

A Multi-objective Newton Optimization Algorithm for Hyper-Parameter Search

Qinwu Xu^{a,b}

Abstract

This study proposes a Newton based multiple-objective optimization algorithm for hyperparameter search. The first order differential (gradient) is calculated using finite difference method and a gradient matrix with vectorization is formed for fast computation. The Newton Raphson iterative solution is used to update model parameters with iterations, and a regularization term is included to eliminate the singularity issue.

The algorithm is applied to search the optimal probability threshold (a vector of eight parameters) for a multi-class object detection problem of a convolutional neural network. The algorithm quickly finds the improved parameter values to produce an overall higher true positive (TP) and lower false positive (FP) rates, as compared to using the default value of 0.5. In comparison, the Bayesian optimization generates lower performance in the testing case. However, the performance and parameter values may “oscillate” for some cases during iterations, which may be due to the data-driven stochastic nature of the subject. Therefore, the optimal parameter value can be identified from a list of iteration steps according to the optimal TP and FP results.

Key words


Newton optimization, machine learning, hyperparameter search, probability

a. the University of Texas at Austin

b. Leidos Holdings Inc.

Qinwu.Xu@utexas.edu

Graphic Abstract





Objective function: Regularization

$$L = \min_{\phi} \left(\left\| P - P_t \right\|_{L_2} \right) + \lambda \phi^2$$

Performance metrics and its target

Parameter ϕ updating at k th iteration:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} + \alpha (G^T G + \lambda I)^{-1} G^T (P_{k-1} - P_t)$$



A Review of Hyperparameter Search in Machine Learning

In this section, I review a few different types of hyperparameter search methods in machine learning (ML), including the popular grid search and random search [Bahmani and Bohb 2023], as well as the more advanced ones – Bayesian optimization and trust region search method.

Grid search – an exhaustive search

Grid search (GS) is an exhaustive searching method. User designs a large matrix with different parameter combinations, and each parameter has a list of discrete values. Performances of all combinations of parameters are ranked, and the top-ranked one is selected as the optimal parameter. E.g., e.g., for eight (8) model hyper-parameter ϕ_i we give 10 values (e.g., 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, 0.45, 0.50, 0.55, 0.60, 0.65, 0.70, 0.75), which results in 10^8 combinations and requires extensive computing resource. Time complexity is $O(M^n)$, where M is number of trial value for each parameter, and n is total parameter number.

Random search – a stochastic “gambling”

It assumes that every parameter follows a statistical distribution such as Gaussian, and at each iteration we randomly select a value out of the Gaussian curve for each parameter. Time complexity is $O(nMn_t)$, n_t is iteration number. The likelihood to quickly get satisfied results is very low.

Bayesian optimization (BO)

Bayesian optimization (BO) is a probability model which intends to learn the objective function using the information learned from its previous observation [Avisheknag 2021]. More specifically, it uses prior information to estimate the next parameter value based on conditional probability and Gaussian process. It is faster than the grid search method.

ParBayesianOptimization in Action (Round 1)




Figure 1. Bayesian optimization procedure: the subgrade function (the blue region) is used to approximate the objective function and it approaches the objective (the dark line) through iterations (Courtesy of Avisheknag 2021).

BO typically involves a few computation steps as below:

Step 1 - initialize some parameter values as the seeds and often needs a group of seeds,

Step 2 - build the surrogate prediction model using conditional probability (Bayesian) and Gaussian process, as:

$$p(y|\phi) = \frac{p(\phi|y)p(y)}{p(\phi)} \quad (1)$$

Where $y \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ follows Gaussian distribution

Step 3 – minimize the acquisition or expected improvement function to estimate the next ϕ value:

$$\min_{\phi} (EI_{y^*}) = \min_{\phi} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{y^*} (y^* - y) p(y|\phi) dy = \int_{-\infty}^{y^*} (y^* - y) \frac{p(\phi|y)p(y)}{p(\phi)} dy \right] \quad (2)$$

Repeat the step 1 to 3 until the iteration number hit the maximum or performance meets the target (see Figure 1). At the end it outputs the iteration pairs (parameter and score), and user picks up the parameters with the highest score.

