From Mixed-Integer Linear to Mixed-Integer Bilevel Linear Programming

Matteo Fischetti, University of Padova





Bilevel Optimization

• The general **Bilevel Optimization Problem** (optimistic version) reads:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}} F(x, y)$$

$$G(x, y) \le 0$$

$$y \in \arg\min_{y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}} \{f(x, y') : g(x, y') \le 0\}$$

where *x* var.s only are controlled by the **leader**, while *y* var.s are computed by another player (the **follower**) solving a different problem.

- A very very hard problem even in a convex setting with continuous var.s only
- **Convergent** solution algorithms are problematic and typically require additional assumptions (binary/integer var.s or alike)

Example: 0-1 ILP

• A generic 0-1 ILP $\min c^T x$ can be reformulated as Ax = bthe following linear & $x \in \{0,1\}^n$

$$\min c^T x$$
$$Ax = b$$
$$x \in [0, 1]^n$$
$$y = 0$$

$$y \in \arg\min_{y'} \{-\sum_{j=1}^n y'_j : y'_j \le x_j, y'_j \le 1 - x_j \ \forall j = 1, \dots, n\}$$

Note that y is fixed to 0 but it cannot be removed from the model!

Interdiction Problems

- A special case where F(x,y) = -f(x,y) and the action of the leader consists in the "**interdiction**" of some choices of the follower
- Typically stated as **min-max** optimization problems of the form:

$$\min_{x} \max_{y} f(y) g(y) \le 0 x_j \in \{0, 1\}, \qquad \forall j \in N \\ 0 \le y_j \le UB_j(1 - x_j), \qquad \forall j \in N \\ F(x) \le 0$$

- E.g., the follower solves a max flow and the leader wants to keep the resulting flow as small as possible by **interdicting** (i.e., deleting) some arcs subject to a budget constraint $F(x) \le 0$
- Very very hard both in theory (Sigma-2) and in practice

Reformulation

By defining the value function \bullet

e value function

$$\Phi(x) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}} \{ f(x, y) : g(x, y) \leq 0 \},$$

$$G(x, y) \leq 0 \},$$

 $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}} F(x, y)$

 $G(x,y) \leq 0$

the problem can be restated as

$$\min F(x, y)$$

$$G(x, y) \le 0$$

$$g(x, y) \le 0$$

$$f(x, y) \le \Phi(x)$$

$$(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}.$$

Dropping the nonconvex condition $f(x,y) \leq \Phi(x)$ one gets the soulletcalled **High Point Relaxation** (HPR)

Mixed-Integer Bilevel Linear Problems

• We will focus the **Mixed-Integer Bilevel Linear** case (MIBLP) where *F*, *G*, *f* and *g* are **affine functions**, namely:

$$\begin{split} \min_{x,y} \ c_x^T x + c_y^T y \\ G_x x + G_y y &\leq q \\ Ax + By &\leq b \\ l &\leq y \leq u \\ x_j \text{ integer}, \ \forall j \in J_x \\ y_j \text{ integer}, \ \forall j \in J_y \\ d^T y &\leq \Phi(x) \end{split}$$

where for a given $x = x^*$ one computes the value function by solving the following **MILP**:

$$\Phi(x^*) := \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}} \{ d^T y : By \le b - Ax^*, \quad l \le y \le u, \quad y_j \text{ integer } \forall j \in J_y \}.$$

Example

• A notorious example from

J. Moore and J. Bard. The mixed integer linear bilevel programming problem. *Operations Research*, 38(5):911–921, 1990.



Example (cont.d)

Value-function reformulation



A convergent B&B scheme

Algorithm 2: A basic branch-and-bound scheme for MIBLP	
Input : A MIBLP instance satisfying proper assumptions;	
Output: An optimal MIBLP solution.	
1 Apply a standard LP-based B&B to HPR, branching as customary on integer-constrained	
variables x_j and y_j that are fractional at the optimal LP solution; incumbent update is instead	
inhibited as it requires the bilevel-specific check described below;	
2 for each unfathomed $B \& B$ node where standard branching cannot be performed do	
3 Let (x^*, y^*) be the integer HPR solution at the current node;	
4 Compute $\Phi(x^*)$ by solving the follower MILP for $x = x^*$;	
5 if $d^Ty^* \leq \Phi(x^*)$ then	
6 The current solution (x^*, y^*) is bilevel feasible: update the incumbent and fathom the	
current node	
8 If not all variab	les x_j with $j \in J_F$ are fixed by branching then
9 Branch on a reduce its do	ny x_j $(j \in J_F)$ not fixed by branching yet, even if x_j^* is integer, so as to main in both child nodes
10 else	
11 let (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) be	an optimal solution of the HPR at the current node amended by the
additional re	striction $d^T y \leq \Phi(x^*);$
12 Possibly upd	late the incumbent with (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) , and fathom the current node
13 end	
14 end	
15 end	

