></b>

The same color code as in Figure 2 is used in Figure 3. The first contraction step discards three of the catalog items. Constraint propagation between HC4Revise and CLUTCH reduces the domain to the convex hull of catalog items 2, 3 and 6. An upper bounding phase (not shown in the figure) then selects the feasible item 2 (with properties  $(y_1, y_2) = (3, 2)$ ) and the corresponding value  $x = 10$  and updates the best known upper bound:  $\tilde{f} \leftarrow 27$ . The subsequent contraction phase with respect to  $f \leq \tilde{f} - \varepsilon$  eliminates a large part of the domain (including item 2), which is then reduced to the optimal solution (item 6) after a CLUTCH phase. In this case, no branching phase is required.




Figure 3: Scenario 2: alternance of filtering and upper bounding phases

## 4. Conclusion

We introduced a generic framework for mixed categorical global optimization with catalogs that produces the globally optimal solution. Based on spatial branch and bound, it optimizes the underlying properties of the catalog items and does not require any modeling effort (such as reformulation with binary variables) from the user. The ranges of the categorical properties, similarly to those of the continuous variables, are reduced or discarded during constraint programming and branching. A novel catalog-based contractor called CLUTCH, invoked upon filtering and branching, guarantees consistency between the categorical properties that are being optimized and the existing catalog items.

We presented an example with two different catalogs that demonstrates how an alternance of constraint propagation between CLUTCH and classical contractors, upper bounding and branching iteratively reduces the ranges of the continuous and property variables until convergence to the global minimum.

The genericity and flexibility of our approach make it an excellent strategy for a wide range of applications in which categorical variables arise. Since it relies on the same mechanisms as spatial branch and bound codes, it can be easily implemented in off-the-shelf solvers with minimal effort.

## References

- [1] Abhishek, K., Leyffer, S., and Linderoth, J. T. (2010). Modeling without categorical variables: a mixed-integer nonlinear program for the optimization of thermal insulation systems. *Optimization and Engineering*, 11(2):185–212.
- [2] Agurok, I. (2019). Multi-extremum optimization in lens design: navigation through merit function valleys maze. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08676*.
- [3] Alliot, J.-M., Durand, N., Gianazza, D., and Gotteland, J.-B. (2012). Finding and proving the optimum: Cooperative stochastic and deterministic search. In *ECAI*, pages 55–60.
- [4] Araya, I., Trombettoni, G., and Neveu, B. (2012). A contractor based on convex interval Taylor. In *International Conference on Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Operations Research (OR) Techniques in Constraint Programming*, pages 1–16. Springer.
- [5] Barjhoux, P.-J., Diouane, Y., Grihon, S., Bettebghor, D., and Morlier, J. (2017). Mixed variable structural optimization: toward an efficient hybrid algorithm. In *World Congress of Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimisation*, pages 1880–1896. Springer.
- [6] Belotti, P., Cafieri, S., Lee, J., and Liberti, L. (2010). Feasibility-based bounds tightening via fixed points. In *International conference on combinatorial optimization and applications*, pages 65–76. Springer.

- [7] Benhamou, F., Goualard, F., Granvilliers, L., and Puget, J.-F. (1999). Revising hull and box consistency. In *International Conference on Logic Programming*, pages 230–244. MIT press.
- [8] Blum, C., Puchinger, J., Raidl, G. R., and Roli, A. (2011). Hybrid metaheuristics in combinatorial optimization: A survey. *Applied soft computing*, 11(6):4135–4151.
- [9] Brown, D. R. and Hwang, K.-Y. (1993). Solving fixed configuration problems with genetic search. *Research in Engineering Design*, 5(2):80–87.
- [10] Carlson, S. E. (1996). Genetic algorithm attributes for component selection. *Research in Engineering Design*, 8(1):33–51.
- [11] Carlson-Skalak, S., White, M. D., and Teng, Y. (1998). Using an evolutionary algorithm for catalog design. *Research in Engineering Design*, 10(2):63–83.
- [12] Chabert, G. and Jaulin, L. (2009). Contractor programming. *Artificial Intelligence*, 173(11):1079–1100.
- [13] Cleary, J. G. (1987). Logical arithmetic. *Future computing systems*, 2(2):125–149.
- [14] Cotta, C., Aldana, J., Nebro, A. J., and Troya, J. M. (1995). Hybridizing genetic algorithms with branch and bound techniques for the resolution of the TSP. In *Artificial neural nets and genetic algorithms*, pages 277–280. Springer.
- [15] Gallardo, J. E., Cotta, C., and Fernández, A. J. (2007). On the hybridization of memetic algorithms with branch-and-bound techniques. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, 37(1):77–83.
- [16] Gao, H., Breitkopf, P., Coelho, R. F., and Xiao, M. (2018). Categorical structural optimization using discrete manifold learning approach and custom-built evolutionary operators. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 58(1):215–228.
- [17] Ichida, K. and Fujii, Y. (1979). An interval arithmetic method for global optimization. *Computing*, 23(1):85–97.
- [18] Kearfott, R. B. and Novoa III, M. (1990). Algorithm 681: INTBIS, a portable interval Newton/bisection package. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 16(2):152–157.
- [19] Lindroth, P. and Patriksson, M. (2011). *Pure categorical optimization: a global descent approach*. Department of Mathematical Sciences, Division of Mathematics, Chalmers . . . .

- [20] Messine, F. (1997). *Méthodes d'optimisation globale basées sur l'analyse d'intervalle pour la résolution de problèmes avec contraintes*. PhD thesis, Toulouse, INPT.
- [21] Nedělková, Z., Cromvik, C., Lindroth, P., Patriksson, M., and Strömberg, A.-B. (2019). A splitting algorithm for simulation-based optimization problems with categorical variables. *Engineering Optimization*, 51(5):815–831.
- [22] Neumaier, A. and Shcherbina, O. (2004). Safe bounds in linear and mixed-integer linear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 99(2):283–296.
- [23] Ryoo, H. S. and Sahinidis, N. V. (1995). Global optimization of nonconvex NLPs and MINLPs with applications in process design. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 19(5):551–566.
- [24] Sherali, H. D. and Adams, W. P. (2013). *A reformulation-linearization technique for solving discrete and continuous nonconvex problems*, volume 31. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [25] Sunaga, T. (1958). Theory of interval algebra and its application to numerical analysis. *RAAG memoirs*, 2(29-46):209.
- [26] Vanaret, C. (2015). *Hybridization of interval methods and evolutionary algorithms for solving difficult optimization problems*. PhD thesis, INP Toulouse.
- [27] Zhang, X. and Liu, S. (2007). A new interval-genetic algorithm. In *Third International Conference on Natural Computation (ICNC 2007)*, volume 4, pages 193–197. IEEE.