

Value Function Gradient Learning for Large-Scale Multistage Stochastic Programming Problems

Jinkyu Lee^a, Sanghyeon Bae^a, Woo Chang Kim^{a,*}, Yongjae Lee^{b,*}

Abstract

A stagewise decomposition algorithm called “value function gradient learning” (VFGL) is proposed for large-scale multistage stochastic convex programs. VFGL finds the parameter values that best fit the gradient of the value function within a given parametric family. Widely-used decomposition algorithms for multistage stochastic programming, such as stochastic dual dynamic programming (SDDP), approximate the value function by adding linear subgradient cuts at each iteration. Although this approach has been successful for linear problems, nonlinear problems may suffer from the increasing size of each subproblem as the iteration proceeds. On the other hand, VFGL has a fixed number of parameters; thus, the size of the subproblems remains constant throughout the iteration. Furthermore, VFGL can learn the parameters by means of stochastic gradient descent, which means that it can be easily parallelized and does not require a scenario tree approximation of the underlying uncertainties. VFGL was compared with a deterministic equivalent formulation of the multistage stochastic programming problem and SDDP approaches for three illustrative examples: production planning, hydrothermal generation, and the lifetime financial planning problem. Numerical examples show that VFGL generates high-quality solutions and is computationally efficient.

Keywords: large-scale optimization, multistage stochastic programming, stagewise decomposition, value function approximation, parametric function

^a Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)

^b Department of Industrial Engineering, Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology (UNIST)

* Corresponding authors: wkim@kaist.ac.kr, yongjaelee@unist.ac.kr

1. Introduction

Multistage stochastic programming (MSP) problems arise in a broad range of areas where decisions should be made under uncertain environments. Such optimization problems include capacity expansion planning, asset liability management, and hydropower production planning (Shiina & Birge, 2003; Cariño et al., 1994; Fleten & Kristoffersen, 2008). The stochastic process, which models the uncertain environment, is generally approximated by a set of finite scenarios, which is called a “scenario tree.” Then, the problem can be replaced by a single large deterministic equivalent problem. However, the deterministic equivalent problem often becomes computationally intractable because the number of scenarios grows exponentially with respect to the number of stages. This “curse of dimensionality” is a critical issue for MSP problems with long-term planning horizons.

In this study, a novel stagewise decomposition algorithm called “value function gradient learning” (VFGL) is proposed. It approximates value functions as parametric convex functions and learns parameters that closely approximate the gradient of the true value functions. To be more specific, the proposed algorithm minimizes the stagewise estimation error of the gradient of the approximated value function based on stochastic gradient descent to find the best parameters within a given parametric form. We show under mild regularity conditions that the approximated solution converges to the optimal solution. Furthermore, we introduce a metric called KKT deviation to measure the suitability of the given parametrization. In our numerical examples, we show that VFGL can efficiently find good quality solutions with the appropriate parameterization of the value function.

There are three unique characteristics of VFGL compared with the traditional stagewise decomposition method. First, VFGL approximates the value function using a fixed parametric functional form. The main advantage of this value function approximation approach is that the size of the subproblems remains constant for every iteration. However, the piecewise linear approximation of the value function results in an increasing size of the subproblems in every iteration because of the increasing number of linear cuts. This makes VFGL computationally suitable for stochastic programs that require many iterations for the value function approximation.

Second, VFGL directly samples a random process from its distribution without the scenario tree approximation. A scenario tree approximation of the distribution of continuous random variables is a nontrivial task. There are many reports in which various scenario tree generation algorithms are discussed (Pflug, 2001; Gülpınar et. al., 2004; Heitsch & Römisch, 2009). However, they are rather heuristic, and the choice of the scenario tree generation algorithm for a particular problem is an open-ended question. Therefore, MSP problems are often solved multiple times under various scenario trees to check the distributional approximation error indirectly. VFGL, by contrast, is free of this issue. However, VFGL might involve the extra step of verifying the suitability of the chosen parametric form of the value function for a specific problem.

Finally, VFGL is an online learning algorithm that learns the parameters online during the exploration of feasible paths. A parallel computation is easy for VFGL because forward explorations can be computed in parallel. An iteration of SDDP involves a forward pass that samples stagewise trial solutions and backward pass that solves all possible stagewise subproblems in a reverse stagewise order. However, an iteration of VFGL involves only forward simulation to sample stagewise trial solutions and update the value function by adjusting parameters in a stagewise order. Therefore, each iteration of VFGL tends to be much faster than that of the traditional stagewise decomposition algorithms. However, one drawback of online learning is that the value function update information is passed on to only the prior stage. Therefore, the number of iterations should be greater than the number of stages so that the final stage information is passed onto the first-stage value function

Three illustrative examples are provided to compare the MSP, SDDP, and VFGL approaches: production optimization, a hydrothermal scheduling problem, and a discretized lifetime portfolio optimization problem. The numerical experiment clearly shows the numerical potential of VFGL compared with SDDP, which is considered a state-of-the-art stagewise decomposition algorithm. The numerical study further shows that the parametric value function form can be recycled to a limited extent for the perturbation problem depending on the problem and perturbation. The performance evaluation of VFGL includes a comparison of various parametric value function forms, where the usefulness of KKT deviation is illustrated.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews literatures on decomposition methods for large-scale stochastic programs. In Section 3, the considered problem is mathematically defined, and the VFGL is derived. Three illustrative examples are shown in Section 4. The conclusions are provided in Section 5.

2. Literature review

Sequential decision making under uncertainty encompasses a broad range of problems where we need to make an optimal sequence of decisions over a period in an uncertain environment. It is often termed as stochastic optimization and it is studied in a variety of forms depending on the problem context, problem setting, and solution modelling. Powell (2019) classifies diverse studies of stochastic optimization into fifteen categories in terms of key modeling characteristics including problem statement regarding optimality, state variable, interaction between uncertainty and decision variables, system dynamics modelling, and objective functions. Along with the comprehensive review for each category of studies, Powell provides a unified framework for a general stochastic optimization.

One of the major aspects that differentiates sequential stochastic optimization approaches is the way of handling time. For example, stochastic control assumes continuous time environments and

aims to find an analytical optimal policy by assuming specific mathematical models for the underlying stochastic processes that governs. The seminal work of Merton (1969) on intertemporal portfolio choice would be the prime example. It laid the foundation of the intertemporal capital asset pricing model (Merton, 1973), which enabled numerous researchers to study the relationship between households' income, consumption, and investment (e.g. Mankiw and Zeldes, 1991; Lucas, 1994; Krueger and Perri, 2006). Also, stochastic control has been widely applied to inventory management (e.g., Ivanov and Sokolov, 2013) and supply chain management (e.g., Protopappa-Sieke, and Seifert, 2010) problems. However, models under continuous time setting is often limited in incorporating complex uncertainty models and realistic decision variable constraints, because analytical solutions exist only under restrictive regularity conditions. Therefore, an application of continuous time models would be difficult when the problem environments are complex.

On the other hand, there are studies like Markov decision process (MDP), multi-stage stochastic programming (MSP), and reinforcement learning (RL) that discretize the time to have a finite or countable time transitions. Thus, these approaches often enjoy flexibility in modelling compared to continuous time models. According to Powell (2019), there are two major streams of discrete time models. First is from the operations research community. They started from deterministic optimization, which is extended to MDP in order to handle large-scale problems. Second is the RL from computer science community that directly developed from MDP models.

Now we look into these two approaches within the discrete-time setting in more detail and discuss exactly where the proposed algorithm (VFGL) is located among existing models.

The MSP framework deals with an optimization of sequential linear/convex/nonconvex programming problems where parameters of each programming depend on the realization of random variables and decisions from the prior stage(s). It has been widely adopted across various fields from finance (Mulvey and Gordon, 2000), energy (Wallace and Fleten, 2013) to production optimization (Guan and Philpott, 2011). MSP problems are solved by deriving the deterministic equivalent by constructing a finite scenario tree that approximates the evolution of underlying stochastic process. However, the deterministic equivalent problem often becomes computationally intractable, because the number of scenarios grows exponentially with respect to the number of stages and/or the number of nodes per stage. This "curse of dimensionality" is a critical issue for MSP problems with long-term planning horizons.

Various decomposition-based algorithms have been proposed for solving large-scale stochastic programs. The two branches of the decomposition approach are: 1) scenario and 2) stagewise decompositions.

First, the scenario decomposition methods decompose stochastic programs in a scenario-wise

manner by relaxing the nonanticipativity constraints, which prevent the use of information unavailable at the time. The two most popular examples are the dual decomposition algorithm (Carøe & Schultz, 1999) and progressive hedging algorithm (Rockafellar & Wets, 1991), which have been widely applied to solve various large-scale stochastic programs (Triki et al., 2005; Berga et al., 2014; Fadda et al., 2019). A dual decomposition algorithm is proposed to solve linear two-stage (or multistage) stochastic integer programming problems. It relaxes the nonanticipativity constraints to derive the Lagrangian dual problem and employs a branch-and-bound method to obtain the optimal solution using the lower bound information obtained from the dual problem. By contrast, the progressive hedging algorithm introduces modified scenario-wise subproblems by relaxing the nonanticipativity constraints through an augmented Lagrangian function that incorporates a multiplier term and quadratic penalty terms. The algorithm iteratively adjusts the solutions to find implementable and admissible solutions that satisfy the nonanticipativity constraints and lie within the scenario-wise feasible region. Rockafellar and Wets (1991) showed that the progressive hedging algorithm converges to the optimal value for convex optimization problems. For nonconvex cases, although convergence is not guaranteed, the algorithm is shown to produce quality solutions (Watson et al., 2011). However, scenario decomposition algorithms should visit all scenarios during every iteration; otherwise, the solutions may violate the nonanticipativity constraints. Therefore, the scenario decomposition approach may be inappropriate for MSP problems with extremely large scenario trees.

Second, the stagewise decomposition algorithms break down the stochastic program into stagewise subproblems and find solutions by sequentially solving the decomposed subproblems. The objective function of each subproblem incorporates a special function called a “value function” (often referred to as a “recourse function” or a “cost-to-go function”), which reflects the future consequences of an immediate decision. As a sampling-based variant of a nested Benders decomposition, the stochastic dual dynamic programming (SDDP) algorithm was introduced by Pereira and Pinto (1991). SDDP iterates between the forward and backward passes. In a forward pass, the algorithm samples a bundle of scenarios to obtain feasible policies, whereas in a backward pass, the value functions are improved by constructing subgradient cuts around each of the stagewise solutions of the feasible policies. The convergence of SDDP was shown for risk-neutral multi-stage stochastic linear programs by Chen et al. (1999) and Philpott et al. (2008) and for risk-averse multi-stage stochastic linear programs by Guigues et al. (2012). Recent studies applied SDDP to multistage stochastic convex programs and investigated its convergence for risk-neutral and risk-averse cases (Girardeau et al., 2015; Guigues, 2016). However, as one of the major drawbacks of SDDP, the size of the stagewise subproblems increases as the algorithm proceeds because the number of subgradient cuts for the subproblems increases with each iteration.