Here J_F is the set of the leader x-variables appearing in the follower problem, all of which are assumed to be integer constrained (we also exclude HPR unboundedness)

A MILP-based solver

- We want to apply a standard Branch-and-Cut MILP solver to HPR, by generating **bilevel-specific cuts** on the fly to approximate the missing nonlinear condition $d^T y \le \Phi(x)$ by a sequence of (local) **linear cuts**
- Forget for a moment about internal heuristics (i.e., deactivate all of them), and assume the LP relaxation at each node is solved by the simplex algorithm → each relevant sol. (x*,y*) comes with an LP basis
- At each B&C node, let (x*,y*) be the current LP optimal vertex:

if (x^*, y^*) is fractional \rightarrow cut it by a MILP cut, or branch **as usual** *if* (x^*, y^*) is integer and $f(x^*, y^*) \leq \Phi(x^*) \rightarrow (x^*, y^*)$ is bilevelfeasible and integer \rightarrow update the incumbent **as usual**

i.e., no bilevel-specific actions are needed (the MILP solver already knows what to do)

The difficult case

- But, what can we do in third possible case, namely (x^*, y^*) is integer but not bilevel-feasible, i.e., when $f(x^*, y^*) > \Phi(x^*)$?
- How can we cut this infeasible but integer (x*,y*)?



Possible answers from the literature

- If (x,y) is restricted to be **binary**, add **a no-good** linear cut requiring to flip at least one variable w.r.t. (x^*,y^*) or w.r.t. x^*
- If (x,y) is restricted to be **integer** and all MILP coeff.s are integer, add a cut requiring a slack of 1 for the sum of all the inequalities that are tight at (x^*, y^*)
- Is there a better way to enforce $f(x^*, y^*) \le \Phi(x^*)$?

Intersection Cuts (ICs)

- Try and use of intersection cuts (Balas, 1971) instead
- ICs are a powerful tool to separate a point **x*** from a set **X** by a linear cut



- All you need is
 - a **cone** pointed at x^* , containing all $x \in X$
 - a convex set S with x* (but no x ϵ X) in its interior
- If x* vertex of an LP relaxation, a suitable cone comes for the LP basis

ICs for bilevel problems

• Our idea is first illustrated on the Moore&Bard example



Define a suitable bilevel-free set

• Take the LP vertex $(x^*, y^*) = (2, 4) \rightarrow f(x^*, y^*) = y^* = 4 > Phi(x^*) = 2$



Intersection cut

• We can therefore generate the intersection cut $y \le 2$ and repeat



Constructing a bilevel-free set

Lemma 1. For any feasible solution \hat{y} of the follower, the set

$$S(\hat{y}) = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x, y) \ge f(x, \hat{y}), \, g(x, \hat{y}) \le 0 \}$$
(10)

does not contain any bilevel-feasible point in its interior.

- Note: $S(\hat{y})$ is a convex set (actually, a **polyhedron**) in the MIBLP case
- Separation algorithm: given an optimal <u>vertex</u> (x*,y*) of the LP relaxation of HPR
 - Solve the follower for *x*=*x*^{*} and get an optimal sol., say \hat{y}

- if
$$(x^*, y^*)$$
 strictly inside $S(\hat{y})$ then
generate a violated IC using the LP-cone pointed at (x^*, y^*)
together with the bilevel-free set $S(\hat{y})$

However...

 The above Lemma does exclude that (x*,y*) can be on the frontier of the bilevel-free set S(ŷ), so we cannot guarantee to cut it ...



