

Time-Varying Optimization with Optimal Parametric Function

Mohsen Amidzadeh, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we consider a class of nonlinear constrained optimization problems. We formulate this problem as a time-varying optimization using continuous-time parametric functions and derive a dynamical system for tracking the optimal solution. We then re-parameterize the dynamical system to express it as a linear combination of the parametric functions. Calculus of variations is applied to optimize the parametric functions, such that the optimality distance of the solution is minimized. Accordingly, an iterative dynamic algorithm is devised to find the solution with an efficient convergence rate. We benchmark the performance of the proposed algorithm with the prediction-correction method from the optimality and computational complexity point-of-views.

Index Terms—Time-varying optimization problem, functional optimization problem, prediction-correction method, optimality distance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Time-Varying Optimization (TVO) problems represent the parametric optimization when the objective, the constraints, or both are parameterized based on continuously-varying functions. It is exploited to find the optimal solution trajectory of the continuous-time optimization problems. In addition, for the optimization problem with the optimal solution being known for one setting, TVO can be used to extrapolate the solution into target settings.

TVO is studied in the context of parametric programming [1]–[5], where the optimization problem is parametrized using continuous parameters. In [3], the authors develop prediction-correction methods to solve nonlinear constrained TVO problems. Their approach tracks a trajectory path with some convergence guarantees. A path-following procedure has been presented in [4] to trace a solution path of a parametric nonlinear problem. The authors utilize quadratic programming as a tracking procedure and derive some convergence properties for their approach. In [5], the authors leverage a path-following method to track the solution of parametric nonlinear constrained programs using a semi-smooth barrier function.

TVO can be also considered as an extension of time-invariant optimization problems [6]–[10]. In [6], a discrete-time prediction-correction approach has been proposed to

minimize unconstrained time-varying functions. They analyze the asymptotic tracking error to ensure convergence of the solution. In [7], the authors present prediction-correction methods to track the optimal solution trajectory, in the primal space, with a bounded asymptotical error. Then, in [8], an interior-point method is developed for optimization problems with time-varying cost and constraint functions. The authors formulate a continuous-time dynamical system to track the optimal solution with asymptotical tracking error being bounded. In [9], prediction-correction methods have been devised, in the dual space, to track the solutions of time-varying linearly constrained problems.

When it comes to the approach for solving TVO problems, the prediction-correction scheme [6], [7], [9], [11]–[14], as a promising tracking algorithm, should be addressed. It constitutes a dynamic-tracking procedure or predictor step to trace the solution trajectory over time, and a Newton-based iterative method or corrector step to adjust the error of predictions. Substantial efforts have been made to analyze the convergence of prediction-correction approaches and ensure the boundedness of tracking error [7], [8], [11].

In this paper, we study a class of nonlinear constrained optimization problems whose optimal solution is known for a setting, and the optimal solution is aimed at a target one. We then exploit the notion of TVO to reformulate the problem based on parametric programming. We then explore a set of parametric functions such that the optimality distance is optimized. In contrast to the works based on the prediction-correction methods, we focus on a functional optimization problem to expedite the convergence rate. In the other words, this paper differs from those prediction-correction approaches, in the sense that the parametric functions are designed to minimize the optimality distance of the solution instead of correcting the predictions.

The main contributions of this paper are listed as:

- We re-express a class of nonlinear constrained optimization problems as a time-varying optimization problem with continuous-time parametric functions. We then use a re-parametrization trick to represent the corresponding dynamical system based on a linear combination of the parametric functions.

M. Amidzadeh is with the Department of Communication and Networking, Aalto University, Finland (mohsen.amidzade@aalto.fi)

- We then globally optimize the parametric functions using a functional optimization problem, and devise an iterative algorithm with the optimality distance of the solutions being minimized.
- We compare the proposed algorithm with the prediction-correction methods from the optimality and computational complexity perspectives.

