



Operations Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://pubsonline.informs.org>

Fabrication-Adaptive Optimization with an Application to Photonic Crystal Design

Han Men, Robert M. Freund, Ngoc C. Nguyen, Joel Saa-Seoane, Jaime Peraire

To cite this article:

Han Men, Robert M. Freund, Ngoc C. Nguyen, Joel Saa-Seoane, Jaime Peraire (2014) Fabrication-Adaptive Optimization with an Application to Photonic Crystal Design. *Operations Research* 62(2):418-434. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1252>

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://pubsonline.informs.org/Publications/Librarians-Portal/PubsOnLine-Terms-and-Conditions>

This article may be used only for the purposes of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval, unless otherwise noted. For more information, contact permissions@informs.org.

The Publisher does not warrant or guarantee the article's accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Descriptions of, or references to, products or publications, or inclusion of an advertisement in this article, neither constitutes nor implies a guarantee, endorsement, or support of claims made of that product, publication, or service.

Copyright © 2014, INFORMS

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages



With 12,500 members from nearly 90 countries, INFORMS is the largest international association of operations research (O.R.) and analytics professionals and students. INFORMS provides unique networking and learning opportunities for individual professionals, and organizations of all types and sizes, to better understand and use O.R. and analytics tools and methods to transform strategic visions and achieve better outcomes.

For more information on INFORMS, its publications, membership, or meetings visit <http://www.informs.org>

Fabrication-Adaptive Optimization with an Application to Photonic Crystal Design

Han Men

Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139,
abbymen@mit.edu

Robert M. Freund

Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139,
rfreund@mit.edu

Ngoc C. Nguyen, Joel Saa-Seoane, Jaime Peraire

Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
{cuongng@mit.edu, jsaa@mit.edu, peraire@mit.edu}

It is often the case that the computed optimal solution of an optimization problem cannot be implemented directly, irrespective of data accuracy, because of either (i) technological limitations (such as physical tolerances of machines or processes), (ii) the deliberate simplification of a model to keep it tractable (by ignoring certain types of constraints that pose computational difficulties), and/or (iii) human factors (getting people to “do” the optimal solution). Motivated by this observation, we present a modeling paradigm called “fabrication-adaptive optimization” for treating issues of implementation/fabrication. We develop computationally focused theory and algorithms, and we present computational results for incorporating considerations of implementation/fabrication into constrained optimization problems that arise in photonic crystal design. The fabrication-adaptive optimization framework stems from the robust regularization of a function. When the feasible region is not a normed space (as typically encountered in application settings), the fabrication-adaptive optimization framework typically yields a nonconvex optimization problem. (In the special case where the feasible region is a finite-dimensional normed space, we show that fabrication-adaptive optimization can be recast as an instance of modern robust optimization.) We study a variety of problems with special structures on functions, feasible regions, and norms for which computation is tractable and develop an algorithmic scheme for solving these problems in spite of the challenges of nonconvexity. We apply our methodology to compute fabrication-adaptive designs of two-dimensional photonic crystals with a variety of prescribed features.

Subject classifications: fabrication-adaptivity; robust regularization; robust optimization; bandgap optimization; photonic crystal design; topology optimization.

Area of review: Optimization.

History: Received December 2012; revision received July 2013; accepted December 2013.

1. Introduction: Problem Statement, Preliminaries, and Computational Aspirations

Consider a general constrained optimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} z^* = \min_x & f(x) \\ \text{s.t. } & x \in S, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the feasible region and $f(\cdot): \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the objective to be optimized. The context of (1) may be as diverse as portfolio optimization (Best 2010), where x_i is the number of shares to be invested in asset i , to optimal microstructure material design, where x_i is the concentration of a dielectric material in pixel (or voxel) i of a discretized physical region as in Men et al. (2010, 2011). Let x^* be an

optimal solution of (1). The notion of *fabrication-adaptivity*, or perhaps more generally *implementation-adaptivity*, has to do with the concern that although the data and other descriptors of the problem may be quite accurate, it may be generically implausible to implement the optimal solution x^* exactly. Some reasons for this may include these:

1. Technological limitations. For example, the production or fabrication technology might not be able to fabricate the product exactly according to the plan specified in x^* , perhaps because of limitations of machine tolerances.

2. Deliberate simplifications. The model (1) may be a deliberate simplification of the real problem in order for the optimization model to be computationally tractable. For example, it may be computationally prohibitive to include odd-lot constraints in a portfolio optimization model or connectivity constraints in a microstructure material design model, etc.

3. Human factors. It may be implausible to assume that people will “do” x^* precisely as the optimization model prescribes.

Indeed, the application that has given rise to this line of study is a nonlinear optimization problem arising in microstructure material design (Men et al. 2010), where $S := [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: x_{\min} e \leq x \leq x_{\max} e\}$ is a hypercube with $n \gg 0$ and the component values x_i represent the permittivity of a dielectric material at pixel (or voxel) i for $i = 1, \dots, n$. The values x_{\min} and x_{\max} correspond to permittivity constants for air and the dielectric material (e.g., gallium arsenide), respectively. The objective is to determine a design for which a prescribed relative eigenvalue bandgap $(2(\lambda_{m+1} - \lambda_m))/(\lambda_{m+1} + \lambda_m)$ is maximized, where λ_m is the m th eigenvalue of a certain system. The resulting optimization problem is nonlinear, nonconvex, and large scale; nevertheless, effective methods for computing solutions are developed in Men et al. (2010, 2011). (In fact, a more proper microstructure material design model should use binary conditions $x_i \in \{x_{\min}, x_{\max}\}$ instead of the interval restrictions $x_i \in [x_{\min}, x_{\max}]$; such binary conditions are typically relaxed in the bandgap optimization problems with almost no degradation in solution quality, see Men et al. 2010.) The computed solution x^* might not be fabricable because of small feature sizes (disconnected pixels with $x_i = x_{\max}$) or complicated material interfaces (such as roughness of boundaries). In principle one can add constraints to ensure that features are not small and/or ensure smooth boundaries of surfaces of the material, but such an approach is decidedly unattractive because it leads to an exponential number of constraints—and makes a complex model even more complex computationally. Instead we proceed as follows. First we observe that it is relatively easy in practice to use human judgment to modify a given design solution x to a fabricable solution y by switching the concentration of material at a relatively small number δ of pixels from x_{\min} to x_{\max} (or vice versa) to remove small features and/or rough material interfaces and, one hopes, not degrade the objective function value too much in the process. Here we presume that $\delta \ll n$. If we anticipate that we will need to perform some sort of manual modification of a solution x , then it is beneficial to account for this *a priori* in the model specification. This is the basic idea of *fabrication-adaptive optimization*, which we now formally describe.

For a generic optimization problem of the form (1), let x be a feasible and/or optimal solution. The basic premise of our approach is that we will fabricate/implement some solution y that is close to x in some prescribed norm, say at most a distance δ from x in the prescribed norm, and that such a nearby fabricable solution y is very easy to determine/compute for any given solution x . We construct the *fabrication-adaptive* (FA) counterpart objective func-

tion $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ of the original objective function $f(\cdot)$ in (1), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &:= \max_y f(y) \\ \text{s.t. } &\|y - x\| \leq \delta \\ &y \in S, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is the FA parameter and $\|\cdot\|$ is the prescribed norm. Then $\tilde{f}(x)$ is a (conservative) upper bound on the objective function value of any (fabricable) solution y whose distance from x is at most δ in the prescribed norm. We then construct the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem, which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{z}^* &= \min_x \tilde{f}(x) \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The FA optimization problem (3) seeks to optimize the conservative FA counterpart $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ of the original objective function $f(\cdot)$. In this way the FA model seeks to produce a solution x_{FA}^* that is more adaptable to modification to a nearby fabricable solution y whose objective value $f(y)$ is not significantly degraded.

The functional form (2) was first introduced by Lewis (2002) for the special case when S is a finite-dimensional normed space (essentially $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ without loss of generality) and with the norm $\|\cdot\|$ replaced by a more general gauge function $g(\cdot)$ (Rockafellar 1970), where it was called the robust regularization of $f(\cdot)$. The term “robust regularization” is appropriate for the context given therein, which includes issues of uncertain data in the construction of $f(\cdot)$, uncertain implementation issues, and the like. Indeed, the function $f(\cdot)$ in Lewis (2002) is considered broadly and so might be a constraint function or an objective function in an optimization problem, or perhaps simply a function of interest. The name robust regularization is also suggestive of a relationship to robust optimization (Ben-Tal et al. 2009, Bertsimas et al. 2011), and it turns out that in the very special case when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, the model (2) and (3) can be formatted as a particular instance of a robust optimization problem; this is shown herein in EC.1 (available as part of the supplemental material at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1252>). However, when $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ (as one would typically expect), the connection between (2) and (3) and robust optimization breaks down; this is also shown in EC.1. Lewis and Pang (2009) generalize the definition of the robust regularization to the case when $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$ and presents a variety of results regarding smoothness of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ and related mathematical properties. In somewhat of a contrast, the focus of this paper is on the model (2)–(3) as a mechanism for fabrication-adaptive optimization; as such, we rely on the premise articulated above that we will fabricate/implement some solution y that is close to x in some prescribed norm, say, at most a distance δ from x in the prescribed norm, and that such a nearby fabricable

solution y is very easy to determine/compute for any given solution x . For this setting we expect $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, whereby there is no connection to robust optimization. In the context of our intended modeling setup, the premise of adapting the solution after the fact to a nearby fabricable solution, and because typically $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, we prefer to use the term “fabrication-adaptive optimization” rather than “robust regularization” for the paradigm (2)–(3) because it is more aligned with aspirations of modeling, application, optimization, and computation.

The notion of fabrication-adaptivity is also related to the modeling of implementation errors. Luo (2003) and Luo et al. (2004) consider such models in the context of signal processing and digital communication, where solutions are affected by errors due to discretization of the signal. Pinar and Arıkan (2004) examine modeling of implementation errors in linear least squares problems (of which signal processing is an application), and Stınstra and Den Hertog (2008) consider implementation errors in generic optimization modeling through the lens of various types of modeling errors. The implementation-error models developed in these works implicitly assume that the set of possible errors is independent of the solution point; therefore, in this case, the modeling of implementation errors can be treated as an instance of robust optimization (Ben-Tal et al. 2009, Bertsimas et al. 2011). This contrasts with fabrication adaptive optimization, as is discussed in EC.1.