• We need to define an **enlarged** bilevel-free set if we want be sure to cut (*x**,*y**), though this requires additional assumptions

An enlarged bilevel-free set

 Assuming g(x,y) is integer for all integer HPR solutions, one can "move apart" by 1 the frontier of S(ŷ) so as be sure that the point (x*,y*) belongs to its interior

Theorem 1. Assume that g(x, y) is integer for all HPR solutions (x, y). Then, for any feasible solution \hat{y} of the follower, the extended set

 $S^{+}(\hat{y}) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} : f(x, y) \ge f(x, \hat{y}), \, g(x, \hat{y}) \le 1\}$ (11)

does not contain any bilevel-feasible point in its interior, where 1 denotes a vector of all one's.

- The above result leads to a "minimalist" **B&C solver for MIBLP**
- **Notes** (see the full papers for details)
 - branching on integer variables can be required to break tailingoff and to ensure finite convergence
 - alternative bilevel-free sets can be defined to produce hopefully deeper ICs
 - additional features (preprocessing, heuristics etc.) available

IC-separation numerical issues

- IC separation can be problematic, as we need to read the cone rays from the LP tableau → numerical accuracy can be a big issue here!
- For MILPs, ICs like Gomory cuts are not mandatory (so we can skip their generation in case of numerical problems), but for MIBLPs they are instrumental #SeparateOrPerish
- Notation change: let $\xi = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n$

 $\min\{\hat{c}^T\xi: \hat{A}\xi = \hat{b}, \xi \ge 0\}$ be the LP relaxation at a given node

$$S = \{\xi : g_i^T \xi \le g_{0i}, i = 1, ..., k\}$$
 be the bilevel-free set
 $\bigvee_{i=1}^k (g_i^T \xi \ge g_{i0})$ be the corresp. disjunction (valid for all feas. sol.s)

Numerically safe ICs

A **single** valid inequality can be obtained by taking, for each variable, the worst LHS Coefficient (and RHS) in each disjunction

To be applied to a **reduced form** of each disjunction where the coefficient of all basic variables is zero (kind of LP reduced costs)

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{k} (g_i^T \xi \ge g_{i0})$$
$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{k} (\overline{g}_i^T \xi \ge \overline{g}_{i0})$$

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{k} (\frac{\overline{g}_{i}^{T}}{\overline{g}_{i0}} \xi \geq 1)$$

Algorithm 1: Intersection cut separation

Input : An LP vertex ξ^* along with its a associated LP basis \hat{B} ;

the feasible-free polyhedron $S = \{\xi : g_i^T \xi \leq g_{0i}, i = 1, ..., k\}$ and the associated valid disjunction $\bigvee_{i=1}^k (g_i^T \xi \geq g_{i0})$ whose members are violated by ξ^* ;

Output: A valid intersection cut violated by ξ^* ;

1 for i := 1 to k do 2 $| (\overline{g}_i^T, \overline{g}_{i0}) := (g_i^T, g_{i0}) - u_i^T(\hat{A}, \hat{b})$, where $u_i^T = (g_i)_{\hat{B}}^T \hat{B}^{-1}$ 3 end 4 for j := 1 to n do $\gamma_j := \max\{\overline{g}_{ij}/\overline{g}_{i0} : i \in \{1, ..., k\}\}$; 5 return the violated cut $\gamma^T \xi \ge 1$

Conclusions

- Mixed-Integer Bilevel Linear Programming is a **MILP** plus additional constr.s
- Intersection cuts can produce valuable information at the B&B nodes
- Sound MIBLP heuristics, preprocessing etc. (not discussed here) available
- Many instances from the literature can be **solved in a satisfactory way**
- Our **binary code** is available on request (research purposes)

Slides http://www.dei.unipd.it/~fisch/papers/slides/

Reference papers:

M. Fischetti, I. Ljubic, M. Monaci, M. Sinnl, "Intersection cuts for bilevel optimization", in Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 18th International Conference, IPCO 2016 Proceedings, 77-88, 2016 (to appear in *Mathematical Programming*)

M. Fischetti, I. Ljubic, M. Monaci, M. Sinnl, "A new general-purpose algorithm for mixedinteger bilevel linear program", to appear in *Operations Research*.

M. Fischetti, I. Ljubic, M. Monaci, M. Sinnl, "Interdiction Games and Monotonicity", Tech. Report 2016 (submitted)