
MONOMIAL BARRIER FUNCTIONS FOR THE BOX-CONSTRAINED CONVEX OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

Hatem A. Fayed

University of Science and Technology, Mathematics Program, Zewail City of Science and Technology
October Gardens, 6th of October, Giza 12578, Egypt
hfayed@zewailcity.edu.eg

January 31, 2024

ABSTRACT

In this article, a novel barrier function is introduced to convert the box-constrained convex optimization problem to an unconstrained problem. For each double-sided bounded variable, a single monomial function is added as a barrier function to the objective function. This function has the properties of being positive, approaching zero for the interior/boundary points and becomes very large for the exterior points as the penalty parameter approaches zero. The unconstrained problem can be solved efficiently using Newton's method with a backtracking line search. Experiments were conducted using the proposed method, the interior-point for the logarithmic barrier (IP), the trust-region reflective (TR) and the limited-memory Broyden, Fletcher, Goldfarb, and Shanno for bound constrained problems (LBFGSB) methods on the convex quadratic problems of the CUTEst collection. Although the proposed method was implemented in MATLAB, the results showed that it outperformed IP and TR for all problems. The results also showed that despite LBFGSB was the fastest method for many problems, it failed to converge to the optimal solution for some problems and took a very long time to terminate. On the other hand, the proposed method was the fastest method for such problems. Moreover, the proposed method has other advantages, such as: it is very simple and can be easily implemented and its performance is expected to be improved if it is implemented using a low-level language, such as C++ or FORTRAN on a GPU.

1 Introduction

The general simple box-constrained convex optimization problem considered in this article is,

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} f(\mathbf{x}), \quad s.t. \Omega = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{l} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}\} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $f(\mathbf{x})$ is twice continuously differentiable convex function.

The Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions at the optimal solution, \mathbf{x}^* , are given by [1],

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^* = l_i &\Rightarrow \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq 0 \\ l_i < x_i^* < u_i &\Rightarrow \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0 \\ x_i^* = u_i &\Rightarrow \nabla f_i(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for $i = 1 \cdots m$ where ∇f is the gradient of f .

This type of problems arises in many applications such as: the constrained autoencoders feature extraction for deep learning [2], the water flow through a porous dam [3], the optimal design problem [4], the torsion applied to a bar [5], the journal bearing [6], the simulation of time-dependent contact and friction problems in rigid body mechanics [7], the obstacle problem [8] and the linear least-squares problems with upper and lower bounds [9].

There are many algorithms in the literature were proposed to solve this problem, some are restricted to convex functions (in some cases quadratic) and some are general. For the convex quadratic function, the problem can be solved in polynomial time by interior-point or trust-region algorithms [10, 11], however, for an indefinite quadratic function, the problem is NP-hard [12]. In the sequel, the methods used for the convex objective functions are overviewed.

Early methods include the active set method [13, 14, 15], in which a sequence of sub-problems are solved iteratively. Initially, it identifies some variables as active (fixed at the bounds) defining a face likely containing the stationary point and then the objective function is minimized using an unconstrained algorithm with respect to the remaining (inactive) variables. In the successive iterations, one constraint is dropped/added to the active set. For large-scale problems, this would be impractical as many iterations would be required to achieve the correct active set. Later, several variants were proposed for the convex quadratic function that are based on the projected Newton method which can add and drop many constraints at each iteration [16, 17, 18]. Several research and convergence study for the convex quadratic function were explored in [19, 20, 21, 22].

Bertsekas [23] applied the gradient projection to the active set algorithm for the general convex function. Further extensions and study of the convergence can be found in [23, 24]. Byrd et al. [25] developed the LBFGSB algorithm which approximates the Hessian of the objective function and performs the gradient projection method to determine the active set. Then, it performs line searches along the directions obtained by a limited memory BFGS method [26] to explore the subspace of the inactive variables. An implementation of their algorithm is available in [27]. Ni and Yuan [28] used the limited memory quasi-Newton methods to update the inactive variables and a projected gradient method to update the active variables. The computational cost and memory requirements per each iteration are small for these methods. This leads to an efficient implementation for large problems.

Lin and Moré [29] used a trust-region Newton's method which relies on the geometry of the feasible set that generates a Cauchy step, a preconditioned conjugate gradient method with an incomplete Cholesky decomposition to generate a direction, and a projected search to compute the step. Coleman and Li [30, 31] suggested a different approach that is related to the trust-region method, namely, the affine-scaling interior-point method. In this method, the first order optimality conditions of (1) is rewritten as a nonlinear system of equations using a certain scaling matrix. The resulting system is solved using Newton's method. Some developments of this method were presented in [11, 32].

Recently, Hager and Zhang [33] developed an active set algorithm (ASA) for box constrained optimization which consists of a nonmonotone gradient projection step, an unconstrained optimization step, and a set of rules for branching between the two steps. In [34], ASTRAL algorithm, an active-set algorithm that uses both the active-set identification and LBFGS [35] updating for the Hessian approximation, was developed. It uses a gradient projection step to determine an active face and then solves trust-region subproblems using primal-dual interior-point techniques. In [36], a two-stage active set algorithm was proposed. In this algorithm, an active set is first estimated by applying a non-monotone line search algorithm, then a truncated-Newton strategy is used in the subspace of the non-active variables.

2 The monomial barrier function

The main idea of the proposed monomial barrier function stems from the shape of the function $g(x) = x^\mu/\mu$ where μ is an even positive integer number (see Fig. 1). For a sufficiently large μ , this function tends to be zero for $|x| \leq 1$ and very large for $|x| > 1$. So, it can be used as a barrier function for the box constraint: $-1 \leq x \leq 1$.

In the following example, a simple 1-dimensional problem is introduced to illustrate the different cases where the minimizer is an interior, exterior and boundary point respectively.

Example 1 Consider the following optimization problem,

$$\min_x f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x-a)^2 \quad s.t. \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

The monomial barrier function can be defined as,

$$P(x; \mu) = \frac{1}{2}(x-a)^2 + x^\mu/\mu \quad (4)$$

As $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ the minimizer of $P(x; \mu)$ approaches the solution of (3). Note that $P(x; \mu)$ is always nonnegative. For a certain μ , the exact minimizer of $P(x; \mu)$ can be obtained by setting $\frac{\partial P(x; \mu)}{\partial x} = 0$; i.e.

$$x - a + x^{\mu-1} = 0 \quad (5)$$




Figure 1: Graphs of x^μ/μ for different values of μ . $\mu = 4$ (.....), $\mu = 16$ (- - -) and $\mu = 64$ (-.-.).

which can be viewed as the point of intersection of the following curves,

$$y = x^{\mu-1}, y = a - x \quad (6)$$

Three different cases can be obtained according to the value of a (see Fig. 2).