BO is excellent for the black box function which takes inputs and generates outputs without known or easy-to-know calculation procedures. BO can also handle noise well [3]. However, it is unable to handle parallel resources due to its consequent optimization process which relied on all prior information [3].

Trust region search (TRS)

The objective function is defined by a linear or quadratic function. A local trust region is defined with a radius, and then a step size is defined to minimize the objective function. If the size is appropriate the next trust region's radius is increased, otherwise the radius is reduced for fine tuning, as illustrated in Figure 2 [Khare 2021].




Figure 2 Trust region optimization example for minimizing Rosenbrock's function ($f(x, y) = (a - x)^2 + b(y - x^2)^2$) (courtesy of Khare 2021): the contour line is Rosenbrock's function, and the circles around the iterates are trust regions with centers indicated by dots. The initial trust radius is taken to be 0.1, which increases initially as the steps taken are appropriate. Then it decreases upon failures to minimize within the larger trust radius. The iteration continues until the function reaches the point of minima.

The model formulates a sub-problem and uses Taylor approximation to form a quadratic polynomial function to approximate the objective function as below for the k th iteration [Fortin and Wolkowicz 2004]:

$$\min_p m_k(p) = f_k + g_k^T p_k + 0.5 p_k^T B_k p_k \quad (3)$$

Such that $\|p_k\| \leq \Delta_k$

Where,

f_k : the function value at the k th iteration,

p_k : the step length,

g_k : gradient vector (first order differential),

B_k : Hessian matrix (2nd order differential),

Δ_k : the trust region radius.

A full step solution of this sub-problem is $p_k = -B_k^{-1} g_k$.

If $\|p_k\| \leq \Delta_k$, the minimum is found, and iteration stops. Otherwise, it is further approximated into the sub-problem with fine tuning toward convergence. In practice, a prediction fitness metrics is used to determine which direction that Δ_k will follow (decrease or increase, etc.), as:

$$\rho_k = \frac{f(x_k) - f(x_k + p_k)}{f(x_k) - f'_k p_k} \quad (4)$$

Where f'_k is the model predicted value at the k th iteration.

$\rho_k < 0$ will reject the step and the radius would be iterated again, $\rho_k \sim 0$ indicates a good prediction and the next Δ_k is increased, and ρ_k is accepted and parameter value is updated as:

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + p_k \quad (5)$$

Based on this step, the trust region radius is changed during every iteration as illustrated in Figure 3.

```

Given  $\hat{\Delta} > 0$ ,  $\Delta_0 \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$ , and  $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$ :
for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ 
    Obtain  $p_k$  (solving the sub-problem)
    Evaluate  $\rho_k$ 
    if  $\rho_k < \frac{1}{4}$ 
         $\Delta_{k+1} = \frac{1}{4} \Delta_k$ 
    else
        if  $\rho_k > \frac{3}{4}$  and  $\|p_k\| = \Delta_k$ 
             $\Delta_{k+1} = \min(2\Delta_k, \hat{\Delta})$ 
        else
             $\Delta_{k+1} = \Delta_k$ ;
    if  $\rho_k > \eta$ 
         $x_{k+1} = x_k + p_k$ 
    else
         $x_{k+1} = x_k$ ;
end (for).

```

Figure 3. Practical procedures for determining the step length and updating model parameters for the TRS method (Khare 2021).

Compared to the linear search algorithm, TRS is robust and has strong convergency capability [2]. However, it is unable to well exploit sparsity and it is difficult to deal with hard case [2].

Motivation and Objective

As discussed in the above section, the ML hyperparameter search methods pose some advantages and disadvantages. The popular Grid search and random search either takes extensive computing resource or being difficult to find the optimal solution without a direction during the iteration. Therefore, this study proposes the numerical optimization method for ML hyperparameter search, although it has been primarily used for solving more deterministic physical problems. The method is primarily based on the Newton method using the first order differential for gradient calculation.

Gradient Calculation Methods

Numerical methods for gradient functionals

This section provides a brief review and analysis of different numerical methods for the calculation of gradient functional in physical problems. For a function $f(\phi)$ dependent on ϕ , its gradient with

respect to ϕ often approximates to be zero at its local and global minimum or maximum, as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4. Example of function with a local minimum, a local maximum, and a global maximum where gradients are zero.