Notations: In this paper, we use lower-case a for scalars, bold-face lower-case \mathbf{a} for vectors and bold-face uppercase \mathbf{A} for matrices. Further, \mathbf{A}^\top is the transpose of \mathbf{A} , $\|\mathbf{a}\|$ is the euclidean norm of \mathbf{a} , $\nabla_{\mathbf{a}}g(\cdot)$ and $\nabla_{\mathbf{a}}^2g(\cdot)$ are the gradient vector and Hessian matrix of multivariate function $g(\mathbf{a})$ with respect to (w.r.t.) vector \mathbf{a} , respectively. We show the components of a n -dimensional column vector \mathbf{a} using the notation $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_n]^\top$. Further, $\{a_n\}_1^N$ collects the components of vector \mathbf{a} from $n = 1$ to $n = N$. We use \mathbf{I} , $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ to denote the identity matrix, all-ones and all-zeros vectors, respectively. We use $\dot{\mathbf{a}}(\theta)$ to represent the derivative of $\mathbf{a}(\theta)$ w.r.t. θ .

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

This paper considers a class of nonlinear constrained optimization problems. The problem includes an objective function $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, vector-valued constraint functions $\mathbf{h}_m(\cdot) = [h_{m,1}, \dots, h_{m,N}]^\top(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and the optimization variables $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. As such, the problem under study is:

$$P_0 : \quad \min_{\{\mathbf{x}_m\}_1^M} \sum_{m=1}^M a_m f(\mathbf{x}_m) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{h}_m(\mathbf{x}_m) = \mathbf{u}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We assume that the optimal solution of Problem P_0 is known for the given non-zero parameters $a_m = p_{0,m}$ with $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. However, the optimal solution is unknown and desired for the target parameters $a_m = p_{\tau,m}$. Note that this type of optimization problem emerges in the distributed optimization programmings as well as in the problems whose objective is a weighted summation of different functions.

The aim is thus to express P_0 based on a TVO problem with parametric functions, and devise a path-following method with convergence rate being optimized. To optimize it, we follow a functional optimization to design the parametric functions. As such, we parameterize $\{a_m\}_1^M$ with the parametric functions $\{b_m(\theta)\}_1^M$ and parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, so that

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} b_m(\theta) = p_{0,m}, \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \tau} b_m(\theta) = p_{\tau,m}, \quad (2)$$

for $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Note that such parametric function as presented in (2) is not unique. We then consider the following TVO problem

$$P_1(\theta) : \quad \mathbf{x}^*(\theta) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\{\mathbf{x}_m(\theta)\}_1^M} \sum_{m=1}^M b_m(\theta) f(\mathbf{x}_m(\theta)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{h}_m(\mathbf{x}_m(\theta)) = \mathbf{u}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x}(\theta) = [\mathbf{x}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M^\top]^\top(\theta)$. As declared, we assume that the solution of $P_1(\theta)$ for $\theta = 0$ is given, and the solution at target $\theta = \tau > 0$ is aimed.

A naive approach to find the solution of $P_1(\theta)$ is to use a Newton-based iterative algorithm. However, this approach suffers from the low convergence rate and its solution optimality depends on a step-length parameter.

Instead, we develop a time-varying approach to exploit the information of optimal solution of $P_1(0)$. We thus formulate a continuous-time dynamical system

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_m(\theta) = \phi_m(\mathbf{x}(\theta), \theta) : \mathbb{R}^{NM} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (4)$$

with optimal trajectory solution denoted by $\mathbf{x}^*(\cdot)$. We then devise an iterative approach to predict $\mathbf{x}^*(\cdot)$ by $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ so that the optimality distance $\|\mathbf{x}(\theta) - \mathbf{x}^*(\theta)\|$ is minimized for $\theta \rightarrow \tau$. Note that (4) shows a set of ODEs which should be solved with initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0)$ to give the target point $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$. As such, we intend to jointly solve TVO $P_1(\theta)$ and design $\{b_m(\theta)\}_1^M$ such that the optimality distance is optimized.

Let the following assumptions hold for TVO $P_1(\theta)$.

Assumption 1: The objective function $f(\cdot)$ and constraints $\mathbf{h}_m(\cdot)$ are twice continuously differentiable with respect to (w.r.t.) \mathbf{x}_m .