Case I: $-1 < a < 1$

Clearly, the optimal solution is $x^* = a$ and the optimal function value is $f^* = 0$. Consider $a = 0.8$, for $\mu = 4$, the solution of (5) is $x \approx 0.6$ while for $\mu = 8$, the solution is $x \approx 0.7$ which is closer to the optimal solution, $x^* = 0.8$ (see Fig. 3). For $\mu = 1024$, the solution of (5), approximated to 8 decimal places, is: $x = 0.80000000$. As expected, the higher the value of μ , the better the approximate solution. Graphs of $f(x)$ and $P(x; 64)$ are shown in Fig. 2a.

Case II: $|a| > 1$

Consider $a = 3$, in this case, the optimal solution is $x^* = 1$ and the optimal function value is $f^* = 2$. For $\mu = 4$, the solution of (5) is $x \approx 1.2$ while for $\mu = 8$, the solution is $x \approx 1.1$. Although both are infeasible, their projections onto the feasible region lead to the optimal solution, $x^* = 1$. This can be incorporated to achieve a fast convergence as will be described later in algorithm 1. Graphs of $f(x)$ and $P(x; 64)$ are shown in Fig. 2b.

Case III: $a = \pm 1$

Consider $a = 1$, in this case, the optimal solution is $x^* = 1$ and the optimal function value is $f^* = 0$. For $\mu = 1024$, the solution of (5), approximated to 8 decimal places, is: $x = 0.99486088$. Thus, for the boundary points, larger values of μ have to be considered to achieve a good approximation. Graphs of $f(x)$ and $P(x; 64)$ are shown in Fig. 2c.

Example 2 Consider the following 2-dimensional optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(x_1 + 2)^2 + x_2^2 \right] \\ \text{s.t. } &-1 \leq x_1 \leq 1, -1 \leq x_2 \leq 1 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It is easy to note that the optimal function value occurs at $x_1 = -1, x_2 = 0$. The monomial barrier function for this problem can be defined as,

$$P(\mathbf{x}; \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \left[(x_1 + 2)^2 + x_2^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2\mu} [x_1^\mu + x_2^\mu] \quad (8)$$




Figure 2: Graphs of $f(x)$ (—) and $P(x; 64)$ (---) for Example 1 for different values of a .

The proposed monomial barrier function can be compared with the logarithmic barrier function which can be defined for this problem as,

$$P_l(\mathbf{x}; \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \left[(x_1 + 2)^2 + x_2^2 \right] - \nu [\log(1 + x_1) + \log(1 - x_1) + \log(1 + x_2) + \log(1 - x_2)] \quad (9)$$

A sequence of values $\{\nu_k\}$ with $\nu_k \rightarrow 0$ is incorporated, and the approximate minimizer, \mathbf{x}^k , of $P_l(\mathbf{x}; \nu_k)$ is obtained for each k .

Contours of both $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ and $P_l(\mathbf{x}; 1/\mu)$ are shown in Fig. 4. It can be noticed that, for $\mu = 2^3$, the contours of both of them are elliptical that are not too elongated and hence most unconstrained minimization algorithms can be applied successfully to find the minimizers. The minimizers of $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ and $P_l(\mathbf{x}; 1/\mu)$ are $(-1.00000003, 0)$ and $(-0.89340298, 0)$ respectively. While for $\mu = 2^{10}$, the minimizers of are $(-1.00000000, 0)$ and $(-0.99902500, 0)$ respectively. Moreover, the projection of the optimal solution of $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ onto the feasible region leads directly to the optimal solution of (7).

It can be noted that, for an active constraint, the contours of $P_l(\mathbf{x}; \nu)$ are too elongated and its Hessian becomes increasingly ill-conditioned near the minimizer as $\nu \rightarrow 0$. This ill-conditioning usually causes problems when solving the linear equations to calculate the Newton step, so, the modified Cholesky decomposition is often used to avoid this problem. On the other hand, the contours of $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ are not elongated that much near the optimal point, as \mathbf{x} is allowed to be feasible or infeasible. This suggests that Cholesky decomposition can be used rather than the modified Cholesky decomposition if $f(\mathbf{x})$ is strictly feasible. Moreover, the required system to be solved at each iteration for




Figure 3: Graphs of $y = 0.8 - x$ (—), $y = x^3$ (-·-·) and $y = x^7$ (- - -).

the monomial barrier method is much smaller than that of the logarithmic barrier method. Hence, the implementation of the monomial barrier method is expected to be faster than the interior-point for the logarithmic barrier method.

2.1 General framework

There are two approaches to handle the general boundary box constraints in (1). The first one is to scale the problem using the transformations,

$$z_i = \frac{x_i - r_i}{q_i}, i = 1 \cdots m \quad (10)$$

where

$$r_i = \frac{u_i + l_i}{2}, q_i = \frac{u_i - l_i}{2} \quad (11)$$

Then, the problem is transformed into,

$$\min_{z \in \Omega} f(z), \quad s.t. \Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m : -1 \leq z \leq \mathbf{1}\} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of ones. Hence the following barrier function can be used,

$$P(z; \mu) = f(z) + \frac{1}{m\mu} \sum_{i=1}^m z_i^\mu \quad (13)$$

Imposing $1/m$ in the barrier term is used to let the number of outer iterations independent on the problem size as will be shown in Theorem 2.


Alternatively, the following barrier function for (1) can be directly defined as,

$$P(x; \mu) = f(x) + \frac{1}{m\mu} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{x_i - r_i}{q_i} \right)^\mu \quad (14)$$

The main steps of the monomial barrier algorithm are shown in Algorithm 1. A sequence of values $\{\mu_k\}$ with $\mu_k \rightarrow \mu_{max}$ is incorporated, these are called the outer iterations. In each outer iteration, an approximate minimizer x^k of $P(x; \mu_k)$ is obtained using Newton's method with a backtracking line search, these are called the inner iterations. This minimizer is then projected onto the feasible region using (15),

$$proj(x_i, l_i, u_i) = \begin{cases} l_i & \text{if } x_i < l_i \\ x_i & \text{if } x_i \in [l_i, u_i] \\ u_i & \text{if } x_i > u_i \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Therefore, a new value $\mu_{k+1} = \tau\mu_k$ is set for the next outer iteration where $\tau > 1$ is a positive integer number and the starting point of the next iteration is set to x^k . This procedure continues until a required tolerance, ϵ_g , of the projected gradient given by (16) is achieved or μ exceeds an upper bound, μ_{max} .