The stage-wise decomposition approach can be regarded as addressing MSP problems under the MDP context. That is, it tries to find an optimal policy under Markovian state transitions, and this would

allow the algorithms to much reduce computational costs. However, state transitions in scenario trees of MSP are often not Markovian, because transitions in scenario tree can depend on the historical state path. We may define the state history as an additional state variable to enforce the Markov property, but this would make the problem too complicated. Therefore, the stage-wise decomposition approach incorporates Markovian state transitions into MSP by employing scenario lattices instead of scenario trees. That is, for any node, its transition probability distribution is shared among all nodes in the same stage, which is called the stage-wise independence assumption. With the stage-wise assumption, a value function can be shared among nodes with in the stage as well, and thus, we need to approximate only a small number of value functions.

On the other hand, reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms have recently gained significant attention with scalable computational efficiency and showing great performances as a solution to MDP problems. RL algorithms take data driven approach to the problem by finding optimal policy with countless trial and error under the simulated environment. In particular, many RL algorithms fix the parametric form of value/policy function and learn the parameters that minimize the loss function with trial and error to find optimal policy. A superb computational efficiency of RL algorithms often comes from the parametric approximation of value/policy functions, which are suitable for learning from large simulated data sets (Geist and Pietquin, 2013; Mnih et al., 2013; Mnih et al., 2016). Along with the blooming development of deep learning models, some RL models have shown impressive performances that even go beyond the human-level, such as Go, Atari or other video games, and even in medical applications. While RL algorithms have various advantages such as model-free assumption, computational efficiency, and performance, they still have difficulties in handling continuous action spaces with complex state-dependent restrictions.

To sum up, even if we cast an MSP problem into an MDP problem using the stage-wise decomposition approach, there are clear differences in problem setting of MSP and RL. First, MSP considers continuous action spaces that are constrained by linear equality and convex inequalities. Furthermore, these constraints are dependent on the current state. Therefore, policy computation and exploration process of RL would not perform well. Second, immediate reward structure and state transition dynamics are known in MSP. These characteristics make MSP to be directly solvable using optimization solvers, not having to follow the trial-and-error of RL.

The purpose of VFGL is to find optimal policies of large-scale MSP problems. We tackle the problem with a stage-wise decomposition approach. Then, the main focus is on approximating value functions efficiently. While the SDDP approximates value functions using piece-wise linear functions, VFGL approximate value functions with parametric function like RL algorithms. However, the parameter learning process of VFGL is very different from RL algorithms. RL algorithms sample costs/rewards based on trial-and-error and parameters are updated from those signals. On the other hand,

VFGL too samples actions based on simulation, but it learns the parameters using the stage-wise gradient information of true value functions by fully exploiting the duality theory in optimization. To summarize, VFGL deals with the MSP problems considered in the operation research community using a stage-wise decomposition approach to handle large-scale problems. While the value function is approximated under stage-wise independent environment analogous to other conventional stage-wise decomposition algorithms, VFGL employ parametric value function approximation like RL algorithms. However, the parameter learning process is based on the duality theory like SDDP algorithms.

3. Value function gradient learning

In this section, we present the value function gradient learning (VFGL) algorithm, which is a new stagewise decomposition algorithm for large-scale multistage stochastic programming problems. First, we define the problem setting for stagewise decomposition algorithms (including VFGL and SDDP) in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2, we describe the main idea of VFGL and why it will work. Section 3.3 details the learning procedure of the optimal parameters based on a stochastic gradient descent. Finally, we discuss how to choose the appropriate parameterization in Section 3.4.

3.1. Problem setting

A sequence of decision-making over multiple periods is considered, where the relevant stochastic process is gradually realized. There is a stochastic process $\xi_{[T]} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_T)$, with ξ_1 deterministic, and a decision process $x_{[T]} = (x_1, \dots, x_T)$, where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}$ in which n_t is the number of dimensions of the decision variable at stage t . It is further assumed that each ξ_t has a finite moment. Each decision was made using only the information available at that time. In particular, the following sequence of decisions and observations is assumed (Shapiro et al., 2009):

$$\text{decision}(x_1) \rightsquigarrow \text{observation}(\xi_2) \rightsquigarrow \text{decision}(x_2) \dots \rightsquigarrow \text{observation}(\xi_T) \rightsquigarrow \text{decision}(x_T)$$

Here, the decision process x_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable, where \mathcal{F}_t is the sigma algebra generated by a stochastic process (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_t) . A T -stage stochastic program in nested form is formulated as follows:

$$\min_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} f_1(x_1) + \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2(x_1, \xi_2)} f_2(x_2, \xi_2) + \mathbb{E}_{|\xi_{[2]}} \left[\dots + \mathbb{E}_{|\xi_{[T-1]}} \left[\min_{x_T \in \mathcal{X}_T(x_{T-1}, \xi_T)} f_T(x_T, \xi_T) \right] \right] \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{|\xi_{[t]}}$ is a conditional expectation operator with respect to $\xi_{[t]}$, the history of the data process up to stage t . For $t = 1$, $f_1(x_1)$ is a deterministic objective function that is convex in x_1 , and $\mathcal{X}_1 = \{x_1: g_{1,i}(x_1) \leq -h_{1,i}, i = 1, \dots, p_1 \text{ and } l_{1,j}(x_1) = b_{1,j}, j = 1, \dots, q_1\}$ is defined by a deterministic

convex feasible region for x_1 , where $g_{1,i}$ is a twice-differentiable convex function in x_1 , $l_{1,j}$ is a linear function in x_1 , and $h_{1,i}$ and $b_{1,j}$ are deterministic coefficients. For $t = 2, \dots, T$, $f_t(x_t, \xi_t)$ is an objective function that is convex in x_t and dependent on ξ_t , and $\chi_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)$ is a convex feasible region for x_t given x_{t-1} and ξ_t . In particular, $\chi_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) := \{x_t: g_{t,i}(x_t, \xi_t) \leq -h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t), i = 1, \dots, p_t \text{ and } l_{t,j}(x_t, \xi_t) = b_{t,j}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t), j = 1, \dots, q_t\}$, where $g_{t,i}$ is a twice-differentiable convex function in x_t , $l_{t,j}$ is a linear function in x_t , $h_{t,i}$ is a twice-differentiable convex function in x_{t-1} , and $b_{t,j}$ is a linear function in x_{t-1} .

The usual MSP approach solves Eq. (1) in two steps: 1) approximating the distribution of the stochastic process $\xi_{[T]}$ by a scenario tree with a finite number of realizations, and 2) solving a large deterministic equivalent convex optimization problem under the approximated scenario tree. However, the deterministic equivalent problem often becomes intractable; hence, the problem is decomposed into subproblems in a stagewise manner.

In this study, the following assumptions are made, which are common in stagewise decomposition approaches, such as SDDP, for sequential decision-making problems.

(A1) *Stagewise independence*: For each stage $t = 1, \dots, T$, ξ_t is independent of $\xi_{[t-1]}$.

(A2) *Relatively Complete Recourse*: For each stage $t = 1, \dots, T$, for any feasible x_{t-1} , and for any realization ξ_t^s of ξ_t , $\chi_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t^s)$ is bounded and nonempty.

Under (A1), the nested structure of Eq. (1) yields the following Bellman equation.

For $t = T, \dots, 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) &= \inf_{x_t \in \chi_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)} \{f_t(x_t, \xi_t) + V_{t+1}(x_t)\} \\ V_t(x_{t-1}) &:= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{V}_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with $V_{T+1} \equiv 0$.

Under the Bellman equation Eq. (2), the optimal policy is obtained by solving the following convex problem.

Problem (1)

For $t = 1$,

$$x_1^* \in \arg \min_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} f_1(x_1) + V_2(x_1)$$

For $t = 2, \dots, T$.

$$x_t^* \in \arg \min_{x_t \in \chi_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)} f_t(x_t, \xi_t) + V_{t+1}(x_t)$$

with x_t^* being a function of x_{t-1} and ξ_t

3.2. Loss function

The main idea of VFGL is to approximate the value function V_t with a fixed convex parametric function \widehat{V}_t with parameter $\theta_t \in \mathbb{R}^{m_t}$. Hence, VFGL solves a sequential decision-making problem by learning the parameters $\theta_t, t = 2, \dots, T$. The revised decomposed subproblems can be described as follows.

The current policy is obtained by solving the following convex problem.

Problem (2)

For $t = 1$,

$$x_1^* \in \arg \min_{x_1 \in X_1} f_1(x_1) + \widehat{V}_2(x_1; \theta_2)$$

For $t = 2, \dots, T$,

$$x_t^* \in \arg \min_{x_t \in X_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)} f_t(x_t, \xi_t) + \widehat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$$

with x_t^* being a function of x_{t-1} and ξ_t

The KKT optimality conditions of the stage t subproblem for $t = 2, \dots, T$ of *Problem (2)* are given below.

Stationarity:

$$\nabla_{x_t} f_t(x_t, \xi_t) + \nabla_{x_t} \widehat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{p_t} \mu_{t,i} \nabla_{x_t} (g_{t,i}(x_t, \xi_t) + h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} \lambda_{t,j} \nabla_{x_t} (l_{t,j}(x_t, \xi_t) - b_{t,j}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) = 0$$

Primal Feasibility:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{t,i}(x_t, \xi_t) &\leq -h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) & i = 1, \dots, p_t \\ l_{t,j}(x_t, \xi_t) &= b_{t,j}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) & j = 1, \dots, q_t \end{aligned}$$

Dual Feasibility:

$$\mu_{t,i} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

Complementary Slackness:

$$\mu_{t,i} \nabla_{x_t} (g_{t,i}(x_t, \xi_t) + h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k_t$$

Let $(\hat{x}_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t^*, \hat{\lambda}_t^*)$ be the optimal primal-dual triple that satisfies the above KKT conditions of the stage t subproblem in *Problem (2)*. Then, this optimal triple of the approximated problem satisfies Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 (*perturbed KKT condition for a subproblem with approximated value function*)

Let $(\hat{x}_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t^*, \hat{\lambda}_t^*)$ be an optimal primal-dual triple that satisfies the KKT condition of the stage t subproblem of *Problem (2)*. Then, $(\hat{x}_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t^*, \hat{\lambda}_t^*)$ satisfies the primal feasibility, dual feasibility, and complementary slackness of the KKT condition of the stage t subproblem of *Problem (1)*, while the stationarity condition is perturbed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{x_t} f_t(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) + \nabla_{x_t} V_{t+1}(\hat{x}_t^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{p_t} \hat{\mu}_{t,i}^* \nabla_{x_t} (g_{t,i}(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) + h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} \hat{\lambda}_{t,j}^* \nabla_{x_t} (l_{t,j}(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) - b_{t,j}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) = \nabla_{x_t} V_{t+1}(\hat{x}_t^*) - \nabla_{x_t} \hat{V}_{t+1}(\hat{x}_t^*; \theta_{t+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix A.