1.1. Basic Nonconvexity Issues, and Practical and Computational Aspirations

In a realistic application of the fabrication-adaptive model (2)–(3), one would typically have $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$. However, at least from an academic perspective, the special case of $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ gives rise to interesting properties with respect to convexity and with respect to connection to the modern domain of *robust optimization*; see Ben-Tal et al. (2009) and Bertsimas et al. (2011). When $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, the fabrication-adaptive objective function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is convex if $f(\cdot)$ is convex; see Proposition 3.1 of Lewis (2002). Again when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, it is also straightforward to show that quasiconvexity is preserved as well: if $f(\cdot)$ is quasiconvex, then the fabrication-adaptive objective function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is quasiconvex.

When $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, the following example shows that the FA counterpart optimization problem of a convex optimization problem need not be convex.

EXAMPLE 1 (A NONCONVEX FA OBJECTIVE FUNCTION WHEN $f(\cdot)$ IS CONVEX). Let $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2: 0 \leq x \leq e\}$, the unit two-dimensional square, and consider the convex (linear) objective function $f(x) := 2x_1 + x_2$, and let $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_1$ and $\delta = 1/10$ for concreteness. At $x^1 := (1 - 2\delta, 1)$, we have

$$\tilde{f}(x^1) = \max\{2y_1 + y_2: 0 \leq y \leq e, \|y - x^1\|_1 \leq \delta\} = 3 - 2\delta.$$

At $x^2 := (1, 1 - 3\delta)$, we have

$$\tilde{f}(x^2) = \max\{2y_1 + y_2: 0 \leq y \leq e, \|y - x^2\|_1 \leq \delta\} = 3 - 2\delta.$$

However, at $x^3 := \frac{1}{2}x^1 + \frac{1}{2}x^2 = (1 - \delta, 1 - 3\delta/2)$, we have

$$\tilde{f}(x^3) = \max\{2y_1 + y_2: 0 \leq y \leq e, \|y - x^3\|_1 \leq \delta\} = 3 - 3\delta/2.$$

In this case we have $\tilde{f}(x^3) = 3 - 3\delta/2 > 3 - 2\delta = \max\{\tilde{f}(x^1), \tilde{f}(x^2)\}$, thus showing that $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is not even quasiconvex on the feasible region S because the level set $L_\beta := \{x \in S: \tilde{f}(x) \leq \beta\}$ is not convex for $\beta = 3 - 2\delta$.

Because the FA optimization problem (2)–(3) can be nonconvex, it makes most practical sense to consider using the FA modeling paradigm when the original function $f(\cdot)$ in (1) is not convex. (Otherwise we are doing the computational unpromising task of transforming a nominally convex problem into a nonconvex problem.) We therefore will take as given that $f(\cdot)$ is not required to be convex and that we expect the FA optimization problem (2)–(3) to be nonconvex. In consideration of goals of algorithms, we aspire to compute solutions \bar{x} of (2)–(3) that are either local optima or perhaps just have “good” objective function value $\tilde{f}(\bar{x})$ where such “goodness” will of necessity be problem/context dependent. In order to design algorithms to solve the FA optimization problem (2)–(3), we focus on two computational tasks that seem natural to require in order to design useful algorithms: (i) computing the FA counterpart function value $\tilde{f}(x)$ for a given $x \in S$ and (ii) computing first-order function objects such as the gradient $\nabla \tilde{f}(x)$ or a (perhaps only local) subgradient of $\tilde{f}(x)$, or of the “pieces” of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ in the case when $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is the pointwise maximum of other functions, for a given $x \in S$. For a given $x \in S$, notice from (2) that computing $\tilde{f}(x)$ is itself generally intractable because it involves maximizing a convex function over a convex set. Nevertheless, in many useful instances with special structure on $f(\cdot)$, S , and/or $\|\cdot\|$, it will be computationally tractable to compute $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ and $\nabla \tilde{f}(\cdot)$ (or other first-order information) efficiently. Indeed, one of the main concerns of the rest of this paper is with special structures of real interest for which computation with the FA counterpart function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is relatively efficient (§2) and with the practical use of the FA paradigm for solving problems that gave rise to this paradigm in the first place—namely, bandgap optimization problems (§§3 and 4). In §2 we examine FA optimization problems with certain structures of interest, mainly functions that are in turn piecewise linear, linear fractional, and piecewise linear fractional as well as a canonical eigenvalue function. We also propose an algorithm for FA optimization in the piecewise linear fractional case. In §3, we review the class of design optimization problems known as bandgap problems that arise in engineering design optimization, and we show how the FA optimization paradigm can be applied to these problems. In §4 we present computational results from applying the FA optimization to various bandgap problems that arise in photonic crystal design, and we demonstrate that our proposed algorithm succeeds in producing much improved adaptive and fabricable solutions.

1.2. Notation

Let $e = (1, \dots, 1)$ denote the vector of ones, whose dimension will be given in context. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote a norm on \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\|\cdot\|_*$ be the associated dual norm, namely, $\|v\|_* := \max\{v^T x : \|x\| \leq 1\}$. The ball of radius δ centered at \bar{x} is denoted $B(\bar{x}, \delta) := \{x : \|x - \bar{x}\| \leq \delta\}$. Recall that a function $f(\cdot)$ on S is convex if $f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \leq \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and all $x, y \in S$. Similarly, $f(\cdot)$ on S is quasiconvex if $f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \leq \max\{f(x), f(y)\}$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and all $x, y \in S$, and $f(\cdot)$ is concave or quasiconcave if $-f(\cdot)$ is convex or quasiconvex, respectively. Note that $f(\cdot)$ is quasiconvex if and only if the lower level sets of $f(\cdot)$ are convex sets; see Avriel (1976). If $f(\cdot)$ is convex on S , then $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subgradient of $f(\cdot)$ at $\hat{x} \in S$ if $f(x) \geq f(\hat{x}) + g^T(x - \hat{x})$ for all $x \in S$. Similarly for a concave function on S , $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a subgradient of $f(\cdot)$ at $\hat{x} \in S$ if $f(x) \leq f(\hat{x}) + g^T(x - \hat{x})$ for all $x \in S$. A function $f(\cdot)$ on S is locally convex at $\hat{x} \in S$ if there exists some $\delta > 0$ for which $f(\cdot)$ is convex on $S \cap B(\hat{x}, \delta)$, and we say that g is a local subgradient of $f(\cdot)$ at \hat{x} if $f(x) \geq f(\hat{x}) + g^T(x - \hat{x})$ for all $x \in S \cap B(\hat{x}, \delta)$. Similar remarks hold for local concavity and a local subgradient of a locally concave function. Let X, Y be any symmetric matrices. We write “ $X \geq 0$ ” to denote that X is symmetric and positive semidefinite, “ $X \succeq Y$ ” to denote that $X - Y \geq 0$, and “ $X > 0$ ” to denote that X is positive definite. If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex cone, then its dual cone K^* is defined by $K^* := \{s \in \mathbb{R}^n : s^T x \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in K\}$.

2. Fabrication-Adaptive Optimization Problems with Special Structures

We study some FA optimization problems with special structures on $f(\cdot)$, S , and/or $\|\cdot\|$.

2.1. Three Special Structures for $S = \mathbb{R}^n$

We show three classes of examples of special structures for instances where $S = \mathbb{R}^n$. In the first class the objective function is the maximum of a finite number of affine functions:

$$f(x) := \max_{i=1, \dots, m} (b_i + (a^i)^T x), \quad (4)$$

and $S = \mathbb{R}^n$. It is easy to derive the fabrication-adaptive objective function in this case:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= \max_{\|y-x\| \leq \delta} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \max_{\|y-x\| \leq \delta} (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \max_{\|d\| \leq \delta} (b_i + (a^i)^T (x + d)) \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} ((b_i + \delta \|a^i\|_*) + (a^i)^T x), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|$. Therefore the FA optimization problem can be written as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{f}(x) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} ((b_i + \delta \|a^i\|_*) + (a^i)^T x). \quad (6)$$

The functional form of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is structurally identical to that of $f(\cdot)$, namely, the maximum of m linear functions, and both $f(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ are convex functions. Let us presume that it is easy to compute the dual norm $\|a\|_*$ for any a . Under this presumption the computation of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ will be as easy as that of $f(\cdot)$, and computing a subgradient of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ at a given value of x will be as easy as that of $f(\cdot)$. Furthermore, it is reasonable to expect that any algorithm for minimizing $f(\cdot)$ in (4) should be easy to apply to solve (6) with similar types of computational guarantees.

The second class of examples contains instances where $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f(x) = \|Ax + b\|_2$ or $f(x)$ is a strictly convex quadratic function and the prescribed norm on the space of variables x is the Euclidean norm $\|x\|_2$. In these cases, Lewis (2002) shows that the resulting fabrication-adaptive optimization problem (3) can be modeled using semidefinite optimization.

The third class of examples are instances of the maximum eigenvalue function where $S = \mathbb{R}^n$. Given symmetric matrices A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n , let $\mathcal{A}(x) := A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x_i$ and consider the maximum eigenvalue function $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by:

$$f(x) := \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{A}(x)).$$

Note that $f(\cdot)$ is convex on \mathbb{R}^n , and $f(\cdot)$ generalizes the maximum of linear functions. (Indeed, $f(\cdot)$ specializes to the maximum of linear functions when all matrices A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n are diagonal.) The fabrication-adaptive counterpart function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ of $f(\cdot)$ is

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} (\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{A}(y))), \quad (7)$$

and $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is also a convex function when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ from Proposition 3.1 of Lewis (2002). However, there does not appear to be any efficient method for computing $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ even in the case when $S = \mathbb{R}^n$ unless the norm $\|\cdot\|$ has very special structure. When $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_1$, then the unit ball is the convex hull of the $2n$ signed unit vectors $e^1, \dots, e^n, -e^1, \dots, -e^n$, whereby $\tilde{f}(x)$ can be computed as

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \{\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{A}(x + \delta e^j)), \lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{A}(x - \delta e^j))\},$$

and so is computable so long as the $2n$ largest eigenvalue problems are efficiently computable. However, when $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_\infty$, it follows from Ben-Tal and Nemirovski (2002) that computing $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is NP-hard, and when $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$, computing $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is also NP-hard (Nemirovski 2012). Here we see that the original objective function $f(\cdot)$ involves the computation of the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix, which is typically tractable; however, the FA counterpart function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is not tractable to compute when $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_p$ and $p = 2$ or $p = \infty$. Indeed, intuition suggests that only norms with a relatively small number of extreme points on their unit ball will be suitable for practical computation of the FA counterpart of the largest eigenvalue function.