 Figure 4: Contours of $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ and $P_l(\mathbf{x}; 1/\mu)$ for Example 2 for different values of μ .

$$\|proj(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{x}_k\|_\infty < \epsilon_g \quad (16)$$

For the inner iterations, Newton's method are applied iteratively to find the minimizer for $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu_k)$. To achieve this, the gradient and Hessian matrix of $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$ are calculated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla P(\mathbf{x}; \mu) &= \nabla f(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x}; \mu), \\ \nabla^2 P(\mathbf{x}; \mu) &= \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{x}) + D(\mathbf{x}; \mu) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x}; \mu) = [e_i]$ and $D(\mathbf{x}; \mu) = [d_{ij}]$ is a diagonal matrix and their entries are given by,

$$e_i = \frac{1}{mq_i} \left(\frac{x_i - r_i}{q_i} \right)^{\mu-1}, d_{ii} = \frac{\mu-1}{mq_i^2} \left(\frac{x_i - r_i}{q_i} \right)^{\mu-2} \quad (18)$$

Algorithm 1 Monomial Barrier

Require: μ_0 : an even positive integer, μ_{max} : an upper bound for μ , $\tau > 1$: a positive integer number, \mathbf{x}_0 : starting point.

Ensure: \mathbf{x}^*

- 1: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 2: Find an approximate minimizer \mathbf{x}^k for $P(\mathbf{x}; \mu_k)$ starting at \mathbf{x}_0 and terminate when the stopping criteria for the inner iterations are met
 - 3: $\mathbf{x}^k \leftarrow$ projection of \mathbf{x}^k onto the bound constraints $\mathbf{l} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{u}$
 - 4: $\mu_{k+1} \leftarrow \tau \mu_k$
 - 5: **if** the stopping criteria for the outer iterations are met **then**
 - 6: Terminate with an approximate solution $\mathbf{x}^* \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^k$
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: $\mathbf{x}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^k$
 - 9: **end for**
-

where r_i and q_i are as given in (11).

Note that the Hessian matrix is always positive definite if $f(\mathbf{x})$ is strictly convex or if it is convex and $x_i \neq r_i$ for all $i = 1 \dots m$.

At an outer iteration k and an inner iteration j , the Newton search direction, $\mathbf{p}^{k,j}$, can be obtained by solving the following linear system using Cholesky decomposition,

$$\nabla^2 P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k) \mathbf{p}^{k,j} = -\nabla P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k) \quad (19)$$

One of the best methods to ensure a global convergence of Newton's method is to invoke an efficient line search [37], in which a step length, α , is taken along the Newton direction as,

$$\mathbf{x}^{k,j+1} = \mathbf{x}^{k,j} + \alpha \mathbf{p}^{k,j} \quad (20)$$

There are many inexact line search techniques that are practically efficient of achieving this goal [37]. In general, there is a trade-off in choosing the optimal value of α . It is desirable to choose α to give a substantial reduction of $P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)$, but at the same time, this choice should be quite fast. The Armijo backtracking line search (see Algorithm 2) is simple but yet efficient in achieving both. It tries the unit step length $\alpha = 1$ first, so it is used if it leads to a sufficient decrease in $P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)$, otherwise it is decreased by a factor of ρ . Typical values used for c and ρ are 10^{-4} and 0.5 respectively. It is often sufficient to find an approximate minimizer for (14), so, the inner iterations can terminate if one of the following criteria is met,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)\|_\infty &\leq \epsilon_{gp} \\ |P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j+1}; \mu_k) - P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)| &\leq \epsilon_p (1 + |P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)|) \\ \|\mathbf{x}^{k,j+1} - \mathbf{x}^{k,j}\|_\infty &\leq \epsilon_x (1 + \|\mathbf{x}^{k,j}\|_\infty) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where ϵ_{gp} is a tolerance for the gradient of the barrier function, ϵ_p is a relative tolerance for the barrier function and ϵ_x is a relative tolerance for the minimizer.

Algorithm 2 Backtracking line search

Require: $\rho, c \in (0, \infty)$

Ensure: α

- 1: $\alpha = 1$
 - 2: **while** $P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j+1}; \mu_k) > P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k) + c\alpha \nabla P(\mathbf{x}^{k,j}; \mu_k)^T \mathbf{p}^{k,j}$ **do**
 - 3: $\alpha \leftarrow \rho \alpha$
 - 4: **end while**
-

The following theorems study the convergence of the MB algorithm and the number of outer iterations required to achieve a certain tolerance for the optimal function value.

Theorem 1 (Convergence). *Suppose that \mathbf{z}^k is the minimizer of $P(\mathbf{z}^k; \mu_k)$ in (13) above, and that $\mu_k \rightarrow \infty$. Then every limit point \mathbf{z} of the sequence \mathbf{z}^k is a solution of the problem (12).*

Proof. Assume that \mathbf{z}^* is the solution of (12); so, $-1 \leq z_i^* \leq 1, i = 1 \cdots m$ and we have,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^*)^\mu \leq m \quad (22)$$

Assume that \mathbf{z}^k is the minimizer for $P(\mathbf{z}; \mu_k)$ for each k , then we have, $P(\mathbf{z}^k; \mu_k) \leq P(\mathbf{z}^*; \mu_k)$; that is,

$$f(\mathbf{z}^k) + \frac{1}{m\mu_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^k)^{\mu_k} \leq f(\mathbf{z}^*) + \frac{1}{m\mu_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^*)^{\mu_k} \quad (23)$$

Using (22),

$$f(\mathbf{z}^k) + \frac{1}{m\mu_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^k)^{\mu_k} \leq f(\mathbf{z}^*) + \frac{1}{\mu_k} \quad (24)$$

Suppose that $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is a limit point for $\{\mathbf{z}^k\}$ so that there is an infinite subsequence \mathcal{K} such that,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{z}^k = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (25)$$

By taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{m\mu_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (\hat{z}_i)^{\mu_k} \leq f(\mathbf{z}^*) + \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{\mu_k} = f(\mathbf{z}^*) \quad (26)$$

Since the second term in the left-hand-side is always nonnegative, we have,

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \leq f(\mathbf{z}^*) \quad (27)$$

Thus,

$$f(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = f(\mathbf{z}^*) \quad (28)$$

□

□

Theorem 2 (Number of outer iterations).