Assumption 2: The matrices $\{\mathbf{Jh}_m\}_1^M$ are invertible for $\theta \in [0, \tau]$, where $\mathbf{Jh}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the transpose of Jacobian matrix of $\mathbf{h}_m(\cdot)$ w.r.t. $\mathbf{x}_m(\theta)$.

III. ODES ASSOCIATED WITH TVO $P_1(\theta)$

For the dynamical system (4), we have:

Proposition 1. *The solution of problem $P_1(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, \tau]$ can be found by solving (4) with:*

$$\phi_m(\mathbf{x}(\theta), \theta) = \\ - \left(b_m(\theta) \nabla_m^2 f + \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n \nabla_m^2 h_{m,n} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Jh}_m \left(\dot{\lambda} - \frac{\dot{b}_m(\theta)}{b_m(\theta)} \lambda \right), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\lambda = -b_m(\theta) \mathbf{Jh}_m^{-1} \nabla_m f, \quad (6)$$

and $\dot{\lambda}$ is obtained using

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_m^\top \dot{\mathbf{x}}_m(\theta) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. see Appendix A. \square

According to (5), the dynamical system $\{\phi_m(\cdot, \cdot)\}_{m=1}^M$ has been formulated based on a nonlinear combination of two parametric functions, $b_m(\theta)$ and $\dot{b}_m(\theta)$. In the sequel, we use a decomposition trick to express the dynamical system as a linear combination of one parametric function.

A. Reparameterizing using Decomposition

We introduce the parametric functions

$$c_m(\theta) := \frac{\dot{b}_m(\theta)}{b_m(\theta)} \quad m \in \{1, \dots, M\}, \quad (7)$$

which should satisfy $\int_0^\tau c_m(\theta) d\theta = \log\left(\frac{p_{e,m}}{p_{0,m}}\right) := \psi_m$ based on (2). We then have:

Proposition 2. *The dynamical system (5) can be reparameterized based on the following linear combination of $\{c_m(\theta)\}_{m=1}^M$:*

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) = \phi(\mathbf{x}(\theta), \theta) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta), \quad (8)$$

where $\phi(\cdot, \cdot) = [\phi_1^\top, \dots, \phi_M^\top]^\top(\cdot, \cdot)$,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{11} & \dots & \gamma_{1M} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \gamma_{N1} & \dots & \gamma_{NM} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{NM \times M},$$

$$\gamma_{nm} = -G_n^{-1} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^M D_k \right)^{-1} D_m - \delta_{nm} \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{1},$$

$$G_n = \text{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_n^{-1} \left(\nabla_n^2 f + \sum_{j=1}^N \nabla_n^2 h_{n,j} \right),$$

$$D_m = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_m^\top G_m^{-1},$$

for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ with

$$\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_m^{-1} \nabla_m f. \quad (9)$$

Proof. We introduce N -by- N matrices $\{G_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and exploit the following decomposition:

$$b_m(\theta) \nabla_m^2 f + \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n \nabla_m^2 h_{m,n} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_m \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) G_m.$$

Then, we get:

$$G_m = \text{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{J}\mathbf{h}_m^{-1} \left(\nabla_m^2 f + \sum_{n=1}^N \nabla_m^2 h_{m,n} \right), \quad (10)$$

for which we used $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = b_m(\theta) \mathbf{v}$ based on (6) and (9). Equation (10) shows that G_m is notably independent of parametric function $b_n(\theta)$. According to (5), we obtain:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_n(\theta) = -G_n^{-1} \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^M D_k \right)^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M D_m c_m(\theta) - c_n(\theta) \mathbf{I} \right) \mathbf{1}, \quad (11)$$

and based on the definition of γ_{nm} , it reads:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_n(\theta) = \sum_{m=1}^M \gamma_{nm} c_m(\theta), \quad n \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

which proves the statement. \square

Note that the dynamical system (8) depends only on $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ and not on $\mathbf{b}(\cdot)$. Further, considering that $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\cdot)$ does not depend on $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$, a linear parametric expression w.r.t. $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ has been obtained for the dynamical system. It enables us to design $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ such that the optimality distance is optimized. Having $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ being designed, we then get: $b_m(\theta) = p_{0,m} \exp\left(\int_0^\theta c_m(\xi) d\xi\right)$ based on (2) and (7).