2.2. Piecewise Linear Convex Objective and $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$

Let the objective function be given by (4), i.e., the same as in §2.1, but now suppose that $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$. For convenience we assume in this subsection that S is closed and bounded, i.e., compact. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \tilde{f}_i(x), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_i(x) &:= \max_y (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ \text{s.t. } &\|y - x\| \leq \delta, \\ &y \in S. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We have the following result on the structure of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$:

PROPOSITION 1. *If S is a convex set, then $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot): S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave function, $i = 1, \dots, m$, whereby $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is the pointwise maximum of concave functions.*

PROOF. Let us fix $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and let $x^1, x^2 \in S$ be given. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and $x^3 = \alpha x^1 + (1 - \alpha)x^2$. Assuming for simplicity that the optimization problem defining $\tilde{f}_i(x)$ attains its optimum, let y^j solve the optimization problem in the definition of $\tilde{f}_i(x^j)$ for $j = 1, 2$, whereby $\tilde{f}_i(x^j) = b_i + (a^i)^T y^j$, $y^j \in S$, and $\|x^j - y^j\| \leq \delta$ for $j = 1, 2$. Therefore $y^3 := \alpha y^1 + (1 - \alpha)y^2$ satisfies $y^3 \in S$, $\|x^3 - y^3\| \leq \delta$, and hence y^3 is feasible for the optimization problem in the definition of $\tilde{f}_i(x^3)$ in (9). Therefore $\tilde{f}_i(x^3) \geq b_i + (a^i)^T y^3 = \alpha(b_i + (a^i)^T y^1) + (1 - \alpha)(b_i + (a^i)^T y^2) = \alpha \tilde{f}_i(x^1) + (1 - \alpha)\tilde{f}_i(x^2)$, and hence $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is concave on S . \square

It follows from Proposition 1 that $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ does not have attractive convex structure. Nevertheless, the computation of $\tilde{f}(x)$ for a given x via (8)–(9) is a tractable convex optimization problem when $\|\cdot\|$ is the L_2, L_1 , or L_∞ norm, and when S is polyhedral or is conveyed in a suitably easy conic form $S = \{x: b - Ax \in K\}$ for some convex cone K . In these cases, computing $\tilde{f}(x)$ amounts to solving m conic convex optimization problems. This is not a particularly burdensome task if m is not too large; and/or if S is a relatively simple set such as a hypercube, simplex, or Euclidean ball; or more generally if S is conveyed in conic form above with structure for which conic optimization can be done efficiently.

Using (8) and (9), the FA optimization problem (3) can therefore be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P^{\text{FA}}: \quad \tilde{z}^* &:= \min_x \tilde{f}(x) = \min_{x, t} t \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S, \quad \text{s.t. } \tilde{f}_i(x) \leq t, \\ &i = 1, \dots, m, x \in S. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Furthermore, we know from Proposition 1 that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is concave, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

In light of the structure of the FA optimization problem (10), we consider computing first-order objects for each of the functions $\tilde{f}_i(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let us fix an index $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. We know from Proposition 1 that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is concave on S and hence has a subgradient for all $x \in S$. Furthermore, there exists a set $B_i \subset S$ of measure zero such that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ will be differentiable for all $x \in S \setminus B_i$ (Rockafellar 1970, Theorem 25.5). To see how to compute such a subgradient, we appeal to duality theory, and we assume that S is conveyed in conic form, namely, $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: b - Ax \in K\}$ where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a closed convex cone. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, we can rewrite (9) as the following problem $P_i(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(x): \quad \tilde{f}_i(x) &= \max_y (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ \text{s.t. } &\|y - x\| \leq \delta, \\ &b - Ay \in K, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

which can be put in conic form by defining $C := \{(w, \alpha): \|w\| \leq \alpha\} \times K$ and rewriting $P_i(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(x): \quad \tilde{f}_i(x) &= \max_y (b_i + (a^i)^T y) \\ \text{s.t. } &\begin{pmatrix} x \\ \delta \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} I \\ A \end{pmatrix} y \in C. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The conic dual $D_i(x)$ of $P_i(x)$ can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} D_i(x): \quad \min_{\pi} &(b_i + \delta\|a^i - A^T \pi\|_* + b^T \pi \\ &+ (a^i - A^T \pi)^T x) \\ \text{s.t. } &\pi \in K^*. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We say that S has a Slater point if there exists $x^0 \in S$ for which $b - Ax^0 \in \text{int}K$. The following result describes a way to compute a subgradient of $\tilde{f}_i(x)$:

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be given. Suppose that S has a Slater point, and suppose $x \in S$. Then $D_i(x)$ attains its optimum at some π_i^* with no duality gap, and furthermore,*

$$p_i := p_i(x) := a^i - A^T \pi_i^* \tag{14}$$

is a subgradient of $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ at x . Furthermore, there is a set $B_i \subset S$ of measure zero for which it holds that $p_i(x)$ is uniquely defined and hence $\nabla \tilde{f}_i(x) = p_i(x)$ for all $x \in S \setminus B_i$.

PROOF. Let us fix $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and consider the duality paired problems $P_i(x)$ and $D_i(x)$. It follows from standard duality theory that there will be no duality gap and the dual problem will attain its optimum under the condition that the primal has a Slater point, namely, a point y for which $\|y - x\| < \delta$ and $b - Ay \in \text{int}K$; see Duffin (1956) or Borwein and Lewis (2006) for a more modern treatment

of conic duality. Let x^0 be a Slater point of S , whereby $b - Ax^0 \in \text{int}K$. Since $x \in S$ by supposition, it follows that $y(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon x^0 + (1 - \varepsilon)x$ is a Slater point of the feasible region of (12) for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently small. It then follows that $D_i(x)$ attains its optimum with no duality gap, and it follows from the formulation of $D_i(x)$ that $\tilde{f}_i(x)$ is the pointwise minimum of affine functions, whose linear terms are of the form $(a^i - A^T \pi)$ for $\pi \in K^*$. It then follows directly from convexity arguments that $a^i - A^T \pi_i^*$ is a subgradient of $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ at x . Furthermore, it follows from (Rockafellar 1970, Theorem 25.5) that there exists a set $B_i \subset S$ of measure zero such that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is differentiable for all $x \in S \setminus B_i$, and hence $\nabla \tilde{f}_i(x) = p_i(x)$ for all $x \in S \setminus B_i$. \square

The computational viability of solving the dual problem $D_i(x)$ must of necessity presume that the dual norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ can be suitably treated in the objective function of $D_i(x)$. Of course, when the norm $\|\cdot\|$ can be described with linear inequalities or second-order cone constraints, then solving $D_i(x)$ is all the easier. For example, when $\|\cdot\|$ is the L_1 - or L_∞ -norm, then $D_i(x)$ can be easily represented as a linear programming problem. When $\|\cdot\|$ is the L_2 -norm or other quadratic norm of the form $\sqrt{x^T Q x}$ for $Q > 0$, then $D_i(x)$ can be represented as a second-order cone problem using a standard transformation; see Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004).

In §2.4 we will present an algorithm for solving (10) that is based on the scheme of sequentially solving the first-order approximation of (10) at a given point $\hat{x} \in S$, namely,

$$P^{\hat{x}}: \min_{x,t} t$$

$$\text{s.t. } \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x}) + \nabla \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})^T (x - \hat{x}) \leq t, \quad i=1, \dots, m, \quad (15)$$

$$x \in S,$$

where the values $\tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})$ and $\nabla \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})$, $i=1, \dots, m$, are computed via Propositions 1 and 2, respectively.

2.3. Linear Fractional Objective and $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$

Let us now consider the case when the objective function is linear fractional:

$$f(x) := \frac{a^T x + g}{c^T x + h}, \quad (16)$$

and suppose that $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, we impose the condition that S is compact and convex, and $c^T x + h > 0$ for all $x \in S$. In this case $f(\cdot)$ is quasilinear on S ; i.e., it is both quasiconvex and quasiconcave on S . We can write the fabrication-adaptive objective function as

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \max_y \left(\frac{a^T y + g}{c^T y + h} \right)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|y - x\| \leq \delta,$$

$$y \in S. \quad (17)$$

We have the following result on the structure of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$:

PROPOSITION 3. $\tilde{f}(\cdot): S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quasiconcave function on S .

PROOF. Let $x^1, x^2 \in S$ be given, let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and let $x^3 = \alpha x^1 + (1 - \alpha)x^2$. Let y^j solve the optimization problem in the definition of $\tilde{f}(x^j)$ in (17) for $j=1, 2$, whereby $\|x^j - y^j\| \leq \delta$, $y^j \in S$, and $(a^T y^j + g)/(c^T y^j + h) = \tilde{f}(x^j)$ for $j=1, 2$. Define $\beta := \min\{\tilde{f}(x^1), \tilde{f}(x^2)\}$. Then the equations $\tilde{f}(x^j) = (a^T y^j + g)/(c^T y^j + h)$ for $j=1, 2$ and the definition of β implies that $a^T y^j + g = \tilde{f}(x^j)[c^T y^j + h] \geq \beta[c^T y^j + h]$ for $j=1, 2$. Also $y^3 := \alpha y^1 + (1 - \alpha)y^2$ satisfies $y^3 \in S$ and $\|x^3 - y^3\| \leq \delta$ and hence is feasible for the optimization problem in the definition of $\tilde{f}(x^3)$ in (17). Furthermore $a^T y^3 + g \geq \beta[c^T y^3 + h]$, and hence $\tilde{f}(x^3) \geq \beta = \min\{\tilde{f}(x^1), \tilde{f}(x^2)\}$, whereby $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is quasiconcave on S . \square

The next result shows that $\tilde{f}(x)$ is the optimal objective function value of a convex optimization problem involving S and a norm constraint. In what follows we use the notation that θS is the scaling of S by the constant θ for $\theta \geq 0$. (When $\theta = 0$, it is customary to define θS to be the recession cone of S ; however, since we assume here that S is bounded, we have for $\theta = 0$ that $\theta S := \{0\}$ under either definition.)