The KKT perturbation from the value function estimation error described in Proposition 1 is denoted with $D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ as follows.

$$D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) := \|\nabla_{x_t} V_{t+1}(x_t) - \nabla_{x_t} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})\|$$

Herein, $\|\cdot\|$ indicates the Euclidean norm, and $dist(\cdot, \cdot)$ refers to the distance measure induced by the Euclidean norm. Let $(x_t^*, \mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)$ be the true optimal solution under the KKT optimality conditions of *Problem (1)*. It is assumed that the second-order sufficiency condition (SOSC) is satisfied for $(x_t^*, \mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)$. The SOSC is a regularity condition on the derivative of the KKT stationarity condition — the detailed definition of “SOSC” can be found in Appendix B. Then, one has the following proposition (Izmailov and Solodov, 2003; Izmailov et al., 2013).

Proposition 2 (*upper Lipschitz stability of the solutions of KKT system under canonical perturbations*)

It is supposed that the SOSC is satisfied for the optimal solution $(x_t^*, \mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)$ of the KKT system of *Problem (1)*. Then, there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of $(x_t^*, \mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)$ and $l > 0$, such that, for any $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ close enough to $(0,0,0)$, any solution $(x_t(\sigma), \mu_t(\sigma), \lambda_t(\sigma)) \in \mathcal{U}$ of the perturbed KKT system

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{x_t} f_t(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) + \nabla_{x_t} V_{t+1}(\hat{x}_t^*) + \sum_{i=1}^{p_t} \hat{\mu}_{t,i}^* \nabla_{x_t} (g_{t,i}(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) + h_{t,i}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} \hat{\lambda}_{t,j}^* \nabla_{x_t} (l_{t,j}(\hat{x}_t^*, \xi_t) - b_{t,j}(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)) = \sigma_1, \\ & g_t(x_t, \xi_t) + h_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) = \sigma_2 \\ & l_t(x_t, \xi_t) - b_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t) = \sigma_3 \end{aligned}$$

satisfies the estimate

$$\|x_t(\sigma) - x_t^*\| + \text{dist}\left((\mu_t(\sigma), \lambda_t(\sigma)), (\lambda_t^*, \mu_t^*)\right) \leq l\|\sigma\|$$

Proof. See Property 1 of Izmailov et al. (2013).

Proposition 2 leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (*optimal convergence of solutions from the approximated value function*)

It is supposed that the SOSC is satisfied for the true optimal solution $(x_t^*, \mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)$ of the KKT system. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be close enough to 0 $\in R^{n_t}$ and with an associated $\mathcal{U}, l > 0$ from Proposition 2. Then, for sufficiently small $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and a solution $(\hat{x}_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t^*, \hat{\lambda}_t^*) \in \mathcal{U}$ from the approximated value function, $\exists \epsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) < \epsilon_2 \Rightarrow \|\hat{x}_t^* - x_t^*\| + \text{dist}\left((\hat{\mu}_t^*, \hat{\lambda}_t^*), (\mu_t^*, \lambda_t^*)\right) < \epsilon_1$$

Proof. See Appendix C.

Under the specified regularity condition in Theorem 1, the approximated solution \hat{x}_t^* is guaranteed to converge to the true optimal solution x_t^* as the stagewise KKT perturbation $D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ approaches zero. Hence, VFGL should satisfy an additional condition (SOSC) for its theoretical convergence to the optimal solution, compared to those of well-known decomposition algorithms such as progressive hedging and SDDP. Because the MSLP has piecewise linear value functions that are not differentiable, they do not satisfy the SOSC. However, in Section 3, we show that the VFGL algorithm demonstrates a remarkable performance on MSLP problems even without the theoretical guarantee of convergence to the optimal solution.

Minimizing $D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ is equivalent to minimizing its squared term $\{D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)\}^2$. For computational reasons, the loss function $J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ to minimize the estimation error $D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) &= \|\nabla V_{t+1}(x_t) - \nabla \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} V_{t+1}(x_t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}} [\mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1})] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

The notation $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}}[\cdot]$ is used to emphasize that the expectation operator is taken with respect to ξ_{t+1} .

The Leibnitz integral rule is applied to change the order of the partial derivative and expectation as follows.

$$J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right)^2$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}} \left[(r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}))^2 \right] - \text{Var}_{\xi_{t+1}}(r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1})) \quad (4)$$

where $r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$ is the residual between the true and estimated gradients, and Var is the variance operator.

With elementary statistics, one can estimate Eq. (4) with S samples $\xi_t^s, s = 1, \dots, S$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \left(\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s))^2 - \frac{1}{S-1} \sum_{s=1}^S (r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t))^2 \right) \\ & \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left(\sum_{n=1}^{n_t} r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)^2 - (r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t))^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\frac{1}{s-1} \approx \frac{1}{s}$ is used for sufficiently large S , and

$\bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)$ is denoted as the sample mean of $r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1})$.

The last term in Eq. (5) is defined as the approximated loss function $J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ at x_t . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) &= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left(\sum_{n=1}^{n_t} 2\bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S j_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_t^s) \end{aligned}$$

where $j_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_t^s) = \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} 2\bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)^2$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \bar{r}_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) &= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) \\ &= \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \\ &= -\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \end{aligned}$$

which is identical to the theta gradient on $r_{t+1,n}$ as follows.

$$\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) = -\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$$

Therefore, the gradient of $j_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)$ with respect to θ_{t+1} is given by

$$\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} j_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) = -2 \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} r_{t+1,n}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) \nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$$

Because x_t is adapted to history $\xi_{[t]}$, the stage $t+1$ loss function is defined by the expectation of $J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)$ with respect to x_t as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_t} [J_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t)] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{J}_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t^i) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where N is the number of samples of x_t , and x_t^i is the i th sample of x_t .

The loss function in the form of Eq. (6) makes it possible to find a theta that minimizes the loss online based on the stochastic gradient descent (SGD). The application of the SGD is discussed in Section 3.3.

3.2.1. Sampling gradient of loss function

In this section, the process of sampling $\mathcal{J}_{t+1}(\theta_{t+1}; x_t^i)$ is described. Because $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$ and $\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$ can be easily computed, it remains to sample the target gradient $\nabla_{x_t} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)$. For a given pair of (x_t, ξ_{t+1}^s) , $\nabla_{x_t} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)$ can be found by differentiating the KKT optimality conditions of simulated subproblems (Kuhn & Tucker, 1950; Barratt, 2018). It is supposed that there is a primal dual optimal solution $(x_{t+1}^*, \lambda_{t+1}^*, \mu_{t+1}^*)$ for the stage $t+1$ subproblem defined in *Problem* (1) at the prior stage decision variable x_t and realization ξ_{t+1}^s . Then, one can readily check from the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L(x_{t+1}^*, \lambda_{t+1}^*, \mu_{t+1}^* | x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) &= f_t(x_{t+1}^*, \xi_{t+1}^s) + V_{t+2}(x_{t+1}^*) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{p_{t+1}} \mu_{t+1,i}^* (g_{t+1,i}(x_{t+1}^*, \xi_{t+1}^s) + h_{t+1,i}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{q_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1,j}^* (l_{t+1,j}(x_{t+1}^*, \xi_{t+1}^s) + b_{t+1,j}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s)) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

that the local sensitivity of the subproblem objective with respect to x_t , at ξ_{t+1}^s is the following:

$$\nabla_{x_t} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_{t+1}} \mu_{t+1,i}^* \nabla_{x_t} h_{t+1,i}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) + \sum_{j=1}^{q_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1,j}^* \nabla_{x_t} b_{t+1,j}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) \quad (8)$$

Unfortunately, Eq. (8) is not available because finding the optimal solution of Eq. (7) requires the next stage value function V_{t+2} . Therefore, Eq. (8) is approximated with bootstrapping by replacing $V_{t+2}(x_{t+1})$ with the current best approximation of it, $\hat{V}_{t+2}(x_{t+1}; \theta_{t+1})$, which is analogous to the Benders cut approximation of SDDP.

3.2.2. Objective weighting

The loss function of VFGL is defined as a norm of multidimensional errors, which implies that the error from each dimension is treated equally in magnitude. However, each decision variable might have a different scale of sensitivity to the value function. For example, one can consider the asset liability management of public pension plans, minimizing the contribution rate while maximizing the wealth of the terminal stage. Typically, pension plan problems include decision variables of the contribution rate and allocation of wealth in various asset classes. A marginal increment in the contribution rate leads to an additional employee's total wage, whereas a similar nominal increment of allocation on Treasury securities affects the growth of wealth based on the risk-free rate. Apparently, the sensitivity of the value function with respect to Treasury securities allocation would be much lower than that of the contribution rate. A loss function without consideration of a decision variable sensitivity scale might lead to poor performance because decision variables with low sensitivity can be easily neglected in learning. In this regard, a weighted loss function is defined as

$$\mathcal{J}_{t+1}^w(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} V_{t+1}(x_t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})}{w_{t+1,n}} \right)^2,$$

where $w_{t+1,n} = \mathbb{E}_{x_t} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} V_{t+1}(x_t) \right]$, $n = 1, \dots, n_t$.

Subsequently, one obtains a scaled loss gradient as follows.

$$\nabla_{\theta_{t+1}} \mathcal{J}_{t+1}^w(\theta_{t+1}; x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) = -2 \sum_{n=1}^{n_t} \frac{1}{w_{t+1,n}^2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} V_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$$

However, the value of $w_{t+1,n}$ cannot be computed directly. Therefore, the value $w_{t+1,n}$ is replaced with its sample mean $\bar{w}_{t+1,n}$, and this approximation is improved as the iteration continues — that is, whenever $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1})$ is sampled at iteration i , the following is updated:

$$\bar{w}_{t+1,n} \leftarrow \frac{i}{i+1} \bar{w}_{t+1,n} + \frac{1}{i+1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{t,n}} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t; \theta_{t+1}) \right)$$

Because the major purpose of $\bar{w}_{t+1,n}$ is scaling, an inaccurate approximation of $w_{t+1,n}$ is not a serious concern as long as it reflects the average scale.