For solving a physical problem, often it calculates a total equilibrium of a physical system such as energy, expressed as an integration of $\int_{\Omega} f(\phi) dx$ (Ω is space domain of x). Due to the complexity and nonlinearity, often there is no direct mathematical solution for this integration, and thus numerical approximation has been used to solve the integration and discretized as:

$$\int_a f(\phi) dx = \Delta x f'(\phi) \tag{6}$$

where $f'(\phi)$ is a “gradient” functional, Δx is the step size of discretization.

The gradient functional $f'(\phi)$ is the key for the accuracy and speed of numerical computation [Xu and Engquist 2020]. Different approaches have been used to solve the $f'(\phi)$, including the finite difference (FD), finite element (FE), and finite volume (FV) methods as shown in Figure 5. FD is a linear approximation which accuracy is highly dependent on the step size Δx . FE has relatively the highest accuracy among these three methods as it intends to closely approximate the shape of the function using either linear or nonlinear function (e.g., 2nd or higher order polynomial function). The FV has faster computing than the FE but lower accuracy as it approximates the element based on the averaged value which ignores the “shape”. However, FV has been heavily used in complex partial differential equation solution, such as the Navier–Stokes equations.




Figure 5. Numerical methods for gradient functional calculation (here the “gradient” refers to the $f'(\phi)$ in the numerical calculation of the integration equation $\int_a f(\phi) dx = \Delta x f'(\phi)$): 1) finite

difference which uses the linear approximation, 2) finite element method which approximate the “shape” of the function (e.g., linear, or polynomial shape approximation), and 3) finite volume method which is based on the average of the “volume”.

Numerical optimization conditions

Numerical optimization based on gradient or graduate functional has two conditions to be satisfied [Xu et al. 2016], including:

1st order necessary condition:

gradient = 0 or $f'(\phi) = 0$, mathematically it is expressed as:

$$f'(\phi) = \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_2} \dots \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_n} \right] \quad (7)$$

Where $\phi = [\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots \phi_n]$ is a parameter vector.

2nd order essential condition:

The hessian matrix H or 2nd order differentials is calculated for optimization [Xu 2014]. Newton method using 1st and 2nd order conditions to updates ϕ_k as:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} - H_k(\phi_k)^{-1} f'(\phi_k) \quad (8)$$

Where $H = \left[\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j} \right]$ for $i = 1, 2 \dots n, j = 1, 2 \dots n$.

A symmetric matrix H with real entry is positive definite ($Z^T H Z > 0$ for every non-zero real vector Z). BFGS algorithm is often used to approximate H .

2nd order Hessian helps find the strict local minimum. It is not uncommon for the 1st order necessary condition to generate non-strict minimum such as the Saddle point (see Figure 6). Strict local minimum assures all nearby points are smaller than it. It also speeds up computation especially when the model parameter number is large (e.g., could be millions as a ML model has).




Figure 6. Gradient with local minimum at the saddle point (not a strict local minimum as the neighborhood has lower values the saddle point).

Gradient calculations for ML

FD method and its derived versions have been used in the data-driven ML problems due to its fast speed and the data-driven nature of the ML problem (e.g., not based on a partial differential equation controlled physical system).

The stochastic gradient decent (SGD) method updates model parameter ϕ at k th iteration as:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} - lr \times f'(\phi_k) \quad (9)$$

where lr is the learning rate.

The gradient, $f'(\phi_k)$ is approximated using the forward FD or central FD method as below:

$$f'(\phi_i) = \frac{y_i - y_{i-1}}{\Delta x} \text{ or } \frac{y_{i+1} - y_{i-1}}{2\Delta x} \quad (10)$$

Central FD often poses higher accuracy than the forward FD as it counts for information of both the previous and next steps.

Multi-objective Newton Optimization Algorithm

Objective function

The objective function is defined as below for searching hyper-parameter ϕ :

$$L = \min_{\phi} (\|P - P_t\|_{L_2}) + \lambda\phi^2 \quad (11)$$

where,

$\|P - P_t\|_{L_2} = \sum_i \sum_j (P_{ij} - P_i^t)^2$ as the sum of loss function values for all parameter i on all data points j .