PROPOSITION 4. If $x \in S$, then $\tilde{f}(x)$ is the optimal objective value of the following convex optimization problem:

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \max_{\bar{y}, \theta} (a^T \bar{y} + g\theta)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|\bar{y} - \theta x\| \leq \theta \delta,$$

$$c^T \bar{y} + h\theta = 1, \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{y} \in \theta S,$$

$$\theta \geq 0.$$

If (\bar{y}, θ) is feasible and/or optimal for (18), then $y = \bar{y}/\theta$ is feasible and/or optimal for (17), respectively.

PROOF. Problem (18) is just a standard transformation of the linear fractional optimization problem (17) via homogenization (see Charnes and Cooper 1962 or Craven and Mond 1973). Note that we cannot have $\theta = 0$ in (18) because this would imply that $\bar{y} = 0$ via the norm constraint, which would imply that $c^T \bar{y} + h\theta = 0 \neq 1$, which is a contradiction. Thus division by zero in the transformation $y = \bar{y}/\theta$ cannot occur. \square

The computational viability of solving (18) will depend on (among other things) the ability to conveniently work with the scaling θS . When S is conveyed in conic linear form as in §2.2, it follows for $\theta \geq 0$ that $\theta S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: \theta b - Ax \in K\}$, in which case the scaling results in no loss of generality of the representation of the feasible region.

Let us now turn to the computation of first-order objects related to $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$. Let us further assume that S is conveyed as a system of linear inequalities so that $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:$

$b - Ax \geq 0$ }; i.e., $K = \mathbb{R}_+^k$ in the conic linear representation. We then can write (18) as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) := & \max_{\bar{y}, \theta} (a^T \bar{y} + g\theta) \\ \text{s.t. } & \|\bar{y} - \theta x\| \leq \theta \delta, \\ & c^T \bar{y} + h\theta = 1, \\ & \theta b - A\bar{y} \geq 0, \\ & \theta \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Let us further restrict our attention to the case when the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is representable with linear inequalities, as in the L_1 - or L_∞ -norm. For concreteness let us examine the case when $\|\cdot\|$ is a weighted L_1 -norm with weights $w := (w_1, \dots, w_n) > 0$, i.e., $\|x\| := \sum_{j=1}^n w_j |x_j|$. Then (19) can be represented as the following linear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) := & \max_{\bar{y}, \theta, q} (a^T \bar{y} + g\theta) \\ \text{s.t. } & \bar{y} - \theta x \leq q, \quad (\pi_1) \\ & -\bar{y} + \theta x \leq q, \quad (\pi_2) \\ & w^T q \leq \theta \delta, \quad (\gamma) \\ & c^T \bar{y} + h\theta = 1, \quad (\tau) \\ & \theta b - A\bar{y} \geq 0, \quad (\lambda) \\ & \theta \geq 0, \quad (\kappa) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where for future reference we assign names of linear optimization dual variables for each of the constraint systems above. We have the following result concerning the computation of the gradient of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$:

PROPOSITION 5. *There is a set $B \subset S$ of measure zero that makes the following hold: suppose $x \in S \setminus B$, let $(\bar{y}^*, \theta^*, q^*)$ solve (20), let $(\pi_1^*, \pi_2^*, \gamma^*, \tau^*, \lambda^*, \kappa^*)$ be optimal dual variables, and define*

$$p := p(x) := \theta^*(\pi_1^* - \pi_2^*). \tag{21}$$

Then $\nabla \tilde{f}(x) = p(x)$.

Below we present a proof of Proposition 5. This proof relies on (20) being a linear optimization problem. This will be the case whenever S is conveyed via linear inequalities and whenever the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is polyhedral, or to be more exact, whenever the norm level set constraint “ $\|v\| \leq t$ ” in variables v, t can be conveniently represented via linear inequalities. Although we specifically worked with the weighted L_1 -norm in (20), there is no loss of generality in working with a weighted L_∞ -norm or other polyhedral norm.

Because (20) is a linear program parameterized by x , it would be convenient to prove Proposition 5 by invoking a standard right-hand-side sensitivity analysis result on parametric linear programming. However, notice that the

parameter x appears in the left-hand side of the first two constraints of (20), and this dependence of the constraint-matrix coefficients of (20) on the parameter x appears to be structural; i.e., we see no way to remove it by a simple change of variable. Thus to prove Proposition 5 we will invoke the following result concerning changes in data coefficients in linear programming.

THEOREM 1. *Consider the following primal and dual pair of linear optimization problems:*

$$\begin{aligned} P(x): \quad & f(x) = \min_y c_x^T y \\ & \text{s.t. } A_x y = b_x, \\ & y \geq 0. \\ D(x): \quad & \max_z b_x^T z \\ & \text{s.t. } A_x^T z \leq c_x, \\ & z \text{ free.} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Suppose $A_x = A_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_x} A_k x_k$, $b_x = b_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_x} b_k x_k$, and $c_x = c_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n_x} c_k x_k$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_x})$ are parameters that determine the data A_x, b_x, c_x of the linear program $P(x)$. Let S denote the subset of \mathbb{R}^{n_x} for which $P(x)$ has an optimal solution. Then there exists a set $B \subset S$ of measure zero that makes the following hold: if $\hat{x} \in S \setminus B$, and y^*, z^* are optimal solutions to $P(\hat{x})$ and $D(\hat{x})$, then

$$\left. \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_k} \right|_{x_k = \hat{x}_k} = c_k^T y^* + b_k^T z^* - (z^*)^T A_k y^*. \tag{23}$$

Theorem 1 follows as the multivariate extension of the case when $n_x = 1$ using rational functions (see Freund 1985, Lemma 1, Theorem 2). \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5. The proof follows by applying Theorem 1 in the linear optimization problem (20). Considering the k th component of x we have from Theorem 1 that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \tilde{f}(x)}{\partial x_k} \right|_{x_k} = \theta^*(\pi_1^*)_k - \theta^*(\pi_2^*)_k,$$

except possibly on a set B of measure zero, which proves the result. \square

2.4. Piecewise Linear Fractional Objective and $S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$

Let us now consider the case when the objective function is piecewise linear fractional:

$$f(x) := \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{(a^i)^T x + g_i}{(c^i)^T x + h_i}, \tag{24}$$

and we impose the conditions that S is compact and convex, and $(c^i)^T x + h_i > 0$ for all $x \in S$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Similar to §2.3, it holds that $f(\cdot)$ is quasiconvex on S (but not quasiconcave). We can write the FA objective function as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \frac{(a^i)^T y + g_i}{(c^i)^T y + h_i} \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \frac{(a^i)^T y + g_i}{(c^i)^T y + h_i} \\ &= \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \tilde{f}_i(x), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_i(x) &:= \max_y \frac{(a^i)^T y + g_i}{(c^i)^T y + h_i} \\ \text{s.t. } &\|y - x\| \leq \delta, \\ &y \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The following result on the structure of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is evident from Proposition 3:

PROPOSITION 6. $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot): S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quasiconcave function, $i = 1, \dots, m$, whereby $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is the pointwise maximum of quasiconcave functions.

PROOF. The proof is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3. \square

Paralleling results in §2.3, we have the following result on the computation of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$, which shows that $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ is computable by solving m convex optimization problems.

PROPOSITION 7. If $x \in S$, then $\tilde{f}(x) = \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \tilde{f}_i(x)$ where for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\tilde{f}_i(x)$ is the optimal objective function value of the following convex optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(x): \quad \tilde{f}_i(x) &:= \max_{\bar{y}, \theta} ((a^i)^T \bar{y} + g_i \theta) \\ \text{s.t. } &\|\bar{y} - \theta x\| \leq \theta \delta, \\ &(c^i)^T \bar{y} + h_i \theta = 1, \\ &\bar{y} \in \theta S, \\ &\theta \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, if (\bar{y}, θ) is feasible and/or optimal for $P_i(x)$ in (27), then $y = \bar{y}/\theta$ is feasible and/or optimal for (26), respectively.

PROOF. Proposition 7 is essentially a restatement of Proposition 4 for each of the $i = 1, \dots, m$ pieces $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ of $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$. \square

As in §2.2, using (25) and (26) the FA optimization problem (3) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P^{\text{FA}}: \quad \tilde{z}^* &:= \min_x \tilde{f}(x) = \min_{x,t} t \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in S, \quad \text{s.t. } \tilde{f}_i(x) \leq t, \\ &i = 1, \dots, m, x \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, we know from Proposition 6 that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is quasiconcave, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Let $\hat{x} \in S$ be a given point. In light of the structure of the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem (28), we consider computing first-order objects for each of the functions $\tilde{f}_i(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Similar to §2.3, we assume that S is conveyed as a system of k linear inequalities, namely, $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: b - Ax \geq 0\}$, i.e., $K = \mathbb{R}_+^k$ in the conic linear representation, and in particular we examine the case when the prescribed norm is the weighted L_1 -norm with weights $w := (w_1, \dots, w_n) > 0$. Then for $i = 1, \dots, m$, problem (27) can be represented as the following linear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(x): \quad \tilde{f}_i(x) &:= \max_{\bar{y}_i, \theta_i, q_i} ((a^i)^T \bar{y}_i + g_i \theta_i) \\ \text{s.t. } &\bar{y}_i - \theta_i x \leq q_i, \quad (\pi_{i,1}) \\ &-\bar{y}_i + \theta_i x \leq q_i, \quad (\pi_{i,2}) \\ &w^T q_i \leq \theta_i \delta, \quad (\gamma_i) \\ &(c^i)^T \bar{y}_i + h_i \theta_i = 1, \quad (\tau_i) \\ &\theta b - A \bar{y}_i \geq 0, \quad (\lambda_i) \\ &\theta_i \geq 0, \quad (\kappa_i) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where for future reference we assign names of linear optimization dual variables for each of the constraint systems above. The analogous result of Proposition 5 is:

PROPOSITION 8. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be given. There is a set $B_i \subset S$ of measure zero which makes the following hold: suppose $x \in S \setminus B_i$. Let $(\bar{y}_i^*, \theta_i^*, q_i^*)$ solve $P_i(x)$ of (29) and let $(\pi_{i,1}^*, \pi_{i,2}^*, \gamma_i^*, \tau_i^*, \lambda_i^*, \kappa_i^*)$ be optimal dual variables, and define

$$p_i := p_i(x) := \theta_i^* (\pi_{i,1}^* - \pi_{i,2}^*). \quad (30)$$

Then $\nabla \tilde{f}_i(x) = p_i(x)$.