IV. OPTIMALITY DISTANCE

Equation (8) shows a set of ODEs that is difficult to precisely solve due to highly non-linearity w.r.t. θ . However, one approach is to use the Euler method [15] to approximate $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ based on a sequential manner:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}(\theta - \Delta\theta) + \Delta\theta \hat{\dot{\mathbf{x}}}(\theta - \Delta\theta), \quad \theta \in (0, \tau], \quad (12)$$

where $\Delta\theta$ is the incremental step and $\hat{\dot{\mathbf{x}}}(\theta) = \phi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\theta), \theta)$. For this method, the optimality distance O_d is upper-bounded by:

$$O_d = \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) - \mathbf{x}(\tau)\| \leq \frac{\Delta\theta^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^L \|\hat{\ddot{\mathbf{x}}}(\tau - j\Delta\theta)\| + \mathcal{O}(L\Delta\theta^3),$$

where $\tau = L\Delta\theta$. This shows that optimality distance is limited by order of $\Delta\theta^2$. However, based on (12) another upper-bound can be found as follows:

$$O_d = \left\| \int_0^\tau (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}) d\theta \right\| \leq \int_0^\tau \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}\| d\theta, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{\dot{\mathbf{x}}}(\tau - j\Delta\theta).$$

By minimizing the upper-bound presented in (13), we can minimize the optimality distance.

V. OPTIMALITY DISTANCE MINIMIZATION

We consider the following functional optimization problem (FOP) to jointly design the parametric functions $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ and find the optimum solution $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$:

$$J_1 : \quad \min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot), \mathbf{c}(\cdot)} \int_0^\tau \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}\|^2 d\theta$$

$$s.t. \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta),$$

$$s.t. \quad \int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta = \boldsymbol{\psi}. \quad (14)$$

By solving FOP J_1 , we can achieve the optimal solution $\mathbf{x}(\theta)$ which minimizes the optimality distance O_d , based on (13). To solve (14), we constitute the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} as:

$\mathcal{H} = \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}\|^2 + \mathbf{w}(\theta)^\top (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta)) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \left(\mathbf{c}(\theta) - \frac{1}{\tau} \boldsymbol{\psi} \right)$, where $\mathbf{w}(\theta)$ is the co-state variables and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the Lagrange multiplier. Using calculus of variations, the functional solution of (14) is obtained by:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_{\mathbf{c}(\theta)} \mathcal{H} = 2\mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta)^\top \left(\mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}(\theta) \right) + \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 0, \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}(\theta)} \mathcal{H} - \frac{d}{d\theta} \nabla_{\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta)} \mathcal{H} \\ \quad = \mathbf{w}(\theta)^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}(\theta)} \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta) + 2\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) + \dot{\mathbf{w}}(\theta) = 0, \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta) = 0, \quad \int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta - \boldsymbol{\psi} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The conditions (15) are intricate to solve. Further, an estimation of $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is needed in advance. This motivates us to devise an iterative algorithm to find the solution of J_1 . As such, we perform the following approach: In the beginning, we initialize $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ such that $\int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta = \boldsymbol{\psi}$. Then, we repeatedly follow two consecutive steps till the algorithm converges. These are the *Prediction* and *Parametral-tuning* steps. In the prediction step of this iterative approach, we sequentially solve (12) using (8), and based on recently updated $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ in order to predict $\mathbf{x}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in (0, \tau]$. In the parametral-tuning step, we minimize the functional objective $\int_0^\tau \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}\|^2 d\theta$ w.r.t. $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ with $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ being obtained based on the solution of prediction step. Consequently, we consider the following FOP, in the second step, to optimize the parametric functions:

$$J_2 : \quad \min_{\mathbf{c}(\cdot)} \int_0^\tau \left\| \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}} \right\|^2 d\theta + \mu \int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta)^\top \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta$$

$$s.t. \quad \int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta = \boldsymbol{\psi}, \quad (16)$$

where the term $\int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta)^\top \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta$ is added to regulate the smoothness of $\mathbf{c}(\theta)$ w.r.t. θ , and $0 < \mu \ll 1$ is the regulation coefficient. Thanks to the linear formulation of dynamical system (8) w.r.t. $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$, J_2 is a convex FOP. This implies that the solution of J_2 is globally optimal.