P : multi-objective vector, e.g., $P = [TP, FP]$, TP is the true positive (%) and FP is the false positive (%).

P_t : the optimization target, e.g., $P_t = [TP_t, FP_t]$, $TP_t = 95\%$ for true positive target and $FP_t = 10\%$ for false positive target.

ϕ : parameter vector (e.g., probability threshold vector as discussed later)

$\lambda\phi^2$: Tikhonov regularization, where λ is a scale factor, e.g., $1 \times e^{-6}$.

Newton Raphson Iterative Solution

Newton Raphson method [Xu and Prozzi 2014] uses the 1st order necessary condition to update ϕ_k at the k th iteration for solving a physical problem. Figure 7 illustrates the basic procedure for Newton iteration on a function $f(\phi)$ to find the parameter ϕ toward the target (objective) value. The numerical optimization procedure is described below.

The Gradients are formed in a matrix and vectorized (e.g., realized by NumPy in Python language for faster computation). Gradient matrix is computed as the 1st order differential of object function value vector P with respect to the parameter vector ϕ as:

$$G = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi} \quad (12)$$




Figure 7. Newton Raphson algorithm for finding the optimal ϕ where the function $f(\phi)$ approaches the target value through three iterations. ϕ starts with the seed value ϕ_0 and gradient $f'(\phi_0)$ is calculated which updates the next value ϕ_1 , this procedure repeats and iterates until the function value is close or equal to the target value.

At the k th iteration the parameter vector is updated as:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} + G^{-1} (f(\phi_{k-1}) - f_t) \quad (13)$$

For numerical discretization solution, the function f is replaced by the vector L and then the above solution can be manipulated to the following by matrix operation:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} + \alpha(G^T G)^{-1} G^T (L_{k-1} - L_t) \quad (14)$$

where,

ϕ_k : threshold vector at current iteration step k

ϕ_{k-1} : threshold vector at previous iteration step $k - 1$

G, G^T : gradient matrix and its transpose

L_{k-1} : objective function vector at the $(k - 1)$ th iteration

L_t : objective target

α : step length or learning rate.

The step length or learning rate α can be approximated as an adaptive function of iteration # n as:

$$\alpha = a + \frac{b}{1+n} \quad (15)$$

It is subjected to $\alpha = \alpha_{max}$ at $n = 0$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{min}$ at $n = N$.

Where α_{min} and α_{max} are minimum and maximum learning rates, and N is the maximum iteration number.

In equation (14) the matrix term $(G^T G)^{-1}$ could induces singularity when parameter number is greater than the number of objectives as an ill-posed condition. Other floating numerical errors may also cause singularity. To address the singularity issue, two solutions can be used as below:

(i) Regularization method which is like a ridge regression approach:

$$G^T G = G^T G + \lambda I \tag{16}$$

Where I is an identity matrix), and λ is a parameter.

(ii). Min-norm solution:

$$\phi_k = \phi_{k-1} + \alpha G^T (G G^T)^{-1} (L_{k-1} - L_t) \tag{17}$$

This study uses the method (i) which achieves superior performance than the approach (ii).

Implementation Example and Analysis

Definition of problem and project goal

A convolutional neural network model is used to predict multiclass labels of input images as shown in Figure 8. The input image includes a variety of objects, specifically, up to total eight (8) labels of human, dog, cat, road, car, building, tree, and bicycle. The final classification network (see Figure 8) will output a probability score y_i for each label ($i=0, 1, 2 \dots 7$). If $y_i \geq \phi_i$ the image is classified as a positive one with object(s) detected, on the other way it is a negative one.

The hyper-parameter optimization goal is to obtain a high true positive (TP) while a low false positive (FP). Figure 9 illustrates the procedure of the problem and optimization procedure, e.g., the objective is to achieve $TP > 95\%$ and $FP < 10\%$ as an example.




Figure 8. The multi-class object classification architecture for detecting multiple (eight) subjects including animals (horse, zebra, dog), nature scenarios (grass and flower), facilities (road and house), and car. The default probability threshold value of 0.5 is used for the final classification layer (i.e., probability score ≥ 0.5 it is a true object, in the other way it is not).