To achieve a relative function tolerance, ϵ_f , such that $|f(\mathbf{z}^n) - f(\mathbf{z}^*)| \leq \epsilon_f(1 + |f(\mathbf{z}^*)|)$ for algorithm 1, at least $n + 1$ iterations are required where,

$$n \geq \frac{\log(2/(\mu_0\epsilon_f))}{\log \tau} \quad (29)$$

Proof. From (24) and for large μ_n ,

$$|f(\mathbf{z}^n) - f(\mathbf{z}^*)| \leq \frac{1}{m\mu_n} \sum_{i=1}^m |(z_i^n)^{\mu_n} - (z_i^*)^{\mu_n}| \leq \frac{2}{\mu_n} = \frac{2}{\tau^n \mu_0} \quad (30)$$

Since

$$1 + |f(\mathbf{z}^*)| \geq 1 \quad (31)$$

So, by dividing (30) by (31),

$$\frac{|f(\mathbf{z}^n) - f(\mathbf{z}^*)|}{1 + |f(\mathbf{z}^*)|} \leq \frac{2}{\tau^n \mu_0} \quad (32)$$

So, to achieve a relative function tolerance, ϵ_f , at least $n + 1$ iterations are required where,

$$\frac{2}{\tau^n \mu_0} \leq \epsilon_f \quad (33)$$

which yields the required result (29). □

□So, for example, if $\mu_0 = 2^5$, $\tau = 2$, then only 17 outer iterations are required to achieve a tolerance of $\epsilon_f = 2^{-20}$. In practice, not all constraints are usually active and hence the number of outer iterations required is often smaller.

3 Experimental results

In this section, the proposed method is compared with the MATLAB built-in function “fmincon” for IP and TR methods and the LBFGB MEX wrapper for lbfgsb v3.0 FORTRAN library [38]. The proposed method was implemented in Matlab where SUITESPARSE¹ “cholmod2” function [39] was used to find the Newton direction using Cholesky decomposition as it was faster than MATLAB built-in function “mldivide” with Cholesky decomposition. Since, the sparse structure of the Hessian matrix of the monomial barrier function does not change over the iterations (inner/outer), the SUITESPARSE “analyze” function is used once, in the first iteration only, to retrieve the best ordering that can be used to quickly update the Cholesky decomposition in the successive iterations. For each problem, the objective function, gradient and Hessian of the objective function were supplied to IP, TR, MB while the objective function and gradient were supplied to LBFGB. All experiments were carried out using MATLAB R2021b on a Server with 2.93 GHz Intel Xeon X5679 CPU of 12 cores and 128 GB RAM under Windows 10 operating system. All methods were terminated when the projected gradient was less than $\epsilon_g = 10^{-4}$ or the maximum number of outer iterations exceeded 50,000. The parameters used for MB were $\tau = 2$, $\mu_{max} = 2^{40}$, $\epsilon_{gp} = 10^{-4}$, $\epsilon_p = 10^{-8}$, $\epsilon_x = 10^{-8}$.

The experiments were performed on the convex quadratic box-constrained problems from the CUTEEST [40] collection. Since the trust-region reflective method requires that $u_i > l_i$ for all variables, so for a fair comparison, each variable, x_i , where $l_i = u_i$ was removed from the problem by setting $x_i = l_i$ and the objective function, gradient and Hessian matrix were updated accordingly. It is worth mentioning that some problems have positive semidefinite Hessian matrices, so ηI_m , a small multiple of the identity matrix, was added to ensure that they become positive definite to be able to compute the Cholesky decomposition ($\eta = 10^{-15}$).

Table 1 to Table 5 show the problem name, the number of variables (N) and the number of non-zero elements of the Hessian matrix of the objective function (NNZ). They also show the the number of outer iterations, the number of active constraints and the elapsed time for each method. A constraint is considered active at a variable x_i if $|x_i - l_i| < 10^{-8}(1 + |l_i|)$ or $|u_i - x_i| < 10^{-8}(1 + |u_i|)$. The smallest elapsed time is shown in bold font while the second smallest is underlined. Table 6 to Table 10 show the optimal function value and the projected gradient obtained by each method.

It can be observed that IP, TR, MB methods converged to the optimal solution achieving the same function value and the required projected gradient tolerance for all problems, however MB was the fastest one. On the other hand, LBFGB converged to the optimal solution for all problems except DIAGPQB with $N \geq 5000$ and DIAGPQT with $N \geq 100,000$ problems (the corresponding function values and projected gradients are double underlined in Table 6). In spite of this, it was the best method (fastest method achieving the required projected gradient tolerance) for 117 problems out of the 154 problems of the collection while MB was the best method for 37 problems and very close to LBFGB in 28 problems (less than 50% extra time).

By investigating DIAGPQB, DIAGPQE and DIAGPQT problems, it was found that the unconstrained optimal solution was strictly feasible and the penalty term of MB at the starting point was very small relative to the objective function leading to an almost quadratic barrier function, so MB achieved the optimal solution in a single iteration. For CVXBQP1, the optimal solution of the monomial barrier function obtained after the first iteration was infeasible, however, its projection onto the feasible region led directly to the optimal solution of the constrained problem.

It can also be observed that the number of outer iterations for MB is less than those for IP and TR for most problems. This is often because MB does not require the starting point to be strictly feasible as in IP and TR and allows it to be on the boundaries, which leads to a faster convergence for the problems where most/all the constraints are active at the starting point.

It can also be noted that most of MB time is consumed in the computation of Cholesky decomposition, so speeding up this step can significantly enhance its performance. As for the future work, a low level implementation of the proposed algorithm on GPU can be explored to benefit from the GPU implementation of the SUITESPARSE “cholmod2” function.