Proposition 3. *The optimal solution of J_2 is obtained by:*

$$\mathbf{c}(\theta) = \mathbf{\Pi}^{-1}(\theta) \left(\mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta)^\top \hat{\mathbf{m}} - \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right), \quad (17)$$

Algorithm 1 Optimal Parametric TVO Algorithm

- 1: **Input:** Optimal solution $\mathbf{x}(0)$.
 - 2: **Outputs:** Optimal solution $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$ and parametric functions $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$.
 - 3: **Initialization:**
Initialize $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ so that $\int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta = \boldsymbol{\psi}$.
Set flag = 1 and iter = 0.
 - 4: **while** flag **do**
 - 5: iter = iter+1.
 - 6: **Prediction step:**
Predict $\mathbf{x}(\theta)$ for $\theta \in (0, \tau]$ using (12) and (8) and based on updated $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$.
 - 7: **Parametral-tuning step:**
Update $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$ using (17) and based on predicted $\mathbf{x}(\theta)$ with $\theta \in (0, \tau]$.
 - 8: **if** Convergence **then**
 - 9: flag = 0.
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: **end while**
-

where

$$\mathbf{\Pi}(\theta) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta)^\top \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) + \mu \mathbf{I},$$

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \left(\int_0^\tau \mathbf{\Pi}^{-1}(\theta) d\theta \right)^{-1} \left(\int_0^\tau \mathbf{\Pi}^{-1}(\theta) \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta)^\top d\theta \hat{\mathbf{m}} - \boldsymbol{\psi} \right).$$

Proof. Applying the Euler-Lagrange equation over J_2 leads to the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta)^\top (\mathbf{\Gamma}(\theta) \mathbf{c}(\theta) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}) + \mu \mathbf{c}(\theta) + \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 0, \\ \int_0^\tau \mathbf{c}(\theta) d\theta - \boldsymbol{\psi} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

By solving (18), the statement follows. \square

Algorithm 1 shows the pseudo-code of the proposed iterative approach. For each iteration (iter), the prediction and parametral-tuning steps are performed to jointly predict the optimal solution $\mathbf{x}^*(\tau)$ and design the parametric functions $\mathbf{c}(\cdot)$. However, we need a metric for the convergence to stop the algorithm. For this, we track the value of $\hat{O}_d := \sum_{j=1}^L \left\| \phi \left(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau - j\Delta\theta), \tau - j\Delta\theta \right) - \hat{\mathbf{m}} \right\|^2$ as an estimation of the upper-bound of optimality distance. We thus consider that the algorithm has converged if the value of \hat{O}_d lies below a threshold O_{th} .

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To evaluate the proposed algorithm, we compare it with the Prediction-Correction Method (PCM) [6] and with a *Benchmark* solution being obtained with an extremely small incremental step $\Delta\theta = 10^{-6}$, regardless of its computational

complexity. Note that, we consider this *Benchmark* as the optimal solution, by which we can compute the optimality distance O_d . These algorithms have been performed using Matlab R2022a on a 8×1.70 GHz Intel Core i5-10310U Processor, equipped with 16 GB of memory and 12 Mbytes of data cache.