Figure 9. Flow chart for the problem definition and optimization: the trained model inferences or predicts different labels as a multi-class problem, and for each class a threshold value is used to determine if the prediction is a true or false object. The true positive (TP) and false positive (FP) are used as the metrics to evaluate the model inference accuracy, e.g., the goal is TP > 95% as and FP < 10%. The threshold vector for all labels is optimized to achieve the TP/FP goal. If the goal is not achieved at a given threshold, it returns back to the model inference stage and updates the threshold vector for new evaluation.

Different parameter ϕ_i value for the label i results in different prediction of TP and FP, which distribution can be plotted in a histogram as shown in Figure 10. The goal is to find a threshold value of ϕ_i for each label, or a vector of threshold for total eight labels, to achieve the optimal performance of TP and FP overall (e.g., total TP > 95% and total FP < 10%).




Figure 10. Threshold optimization illustration: for each class or label, a histogram distribution of all positive (blue color) and false (red color) instances are formed, and an appropriate cutline (threshold) between the positive and false instances are warranted to obtain the optimization goal of a higher TP and a lower FP overall (portion on the right side of the threshold). One challenge is to optimize a vector of threshold values instead of a single threshold for the optimal overall performance.

Results and analysis

Newton optimization result

The model is tested on 6487 instances including 1002 positive cases (with object presented) and 5485 negative cases (without any object presented in the image). Figure 11 to Figure 15 show the Newton optimization results with iterations for different scenarios. Results show that the method could help find the optimal parameter values toward the optimization goal. The optimization results are dependent on the specific TP and FP goals. An optimal TP of 92.2% and FP of 10.0% (Figure 13) is achieved given a goal of TP 90% and FP of 10%. An optimal TP of 94.7% and FP of 16.3 (Figure 14) or TP of 94.0% and FP of 15.3% (Figure 15) are achieved given a goal of TP 95% and FP of 15%.

The initial seed values also play a role in the final optimization performance. Generally, a seed with value closer to the truth could yield better results, but variable initial seed values may not necessarily obtain improved results than the constant values for all parameters since these parameters are all for the same type (threshold of probability score for classification). For example, the initial seed of 0.9 (too large) yields a TP of only 84.1% and a FP of 10.1% until the 200th iteration (see Figure 12).

The iteration also generates “oscillation” performance for some cases, where the optimal results may occur at some middle iteration steps. For example in Figure 14, the optimal threshold parameter vector is [class 1: 0.59971717, class 2: 0.599717, class 3: 0.63323, class 4: 0.700931, class 5: 0.6668995, class 6: 0.599717, class 7: 0.59971717, class 8: 0.70093103]. The optimal parameter values all fall within the expected range of (0,1).




Figure 11. Newton optimization with target $TP = 0.9$ and $FP = 0.1$, initial parameter seed $\phi = 0.5$, using adaptive learning rate. Both TP and FP decreases till FP reaches 0.1 when iteration converges at around 20th iteration. Parameter ϕ values change toward different directions for different labels. The optimal TP is 91.5% and FP is 9.8% at the 25th iteration, and results converge since the 15th iteration.




Figure 12. Newton optimization with target $TP = 0.9$ and $FP = 0.1$, initial parameter seed $\phi = 0.9$. Both TP and FP increase with iterations since the initial seed starts from a large value. The optimal TP is 84.1% and FP is 10.1% at the 200th iteration.




Figure 13. Newton optimization with target $TP = 0.9$ and $FP = 0.1$, initial parameter seed $\phi = 0.3$, using adaptive learning rate which drops from 0.15 to 0.001 with iterations. Oscillations

were observed for TP, FP, and parameter values, and at around 7th iteration optimal performances were achieved (TP of 92.2%, FP of 10%).





Figure 14. Newton optimization with target $TP = 0.95$ and $FP = 0.15$, initial parameter seed $\phi = 0.5$. Both TP and FP decrease first and then increase after around 20th iteration. Some parameter ϕ values increase, and some others decrease with the iterations. The optimal TP is 94.7% and FP is 16.3% at the 15th iteration.