3.3. Parameter optimization

Parameters θ_{t+1} that minimize the weighted loss functions $J_{t+1}^w(\theta_{t+1})$ for $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$ are optimized with the SGD algorithm. The SGD algorithm for VFGL is described in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Stochastic Gradient Descent for VFGL

Require: N (maximum iteration), α_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$ (step size), S (sample size)
Initialize: $i \leftarrow 1$ (iteration count), θ_t for $t = 1, \dots, T$ (parameter values)

```

1  while  $i \leq N$  do
2      for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
3          if  $t = 1$  do
4              Solve the first stage subproblem of Problem (2). Save optimal solution  $x_1^i$ .
5          else if  $t > 1$  do
6              for  $s = 1, \dots, S$  do
7                  Sample  $\xi_t^s$ 
8                  Solve the stage  $t$  subproblem of Problem (2). Save optimal solution  $(x_t^s, \lambda_t^s, \mu_t^s)$ .
9                  Compute  $\nabla_{\theta_t} j_t^w(\theta_t; x_{t-1}^i, \xi_t^s)$ 
10             end for
11             Compute  $\nabla_{\theta_t} J_t^w(\theta_t; x_{t-1}^i) = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \nabla_{\theta_t} j_t^w(\theta_t; x_{t-1}^i, \xi_t^s)$ 
12             Update  $\theta_t \leftarrow \theta_t - \alpha_i \nabla_{\theta_t} J_t^w(\theta_t; x_{t-1}^i)$ 
13              $x_t^i \leftarrow$  randomly chosen from  $\{x_t^1, \dots, x_t^k\}$ 
14         end if
15     end for
16      $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
17 end while
```

Here, the step size (or learning rate) α_i satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i = \infty, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i^2 < \infty$$

for the convergence (Robbins & Monro, 1951).

SGD is widely used in the parameter optimization of artificial intelligence algorithms, and there are a number of variants of SGD to address problem-specific issues. One variant of SGD that can be particularly useful for this problem is implicit stochastic gradient descent (ISGD). ISGD involves the extra step of calculating the updated parameter implicitly defined by the following equation.

$$\theta_t^{new} = \theta_t^{old} - \alpha_i \nabla_{\theta_t} J_t^w(\theta_t^{new}; x_{t-1})$$

Despite the additional computational burden, the ISGD is known to have a stable convergence regardless of the choice of learning rate α_i . The ISGD is suitable for VFGL because the unstable scale of gradients of VFGL tends to require a careful selection of the learning rate for convergence, which is cumbersome.

In Algorithm 1, $\nabla_{\theta_t} J_t^w(\theta_t; x_{t-1}^i)$ is approximated with S samples. One can employ some variance reduction techniques (Hammersley & Morton, 1956; Siegmund, 1976; Rubinstein & Marcus, 1985; Haghghat & Wagner, 2003) to enhance the sample approximation. In particular, moment

matching is used. The moment matching algorithms vary the values of finite samples and/or probability assigned to them so that the moments of the samples are matched to that of their original distribution.

The following procedure can be considered one of the most naïve forms of the moment matching algorithm. For S samples y_1, \dots, y_S drawn from their true distribution Y with mean μ and covariance Σ , each y_s is transformed as follows.

$$z_s = \mu + \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} C^{-\frac{1}{2}} (y_s - \bar{y}),$$

where \bar{y} is the sample mean, and C is the sample covariance matrix. One can easily check that the mean and variance of z_s exactly match those of Y . However, matching up to the second moment might not be sufficient, depending on the underlying distribution and structure of the problems. For more details of moment matching algorithms, see Høyland et al. (2003), Ji et al. (2005), Ponomareva et al. (2015), Staino & Russo (2015), and Radhakrishnan et al. (2018).

3.3.1. Stopping criterion

The convergence of parameter values can be used as the stopping criterion of VFGL. One cannot employ the expected optimality gap for the stopping criterion as in SDDP because a first stage problem in VFGL no longer provides a lower bound of the problem. However, one can observe the change in parameters of the value function. In particular, a total parameter change for the i -th iteration is defined as follows.

$$\Delta\theta^i = \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta\theta_t^i,$$

where $\Delta\theta_t^i = \|\theta_t^i - \theta_t^{i-1}\|_2$ is the parameter change for the stage t value function V_t in the i -th iteration. When $\Delta\theta^i$ is sufficiently small, one can conclude that the value function converges. The entire procedure of VFGL is presented in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: VFGL

Require: N (maximum iteration), α_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$ (step size),
 S (sample size), ϵ (minimum theta update threshold),
 \hat{V}_{t+1} for $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$ (parametric value function),

Initialize: $i \leftarrow 1$ (iteration counter)
 $\Delta\theta \leftarrow \infty$ (total theta update level)
 $p_t^s \leftarrow \frac{1}{S}$
 θ_t^1 for $t = 2, \dots, T - 1$ (parameter values)

```

1  while  $\Delta\theta^i > \epsilon$  and  $i < N$  do
2       $\Delta\theta^i \leftarrow 0$ 
3      for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
4          if  $t = 1$  do
5              | Solve the first stage subproblem of Problem (2).

```

```

6   | | Save optimal solution  $x_1^i$ .
7   | else if  $t > 1$  do
8   | | Sample random variables  $\xi_t^s$  for  $s = 1, \dots, S$ 
9   | | (optional) Match moments of sampled  $\xi_t^s$  with the corresponding probability  $p_t^s$ 
10  | | for  $s = 1, \dots, S$  do
11  | | | Solve the corresponding subproblem of Problem (2)
12  | | | Compute the loss gradient  $\nabla_{\theta_t} \mathcal{J}_t^w(\theta_t^i; x_{t-1}^i, \xi_t^s)$ 
13  | | | Compute the minibatch loss gradient  $\nabla_{\theta_t} \mathcal{J}_t^w(\theta_t^i; x_{t-1}^i) = \sum_{s=1}^S p_t^s \nabla_{\theta_t} \mathcal{J}_t^w(\theta_t^i; x_{t-1}^i, \xi_t^s)$ 
14  | | | Update  $\theta_{t+1}$  by ISGD on  $\theta_{t+1}^{i+1} = \theta_{t+1}^i - \alpha_i \nabla_{\theta_t} \mathcal{J}_t^w(\theta_t^i; x_{t-1}^i)$ 
15  | | | Sample  $\xi_t^i$  solve the stage  $t$  subproblem of Problem (2) and save  $x_t^i$ 
16  | | |  $\Delta \theta^i \leftarrow \Delta \theta^i + \|\theta_{t+1}^{i+1} - \theta_t^i\|_2$ 
17  | | end if
18  | end for
19  |  $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
20  | end for

```

3.4. Quality measure of parametric form: KKT deviation

The biggest hurdle of the proposed algorithm is finding an appropriate parametric form of the value function. As pointed out by Agrawal et al. (2020), the tractable form of the true value function can be found only in a few cases. Fortunately, the choice of the parametric approximation of the value function \hat{V}_t need not be exact. If the modeling capacity of \hat{V}_t is strong enough that its gradients can be sufficiently close to the gradients of the true value, VFGL can find a solution that is sufficiently close to the true optimal solution. There may be multiple parametric forms of the value function that can well approximate the true value function, and they must be compared.

In this regard, a measure is proposed to evaluate the performance of various parametric approximations to choose the best one among them. The solution of VFGL converges to the true solution as D_t goes to 0 by Theorem 1. Let D be the expected value of the sum of D_t over stages as follows.

$$D(\theta_2, \dots, \theta_T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} D_t(\theta_{t+1}; x_t) \right]$$

One forward simulates solution $x_t^i, t = 1, \dots, T, i = 1, \dots, N$ based on the current approximation $\hat{V}_{t+1}, t = 1, \dots, T-1$ to obtain the estimator of D as follows.

$$\hat{D}(\theta_2, \dots, \theta_T) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left\| \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \nabla_{x_t} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t^i, \xi_{t+1}^s) - \nabla_{x_t} \hat{V}_{t+1}(x_t^i; \theta_{t+1}) \right\|_2$$

where each $\nabla_{x_t} \mathcal{V}_{t+1}(x_t^i, \xi_{t+1}^s)$ is sampled from the bootstrapping described in Section 2.2.1.

Here, \hat{D} is referred to as KKT deviation, and it indicates the performance of the value function gradient approximation based on the current parametric form. A better quality of the solution would be expected for a low KKT deviation, but a high KKT deviation does not necessarily lead to an erroneous solution. Instead, the KKT deviation can be regarded as a confidence level of the solution. Illustrative examples of the relationship between the KKT deviations and solution qualities are presented in Section 4.

Remark 1. A good candidate for the initial choice of the parametric form of the value function is the functional form of the stagewise objective function or the indefinite integral form of the stagewise objective function. Such a claim is based on the observation that the past stage decision variables of the decomposed multistage stochastic programming problems are frequently used as a resource constraint. Furthermore, the stagewise objective function is frequently a function of such available resources. However, sometimes the analytical form of the indefinite integral of the objective function might not be available. In such a case, one can approximate the indefinite integral form with sampling. More detailed illustrations and discussions can be found in Section 4.

4. Illustrative examples

In this section, three illustrative examples with different application domains are presented to demonstrate the empirical performance of VFGL. The three examples are financial planning, production planning, and hydrothermal energy planning, where they have different types of decision variables, objectives, and constraints. These problems have been extensively studied within the optimization community.

In the numerical experiments, seven to eleven stage multistage stochastic convex problems are considered to compare the results from MSP, SDDP, and VFGL. Here, MSP is a deterministic equivalent of the multistage stochastic convex problems. MSP was used as a benchmark to assess the solution quality of SDDP and VFGL because MSP finds a global optimum given a finite scenario tree. The stopping criteria for SDDP and VFGL are different. Therefore, the two algorithms were run until solution convergence, and their first stage solution, elapsed time, and degree of convergence at each iteration were compared. For SDDP, 20 scenarios for upper bound calculation in the forward pass were sampled, but the backward pass was performed on only one sampled path. All the experiments were performed using an Intel i5-7500 processor with 32 GB of RAM. For each stagewise subproblem, MOSEK¹ solver 12.9.0 was used to solve the linear and convex problems by means of CVXPY 1.0.28, a Python-based modeling framework (Diamond & Boyd, 2016).