4 Conclusions

In this article, a novel barrier function was introduced for the box-constrained convex optimization problems to convert them into unconstrained ones. The proposed barrier function has several advantages: 1) it adds a single monomial function for both the lower and upper bounds for each variable, 2) it solves a smaller linear system than that of the

¹Available at: <https://people.engr.tamu.edu/davis/suitesparse.html>

other barrier functions to find the Newton direction at each iteration and hence it is faster, 3) the optimal solution of the barrier function can be infeasible, however, its projection onto the feasible region can lead directly to the optimal solution of the main problem achieving a fast convergence, 4) the algorithm is very simple and can be easily implemented, 5) it can be easily extended to include equality constraints, which has enormous applications, using Lagrangian functions. Experiments applied to the CUTEst problems showed that the MATLAB implementation of the proposed algorithm was faster than the IP and TR algorithms for all problems. Although it was slower than LBFGSB for many problems, it converged to the optimal solution for all problems unlike LBFGSB which failed to converge for some problems. A low level implementation of the MB algorithm on GPU and/or combining the proposed method with existing methods can be explored in the future to make it more competitive.

References

- [1] Neculai Andrei. *Simple bound constraints optimization*, pages 147–184. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017.
- [2] Babajide O. Ayinde and Jacek M. Zurada. Deep learning of constrained autoencoders for enhanced understanding of data. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 29(9):3969–3979, 2018.
- [3] Claudio Baiocchi, Valeriano Comincioli, Enrico Magenes, and Gianni Arrigo Pozzi. Free boundary problems in the theory of fluid flow through porous media: Existence and uniqueness theorems. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 97:1–82, 1973.
- [4] Ernesto G Birgin, Ivan Chambouleyron, and José Mario Martínez. Estimation of the optical constants and the thickness of thin films using unconstrained optimization. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 151(2):862–880, 1999.
- [5] J. Cea and R. Glowinski. Sur des méthodes d’optimisation par relaxation. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis - Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique*, 7(R3):5–31, 1973.
- [6] Colin W. Cryer. The method of christopherson for solving free boundary problems for infinite journal bearings by means of finite differences. *Math. Comput.*, 25(115):435–443, 1971.
- [7] Per Lötstedt. Numerical simulation of time-dependent contact and friction problems in rigid body mechanics. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, 5(2):370–393, jun 1984.
- [8] J.F. Rodrigues. *Obstacle Problems in Mathematical Physics*. Dover Books on Physics. Dover Publications, Incorporated, 2020.
- [9] P. B. Stark and R. L. Parker. Bounded-variable least-squares: an algorithm and applications. *Comput. Stat.*, 10:129–141, 1995.
- [10] D. Goldfarb and S. Liu. An $O(n^3L)$ primal interior point algorithm for convex quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 49(1):325–340, Nov 1990.
- [11] Matthias Heinkenschloss, Michael Ulbrich, and Stefan Ulbrich. Superlinear and quadratic convergence of affine-scaling interior-point newton methods for problems with simple bounds without strict complementarity assumption. *Math. Progr.*, 86:615–635, 1999.
- [12] Katta G. Murty and Santosh N. Kabadi. Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming. *Math. Progr.*, 39(2):117–129, Jun 1987.
- [13] Roger Fletcher and M. P. Jackson. Minimization of a quadratic function of many variables subject only to lower and upper bounds. *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 14:159–174, 1974.
- [14] Philip E. Gill, Walter Murray, and Margret H. Wright. *Practical Optimization*. Academic Press, New York, NY, 1981.
- [15] Dianne Prost O’Leary. A generalized conjugate gradient algorithm for solving a class of quadratic programming problems. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 34:371–399, Dec 1980.
- [16] D.P. Bertsekas. *Constrained Optimization and Lagrange Multiplier Methods*. Computer science and applied mathematics : a series of monographs and textbooks. Academic Press, 1982.
- [17] Ron Dembo and Ulrich Tulowitzki. *Mobile Systems IV*. Technical report, Yale University, 1983.
- [18] Eugene K. Yang and Jon W. Tolle. A class of methods for solving large, convex quadratic programs subject to box constraints. *Math. Progr.*, 51(1):223–228, Jul 1991.
- [19] Zdenek Dostál. Box constrained quadratic programming with proportioning and projections. *SIAM J. on Optimization*, 7(3):871–887, mar 1997.

- [20] Zdenek Dostál. A proportioning based algorithm with rate of convergence for bound constrained quadratic programming. *Numer. Algorithms*, 34:293–302, 12 2003.
- [21] Jorge J. Moré and Gerardo Toraldo. Algorithms for bound constrained quadratic programming problems. *Numer. Math.*, 55(4):377–400, Jul 1989.
- [22] Jorge J. Moré and Gerardo Toraldo. On the solution of large quadratic programming problems with bound constraints. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 1(1):93–113, 1991.
- [23] Dimitri P. Bertsekas. Projected newton methods for optimization problems with simple constraints. *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, 20(2):221–246, 1982.
- [24] Paul H. Calamai and Jorge J. Moré. Projected gradient methods for linearly constrained problems. *Math. Progr.*, 39(1):93–116, Sep 1987.
- [25] Richard H. Byrd, Peihuang Lu, Jorge Nocedal, and Ciyou Zhu. A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 16:1190–1208, 1995.
- [26] Richard H. Byrd, Jorge Nocedal, and Robert B. Schnabel. Representations of quasi-newton matrices and their use in limited memory methods. *Math. Progr.*, 63(1):129–156, Jan 1994.
- [27] Ciyou Zhu, Richard H. Byrd, Peihuang Lu, and Jorge Nocedal. Algorithm 778: L-BFGS-B: Fortran subroutines for large-scale bound-constrained optimization. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 23(4):550–560, dec 1997.
- [28] Q. Ni and Y. Yuan. A subspace limited memory quasi-newton algorithm for large-scale nonlinear bound constrained optimization. *Math. Comput.*, 66(220):1509–1520, 1997.
- [29] Chih-Jen Lin and Jorge J. Moré. Newton’s method for large bound-constrained optimization problems. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 9(4):1100–1127, 1999.
- [30] Thomas F. Coleman and Yuying Li. On the convergence of interior-reflective newton methods for nonlinear minimization subject to bounds. *Math. Progr.*, 67(1):189–224, Oct 1994.
- [31] Thomas F. Coleman and Yuying Li. An interior trust region approach for nonlinear minimization subject to bounds. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 6:418–445, 1996.
- [32] Michael Ulbrich, Stefan Ulbrich, and Matthias Heinkenschloss. Global convergence of trust-region interior-point algorithms for infinite-dimensional nonconvex minimization subject to pointwise bounds. *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, 37(3):731–764, 1999.
- [33] William W. Hager and Hongchao Zhang. A new active set algorithm for box constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 17(2):526–557, 2006.
- [34] L. Xu and J. Burke. An active set l_∞ -trust-region algorithm for box constrained optimization. *Optim. Online*, July 2007.
- [35] Dong C. Liu and Jorge Nocedal. On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization. *Math. Progr.*, 45(1):503–528, Aug 1989.
- [36] Andrea Cristofari, Maria. De Santis, Stefano Lucidi, and Francesco Rinaldi. A two-stage active-set algorithm for bound-constrained optimization. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 172:369–401, 2017.
- [37] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer, New York, NY, USA, second edition, 2006.
- [38] Stephen Becker. LBFGSB (L-BFGS-B) mex wrapper. <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/35104> 2022.
- [39] Yanqing Chen, Timothy A. Davis, William W. Hager, and Sivasankaran Rajamanickam. Algorithm 887: CHOLMOD, supernodal sparse cholesky factorization and update/downdate. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 35(3), oct 2008.
- [40] Nicholas I. Gould, Dominique Orban, and Philippe L. Toint. Cutest: A constrained and unconstrained testing environment with safe threads for mathematical optimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 60(3):545–557, apr 2015.