Seed = [0.59971717 0.599717 0.63323 0.700931 0.6669 0.599717 0.599717 0.700931]

Figure 15. Newton optimization with target $TP = 0.96$ and $FP = 0.15$, initial parameter seed ϕ is variable (from some pre-optimization results). Both TP and FP generally increase with iterations for this case. However, a jump “oscillation” appears at the 4th iteration. Results are not necessarily better than using the constant initial seed of 0.5 across all parameters. The optimal TP is 94.0% and FP is 15.3% at the 15th iteration.

In summary, the Newton optimization method computes gradient matrix to find search directions which helps accelerate the iteration with improved accuracy as compared to the data-driven approach (e.g., grid and random search). It optimizes multiple objectives simultaneously using matrix vectorization. However, the implementation case for the ML problem here seems more difficult to converge than the PDE-based physical problem [e.g., Xu 2014, 2017]. It shows some performance oscillation along with iterations at some cases. This could be due to the stochastic nature of data for the ML problem. To address this shortcoming, my current solution is to iterate more times and then select the best results out of all iterations.

Bayesian optimization results

Figure 12 illustrates the Bayesian optimization results and procedures. It achieves a TP of 93.0% and 17.0% for the same problem, which is 1.7 point lower and 0.7 point higher, respectively, than that of the Newton optimization. It also results in a negative parameter value which is out of the

expected range between 0 and 1 and thus cannot be used for implementation. However, the parameter values may be controlled using some techniques which are not explored in this study.

Parameter seeds (three were used as a trial group):

```
[  
  [0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5], # seed 1  
  [0.75, 0.75, 0.75, 0.75, 0.75, 0.75, 0.75, 0.75], # seed 2  
  [0.9, 0.9, 0.9, 0.9, 0.9, 0.9, 0.9, 0.9] # seed 3  
]
```




Figure 16. Bayesian optimization: starting from three (3) seed vectors for the eight (8) parameters, and then apply Bayesian optimization. It results in a TP of 93.0% and a FP of 17.0%. The resulted optimal parameter vector shows that for class 7 and class 8 the threshold value is out of expected range of (0,1).

The Bayesian method can utilize prior results to estimate the next parameter value using conditional probability and Gaussian process, which has improved the performance than other methods including the grid search and random search. It is also much faster than grid search. However, it is primarily used for single objective optimization problem. Results also show oscillations, and the output parameters has values out of the expected range (see Figure 16).

Conclusion

This research has developed a Newton Raphson based multi-objective optimization for hyperparameter search. It is applied to a probability-threshold vector search for the objectives of TP and FP rates. Results show that this method can effectively improve TP and FP performance compared to using the default value of 0.5 without optimization. Its performance is better than the Bayesian optimization in this testing case.

In the future, further studies can be warranted:

- 1) improving the convergency and reducing performance oscillation at iteration steps and
- 2) applying the method to broader machine learning problems for optimization and hyperparameter search.

Reference

- [1]. Shivangi Khare. Trust Region Methods. Medium. 2021.
- [2]. MJ Bahmani. HyperBand and BOHB: understanding state of the art hyperparameter optimization algorithms. Neptune.AI, MLOps Blog. 2023.

<https://neptune.ai/blog/hyperband-and-bohb-understanding-state-of-the-art-hyperparameter-optimization-algorithms>

- [3]. Q. Xu, A Finite-element and Newton- Raphson Method for Inverse Computing Multilayer Moduli, Finite Elements in Analysis and Design, Volume 81, April 2014, Pages 57-68
- [4]. avisheknag17. Bayesian_optimization. GitHub. 2021.
https://github.com/avisheknag17/public_ml_models/blob/master/bayesian_optimization/bayesian_optimization.ipynb
- [5]. Q. Xu, H. Zhu, J. Prozzi. An inverse model and mathematical solution for inferring viscoelastic properties and dynamic deformations of heterogeneous structures. Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, Volume 300, 1 March 2016, Pages 798-833.
- [6]. Qinwu Xu, Björn Engquist, Mansour Solaimanian & Kezhen Yan. A new nonlinear viscoelastic model and mathematical solution of solids for improving prediction accuracy. Scientific Reports volume 10, Article number: 2202 (2020).
- [7]. Charles Fortin and Henry Wolkowicz. The trust region subproblem and semidefinite programming. Optimization Methods and Software Vol. 19, No. 1, February 2004, pp. 41–67.