PROOF. The result follows directly from Proposition 5. \square

Based on Propositions 7 and 8, we propose an algorithm for solving the FA optimization problem P^{FA} in (28). Let $\hat{x} \in S$ be a given point. We sequentially solve the first-order approximation of (28) based on the point \hat{x} , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{\hat{x}}: \quad \min_{x,t} &t \\ \text{s.t. } &\tilde{f}_i(\hat{x}) + \nabla \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})^T (x - \hat{x}) \leq t, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ &x \in S, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the values $\tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})$ and $\nabla \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ are computed via Propositions 7 and 8, respectively. This leads to the sequential linear optimization scheme described in Table 1, which we refer to as Algorithm FA (for Fabrication-Adaptivity).

Note that Algorithm FA is designed for the case when $f(\cdot)$ is piecewise linear fractional (24). When the denominators in the linear fractional forms are all equal to 1, i.e.,

Table 1. Algorithm for fabrication-adaptive optimization problem when $f(\cdot)$ is piecewise linear fractional and S is given by linear inequalities.

Algorithm FA when $f(\cdot)$ is piecewise linear fractional problem
Step 1. Start with initial guess $\hat{x} := x^0$ and tolerance ϵ_{tol} .
Step 2. For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, do: Compute function value $\tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})$ via (29). Compute first-order information $p_i(\hat{x})$ via (30).
Step 3. Form the linear optimization problem $P^{\hat{x}}$ in (31).
Step 4. Solve $P^{\hat{x}}$ for an optimal solution x^* .
Step 5. If $\ x^* - \hat{x}\ \leq \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$, stop. Else update $\hat{x} \leftarrow x^*$ and go to Step 2.

$c^i = 0$ and $h_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, then it follows from Proposition 1 that $\tilde{f}_i(\cdot)$ is concave on S , whereby for $\hat{x} \in S$ we have:

$$\tilde{f}_i(x) \leq \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x}) + \nabla \tilde{f}_i(\hat{x})^T (x - \hat{x}) \quad \text{for all } x \in S, i = 1, \dots, m.$$

This in turn implies that if (x, t) is feasible for $P^{\hat{x}}$ (31), then (x, t) is also feasible for P^{FA} (28), whereby the optimal value of $P^{\hat{x}}$ will always be an upper bound on the value of P^{FA} in this case.

When we discuss bandgap optimization problems in §3 (for which the concept of fabrication-adaptivity was originally inspired), we will show that the original bandgap optimization problem can be cast as an instance of the piecewise linear fractional optimization problem (24), and that Algorithm FA can therefore be used to solve the FA optimization problem associated with this problem. We will show computational results for a particularly useful bandgap optimization problem, namely, the photonic crystal design problem, in §4.

2.5. A Very Special Piecewise Linear Fractional Problem

Let us now consider the following very special piecewise linear fractional objective function:

$$f(x) := \frac{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T x + g_i) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T x + h_j)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T x + g_i) + \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T x + h_j)}. \quad (32)$$

Similar in spirit to §2.4, we suppose that S is compact and convex, and we impose the condition that $(a^i)^T x + g_i > 0$ and $(c^j)^T x + h_j > 0$ for all $x \in S$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Optimization problems with this structure arise naturally and often in bandgap optimization applications, which will be discussed in §3. (Indeed, bandgap optimization problems gave rise to our interest in this particular structure to begin with.)

In order to analyze the properties of $f(\cdot)$ as well as the fabrication-adaptive objective $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$, we will use the following result.

PROPOSITION 9. Suppose that $(a^i)^T x + g_i > 0$ and $(c^j)^T x + h_j > 0$ for all $x \in S$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &:= \frac{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T x + g_i) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T x + h_j)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T x + g_i) + \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T x + h_j)} \\ &= \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{((a^i)^T x + g_i) - ((c^j)^T x + h_j)}{((a^i)^T x + g_i) + ((c^j)^T x + h_j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

PROOF. To ease the notational burden let $U_i = (a^i)^T x + g_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $L_j = (c^j)^T x + h_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Let us also define the general function $\phi(U, L) := (U - L)/(U + L)$, and notice that $\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ is increasing in U and decreasing in L for $U > 0$ and $L > 0$. For a given value of $x \in S$, let us consider the left side and the right side of the equality (33) we need to prove. Clearly the right side is at least as large as the left side. Now suppose that (\hat{i}, \hat{j}) is a pair of indices that attains the maximum in the right side of (33). Then we have from the monotonicity of $\phi(U, L)$ that

$$\frac{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} U_i - \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} U_i + \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j} \geq \frac{U_{\hat{i}} - \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j}{U_{\hat{i}} + \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} L_j} \geq \frac{U_{\hat{i}} - L_{\hat{j}}}{U_{\hat{i}} + L_{\hat{j}}},$$

thus showing that the left side of (33) is at least as large as the right side, completing the proof. \square

Proposition 9 shows that $f(\cdot)$ can alternatively be rewritten as the maximum of $m := |\mathcal{I}| \cdot |\mathcal{J}|$ linear fractional functions (where $|\mathcal{K}|$ denotes the cardinality of the set \mathcal{K}), and so is an instance of the format (24), and hence all of the results of §2.4 apply herein.

Indeed, we can write the FA objective function as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \frac{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T y + g_i) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T y + h_j)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((a^i)^T y + g_i) + \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} ((c^j)^T y + h_j)} \\ &= \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{((a^i)^T y + g_i) - ((c^j)^T y + h_j)}{((a^i)^T y + g_i) + ((c^j)^T y + h_j)} \\ &= \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} \max_{y \in S, \|y-x\| \leq \delta} \frac{(a^i - c^j)^T y + (g_i - h_j)}{(a^i + c^j)^T y + (g_i + h_j)} \\ &= \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} \tilde{f}_{i,j}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{i,j}(x) &:= \max_y \frac{(a^i - c^j)^T y + (g_i - h_j)}{(a^i + c^j)^T y + (g_i + h_j)} \\ &\text{s.t. } \|y - x\| \leq \delta, \\ &\quad y \in S, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which has the exact same format as (25) and (26) with a finite index set given by all pairs $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$. Therefore, $\tilde{f}_{i,j}(\cdot)$ is quasiconcave and $f(\cdot)$ is the pointwise maximum of quasiconcave functions (Proposition 6), the computation of $\tilde{f}_{i,j}(x)$ for a given $x \in S$ is the solution of the convex optimization problem described in Proposition 7, and the computation of $\nabla \tilde{f}_{i,j}(x)$ for a given x is obtained from dual variables as described in Proposition 8. Furthermore, the algorithm presented in §2.4 can be applied to solve the FA

optimization problem derived from the original objective function given in (32).

3. Fabrication-Adaptivity for Bandgap Optimization Problems

The motivation for developing the fabrication-adaptivity paradigm stemmed from work on bandgap design optimization, and more specifically on photonic crystal design optimization. The works of Cox and Dobson (2000), Kao et al. (2005), and Men et al. (2010, 2011) contain methods to optimize bandgaps for this class of problems, but of necessity none of these works addresses issues of fabricability. The chief goal of this paper is to construct and solve fabrication-adaptive optimization problems for this class of problems. In this section we first review bandgap optimization problems in general, and we present the class of bandgap optimization models used in the previous work. We then show how to apply the fabrication-adaptive formulation to bandgap optimization problems. The presentation herein is at a high level, and properties are stated as summary results of previous work without proofs; for a more detailed presentation, we refer the interested reader to Men et al. (2010).

3.1. Bandgap Optimization Problems

A *bandgap* is a concept that arises in many engineering applications. In semiconductor physics, an electron can sometimes transition from one energy state to another by a change in crystal momentum. An *energy bandgap* thus denotes a range of energy states that the electrons are forbidden to occupy despite any change in momentum (in the absence of any external excitation). Analogously, in photonic crystals (periodic optical nanostructures), photons can


behave as waves and propagate with certain frequencies through the bulk material at admissible wavevectors. A *frequency bandgap* is defined as the range of disallowed frequencies of the photons; if a photon is traveling according to a given wavevector, it will get attenuated within the crystal if it is propagating at any frequency within the frequency bandgap. The energy bandgap phenomenon has been used in applications such as insulators, laser diodes, solar cells, etc., and the frequency bandgap phenomenon has been used in applications such as frequency filters, waveguides, and optical buffers.

Bandgap optimization is the process of designing the composition and structure of a material to maximize a specific bandgap. The bandgap optimization problem is generally written as the following nonlinear nonconvex eigenvalue-constrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P: \quad & \max_{x \in S} \frac{\min_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_{m+1}(k, x) - \max_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_m(k, x)}{(1/2)(\min_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_{m+1}(k, x) + \max_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_m(k, x))} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{A}(k, x)u_j(k, x) = \lambda_j(k, x)\mathbf{M}u_j(k, x), \\
 & j = m, m + 1, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{Q}. \quad (36)
 \end{aligned}$$

The decision variables of problem P are $x \in S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, which represent the discretized material property of the design domain, as shown in the left panel of Figure 1. The objective of problem P is the eigenvalue *gap-midgap* ratio, which is defined as the difference between two prescribed consecutive eigenvalues divided by their mean (for scale invariance). The constraints of problem P are described in the equation line (36), which is shorthand for “for each k in the index set \mathcal{Q} , $\lambda_j(k, x)$ is the j th ordered (generalized) eigenvalue (for $j = m, m + 1$) of $\mathbf{A}(k, x)$ with respect to \mathbf{M} , for the given design variable x .” Here \mathcal{Q} is a particular governing index set and is typically discretized to have the

Figure 1. Bandgap optimization problem.



Notes. The left figure is the schematic representation of the design problem. The design region is represented by piecewise constant values x_i of pixel (or voxel) i for each of $i = 1, \dots, n_x$ pixels, where x_i is the value of the material property of design interest (such as permittivity, Poisson’s ratio, Young’s modulus, etc.). The right figure is the band diagram: in this example, \mathcal{Q} is the interval $[k_1, k_{n_k}]$, which is discretized into a finite number of components $\{k_1, \dots, k_{n_k}\}$. Each curve shows an eigenvalue parameterized over the elements of \mathcal{Q} . The band shown in the figure is the difference between the sixth and seventh eigenvalues and portrays the numerator of the objective function in (36). The objective is to determine the values of the design variables x for which the resulting bandgap between these consecutive eigenvalues is largest.

n_k values $\mathcal{Q} = \{k_1, \dots, k_{n_k}\}$, as shown in the right panel of Figure 1. (Indeed, in most bandgap problems \mathcal{Q} indexes a discretization of the wave vectors that lie on the boundary of the Brillouin zone.)