Table 1: The number of iterations, number of active constraints and elapsed time of the different methods.

Problem	N	NNZ	Number of Outer Iterations				Number of Active Constraints				Elapsed Time			
			LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB
CVXBQP1	10	48	2	7	7	1	10	10	10	10	<u>0.028</u>	1.206	1.357	0.017
	50	328	2	7	7	1	50	50	50	50	<u>0.027</u>	1.147	1.353	0.016
	100	672	2	7	7	1	100	100	100	100	<u>0.025</u>	1.205	1.353	0.017
	1000	6968	2	7	7	1	1000	1000	1000	1000	<u>0.026</u>	1.212	1.447	0.023
	10000	69968	2	8	7	1	10000	10000	10000	10000	0.030	1.362	2.978	<u>0.063</u>
	100000	699968	2	9	7	1	100000	100000	100000	100000	0.069	2.448	133.306	<u>0.980</u>
DIAGPQB	10	10	39	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.037</u>	1.113	1.182	0.015
	50	50	233	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0.130	1.123	1.225	<u>0.150</u>
	100	100	526	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.101</u>	1.126	1.207	0.015
	500	500	3117	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.551	<u>1.290</u>	1.846	0.026
	1000	1000	8105	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	2.532	<u>1.131</u>	1.226	0.016
	5000	5000	24600	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	31.666	<u>1.226</u>	1.451	0.042
	10000	10000	24579	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	59.735	<u>1.274</u>	1.530	0.028
	100000	100000	24606	18	14	1	0	1	1	1	544.088	<u>2.807</u>	12.590	0.095
	1000000	1000000	24582	12	10	1	0	3	3	3	6983.080	<u>14.382</u>	130.728	2.996
	DIAGPQE	10	10	14	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.033</u>	1.082	1.175
50		50	36	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.035</u>	1.080	1.150	0.015
100		100	54	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.038</u>	1.210	1.383	0.025
500		500	109	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.053</u>	1.077	1.152	0.015
1000		1000	177	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.428</u>	1.087	1.388	0.032
5000		5000	398	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.522</u>	1.096	1.229	0.020
10000		10000	564	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.502	<u>1.112</u>	1.354	0.034
100000		100000	2142	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	47.865	<u>1.236</u>	2.733	0.093
1000000		1000000	7272	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1861.231	<u>2.484</u>	18.029	0.884
DIAGPQT		10	10	14	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.032</u>	1.077	1.146
	50	50	47	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0.189	1.274	1.819	<u>0.292</u>
	100	100	106	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.044</u>	1.092	1.165	0.014
	500	500	406	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.495</u>	1.785	2.052	0.054
	1000	1000	643	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	<u>0.248</u>	1.110	1.183	0.016
	5000	5000	2943	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	5.908	<u>1.162</u>	1.414	0.034
	10000	10000	6575	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	15.954	<u>1.203</u>	1.469	0.025
	100000	100000	24570	18	14	1	0	1	1	1	547.766	<u>2.641</u>	12.144	0.095
	1000000	1000000	24588	46	8	1	0	1	1	1	6967.185	<u>49.407</u>	99.304	2.896

Table 2: The number of iterations, number of active constraints and elapsed time of the different methods.

Problem	N	NNZ	Number of Outer Iterations				Number of Active Constraints				Elapsed Time			
			LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB
OBSTCLAE	16	12	2	5	8	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.024</u>	1.154	1.330	0.015
	100	288	16	28	16	23	63	63	63	63	0.049	1.450	1.550	<u>0.332</u>
	529	2121	36	100	19	23	266	266	266	266	0.037	1.496	1.451	<u>0.122</u>
	1024	4380	47	115	22	23	508	508	508	508	0.057	1.731	1.580	<u>0.238</u>
	5625	26353	89	1007	24	24	2775	2759	2757	2771	0.149	32.526	2.935	<u>1.115</u>
	10000	47628	120	1510	24	24	4963	4952	4923	4982	0.331	100.558	4.586	<u>2.724</u>
	15625	75153	140	2149	22	23	7866	7834	7736	7860	0.505	253.268	5.800	<u>2.917</u>
OBSTCLAL	16	12	1	1	8	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.023</u>	1.114	1.327	0.014
	100	288	11	5	14	23	63	63	63	63	0.031	1.201	1.414	<u>0.049</u>
	529	2121	24	10	15	23	266	266	266	266	0.035	1.208	1.398	<u>0.122</u>
	1024	4380	28	11	18	23	508	508	508	508	0.038	1.245	1.535	<u>0.207</u>
	5625	26353	50	19	20	24	2754	2770	2757	2771	0.084	1.884	2.558	<u>1.144</u>
	10000	47628	72	28	19	24	4962	4978	4923	4982	0.177	3.357	3.648	<u>1.867</u>
	15625	75153	75	28	19	23	7840	7841	7736	7860	0.252	4.868	5.365	<u>2.920</u>
OBSTCLBL	16	12	2	4	6	5	16	16	16	16	0.024	1.122	1.306	<u>0.032</u>
	100	288	9	11	10	5	84	84	84	84	0.031	1.187	1.332	<u>0.039</u>
	529	2121	22	47	14	7	277	277	277	277	0.035	1.266	1.402	<u>0.121</u>
	1024	4380	27	70	15	7	475	475	475	475	0.038	1.384	1.492	<u>0.137</u>
	5625	26353	46	110	15	7	1802	1803	1801	1805	0.090	2.626	2.505	<u>0.602</u>
	10000	47628	66	179	15	7	2969	2971	2969	2973	0.190	5.886	3.584	<u>0.936</u>
	15625	75153	65	549	15	7	4356	4348	4349	4356	0.257	21.937	4.979	<u>1.433</u>
OBSTCLBM	16	12	2	3	6	5	16	16	16	16	0.024	1.104	1.300	<u>0.032</u>
	100	288	9	11	10	5	84	84	84	84	0.032	1.192	1.319	<u>0.038</u>
	529	2121	19	11	14	7	277	277	277	277	0.034	1.131	1.397	<u>0.096</u>
	1024	4380	25	12	15	7	475	475	475	475	0.037	1.203	1.488	<u>0.178</u>
	5625	26353	43	16	14	7	1803	1804	1799	1805	0.086	1.356	2.404	<u>0.537</u>
	10000	47628	63	15	14	7	2969	2972	2964	2973	0.183	1.454	3.442	<u>0.973</u>
	15625	75153	79	20	15	7	4351	4356	4349	4356	0.320	1.760	4.883	<u>1.493</u>