4.1 Lifetime financial planning

Merton (1969) solved a continuous-time portfolio optimization problem, where the objective is to maximize the total utility of consumption and terminal wealth by appropriately deciding the level of consumption and the allocation of wealth in stocks and bonds. See Appendix E for the full problem definition and its analytical solution. For the numerical experiment, the time period is discretized into

¹ See <http://www.mosek.com>

T stages, and the problem is approximated using an MSP formulation. The approximated problem is solved with MSP, SDDP, and VFGL. The variables, parameters, and parameter value for the discretized lifetime financial planning problem case study are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Decision variables and parameters for discretized lifetime financial planning

Decision variables	Description
C_t	Consumption at stage t
W_t	Wealth in the beginning of stage t
S_t	Amount invested into stock at stage t
B_t	Amount invested into bond at stage t

Parameters	Description	Value
ρ	Discount rate.	0
γ	Utility risk aversion coefficient	1
μ, σ	Mean return, volatility respectively, of stock	1.06, 0.20
r	Risk-free rate of bond	1.03
ϵ	Scaling coefficient of bequest utility	1
ξ_t	Random variable following a standard normal distribution	-

The total cost is as follows.

$$-\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T e^{-\rho t} U(C_t) + \epsilon^\gamma e^{-\rho T} U(W_T) \right]$$

Stagewise subproblems are defined as follows.

Stage 1 subproblem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && -U(C_1) + V_2(S_1, B_1) \\ & \text{subject to} && S_1 + B_1 + C_1 = 1 && \text{Initial wealth} \\ & && S_1, B_1, C_1 \geq 0 && \text{Non-negativity} \end{aligned}$$

Stage t subproblem ($t = 2, \dots, T - 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && -U(C_t) + V_{t+1}(S_t, B_t) \\ & \text{subject to} && S_t + B_t + C_t = r\Delta t B_{t-1} + e^{\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\xi_t} S_{t-1} && \text{Inventory balance} \\ & && S_t, B_t, C_t \geq 0 && \text{Non-negativity} \end{aligned}$$

Stage T subproblem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && -U(W_T) \\ & \text{subject to} && W_T = r\Delta t B_{T-1} + e^{\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\xi_T} S_{T-1} && \text{Inventory balance} \end{aligned}$$

From the special structure of the terminal stage problem, $V_T(S_{T-1}, B_{T-1})$ can be calculated as follows.

$$V_T(S_{T-1}, B_{T-1}) = \int_{\xi_T} -\ln \left(r\Delta t B_{T-1} + e^{\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\xi_T} S_{T-1} \right) \varphi(\xi_T) d\xi_T$$

where $\varphi(\xi_T)$ is a probability density function of ξ_T . Finding an exact parametric form of $V_T(S_{T-1}, B_{T-1})$ above is extremely difficult. Instead, the parametric form of $V_T(S_{T-1}, B_{T-1})$ is approximated with finite sampling as follows.

$$\int_{\xi_T} -\ln\left(rdtB_{T-1} + e^{\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)dt + \sigma\sqrt{dt}\xi_T} S_{T-1}\right) \varphi(\xi_T) d\xi_T \approx \frac{1}{b_T} \sum_{i=1}^{b_T} -\ln(rB_{T-1} + \beta_{i,T} S_{T-1})$$

where $\beta_{i,T}$ is a sampled value of $e^{\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\xi_T}$, and b_T is the sampling number. Therefore, the parametric value function is set to include the parametric term as follows.

$$\theta_t^1 \sum_{i=1}^{b_T} -\ln(rB_{T-1} + \beta_{i,T} S_{T-1})$$

A negative utility term is added for flexibility by $-\theta_t^2 \ln(\theta_t^3 B_t + \theta_t^4 S_t)$ to increase the model capacity. Therefore, the parametric value function for stage $t = 2, \dots, T$ is defined as follows.

$$\hat{V}_t(S_{t-1}, B_{t-1}; \theta_t = (\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2, \theta_t^3, \theta_t^4)) = -\theta_t^1 \sum_{i=1}^{b_t} \ln(rB_{t-1} + \beta_{i,t} S_{t-1}) - \theta_t^2 \ln(\theta_t^3 B_{t-1} + \theta_t^4 S_{t-1})$$

where b_t is the sampling number. Moreover, $b_t = 30$ is set for all t , and the parameters are initialized as follows.

$$\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2, \theta_t^3, \theta_t^4 = \left(\frac{1}{b_t}, \frac{1}{b_t}, 1, 1\right)$$

An 11-stage scenario tree is constructed using three samples per stage, where the samples are normalized to match the first and second moments of the true distribution perfectly. The constructed scenario tree is shared between MSP and SDDP. The experimental results for MSP, SDDP, and VFGL are summarized in Table 2. It presents the averaged first stage solutions over 20 independently generated instances of MSP, SDDP, and VFGL. The results from Table 2 verifies that the MSP solution matches well with the analytical solution, and VFGL provides more accurate solutions than SDDP.

Table 2. Comparison of objective value, first stage solution, and computation time between algorithms for lifetime financial planning problem

Algorithm	Objective value	Risky asset portion	Risk-free asset	Risky asset	Consumption	Average computation time (s)
Analytical	-	0.7500	0.2292	0.6875	0.0833	-
MSP	29.5508 (0.0000)	0.7510 (0.000)	0.2282 (0.000)	0.6885 (0.000)	0.0833 (0.000)	-
SDDP	29.4377 (0.0577)	0.7694 (0.012)	0.2114 (0.012)	0.7053 (0.012)	0.0833 (0.000)	4552 (15)
VFGL	29.5112 (0.0305)	0.7508 (0.000)	0.2284 (0.000)	0.6883 (0.000)	0.0833 (0.000)	354 (1)

The evolution of the first stage solutions of (a) SDDP and (b) VFGL for a randomly generated

instance is depicted in Figure 1. While the first stage solution of VFGL quickly converges, almost within 20 iterations, the solution of SDDP is not stabilized within 200 iterations. SDDP was further run for 1000 iterations, which took approximately 28,000 s, but the first stage solution was still not fully stabilized. The SDDP algorithm shows a particularly slow convergence of this example.




Figure 1. Comparison of evolution of the first stage solution between SDDP and VFGL for discretized lifetime financial planning problem

The computation time per iteration is illustrated in Figure 2. Figures 1 and 2 clearly show that VFGL is not only faster in convergence but also faster in each iteration than SDDP. Furthermore, SDDP shows increasing computation time with iteration. Because SDDP requires a high number of iterations for convergence, the computational advantage of VFGL over SDDP is significant in this sample.




Figure 2. Comparison of computation time per iteration between SDDP and VFGL for discretized financial planning problem

The stopping criteria of SDDP and VFGL are displayed in Figure 3. The dashed upper bound of Figure 3(a) refers to the conservative upper bound estimation with 95% confidence (Shapiro, 2011). Figure 3(b) describes the total θ change in VFGL at each iteration. The convergence of the parameter for VFGL is apparent in Figure 3(b) after approximately 10 iterations, which coincides with the solution convergence shown in Figure 1. However, the approximated SDDP bound of Figure 3(a) provides little information about the solution convergence.




Figure 3. Comparison of stopping criteria between SDDP and VFGL for discretized lifetime financial planning problem

Different parametric forms of the value function are applied to this example, and the result changes are analyzed. By constructing the parametric form of the value function for this example, one can easily change the parametric family by changing the sampling number b_t . The KKT deviation, solution error, and objective value for different b_t values are described in Table 3. The KKT deviation tends to decrease as b_t increases. While a negative correlation between the KKT deviation and the first stage solution error is evident, a negative correlation between the KKT deviation and the objective value is not very clear in Table 3. An extremely flat objective function and objective approximation error may be the causes. Therefore, one can argue that the KKT deviation is a valid metric that indicates the possible appropriateness of the parametric form of the value function.

Table 3. Comparison of KKT deviation, first stage solution error, and objective value between various sampling numbers for discretized financial planning problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Sampling number b_t	KKT deviation	First stage solution error	Objective value
2	6.7044	0.3258	29.6344
3	3.0451	0.3217	29.5369
4	1.0743	0.3155	29.5102
5	0.2846	0.2990	29.4814
10	0.0128	0.0399	29.5106
15	0.0103	0.0062	29.5396
20	0.0157	0.0013	29.4975
25	0.0159	0.0008	29.4246
*30	0.0075	0.0001	29.5112

Finally, the risk-free return and standard deviation of the risky asset of the original problem are perturbed, and whether the given parametric form of the value function can be robustly recycled with respect to the perturbation is determined. The results of the perturbed problem are reported in Table 4. The table shows that both the solution and the objective from VFGL and MSP for any perturbation coincide within an approximation error. It can be concluded that the given parametric family of the value function can be recycled for a small perturbation of the asset distribution for this example.

Table 4. Comparison of perturbed problems with a fixed parametric value function form for discretized lifetime financial planning problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Parameter			VFGL					MSP			
Risk-free return	Risky return	Risky volatility	KKT deviation	Objective	Risk free	Risky	Consumption	Objective	Risk free	Risky	Consumption
0.04	0.060	0.20	0.0114	29.5281	0.4567	0.4600	0.0833	29.5266	0.4564	0.4603	0.0833
0.034	0.060	0.26	0.0105	29.5245	0.5122	0.4045	0.0833	29.5458	0.5120	0.4046	0.0833
0.031	0.060	0.29	0.0107	29.5399	0.5367	0.3799	0.0833	29.5565	0.5372	0.3795	0.0833
*0.030	*0.060	*0.20	0.0075	29.5112	0.2284	0.6883	0.0833	29.5508	0.6885	0.2282	0.0833
0.028	0.060	0.32	0.0106	29.5429	0.5571	0.3596	0.0833	29.5667	0.5580	0.3587	0.0833
0.025	0.060	0.35	0.0108	29.5567	0.5746	0.3421	0.0833	29.5768	0.5755	0.3412	0.0833
0.022	0.060	0.38	0.0109	29.5703	0.5900	0.3267	0.0833	29.5867	0.5910	0.3257	0.0833
0.019	0.060	0.41	0.0110	29.5791	0.6036	0.3130	0.0833	29.5966	0.6047	0.3119	0.0833
0.016	0.060	0.44	0.0110	29.5905	0.6159	0.3008	0.0833	29.6065	0.6171	0.2996	0.0833
0.013	0.060	0.47	0.0111	29.5993	0.6270	0.2897	0.0833	29.6163	0.6282	0.2884	0.0833
0.01	0.060	0.5	0.0112	29.6081	0.6371	0.2795	0.0833	29.6261	0.6384	0.2783	0.0833

4.2 Production planning

A simple T -stage factory production/storage planning problem was considered. Specifically, a dynamic lot size problem was solved to find an optimal way of satisfying stochastic demand while minimizing the cost incurred by manufacturing, ordering, or carrying inventory. The problem is regarded as a standard production planning problem and has been widely studied (e.g., Wagner & Whitin, 1958; Shapiro, 1993; Karimi et al., 2003).