We then consider the constrained optimization problem E_1 [16], [17], and change the constraints to add non-linearity to the problem.

$$E_1 : \quad \min_{\{\mathbf{x}_m\}_1^M} \sum_{m=1}^M a_m \operatorname{erfc} \left(\gamma_0 \frac{x_{m,1}}{\sqrt{2 \frac{0.1}{x_{m,2}} - 1}} \right)$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{m=1}^M \log(1 + x_{m,1}) = L,$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{m=1}^M x_{m,2}^2 = 1,$$

where the optimization variables are $\mathbf{x}_m = [x_{m,1}, x_{m,2}]^\top$ for $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, $M = 100$, $a_m = m^{-\tau} / \sum_{m=1}^M m^{-\tau}$, $\tau = 3$ and $\gamma_0 = 40$. For E_1 , it can be verified that the optimal solution when $a_m = \frac{1}{M}$ is obtained as:

$$x_{m,1} = \exp(L/M - 1), \quad x_{m,2} = \sqrt{1/M}, \quad m \in \{1, \dots, M\}.$$

Therefore, we constitute a TVO problem exactly as E_1 but with parametric functions $\{b_m(\theta)\}_1^M$ replacing $\{a_m\}_1^M$ such that:

$$b_m(0) = \frac{1}{M}, \quad b_m(\tau) = a_m, \quad m \in \{1, \dots, M\}.$$

We further use the re-parametrizing functions $c(\cdot)$ with $c_m(\theta) := \frac{\dot{b}_m(\theta)}{b_m(\theta)}$. We then apply Algorithm 1 with hyper-parameters $\mu = 10^{-7}$, $O_{th} = 10^{-5}$ and $\Delta\theta = 10^{-2}$ to find the optimal solution.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the trajectory solutions $\{\mathbf{x}_m(\theta)\}_1^M$, being obtained by Algorithm 1, as a function of θ for different iterations. For the first iteration, the trajectory solutions portray a highly nonlinear behavior. However, as the number of iteration increases, this non-linearity reduces. When the algorithm converges (3rd iteration), the linear curvature of the trajectory solutions indicates that a precise solution with minimal optimality distance has been obtained.

We apply the PCM for Problem E_1 to obtain the solution. To have a fair comparison, we adjust the hyper-parameter $\Delta\theta$ for PCM such that the corresponding optimal value is almost equal to the Algorithm 1. As such, we need to decrease it by 1×10^{-4} .

Table I compares the performance results of PCM, Benchmark and Algorithm 1 (Alg1). The second column shows the optimal values that these approaches achieve, the third column indicates the elapsed time, in seconds, that lasts for




Fig. 1: Trajectory Solutions for $x_{m,1}$ with $m \in \{1, 8, 15\}$.




Fig. 2: Trajectory Solutions for $x_{m,2}$ with $m \in \{20, 30, 100\}$.

them to be performed, and the fourth and fifth columns show the optimality distance O_d and \hat{O}_d , respectively. According to the values of \hat{O}_d , Alg1 converges after three iterations. It can be seen that Alg1 outperforms PCM from the computational complexity perspective since it converges within 105 seconds while the latter converges after 271 seconds. Furthermore, the optimality distance of Alg1 in the third iteration is superior to the distance of PCM, implying that Alg1 gives a more accurate solution than PCM. These results depict that Alg1 can find the optimal solution with lower complexity and better precision.

TABLE I: Performance Result of Algorithm 1 and PCM.

Approach	Optimal Value	Elapsed Time [s]	O_d	\hat{O}_d
Benchmark	5.6089×10^{-7}	2066	N/A	N/A
PCM	5.6086×10^{-7}	271	0.00135	N/A
Alg1, iter=1	3.2443×10^{-5}	3	0.8291	N/A
iter=2	5.6088×10^{-7}	52	5.132×10^{-4}	0.228
iter=3	5.6088×10^{-7}	105	5.130×10^{-4}	2.68×10^{-6}
iter=4	5.6088×10^{-7}	160	5.130×10^{-4}	2.14×10^{-6}