Table 3: The number of iterations, number of active constraints and elapsed time of the different methods.

Problem	N	NNZ	Number of Outer Iterations				Number of Active Constraints				Elapsed Time			
			LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB
OBSTCLBU	16	12	1	1	6	5	16	16	16	16	0.023	1.039	1.303	<u>0.032</u>
	100	288	10	11	11	5	84	84	84	84	0.031	1.187	1.347	<u>0.038</u>
	529	2121	21	10	15	7	277	277	277	277	0.035	1.193	1.402	<u>0.083</u>
	1024	4380	26	10	16	7	475	475	475	475	0.037	1.200	1.500	<u>0.151</u>
	5625	26353	52	17	15	7	1805	1805	1801	1805	0.097	1.414	2.539	<u>0.699</u>
	10000	47628	58	21	15	7	2974	2972	2966	2973	0.170	1.786	3.517	<u>0.994</u>
	15625	75153	86	24	15	7	4362	4357	4349	4356	0.344	2.267	5.005	<u>1.495</u>
TORSION1	16	12	1	1	7	7	16	16	16	16	0.023	1.033	1.312	<u>0.032</u>
	36	64	3	4	16	9	32	32	32	32	0.026	1.066	1.328	<u>0.034</u>
	64	156	6	4	10	5	44	44	44	44	0.030	1.125	1.320	<u>0.032</u>
	100	288	9	5	12	8	68	68	68	68	0.031	1.135	1.337	<u>0.036</u>
	484	1920	20	8	14	8	228	228	228	228	0.034	1.191	1.379	<u>0.050</u>
	1024	4380	31	10	14	8	436	436	436	436	0.039	1.215	1.436	<u>0.078</u>
	5476	25632	67	24	13	8	1956	1956	1956	1956	0.107	1.587	2.090	<u>0.339</u>
	10000	47628	62	31	12	7	3404	3484	3420	3444	0.169	2.201	2.699	<u>0.461</u>
	14884	71520	77	38	12	7	4972	5100	4932	5044	0.280	3.008	3.594	<u>0.831</u>
	TORSION2	16	12	2	5	7	7	16	16	16	16	0.023	1.127	1.305
100		288	9	11	12	8	68	68	68	68	0.032	1.196	1.325	<u>0.037</u>
484		1920	24	14	14	8	228	228	228	228	0.035	1.206	1.371	<u>0.052</u>
1024		4380	37	15	14	8	436	436	436	436	0.041	1.223	1.432	<u>0.082</u>
5476		25632	78	22	13	8	1996	1956	1956	1956	0.125	1.650	2.086	<u>0.363</u>
10000		47628	104	26	12	7	3564	3448	3420	3444	0.271	2.293	2.683	<u>0.516</u>
14884		71520	127	23	12	7	5268	5044	4932	5044	0.469	2.849	3.668	<u>0.913</u>
TORSION3	16	12	1	1	5	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.023</u>	1.035	1.229	0.015
	100	288	4	3	11	7	88	88	88	88	0.030	1.106	1.337	<u>0.035</u>
	484	1920	13	5	12	8	372	372	372	372	0.032	1.083	1.364	<u>0.051</u>
	1024	4380	17	7	12	8	748	748	748	748	0.034	1.203	1.421	<u>0.097</u>
	5476	25632	36	12	13	7	3692	3692	3692	3692	0.063	1.347	2.089	<u>0.359</u>
	10000	47628	41	16	13	6	6588	6580	6540	6564	0.107	1.598	2.813	<u>0.579</u>
	14884	71520	50	19	12	6	9796	9764	9724	9756	0.163	1.848	3.700	<u>0.947</u>

Table 4: The number of iterations, number of active constraints and elapsed time of the different methods.