Much of the details and derivation of the generalized eigensystem equation of (36) are beyond the scope of the present paper. However, we call out certain properties of \mathbf{M} and the family of matrices $\mathbf{A}(k, x)$ because they are used in subsequent reformulations.

PROPOSITION 10. *Let $\lambda_1(k, x) \leq \lambda_2(k, x) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N(k, x)$ denote the eigenvalues of the generalized eigensystem equation of (36), with corresponding normalized eigenfunctions $u_1(k, x), u_2(k, x), \dots, u_N(k, x)$. Then \mathbf{M} and $\mathbf{A}(k, x)$ have the following properties:*

- (i) $\mathbf{M} \succ 0$,
- (ii) $\mathbf{A}(k, x) \succeq 0$, for all $k \in \mathcal{Q}$, $x \in S$,
- (iii) $\mathbf{A}(k, x) = \mathbf{A}_0(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} \mathbf{A}_i(k) x_i$, for all $k \in \mathcal{Q}$,
- (iv) $\lambda_i(k, x) \geq 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, and
- (v) $u_i(k, x)^T \mathbf{M} u_j(k, x) = \delta_{ij}$, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, N$. \square

Item (i) of Proposition 10 states that the (mass) matrix \mathbf{M} is positive definite, and item (ii) states that $\mathbf{A}(k, x)$ is positive semidefinite for any feasible design x and for every $k \in \mathcal{Q}$. Item (iii) states that the matrix $\mathbf{A}(k, x)$ depends affinely on the design variables x for every $k \in \mathcal{Q}$. Items (iv) and (v) state that the generalized eigenvalues are nonnegative and the generalized eigenfunctions are \mathbf{M} -orthogonal, which are direct consequences of the previous three items.

Now let $\hat{x} \in S$ be given. To ease the notation burden, we identify the finite set $\mathcal{Q} := \{k_1, \dots, k_{n_k}\}$ with the counter $t \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$. In Men et al. (2010) it is shown how to construct operators $\mathcal{A}_{l,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) = A_{l,t,0}^{\hat{x}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_{l,t,i}^{\hat{x}} x_i$ and $\mathcal{A}_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) := A_{u,t,0}^{\hat{x}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_{u,t,i}^{\hat{x}} x_i$, and also corresponding mass matrices $M_{l,t}^{\hat{x}}$ and $M_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}$, for each $t \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$, all of whose data depends on the current point \hat{x} , which are used to construct the following (convex) linear fractional semidefinite optimization problem (SDP):

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\text{SDP}}^{\hat{x}}: \quad & \max_{x \in S, \lambda_l, \lambda_u} \quad 2 \frac{\lambda_u - \lambda_l}{\lambda_u + \lambda_l} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathcal{A}_{l,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) \leq \lambda_l M_{l,t}^{\hat{x}}, \quad t = 1, \dots, n_k, \\
 & \mathcal{A}_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) \geq \lambda_u M_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}, \quad t = 1, \dots, n_k, \\
 & \lambda_l \geq 0, \lambda_u \geq 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

PROPOSITION 11. *For a given $\hat{x} \in S$, the nonlinear nonconvex problem P is locally approximated as the (convex) linear fractional semidefinite program $P_{\text{SDP}}^{\hat{x}}$ of (37). \square*

Without going into the fine details, we note that λ_l and λ_u in (37) are intended to model $\max_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_m(k, x)$ and $\min_{k \in \mathcal{Q}} \lambda_{m+1}(k, x)$ in (36), respectively, and that the two pairs of semidefinite inclusions in (37) locally model the m th and $(m + 1)$ st eigenvalue position for each $k \in \mathcal{Q} = \{k_1, \dots, k_{n_k}\}$.

Our goal herein is to apply the fabrication-adaptivity paradigm to bandgap optimization problems. Note that the

objective function of (37) is at least as challenging as the largest eigenvalue function of §2.1. Recall from the discussion in §2.1 that the fabrication-adaptive counterpart function of the largest eigenvalue function is typically not computationally tractable. We therefore proceed by replacing the semidefinite inclusions in (37) with linear inequality approximations, the methodology for which is described in EC.2.1, which yields the data $B^{\hat{x}}$, $C^{\hat{x}}$, $g^{\hat{x}}$, and $h^{\hat{x}}$ for the linear fractional optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{\text{LFP}}^{\hat{x}}: \quad & \max_{x \in S, \lambda_l, \lambda_u} \quad 2 \frac{\lambda_u - \lambda_l}{\lambda_u + \lambda_l} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & B^{\hat{x}} x + g^{\hat{x}} \leq e \lambda_l, \\
 & C^{\hat{x}} x + h^{\hat{x}} \geq e \lambda_u, \\
 & \lambda_l \geq 0, \lambda_u \geq 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

PROPOSITION 12. *For a given $\hat{x} \in S$, the linear fractional semidefinite program $P_{\text{SDP}}^{\hat{x}}$ of (37) is approximated as the linear fractional optimization problem $P_{\text{LFP}}^{\hat{x}}$ of (38). \square*

Here the two groups of semidefinite inclusions in (37) are replaced by \mathcal{N}_B and \mathcal{N}_C linear inequalities, respectively. The detailed methodology and derivation of the approximating linear inequalities are not the focus of the current work but are nevertheless presented in EC.2.1 for completeness. In addition, the computational results presented in EC.2.3 show that solutions of (38) are nearly as good and often are superior to those of (37). Our methodology is similar in spirit to that of Sherali and Fraticelli (2002), who replace semidefinite inclusions with linear inequalities to solve nonconvex quadratic optimization problems on the simplex.

3.2. Fabrication-Adaptivity Formulation

Notice that the linear fractional formulation in (38) can be equivalently written in the following format that emphasizes the special piecewise linear structure of the objective function:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{x \in S} f^{\hat{x}}(x) \\
 & := 2 \frac{\min_{i \in \mathcal{J}} (C^{\hat{x}} x + h^{\hat{x}})_i - \max_{j \in \mathcal{F}} (B^{\hat{x}} x + g^{\hat{x}})_j}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{J}} (C^{\hat{x}} x + h^{\hat{x}})_i + \max_{j \in \mathcal{F}} (B^{\hat{x}} x + g^{\hat{x}})_j},
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_C\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_B\}$. Note in (39) that the only constraint is the feasibility inclusion $x \in S$. This special piecewise linear fractional function is of the exact structure as the problem discussed in §2.5 (with the equivalence that now the objective is maximization rather than minimization and hence the roles of the “max” and “min” are switched in the fractional objective function). Furthermore, it will also be the case in the bandgap application that the suppositions of §2.5 are also satisfied; namely, S is compact and is conveyed as a system of linear inequalities $S = \{x: Ax \leq b\}$, the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is a weighted 1-norm $\|x\| := \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} w_i |x_i|$ for positive weights (w_1, \dots, w_{n_x}) , and

$(C^{\hat{x}}x + h^{\hat{x}})_i > 0$ and $(B^{\hat{x}}x + g^{\hat{x}})_j > 0$ for all $x \in S$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$, respectively. Therefore, we can invoke the results in §2.5 regarding computation and optimization of the fabrication-adaptive counterpart function $\tilde{f}^{\hat{x}}(x)$. Let us see how this can be done. From Proposition 9 (with “min” and “max” appropriately interchanged) we have that

$$f^{\hat{x}}(x) = \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} 2 \frac{(C_i^{\hat{x}} - B_j^{\hat{x}})x + (h_i^{\hat{x}} - g_j^{\hat{x}})}{(C_i^{\hat{x}} + B_j^{\hat{x}})x + (h_i^{\hat{x}} + g_j^{\hat{x}})}. \quad (40)$$

Furthermore, from (34) and (35) we have that

$$\tilde{f}^{\hat{x}}(x) = \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}} \tilde{f}_{i,j}^{\hat{x}}(x), \quad (41)$$

where for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{ij}^{\hat{x}}(x) := \min_y & 2 \frac{(C_i^{\hat{x}} - B_j^{\hat{x}})y + (h_i^{\hat{x}} - g_j^{\hat{x}})}{(C_i^{\hat{x}} + B_j^{\hat{x}})y + (h_i^{\hat{x}} + g_j^{\hat{x}})} \\ \text{s.t. } & \|y - x\| \leq \delta, \\ & y \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It also follows that $\tilde{f}_{ij}^{\hat{x}}(x)$ and $\nabla \tilde{f}_{ij}^{\hat{x}}(x)$ are computable via the convex optimization problems described in Propositions 7 and 8, respectively, and that Algorithm FA of Table 1 can be adapted (taking into account that the roles of min and max are switched and that the linear fractional pieces are indexed by pairs (i, j)) to solve the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem. The format for (28) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in S} \tilde{f}^{\hat{x}}(x) = \max_{x,t} & t \\ \text{s.t. } & \tilde{f}_{i,j}^{\hat{x}}(x) \geq t, \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}, \\ & x \in S, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and the linearization of (43) at \hat{x} then is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x,t} & t \\ \text{s.t. } & \tilde{f}_{i,j}^{\hat{x}}(\hat{x}) + (\nabla \tilde{f}_{i,j}^{\hat{x}}(\hat{x}))^T (x - \hat{x}) \geq t, \\ & \text{for all } (i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}, \\ & x \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Table 2 presents the version of Algorithm FA, which we call Algorithm FA-B, for solving bandgap problems.

4. Computational Results for Fabrication-Adaptive Optimization

We first test the intended effectiveness of Algorithm FA (Table 1) on random problems. These results are presented in §4.1. We then apply Algorithm FA-B to a variety of bandgap problems that arise in photonic crystal design, which was the problem class that engendered this line of research. We show via several examples how the solutions produced by Algorithm FA-B succeed in producing improved fabricable design solutions compared to solutions based on the optimal solution of the original design optimization problem. These results are presented in §4.2.

Table 2. Fabrication-adaptive optimization algorithm for bandgap problems.