In the example, the factory can produce and store each product $i \in I$ while facing uncertain demand. In the first stage, there is no demand, and the factory manager must only decide how much to produce and store. It is assumed that the available resource for the production is fixed and cannot be transferred to the next stage. In addition, there is no ordering cost for production. In the second stage and forward, the manager observes realized demand and adjusts the production level to meet the demand. Any products left after demand are stored in the next stage with storage cost. When the demand exceeds the sum of supply and initial storage, the shortage is outsourced at a relatively high cost. An optimal production policy is sought that minimizes the sum of the expected storage and outsourcing costs. The example involves three products for seven stages. The demand is independent and identically distributed over stages with three possible values with equal probability. The decision variables and parameters, and values for parameters are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Decision variables and parameters for production planning problem

Decision	Description
----------	-------------

variables		
$x_{t,i}$	Quantity of product i produced at stage t	
$y_{t,i}$	Quantity of product i outsourced at stage t	
$s_{t,i}$	Quantity of product i stored at the end of stage t	
Parameters	Description	Value
$a_{t,i}$	Production cost of product i at stage t	(1, 2, 5)
$b_{t,i}$	Outsourcing cost of product i at stage t	(6, 12, 20)
$c_{t,i}$	Storage cost of product i from the end of stage t to beginning of stage $t + 1$	(3, 7, 10)
r_t	Maximum production resource available at stage t	10
$d_{t,i}$	Random demand of product i at stage t	{(5, 3, 1), (6, 2, 1), (1, 2, 2)}

The total cost is as follows.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \sum_{i \in I} (y_{t,i} b_{t,i} + s_{t,i} c_{t,i}) + y_{T,i} b_{T,i} \right]$$

The stagewise subproblems at the first stage, middle stages, and final stage are defined as follows.

Stage 1 subproblem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{i \in I} y_{1,i} b_{1,i} + \sum_{i \in I} s_{1,i} c_{1,i} + v_2(s_1) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in I} x_{1,i} a_{1,i} \leq r_1 && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Resource limit} \\
& && s_{1,i} = x_{1,i} + y_{1,i} && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Storage balance} \\
& && x_{1,i}, y_{1,i}, s_{1,i} \geq 0 && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Non-negativity}
\end{aligned}$$

Stage t subproblem ($t = 2, \dots, T - 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{i \in I} y_{t,i} b_{t,i} + \sum_{i \in I} s_{t,i} c_{t,i} + v_{t+1}(s_t) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in I} x_{t,i} a_{t,i} \leq r_t && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Resource limit} \\
& && s_{t,i} = s_{t-1,i} + x_{t,i} + y_{t,i} - d_{t,i} && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Storage balance} \\
& && x_{t,i}, y_{t,i}, s_{t,i} \geq 0 && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Non-negativity}
\end{aligned}$$

Stage T subproblem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{i \in I} y_{T,i} b_{T,i} \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in I} x_{T,i} a_{T,i} \leq r_T && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Resource limit} \\
& && s_{T,i} = s_{T-1,i} + x_{T,i} + y_{T,i} - d_{T,i} && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Storage balance} \\
& && x_{T,i}, y_{T,i}, s_{T,i} \geq 0 && \text{For } i \in I && \text{Non-negativity}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the stagewise value functions of this problem are convex piecewise linear because each stagewise subproblem is linear programming. Since a piecewise linear function is not differentiable, the convergence of VFGL to the optimal is not guaranteed by the Theorem 1. Through this example, we limitedly check the viability of VFGL to multistage stochastic convex programming without the SOS condition.

For all products, the outsourcing cost is significantly higher than the production resource cost and storage cost. Therefore, one obtains a crude insight that the optimal solution would avoid outsourcing products, which is likely to be achieved by creating nonempty storage. Furthermore, the storage cost is paid in advance. Therefore, one can expect that the value function would decrease with storage to some extent. However, the disutility of storage increases after a certain point because there exists a certain level of storage sufficient for providing a buffer for uncertain demands. From these points of view, one can use the following form of the parametric value function:

$$\hat{V}_t(s_{t-1}; \theta_t = (\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2)) = s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^1 + \sum_{i=1}^3 e^{-\theta_{t,i}^2 s_{t-1,i}} \quad \text{for } t = 2, \dots, T$$

Here, $\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2 \in \mathbf{R}^3$. The first linear term represents the overall decreasing disutility of storage, while the exponential term is added to reflect the increasing disutility of storage after a certain point. The parameters are initialized first using the following values.

$$\theta_t^1 = (-1, -1, -1), \theta_t^2 = (0, 0, 0) \quad \text{for } t = 2, \dots, T$$

Table 6. Comparison of objective value, first stage solution, and computation time between algorithms for production planning problem

Algorithm	Objective value	Production			Outsource			Computation time (s)
		Product 1	Product 2	Product 3	Product 1	Product 2	Product 3	
Optimal (MSP)	178 (0.0)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-
SDDP	179 (0.4)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.02 (0.06)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1016 (5)
VFGL	178 (0.2)	0.99 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.01 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	157 (1)

Table 6 presents the first stage solution of the MSP model and the averaged first stage solutions over 20 generated instances of SDDP and VFGL. SDDP took approximately 100 iterations for the first stage solution convergence, while VFGL took around 200 iterations. Parentheses in Table 6 indicate the standard deviation of each solution. Both SDDP and VFGL show accurate solutions and objective values within an acceptable standard deviation. However, there is a striking difference in the computation time between the two. The computation time for SDDP is seven times longer than that of VFGL, even with 100 fewer iterations. Figure 4 shows the first stage solution of (a) SDDP and (b) VFGL. Only production decision variables are shown because the first stage outsourcing decision variable always turned out to be 0, making the storage decision identical to the production decision. One can see that the first stage solution has been stabilized for both algorithms. Regarding the computation time and stopping criterion, similar findings to Section 3.1 can be seen in Appendix F.




Figure 4. Comparison of evolution of the first stage solution between SDDP and VFGL for production planning problem

To see the effect of the choice of parametric form in VFGL, a few more parametric forms were tested. The KKT deviation and first stage solution error for each parametric form of the value function are described in Table 7. The KKT deviations are calculated using 50 forward simulated solutions, and the number of iterations of VFGL is set to 200. The initial choice of parametric form has the best KKT deviation and solution error values. Table 7 shows that both the first stage solution error and objective value are inversely related to KKT deviation in the proposed parametric forms, which verifies the use of KKT deviation for the performance measure of parametric family choice.

Table 7. Comparison of KKT deviation, first stage solution error, and objective value between various parametric forms for production planning problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Parametric form	KKT deviation	First stage solution error	Objective value
* $s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^1 + \sum_{i=1}^3 e^{-\theta_{t,i}^2 s_{t-1,i}}$	2.53 (0.32)	0.01 (0.01)	178.40 (0.06)
$s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^1 + s_{t-1}^2 \cdot \theta_t^2$	49.14 (0.32)	0.52 (0.00)	180.19 (0.06)
$s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^1 + e^{s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^2}$	98.33 (0.32)	1.36 (0.07)	188.74 (0.06)
$s_{t-1} \cdot \theta_t^1$	110.30 (0.32)	1.41 (0.000)	188.74 (0.06)
0	137.6 (0.32)	1.41 (0.000)	188.40 (0.06)

The value of the parameter is slightly perturbed to check whether the same parametric form of the value function is still reusable. In particular, the maximum amount of resources r_t is perturbed using the initial parametric form, and the result is summarized in Table 8. The result corresponding to the original experimental value ($r_t = 10$) is marked in the table. The parametric form of the experiment is applicable to the perturbation of the original problem. The parametric form of the experiment gives an accurate first stage solution and objective values for the upward perturbation of the maximum resource. However, downward perturbation of the maximum resource with a magnitude greater than

0.5 results in an erroneous first stage solution. Despite the error in the first stage solution, the objective value for the VFGL solution seems to remain accurate, which implies that either the solution from VFGL is optimal or the suboptimality of the VFGL solution is not substantial.

Table 8. Comparison of perturbed problems with a fixed parametric value function form for production planning problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Maximum resource	VFGL					MSP			
	KKT deviation	Objective	Product 1	Product 2	Product 3	Objective	Product 1	Product 2	Product 3
8	1.22	227.63	1.63	0.33	1.07	227.22	2.00	0.00	1.20
8.5	1.85	215.83	1.61	0.09	1.07	214.65	2.50	0.00	1.10
9	0.98	202.38	1.58	0.00	1.02	202.44	2.00	0.00	1.00
9.5	1.35	190.08	1.49	0.00	1.01	190.39	1.50	0.00	1.00
*10	2.50	177.51	0.99	0.00	1.01	178.33	1.00	0.00	1.00
10.5	2.75	167.59	0.49	0.00	1.01	167.50	0.50	0.00	1.00
11	2.55	156.63	0.00	0.00	1.00	156.67	0.00	0.00	1.00
11.5	2.24	147.74	0.00	0.00	0.90	147.67	0.00	0.00	0.90
12	1.78	138.50	0.00	0.00	0.81	138.67	0.00	0.00	0.80
12.5	2.00	130.38	0.00	0.00	0.71	129.67	0.00	0.00	0.70
13	2.03	121.94	0.00	0.00	0.61	120.67	0.00	0.00	0.60
13.5	2.17	111.65	0.00	0.00	0.51	111.67	0.00	0.00	0.50
14	4.16	102.90	0.00	0.00	0.40	102.67	0.00	0.00	0.40
14.5	2.76	94.51	0.00	0.00	0.20	94.00	0.00	0.00	0.20
15	4.70	85.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.33	0.00	0.00	0.00

4.3 Hydrothermal generation

In this example, the aim is to find an optimal electricity generation level for hydro and thermal plants while maintaining a desirable reservoir level. This example is a slightly modified and simplified version of the example given by Guigues (2014). For each stage t , the deterministic demand of electricity has to be met. The electricity system contains hydro plants and thermal plants for generation. Hydro plants can produce electricity at a lower price, but the resource is limited by the reservoir level. In a hydro plant, the water inflow to the reservoir is uncertain. It is assumed that thermal plants have unlimited capacity in electricity generation but require a higher generation cost. In addition to the cost of electricity generation, there is a disutility cost with respect to each stage of the final water reservoir level. The disutility reflects the environmental concern while draining the reservoir. The objective is to minimize the sum of the expected generation cost and disutility. For the case study, a model with seven stages is considered. We assume that the water inflow to the reservoir follows independent and identical normal distributions over different stages. The decision variables, parameters with their values for this example are described in the Table 9.