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we reformulated a class of nonlinear constrained optimization problems based on a time-varying optimization with some parametric functions. We then leveraged a re-parametrization trick to find a dynamical system being linearly expressed with respect to the parametric functions. To minimize the optimality distance of the solution, being traced by a dynamical system, we utilized a functional minimization problem. As such, an iterative algorithm was devised to find the solution trajectory with optimal optimality distance. Based on the results, the proposed algorithm outperforms the prediction-correction method from the optimality distance and convergence rate perspectives.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Guddat, F. G. Vazquez, and H. T. Jongen, *Parametric Optimization: Singularities, Pathfollowing and Jumps*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 1990.
- [2] Q. T. Dinh, C. Savorgnan, and M. Diehl, "Adjoint-based predictor-corrector sequential convex programming for parametric nonlinear optimization," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 22, no. 4, p. 1258–1284, 2012.
- [3] V. Kungurtsev and M. Diehl, "Sequential quadratic programming methods for parametric nonlinear optimization," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 475–509, Feb. 2014.
- [4] V. Kungurtsev and J. Jäschke, "A predictor-corrector path-following algorithm for dual-degenerate parametric optimization problems," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 27, no. 1, p. 538–564, 2017.
- [5] D. Liao-McPherson, M. M. Nicotra, and I. V. Kolmanovskiy, "A semismooth predictor corrector method for real-time constrained parametric optimization with applications in model predictive control," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 3600–3607.
- [6] S. Andrea, M. Aryan, K. Alec, L. Geert, and A. Ribeiro, "A class of prediction-correction methods for time-varying convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 17, pp. 4576–4591, 2016.
- [7] A. Simonetto and E. Dall'Anese, "Prediction-correction algorithms for time-varying constrained optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 20, pp. 5481–5494, 2017.
- [8] M. Fazlyab, S. Paternain, V. M. Preciado, and A. Ribeiro, "Prediction-correction interior-point method for time-varying convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 1973–1986, 2018.
- [9] A. Simonetto, "Dual prediction-correction methods for linearly constrained time-varying convex programs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 3355–3361, 2019.

- [10] A. Simonetto, E. Dall'Anese, S. Paternain, G. Leus, and G. B. Giannakis, "Time-varying convex optimization: Time-structured algorithms and applications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 108, no. 11, pp. 2032–2048, 2020.
- [11] D. Guo, X. Lin, Z. Su, S. Sun, and Z. Huang, "Design and analysis of two discrete-time ZD algorithms for time-varying nonlinear minimization," *Numer. Algorithms*, vol. 77, no. 1, p. 23–36, 2018.
- [12] S. Paternain, M. Morari, and A. Ribeiro, "Real-time model predictive control based on prediction-correction algorithms," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2019, pp. 5285–5291.
- [13] N. Bastianello, A. Simonetto, and R. Carli, "Prediction-correction splittings for nonsmooth time-varying optimization," in *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2019, pp. 1963–1968.
- [14] A. Bernstein, E. Dall'Anese, and A. Simonetto, "Online primal-dual methods with measurement feedback for time-varying convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 8, pp. 1978–1991, 2019.
- [15] A. Iserles, *A First Course in the Numerical Analysis of Differential Equations*, 2nd ed., ser. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [16] M. Amidzade, H. Al-Tous, O. Tirkkonen, and G. Caire, "Cellular network caching based on multipoint multicast transmissions," in *Proc. IEEE Glob. Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM)*, Dec. 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [17] —, "Cellular traffic offloading with optimized compound single-point unicast and cache-based multipoint multicast," in *IEEE Wireless Commun. and Net. Conf. (WCNC)*, 2022, pp. 2268–2273.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 1.

We constitute the Lagrangian function, and obtain the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions which read:

$$\begin{cases} b_m(\theta) \nabla_m f + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{h}_m \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{h}_m(\mathbf{x}_m) - \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the Lagrange multiplier. By considering **Assumption 1** and taking derivative of the recent conditions w.r.t. θ , we get:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{b}_m(\theta) \nabla_m f + \left(b_m(\theta) \nabla_m^2 f + \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \nabla_m^2 h_{m,j} \right) \dot{\mathbf{x}}_n(\theta) \\ \quad + \mathbf{J} \mathbf{h}_m \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{J} \mathbf{h}_m^\top \dot{\mathbf{x}}_m = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

By combining (19) and (20) and considering **Assumption 2**, the statement follows.