Algorithm FA-B for bandgap problems	
<i>Step 1.</i>	Start with initial guess $\hat{x} := x^0$ and tolerance ϵ_{tol}
<i>Step 2(a).</i>	Construct the linear operators for (37) based on \hat{x} , for each $t \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$: $\mathcal{A}_{l,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) := A_{l,t,0}^{\hat{x}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_{l,t,i}^{\hat{x}} x_i$ $\mathcal{A}_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}(x) := A_{u,t,0}^{\hat{x}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} A_{u,t,i}^{\hat{x}} x_i$ $M_{l,t}^{\hat{x}} \text{ and } M_{u,t}^{\hat{x}}$
<i>Step 2(b).</i>	Construct the data for (38) based on \hat{x} and the linear operators from Step 2(a): $B^{\hat{x}}$, $g^{\hat{x}}$, $C^{\hat{x}}$, and $h^{\hat{x}}$
<i>Step 3.</i>	For each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$, do: Compute the function value $\tilde{f}_{i,j}(\hat{x})$ of (42) via (29) Compute first-order information $\nabla \tilde{f}_{i,j}(\cdot)$ at \hat{x} via (30)
<i>Step 4.</i>	Form the linear optimization problem (44)
<i>Step 5.</i>	Solve (44) for an optimal solution x^*
<i>Step 6.</i>	If $\ x^* - \hat{x}\ \leq \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$, stop. Else update $\hat{x} \leftarrow x^*$ and go to <i>Step 2</i> .

4.1. Computation on Random Piecewise Linear Fractional Problems

We tested Algorithm FA on randomly generated instances of the specially structured piecewise linear fractional optimization problem (32) presented in §2.5. All problems were generated using $n = 50$, $n_{\mathcal{I}} = 20$, and $n_{\mathcal{J}} = 30$ and S set to a unit hypercube of the form $S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1.0 \leq x_i \leq 2.0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$. All of the components of a^i , c^j , g_i , and h_j were chosen randomly from the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}[0, 1]$, for $i = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{I}}$, $j = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{J}}$. The choice of S , the range of the data, and the size of the generated problems are in close agreement with problems arising in photonic crystal design problems to be discussed in §4.2.

Given a randomly generated instance of (32), let us denote the optimal solution of the original optimization problem (32) as

$$x_O^* := \arg \min_{x \in S} f(x). \quad (45)$$

To construct the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem, we used the norm $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_1$ and set $\delta = 5.0$; note that this choice allows for changing up to 10% (5/50) of the components x_i of x by one unit, which is the full range of x_i by definition of S . Let x_{FA}^* denote the computed solution of the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem using Algorithm FA.

Note that x_O^* is the optimal solution of (32), which is solvable as a linear optimization problem. In contrast, x_{FA}^* is not necessarily the (global) optimal solution of FA optimization problem (28) and is computed using Algorithm FA (Table 1). Here and in what follows we used the

Gurobi Optimizer (Gurobi Optimization 2013) to solve all linear optimization problems.

We generated 20 random instances of (32). Since the results of all 20 instances lead to the same conclusion, we only discuss detailed results from a particular one. For this problem instance, the optimal objective function value of the original problem is $f(x_O^*) = 0.129$, whereas the value of the original objective function evaluated at the fabrication-adaptive solution is $f(x_{FA}^*) = 0.135$, which is inferior (larger) to that of the optimal value as expected. We tested the adaptivity of x_O^* and x_{FA}^* as follows. For these two solutions under consideration, and a given value of $\sigma \in [0, \delta]$, we compute the most conservative objective function value $f(y)$ among all solutions y for which $\|y - \hat{x}\| \leq \sigma$ and $y \in S$. That is, we compute

$$\text{ZAD}^{\hat{x}}(\sigma) := \max_y f(y) \quad (46)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|y - \hat{x}\| \leq \sigma \quad y \in S,$$

for $\hat{x} = x_O^*$ and $\hat{x} = x_{FA}^*$. One can interpret (46) as computing the worst solution y whose distance from \hat{x} is at most σ . In the absence of an intelligent method for adapting a solution \hat{x} , (46) essentially assumes the solution \hat{x} will be adapted to a nearby solution y in an *adversarial* manner (hence the choice of notation “ZAD” in (46)). The values of $\text{ZAD}^{\hat{x}}(\sigma)$ were computed using Steps 2 through 4 of Algorithm FA in Table 1. Plots of $\text{ZAD}^{x_O^*}(\sigma)$ and $\text{ZAD}^{x_{FA}^*}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in [0, \delta]$ are shown in Figure 2(a). For small values of σ , the range of adversarial solutions is small, and hence the superior original objective function value of x_O^* yields $\text{ZAD}^{x_O^*}(\sigma) < \text{ZAD}^{x_{FA}^*}(\sigma)$. However, as the values of σ increase, the superior adaptability of the solution x_{FA}^* is revealed. When the range of adversarial solutions is larger, $\text{ZAD}^{x_O^*}(\sigma) > \text{ZAD}^{x_{FA}^*}(\sigma)$, showing that nearby adversarial solutions of x_{FA}^* are superior to those of x_O^* . These plots reveal that the solution x_{FA}^* is indeed effectively more adaptive, with the advantage growing as the allowable range of nearby solutions grows. We also repeated this computational exercise using $\delta = 10.0$. The resulting plots of

$\text{ZAD}^{x_O^*}(\sigma)$ and $\text{ZAD}^{x_{FA}^*}(\sigma)$ for the case of $\delta = 10.0$ are shown in Figure 2(b). Notice that the results for the case $\delta = 10.0$ further reinforce the above observations.

Of the 20 randomly generated instances of (32), all exhibited similar effectiveness of the adaptivity of x_{FA}^* in terms of $\text{ZAD}^{x_O^*}(\sigma)$ and $\text{ZAD}^{x_{FA}^*}(\sigma)$.

4.2. Computational Experience on Bandgap Problems in Photonic Crystal Design

In this section we present results from applying the fabrication-adaptive optimization model to bandgap problems in photonic crystal design, which was the originator of our need to pursue this line of research. As briefly reviewed in §3, the goal is to optimize the bandgap between two consecutive eigenvalues, where the bandgap is the largest gap that separates the two eigenvalues over all values of k in the governing index set \mathcal{Q} . We seek to solve fabrication-adaptive models (43) using Algorithm FA-B (Table 2). There are many different types of bandgap optimization problems that one can construct as well as different schemes themselves for constructing bandgap optimization problems in photonic crystal design. For example, one arrives at different bandgap optimization problems depending on which eigenvalue gap one seeks to optimize (the m th bandgap, defined as the relative gap between the m th and the $(m + 1)$ st eigenvalues for $m = 1, \dots, N - 1$), the choice of polarization (TE (Transverse Electric) or TM (Transverse Magnetic) or complete (TEM (Transverse Electric and Magnetic)) polarization), and the lattice structure of the photonic crystal (typically a square lattice or a triangular lattice). Different combinations of these choices lead to different bandgap optimization problems with different optimal solutions. Among the numerous topological varieties in the optimal structures derived from different bandgap problems, one often encounters solutions that are either not fabricable or pose onerous fabrication challenges because of thin connectors, small features, rough

Figure 2. Adaptivity of x_O^* and x_{FA}^* to nearby *adversarial* solutions, as defined in (46).





Figure 3. Solutions to the second TE bandgap problem in the square lattice.



Note. (a) is the original optimal design x_0^* , with $\text{Gap}(x_0^*) = 65.5\%$; (b) is the solution y_0 which is a manual modification of x_0^* , with $\text{Gap}(y_0) = 20.3\%$, and 3% of pixels being modified; (c) is the computed solution x_{FA}^* of using Algorithm FA-B, with $\text{Gap}(x_{FA}^*) = 49.6\%$, using $\delta = 3\%$.

edges, isolated structures, and other related solution configurations.

Among the more than 60 bandgap problems that we have solved, the original optimal solutions of at least 15 are not fabricable without postprocessing modification. Furthermore, most of the nonfabricable solutions are for optimization problems for complete (TEM) bandgaps or other multiple-bandgap problems (Men 2011, Men et al. 2011). We applied the fabrication adaptive optimization paradigm and algorithms to most of these problems. Herein we report on some of our computational experience to address questions such as (i) how sensitive are solutions of the original problem to fabrication-adaptivity modifications? (ii) How good are the solutions computed when solving the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem? (iii) How do fabrication adaptive solutions compare to solutions of the original optimization problem?

For a given problem instance, let x_0^* be the optimal solution of the original bandgap problem (37) (or (38)), and let x_{FA}^* be the computed solution of the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem using Algorithm FA-B. In the case when x_0^* and/or x_{FA}^* are not fabricable, we applied manual changes of these solutions to produce fabricable solutions y_{FA} and/or y_0 by using our own problem-domain common sense to modify pixel values to create more fabricable designs. The manual changes we employed are of the ordinary variety such as removing thin rods, removing small features, smoothing boundaries of materials, and straightening inner edges of material boundaries. All of these modifications can be easily accomplished with standard image processing filters.


As in §4.1, let x_0^* be the optimal solution of the original bandgap problem (37) (or (38)). An example of the poor performance of x_0^* after modification for fabrication arises in solving for the second TE bandgap in the square lattice, as shown in Figure 3. Figure 3(a) shows the design x_0^* , which has a bandgap of 65.6% but which contains very thin rods that are challenging to fabricate. One can remove the thin rods by modifying 3% of the pixels, yielding the design

y_0 shown in part (b) of Figure 3. However, this small modification of the fabricable solution y_0 drastically reduces the bandgap, from 65.6% down to 20.3%. Figure 3(c) shows the computed solution x_{FA}^* of the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem using Algorithm FA-B, for the value of $\delta = 3\%$. Not only is the bandgap for x_{FA}^* much higher (49.6%) than that of y_0 , but it is actually fabricable as is. This is very fortunate, but perhaps “accidental,” as it is more typical that the solution x_{FA}^* would need to be modified to a nearby solution as we will see below. The main point of this example is to show how unadaptable the solution x_0^* can be to modification that will make it fabricable without unduly reducing the size of the bandgap.