Table 9. Decision variables and parameters for hydrothermal generation problem

Decision variables	Description
r_t^{init}	Water reservoir level in the beginning of stage t
r_t^{final}	Water reservoir level in the end of stage t
W_t	Hydro electricity generation level at stage t

Parameters	Description	Value
H_t	Thermal electricity generation level at stage t	
r_0^{init}	Initial water reservoir level	40
c_t^W	Cost of hydro electricity production per unit at stage t	2
c_t^H	Cost of thermal electricity production per unit at stage t	7
d_t	Electricity demand at stage t	20
a_t	Reservoir level utility coefficient	0.1
b_t	Reservoir level utility scaling constant	5
I_t	Water inflow to reservoir in the beginning of stage t	Normally distributed with mean 20, standard deviation 5

The total cost is as follows.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T c_t^W W_t + c_t^H H_t + e^{-a_t r_t^{final}} \right]$$

The stagewise subproblems are given below. Here, the third term of the objective function is a disutility on the reservoir level, which can be considered a negative of scaled exponential utility.

Stage 1 subproblem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && c_1^W W_1 + c_1^H H_1 + e^{-a_1 r_1^{final} + b_1} + V_2(r_1^{final}) \\
& \text{subject to} && r_1^{init} = r_0 && \text{Initial reservoir} \\
& && r_1^{final} = r_1^{init} - W_1 && \text{Reservoir balance} \\
& && W_1 + H_1 \geq d_1 && \text{Demand} \\
& && r_1^{final}, W_1, H_1 \geq 0 && \text{Non-negativity}
\end{aligned}$$

Stage t subproblem ($t = 2, \dots, T - 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && c_t^W W_t + c_t^H H_t + e^{-a_t r_t^{final} + b_t} + V_{t+1}(r_t^{final}) \\
& \text{subject to} && r_t^{init} = r_{t-1}^{final} + I_t && \text{Initial reservoir} \\
& && r_t^{final} = r_t^{init} - W_t && \text{Reservoir balance} \\
& && W_t + H_t \geq d_t && \text{Demand} \\
& && r_t^{final}, W_t, H_t \geq 0 && \text{Non-negativity}
\end{aligned}$$

Stage T subproblem

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && c_T^W W_T + c_T^H H_T + e^{-a_T r_T^{final} + b_T} \\
& \text{subject to} && r_T^{init} = r_{T-1}^{final} + I_T && \text{Initial reservoir} \\
& && r_T^{final} = r_T^{init} - W_T && \text{Reservoir balance} \\
& && W_T + H_T \geq d_T && \text{Demand}
\end{aligned}$$

$$r_t^{final}, W_T, H_T \geq 0$$

Non-negativity

Next, the parametric value function form \hat{V}_t must be determined. The parametric utility function is set as follows.

$$\hat{V}_t(r_{t-1}^{final}; \theta_t = (\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2)) = \theta_t^1 r_{t-1}^{final} + e^{-\theta_t^2 r_{t-1}^{final} + b_t}, t = 2, \dots, T$$

where the first linear term is added to capture the cost reduction by increasing the portion of hydro plant generation, and the second term is added to capture the decreased disutility from the increased reservoir level. The second term is the indefinite integral form of the stagewise objective function proposed in Remark 1. The initial parameter values are set as follows.

$$(\theta_t^1, \theta_t^2) = (-1, -1), \quad t = 2, \dots, T$$

The scaling term of the parametric value function is fixed by b_t , which is the scaling constant of the utility function from the original problem. Therefore, it is advisable to try first a parametric value function with minimal parameter flexibility and then increase the parameter flexibility if the result is not satisfactory.

Table 10. Comparison of objective value, first stage solution, and computation time between algorithms for hydrothermal generation problem

Algorithm	Objective value	Hydro plant generation	Thermal plant generation	Computation time (s)
Optimal	397	9.90	10.10	-
(MSP)	(0.1)	(0.05)	(0.05)	
SDDP	397	9.78	10.22	978
	(2)	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.20)
VFGL	400	10.45	9.55	337
	(1)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(3.15)

The experimental results of MSP, SDDP, and VFGL are summarized in Table 10. It presents the first stage solution of the true MSP model, and the averaged first stage solutions from 20 generated instances of SDDP and VFGL. The table shows that the MSP and SDDP give similar solutions, whereas the result from VFGL is slightly different. A slight suboptimality of VFGL in the objective value compared to those of MSP and SDDP is also observed.




Figure 5. Comparison of evolution of the first stage solution between SDDP and VFGL for hydrothermal generation problem

Figure 5 displays a sample of the first-stage solution convergence for SDDP and VFGL among 20 trials. It shows that SDDP and VFGL seem to converge after 100 and 500 iterations, respectively. Table 10 and Figure 5 indicate that the VFGL tends to underappreciate slightly the thermal electric generation compared with SDDP and MSP. The applicability of VFGL may depend on the tolerance level.

However, two interesting properties of VFGL can be found in this experiment. First, the evolution of solutions from VFGL tends to fluctuate less than that of SDDP. It is true that the solutions from the SDDP algorithm quickly converged after approximately 10 iterations. However, during the early learning phase, the solutions fluctuated drastically with every iteration. This implies that it is extremely dangerous to use the result from the SDDP algorithm that has not sufficiently converged because it might yield extremely different results after more iterations. However, the degree of solution fluctuation is much smaller for the VFGL algorithm. There may be a gradual update of the value function for the stability of the solution convergence of VFGL. In other words, a small update of the value function parameters is smoother and less drastic than adding a linear cut to the value function approximation. Second, the computation time for VFGL is approximately one third that of SDDP, even with a five times greater number of iterations. Similar to the first two examples, the computation time of SDDP increases in every iteration, while that of VFGL remains relatively consistent (see Appendix G). Therefore, the VFGL algorithm would be more computationally robust for large-scale problems that require a very large number of iterations.

This example is solved with different parametric forms of the value function, and the results are reported in Table 11. A lower KKT deviation leads to less solution error. However, the first four parametric forms give a comparable objective. Therefore, the suboptimality of solutions from the first four parametric forms is likely to be small. The quadratic parametric function includes a linear term, implying that its model capacity is greater than that of the linear function. However, there are a higher KKT deviation and solution error for the quadratic form compared with the linear one. This implies that

the trained parameters for the quadratic function fell into local optimality. The suboptimality of the parameters occurs owing to the nonconvexity of the loss function with respect to the parameters. Nevertheless, the quadratic form gives a better objective value. For this reason, it is suspected that there are a flat objective value and approximation error.

Table 11. Comparison of KKT deviation, first stage solution error, and objective value between various parametric forms for hydrothermal generation problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Parametric form	KKT deviation	First stage solution error	Objective value
$*\theta_t^1 r_{t-1}^{final} + e^{-\theta_t^2 r_{t-1}^{final} + b_t}$	3.56 (1.27)	0.8 (0.8)	400 (0.8)
$\theta_t^1 r_{t-1}^{final}$	3.65 (1.27)	1.1 (0.7)	400.8 (0.1)
$\theta_t^1 r_{t-1}^{final} + \theta_t^2 (r_{t-1}^{final})^2$	3.50 (1.68)	1.3 (0.7)	399.0 (0.1)
$\theta_t^1 r_{t-1}^{final} - \log(\theta_t^2 r_{t-1}^{final})$	5.98 (1.06)	4.2 (1.7)	400.1 (0.4)
0	14.02 (2.07)	14.2 (0.0)	451.1 (0.0)

The original problem parameters are perturbed to determine whether the parametric value function is still applicable. In particular, the costs of hydro and thermal generation vary. For most of the perturbations in Table 12, VFGL gives a slightly suboptimal objective value with a noticeable difference in the first stage solution compared with the results of MSP. The suboptimality of VFGL seems to be greater for the thermal generation cost perturbation than for the hydro generation cost perturbation. Depending on the tolerance level, the suboptimality of VFGL with a given parametric form might be acceptable or unacceptable. To make the VFGL solution more accurate for the perturbed problems, more suitable parametric families of the value function should be explored.

Table 12. Comparison of perturbed problems with a fixed parametric value function form for hydrothermal generation problem (indicates the baseline case for the comparison)*

Parameter		VFGL				MSP		
c_t^w	c_t^h	KKT deviation	Objective value	Hydro plant generation	Thermal plant generation	Objective value	Hydro plant generation	Thermal plant generation
2	5	2.24	365.00	5.06	14.94	370.74	5.39	14.61
2	5.5	2.68	374.01	6.26	13.74	378.38	7.53	12.47
2	6	2.45	382.01	7.68	12.32	378.99	8.36	11.64
2	6.5	3.24	389.62	8.91	11.09	392.04	9.8	10.2
*2	*7	3.66	396.64	9.90	10.10	400.39	10.45	9.55
2	7.5	3.6	402.68	10.91	9.09	404.15	10.88	9.12
2	8	4.52	408.99	11.61	8.39	417.47	13.18	6.82
3	7	2.66	521.85	7.67	12.33	523.37	8.68	11.32
3.5	7	2.44	583.90	6.49	13.51	585.67	6.89	13.11
4	7	1.87	645.08	4.88	15.12	644.56	5.11	14.89
4.5	7	1.89	705.74	2.78	17.22	711.22	3.91	16.09

5	7	1.35	764.90	0.81	19.19	765.76	1.54	18.46
---	---	------	--------	------	-------	--------	------	-------

4.4 Discussion

Throughout the experiment, the VFGL algorithm successfully solved the problems with an accuracy comparable to that of the SDDP, given the right parametric form for the value function approximation. A key characteristic of the VFGL is an almost constant computation time per iteration, which is shown to be a clear computational advantage compared to SDDP.

As a critical drawback of the algorithm, the parametric form of the value function must be determined prior to the problem solving. However, this is not a specific problem with our algorithm. Ghadimi, Perkins, and Powell (2020) noted that the choice of appropriate parameterization is often considered an art of modeling for engineering problems, particularly within the machine learning domain. Indeed, it was shown to be a vital part of the proposed VFGL algorithm, as such choices had a significant impact on the solution quality. Therefore, we introduced a measure for evaluating the fitness of a given parametric form called the KKT deviation, which was proven to be useful for evaluating different parameterizations. One rule of thumb for the choice of parametric form would be to start from the same functional form of the objective function or the indefinite integral form of the objective function.

5. Conclusion

A novel learning-based stagewise decomposition algorithm, VFGL, was proposed to solve large-scale multistage stochastic programs approximately. The algorithm approximates the value functions by a convex parametric form of functions, which is distinguished from the Benders decomposition based algorithms that use piecewise linear approximation. Three illustrative examples demonstrated the computational advantages of VFGL compared with the deterministic equivalent formulation approach and widely used stagewise decomposition algorithm called SDDP. The choice of appropriate parametric form would require some effort; thus, the KKT deviation was proposed to measure the suitability of different parametric forms. Finally, numerical experiments indicated that VFGL can recycle the same parametric form for the same optimization problem with slightly different parameters, which can be useful for real-world applications (Bertsimas & Stellato, 2020).

Future studies on VFGL should focus on finding an appropriate parametric form of the value function. One possible approach would be to construct a general parametric function approximation with a large modeling capacity, similar to artificial neural networks. Another possible method is directly parametrizing the gradient of the value function, which may greatly increase the modeling capacity.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT (NRF-2020R1A2C101067711 and NRF-2019R1C1C1010456).

References

- Agrawal, A., Barratt, S., Boyd, S., & Stellato, B. (2020). *Learning Convex Optimization Control Policies*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. <http://proceedings.mlr.press>
- Barratt, S. (2019). On the Differentiability of the Solution to Convex Optimization Problems. *arXiv*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.05098>
- Berga, B. P., Denton, B. T., Erdoganc, S. A., Rohleder, T., & Huschkad, T. (2014). Optimal booking and scheduling in outpatient procedure centers. *Computers & Operations Research*, *50*, 24-37. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2014.04.007>
- Bertsimas, D., & Stellato, B. (2020). The voice of optimization. *Machine Learning*, *110*(2), 249-277. doi:10.1007/s10994-020-05893-5
- Cariño, D. R., Kent, T., Myers, D. H., Stacy, C., Sylvanus, M., Turner, A. L., . . . Ziemba, W. T. (1994). The Russell-Yasuda Kasai Model: An Asset/Liability Model for a Japanese Insurance Company Using Multistage Stochastic Programming. *INFORMS Journal on Applied Analytics*, *24*(1), 29-49. doi:10.1287/inte.24.1.29
- Carøe, C. C., & Schultz, R. (1999). Dual decomposition in stochastic integer programming. *Operations Research Letters*, *24*(1-2), 37-45. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377\(98\)00050-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377(98)00050-9)
- Case, K. E., Quigley, J. M., & Shiller, R. J. (2005). Comparing wealth effects: The stock market versus the housing market. *Advances in Macroeconomics*, *5*(1)
- Chen, Z. L., & Powell, W. B. (1999). Convergent Cutting-Plane and Partial-Sampling Algorithm for Multistage Stochastic Linear Programs with Recourse. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, *102*(3), 497-524. doi:10.1023/A:1022641805263
- Diamond, S., & Boyd, S. (2016). CVXPY: A Python-Embedded Modeling Language for Convex Optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *17*, 1-5. Retrieved from <http://jmlr.org/papers/v17/15-408.html>
- Fadda, E., Perboli, G., & Tadei, R. (2019). A progressive hedging method for the optimization of social engagement and opportunistic IoT problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *277*(2), 643-652. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.02.052>
- Fleten, S.-E., & Kristoffersen, T. K. (2008). Short-term hydropower production planning by stochastic programming. *Computers & Operations Research*, *35*(8), 2656-2671. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2006.12.022>
- Geist, M., & Pietquin, O. (2013). Algorithmic Survey of Parametric Value Function Approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, *24*(6), 845-867. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2013.2247418
- Girardeau, P., Leclere, V., & Philpott, A. B. (2015). On the convergence of decomposition methods for multistage stochastic convex programs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, *40*(1), 130-145.
- Guan, Z., & Philpott, A. B. (2011). A multistage stochastic programming model for the New Zealand dairy industry. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *134*(2), 289-299
- Gülpınar, N., Rustem, B., & Settergren, R. (2004). Simulation and optimization approaches to scenario tree generation. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, *28*(7), 1291-1315. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1889\(03\)00113-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1889(03)00113-1)
- Guigues, V. (2016). Convergence analysis of sampling-based decomposition methods for risk-averse multistage stochastic convex programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, *26*(4), 2468-2494.
- Guigues, V., & Römis, W. (2012). Sampling-based decomposition methods for multistage stochastic

- programs based on extended polyhedral risk measures. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2), 286-312.
- Haghighat, A., & Wagner, J. C. (2003). Monte Carlo variance reduction with deterministic importance functions. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, 42(1), 25-53. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-1970\(02\)00002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-1970(02)00002-1)
- Hammersley, J. M., & Morton, K. W. (1956). A new Monte Carlo technique: antithetic variates. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 52(3), 449-475. doi:10.1017/S0305004100031455
- Heitsch, H., & Römisch, W. (2009). Scenario tree modeling for multistage stochastic programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 118(2), 371-406. doi:10.1007/s10107-007-0197-2
- Høyland, K., Kaut, M., & Wallace, S. W. (2003). A Heuristic for Moment-Matching Scenario Generation. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 24(2), 169-185. doi:10.1023/A:1021853807313
- Ivanov, D., & Sokolov, B. (2013). Control and system-theoretic identification of the supply chain dynamics domain for planning, analysis and adaptation of performance under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 224(2), 313-323
- Izmailov, A. F., Kurennoy, A. S., & Solodov, M. V. (2013). A note on upper Lipschitz stability, error bounds, and critical multipliers for Lipschitz-continuous KKT systems. *Mathematical Programming*, 142(1), 591-604. doi:10.1007/s10107-012-0586-z
- Izmailov, A. F., & Solodov, M. V. (2003). Karush-Kuhn-Tucker systems: regularity conditions, error bounds and a class of Newton-type methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(3), 631-650. doi:10.1007/s10107-002-0346-6
- Ji, X., Zhu, S., Wang, S., & Zhang, S. (2005). A stochastic linear goal programming approach to multistage portfolio management based on scenario generation via linear programming. *IIE Transactions*, 37(10), 957-969. doi:10.1080/07408170591008082
- Kaelbling, L. P., Littman, M. L., & Moore, A. W. (1996). Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4, 237-285.
- Karimi, B., Fatemi Ghomi, S. M. T., & Wilson, J. M. (2003). The capacitated lot sizing problem: a review of models and algorithms. *Omega*, 31(5), 365-378. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483\(03\)00059-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483(03)00059-8)
- Krueger, D., & Perri, F. (2006). Does income inequality lead to consumption inequality? Evidence and theory. *Review of Economic Studies*, 73(1), 163-193
- Kuhn, H., & Tucker, A. (1950). *Nonlinear programming*. Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability: University of California Press.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Hunt, J. J., Pritzel, A., Heess, N., Erez, T., Tassa, Y., . . . Wierstra, D. (2016). Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *International conference on learning representations*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02971>
- Lucas, D. J. (1994). Asset pricing with undiversifiable income risk and short sales constraints. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34(3), 325-341
- Mankiw, N. G., & Zeldes, S. P. (1991). The consumption of stockholders and nonstockholders. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 29(1), 97-112
- Merton, R. C. (1969). Lifetime Portfolio Selection under Uncertainty: The Continuous-Time Case. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 51(3), 247-257. doi:10.2307/1926560
- Mnih, V., Badia, A. P., Mirza, M., Graves, A., Lillicrap, T., Harley, T., . . . Kavukcuoglu, K. (2016). *Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning*. Paper presented at the International conference on machine learning.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Graves, A., Antonoglou, I., Wierstra, D., & Riedmiller, M. (2013). Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5602>
- Mulvey, John M., Gordon Gould, and Clive Morgan (2000). "An asset and liability management system for Towers Perrin-Tillinghast." *Interfaces*, 30(1) 96-114
- Pereira, M. V. F., & Pinto, L. M. V. G. (1991). Multi-stage stochastic optimization applied to energy planning. *Mathematical Programming*, 52(1), 359-375. doi:10.1007/BF01582895
- Pflug, G. C. (2001). Scenario tree generation for multiperiod financial optimization by optimal

- discretization. *Mathematical Programming*, 89(2), 251-271. doi:10.1007/PL00011398
- Philpott, A. B., & Guan, Z. (2008). On the convergence of stochastic dual dynamic programming and related methods. *Operations Research Letters*, 36(4), 450-455. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2008.01.013>
- Ponomareva, K., Roman, D., & Date, P. (2015). An algorithm for moment-matching scenario generation with application to financial portfolio optimisation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 240(3), 678-687. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.07.049>
- Powell, W. B. (2019). A unified framework for stochastic optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 275(3), 795-821. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.07.014>
- Protopappa-Sieke, M., & Seifert, R. W. (2010). Interrelating operational and financial performance measurements in inventory control. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 204(3), 439-448
- Radhakrishnan, R., Yadav, A., Date, P., & Bhaumik, S. (2018). A New Method for Generating Sigma Points and Weights for Nonlinear Filtering. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3), 519-524. doi:10.1109/LCSYS.2018.2843184
- Robbins, H., & Monro, S. (1951). A Stochastic Approximation Method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22, 400-407.
- Rockafellar, R. T., & Wets, R. J.-B. (1991). Scenarios and Policy Aggregation in Optimization Under Uncertainty. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.16.1.119>
- Rubinstein, R. Y., & Marcus, R. (1985). Efficiency of Multivariate Control Variates in Monte Carlo Simulation. *Operations Research*, 33(3), 661-677. doi:10.1287/opre.33.3.661
- Shapiro, A. (2011). Analysis of stochastic dual dynamic programming method. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 209(1), 63-72. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2010.08.007>
- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., & Ruszczyński, A. (2009). *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory* MOS-SIAM. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718751>
- Shapiro, J. F. (1993). Chapter 8 Mathematical programming models and methods for production planning and scheduling. In *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science* (Vol. 4, pp. 371-443): Elsevier.
- Shiina, T., & Birge, J. R. (2003). Multistage stochastic programming model for electric power capacity expansion problem. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 20(3), 379. doi:10.1007/BF03167428
- Siegmund, D. (1976). Importance Sampling in the Monte Carlo Study of Sequential Tests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 4(4), 673-684. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2958179>
- Staino, A., & Russo, E. (2015). A moment-matching method to generate arbitrage-free scenarios. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 246(2), 619-630. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.04.045>
- Triki, C., Beraldi, P., & Gross, G. (2005). Optimal capacity allocation in multi-auction electricity markets under uncertainty. *Computers & Operations Research*, 32(2), 201-217. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0548\(03\)00211-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0548(03)00211-9)
- Wagner, H. M., & Whitin, T. M. (1958). Dynamic Version of the Economic Lot Size Model. *Management Science*, 5(1), 89-96. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626974>
- Wallace, S. W., & Fleten, S. E. (2003). Stochastic programming models in energy. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 10, 637-677
- Watson, J.-P., & Woodruff, D. L. (2011). Progressive hedging innovations for a class of stochastic mixed-integer resource allocation problems. *Computational Management Science*, 8(4), 355-370. doi:10.1007/s10287-010-0125-4