An example of the quality of solutions computed using Algorithm FA-B is shown in Figure 4, which shows solutions to the complete (TEM) bandgap problem involving the first TE bandgap and the second TM bandgap, in the triangular lattice. For this bandgap problem, the bandgap for the original (nonfabricable) solution x_0^* (Figure 4(a)) is 33.3%. Figure 4(b) shows the computed solution x_{FA}^* of the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem using Algorithm FA-B, for the value of $\delta = 5\%$. Figure 4(c) shows the manually modified solution y_{FA} of x_{FA}^* , with about 4% of pixels being modified. The modified solution y_{FA} is significantly more fabricable than x_0^* , yet its bandgap value 31.9% is only modestly decreased from that of the original (nonfabricable) solution.

Our last two examples illustrate the comparative value of the fabrication-adaptive optimization approach. First we solve for the fifth TE bandgap in the triangular lattice, as shown in Figure 5. By simply eliminating the small features of the original optimal solution x_0^* shown in Figure 5(a) (which comprise 5% of the pixels), the bandgap of the manually modified solution y_0 is sharply decreased from 43.9% to 28.8%. However, the fabrication-adaptive computed solution using Algorithm FA-B (using the same modification allowance $\delta = 5\%$ of pixels) yields the solution x_{FA}^* (shown in Figure 5(c)). The manual modification of this solution is y_{FA} , and is shown in Figure 5(d). The modified solution

Figure 4. Solutions to the complete (TEM) bandgap problem involving the first TE bandgap and the second TM bandgap, in the triangular lattice.




Note. (a) is the original optimal design x_O^* , with $\text{Gap}(x_O^*) = 33.8\%$; (b) is the computed solution x_{FA}^* using Algorithm FA-B, with $\text{Gap}(x_{FA}^*) = 32.7\%$, using $\delta = 5\%$; (c) is the solution y_{FA} , which is a manual modification of x_{FA}^* , with $\text{Gap}(y_{FA}) = 31.9\%$, and 4% modification.

y_{FA} is designed so that the inner edges of the triangular structures in x_{FA}^* are straight, in order to make the resulting solution more fabricable. The resulting bandgap of the modified solution y_{FA} is 32.9%, which is better than that of the fabricable solution y_O based on the original optimal solution.

A similar situation occurs to solutions of the fourth TE bandgap in the square lattice. Figures 6(a) and 6(b)


show the original optimal solution and its manual modification to a fabricable solution by removing the thin rods, which reduces the original bandgap from 64.3% to 28.8%. In contrast, the computed solution x_{FA}^* shown in Figure 6(c) is truly more adaptive to modification for fabrication. Figure 6(d) shows the manually modified solution y_{FA} of x_{FA}^* , which was done by straightening the inner

Figure 5. Designs with fifth TE eigenbandgap in a triangular lattice.



Note. (a) Original optimal design x_O^* , with $\text{Gap}(x_O^*) = 43.9\%$; (b) manually modified design y_O based on the original design, with $\text{Gap}(y_O) = 28.8\%$, and 5% modifications; (c) fabrication-adaptive optimal design x_{FA}^* , with $\text{Gap}(x_{FA}^*) = 34.2\%$ and $\delta_{FA} = 5\%$; (d) manually modified design y_{FA} based on the FA optimal design, with $\text{Gap}(y_{FA}) = 32.9\%$, and 0.8% modification.

Figure 6. Solutions to the fourth TE bandgap in the square lattice.



Note. (a) is the original optimal design x_O^* , with $\text{Gap}(x_O^*) = 64.3\%$; (b) is the solution y_O which is a manual modification of x_O^* , with $\text{Gap}(y_O) = 28.8\%$, and 1.2% of pixels being modified; (c) is the computed solution x_{FA}^* using Algorithm FA-B, with $\text{Gap}(x_{FA}^*) = 45.8\%$, using $\delta = 5\%$; (d) is the solution y_{FA} , which is a manual modification of x_{FA}^* , with $\text{Gap}(y_{FA}) = 43.7\%$, and also 1.2% of pixels being modified.

sides of the square structures. In the manual modifications of both solutions x_O^* and x_{FA}^* , the fraction of pixels modified was very small, both are roughly 1.2%. However, in the case of the original solution, the bandgap was significantly reduced (from 64.3% to 28.8%), whereas in the case of the fabrication-adaptive solution, the bandgap reduction was minor (from 45.8% to 43.7%).

These examples show that although manual modification of solutions might appear to be minor, the negative effect on the bandgap can be very significant at solutions to the original problem, but (as intended) are less significant at computed solutions to the fabrication-adaptive optimization problem.

5. Conclusions

We have introduced the *fabrication-adaptive* optimization modeling paradigm (2)–(3), which stems from the *robust regularization* operation on functions (Lewis 2002). The FA modeling paradigm does not necessarily yield a convex optimization model even when the original optimization problem is convex. Hence, we examined a variety of special structures on functions, feasible regions, and norms, for which computation is tractable, and we developed an algorithmic scheme for solving certain FA optimization problems that arise from piecewise linear fractional optimization. We first tested the FA paradigm and algorithm on randomly generated problems to show some general behavior of solutions. We next applied our methodology to bandgap optimization problems in photonic crystal design, which were the originating class of problems that engendered this line of research. These bandgap problems were originally modeled using SDP formulations of iteration-specific approximation problems. To apply the FA framework, we developed piecewise linear approximations of the semidefinite inclusions, which worked surprisingly well and enabled replacing SDP inclusions with linear inequalities that yielded linear optimization problems. We used the FA model and algorithm to compute significantly improved fabricable designs of a variety of bandgap optimization problems in photonic crystal design.

As mentioned above, the success of piecewise linear approximations of the semidefinite inclusions in bandgap optimization models is counter to traditional notions that such approximations are crude at best. It is unclear at this point whether the success of our simple LP/SDP approximation is due to the very specific structure of bandgap design problems and the resulting eigenvalue bound inclusions. Future research on our agenda includes other applications and extensions of fabrication-adaptive optimization, as well as exploration aimed at understanding the possible reach of success of the LP/SDP approximation method described in the EC.2 of this paper.

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material to this paper is available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1252>.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by AFOSR Grant [FA9550-11-1-0141], the Singapore-MIT Alliance, the MIT-Chile-Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile Seed Fund, and LaCaixa Fellowship.

References

- Avriel M (1976) *Nonlinear Optimization: Analysis and Methods* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).
- Ben-Tal A, Nemirovski A (2002) On tractable approximations of uncertain linear matrix inequalities affected by interval uncertainty. *SIAM J. Optim.* 12:811–833.
- Ben-Tal A, El Ghaoui L, Nemirovski A (2009) *Robust Optimization* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).
- Bertsimas D, Brown DB, Caramanis C (2011) Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM Rev.* 53(3):464–501.
- Best M (2010) *Portfolio Optimization* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL).
- Borwein J, Lewis A (2006) *Convex Analysis and Nonlinear Optimization* (Springer, New York).
- Boyd S, Vandenberghe L (2004) *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).
- Charnes A, Cooper WW (1962) Programming with linear functionals. *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.* 9(3/4):181–186.
- Cox SJ, Dobson DC (2000) Band structure optimization of two-dimensional photonic crystals in *H*-polarization. *J. Comput. Phys.* 158(2):214–224.
- Craven BD, Mond B (1973) The dual of a fractional linear program. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 42(3):507–512.
- Duffin RJ (1956) Infinite programs. Kuhn HW, Tucker AW, eds. *Linear Inequalities and Related Systems* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ), 157–170.
- Freund RM (1985) Postoptimal analysis of a linear program under simultaneous changes in matrix coefficients. *Mathematical Programming Essays in Honor of George B. Dantzig Part I* (Springer, Berlin), 1–13.
- Gurobi Optimization, Inc. (2013) *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*. <http://www.gurobi.com>.
- Kao CY, Osher S, Yablonovitch E (2005) Maximizing band gaps in two-dimensional photonic crystals by using level set methods. *Appl. Phys. B: Lasers Optics* 81(2):235–244.
- Lewis A (2002) Robust regularization. Technical report, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.
- Lewis AS, Pang CHJ (2009) Lipschitz behavior of the robust regularization. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 48(5):3080–3104.
- Luo Z-Q (2003) Applications of convex optimization in signal processing and digital communication. *Math. Programming* 97(1–2):177–207.
- Luo Z-Q, Sturm JF, Zhang S (2004) Multivariate nonnegative quadratic mappings. *SIAM J. Optim.* 14(4):1140–1162.
- Men H (2011) Optimal design of photonic crystals. Ph.D. thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore.
- Men H, Nguyen NC, Freund RM, Parrilo PA, Peraire J (2010) Bandgap optimization of two-dimensional photonic crystals using semidefinite programming and subspace methods. *J. Comput. Phys.* 229(10):3706–3725.
- Men H, Nguyen NC, Freund RM, Lim KM, Parrilo PA, Peraire J (2011) Design of photonic crystals with multiple and combined band gaps. *Physical Rev. E* 83(4):046703.
- Nemirovski A (2012) Private communication with Robert Freund, November 16, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.
- Pinar MÇ, Arıkan O (2004) On robust solutions to linear least squares problems affected by data uncertainty and implementation errors with application to stochastic signal modeling. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 391:223–243.
- Rockafellar T (1970) *Convex Analysis* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).
- Sherali HD, Fraticelli BMP (2002) Enhancing RLT relaxations via a new class of semidefinite cuts. *J. Global Optim.* 22(1–4):233–261.
- Stinstra E, Den Hertog D (2008) Robust optimization using computer experiments. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 191(3):816–837.

Han Men is a postdoctoral associate in the Aerospace Computational Design Lab at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Her primary research area is computation modeling and optimization, which includes reduced-basis methods, microstructured material design, and efficient optimization methods for PDE-constrained problems.

Robert M. Freund is the Theresa Seley Professor in Management Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management. His research interests are in nonlinear optimization with an emphasis on computational complexity, convex optimization, convex analysis, and large-scale applications.

Ngoc C. Nguyen is a research scientist in the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His research interests are in the development, analysis, and application of numerical methods for the simulation and

optimization of complex physical systems across disciplines. He is the recipient of the Springer Computational Science and Engineering Prize 2009.

Joel Saa-Seoane is a Ph.D. candidate in the Aerospace Computational Design Lab at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He received a LaCaixa Ph.D. fellowship in 2010–2012. His areas of interest include the development of computational methods for PDE-constrained problems and the design optimization of structured materials.

Jaime Peraire is the H. N. Slater Professor and the department head of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is an American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Fellow. His research interests include computational aerodynamics, numerical analysis, and simulation-based design and optimization.