Problem	N	NNZ	Number of Outer Iterations				Number of Active Constraints				Elapsed Time			
			LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB
TORSION4	16	12	2	4	5	1	16	16	16	16	0.024	1.112	1.231	<u>0.025</u>
	100	288	6	13	11	7	88	88	88	88	0.030	1.202	1.335	<u>0.037</u>
	484	1920	15	12	12	8	372	372	372	372	0.033	1.194	1.363	<u>0.054</u>
	1024	4380	21	14	12	8	748	748	748	748	0.035	1.216	1.417	<u>0.107</u>
	5476	25632	54	20	13	7	3692	3692	3692	3692	0.085	1.522	2.094	<u>0.404</u>
	10000	47628	69	22	13	6	6556	6556	6540	6564	0.164	1.937	2.808	<u>0.647</u>
	14884	71520	84	31	13	6	9764	9740	9724	9756	0.271	2.696	3.786	<u>1.147</u>
TORSION5	16	12	1	1	4	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.023</u>	1.036	1.196	0.020
	100	288	1	1	10	7	100	100	100	100	0.023	1.034	1.322	<u>0.034</u>
	484	1920	4	4	13	9	444	444	444	444	0.030	1.120	1.373	<u>0.054</u>
	1024	4380	9	5	13	9	860	860	860	860	0.032	1.149	1.519	<u>0.081</u>
	5476	25632	20	7	13	9	4524	4524	4524	4524	0.047	1.264	2.160	<u>0.402</u>
	10000	47628	23	9	13	9	8316	8316	8316	8316	0.069	1.369	2.830	<u>0.705</u>
	14884	71520	25	10	13	9	12348	12340	12340	12340	0.094	1.505	3.843	<u>1.221</u>
TORSION6	16	12	2	3	4	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.023</u>	1.099	1.194	0.022
	100	288	3	10	10	7	100	100	100	100	0.025	1.181	1.319	<u>0.036</u>
	484	1920	11	11	13	9	444	444	444	444	0.032	1.213	1.368	<u>0.058</u>
	1024	4380	17	12	14	9	860	860	860	860	0.034	1.201	1.441	<u>0.099</u>
	5476	25632	37	17	14	9	4524	4524	4524	4524	0.064	1.428	2.211	<u>0.479</u>
	10000	47628	49	22	13	9	8308	8316	8316	8316	0.115	1.764	2.806	<u>0.858</u>
	14884	71520	54	23	13	9	12332	12340	12340	12340	0.163	2.115	3.819	<u>1.495</u>
TORSIONA	16	12	3	3	8	2	12	12	12	12	<u>0.025</u>	1.061	1.263	0.025
	100	288	9	6	12	8	60	60	60	60	0.031	1.174	1.328	<u>0.036</u>
	484	1920	17	8	12	8	212	212	212	212	0.032	1.189	1.244	<u>0.051</u>
	1024	4380	32	10	13	8	404	404	404	404	0.039	1.206	1.435	<u>0.083</u>
	5476	25632	69	24	13	7	1892	1892	1876	1884	0.112	1.571	2.092	<u>0.297</u>
	10000	47628	65	32	12	7	3260	3364	3308	3332	0.176	2.242	2.685	<u>0.534</u>
	14884	71520	77	38	12	7	4900	4969	4828	4916	0.290	3.060	3.751	<u>0.827</u>

Table 5: The number of iterations, number of active constraints and elapsed time of the different methods.

Problem	N	NNZ	Number of Outer Iterations				Number of Active Constraints				Elapsed Time			
			LFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LFGSB	TR	IP	MB
TORSIONB	16	12	3	7	8	1	12	12	12	12	<u>0.026</u>	1.163	1.310	0.014
	100	288	9	12	12	8	60	60	60	60	0.031	1.189	1.325	<u>0.035</u>
	484	1920	26	11	12	8	212	212	212	212	0.035	1.196	1.359	<u>0.053</u>
	1024	4380	40	12	13	8	404	404	404	404	0.041	1.215	1.422	<u>0.087</u>
	5476	25632	88	15	13	7	1916	1876	1876	1884	0.132	1.510	2.089	<u>0.318</u>
	10000	47628	108	19	12	7	3444	3350	3308	3332	0.279	2.043	2.690	<u>0.611</u>
	14884	71520	126	19	12	7	5124	4904	4828	4916	0.480	2.401	3.715	<u>0.833</u>
TORSIONC	16	12	1	1	7	6	16	16	16	16	0.023	1.035	1.309	<u>0.031</u>
	100	288	4	4	9	5	84	84	84	84	0.030	1.119	1.334	<u>0.032</u>
	484	1920	12	5	12	8	364	364	364	364	0.032	1.136	1.362	<u>0.055</u>
	1024	4380	18	7	12	8	732	732	732	732	0.035	1.188	1.419	<u>0.093</u>
	5476	25632	33	12	13	7	3668	3660	3660	3660	0.061	1.342	2.094	<u>0.323</u>
	10000	47628	43	16	13	6	6548	6532	6492	6532	0.111	1.593	2.832	<u>0.532</u>
	14884	71520	49	19	12	6	9708	9700	9660	9692	0.159	1.823	3.716	<u>0.825</u>
TORSIOND	16	12	2	5	7	6	16	16	16	16	0.024	1.123	1.305	<u>0.032</u>
	100	288	7	8	9	5	84	84	84	84	0.031	1.183	1.315	<u>0.034</u>
	484	1920	17	11	12	8	364	364	364	364	0.033	1.194	1.360	<u>0.056</u>
	1024	4380	24	12	12	8	732	732	732	732	0.036	1.210	1.412	<u>0.098</u>
	5476	25632	53	17	13	7	3660	3660	3660	3660	0.086	1.463	2.087	<u>0.362</u>
	10000	47628	66	18	13	6	6532	6508	6492	6532	0.165	1.803	2.782	<u>0.667</u>
	14884	71520	83	28	13	6	9708	9676	9660	9692	0.267	2.480	3.787	<u>1.026</u>
TORSIONE	16	12	1	1	5	1	16	16	16	16	<u>0.023</u>	1.031	1.226	0.020
	100	288	1	1	10	7	100	100	100	100	0.023	1.037	1.322	<u>0.035</u>
	484	1920	4	4	10	9	444	444	444	444	0.030	1.122	1.350	<u>0.055</u>
	1024	4380	9	5	13	9	852	852	852	852	0.032	1.142	1.450	<u>0.085</u>
	5476	25632	20	7	13	9	4508	4508	4508	4508	0.048	1.140	2.162	<u>0.411</u>
	10000	47628	23	9	13	9	8292	8292	8292	8292	0.067	1.524	2.967	<u>0.692</u>
	14884	71520	28	10	13	9	12316	12308	12308	12308	0.098	1.446	3.953	<u>1.092</u>
TORSIONF	16	12	2	4	4	1	16	16	16	16	0.023	1.111	1.193	<u>0.025</u>
	100	288	3	18	10	7	100	100	100	100	0.025	1.189	1.317	<u>0.035</u>
	484	1920	12	11	10	9	444	444	444	444	0.032	1.193	1.348	<u>0.059</u>
	1024	4380	17	12	14	9	852	852	852	852	0.034	1.203	1.439	<u>0.096</u>
	5476	25632	38	14	14	9	4508	4508	4508	4508	0.062	1.386	2.217	<u>0.486</u>
	10000	47628	48	19	13	9	8276	8276	8292	8292	0.112	1.672	2.805	<u>0.851</u>
	14884	71520	54	19	13	9	12300	12300	12308	12308	0.166	1.950	3.860	<u>1.319</u>

Problem	N	Optimal Function Value				Projected Gradient			
		LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB
CVXBQP1	10	2.4750E+00	2.4751E+00	2.4751E+00	2.4750E+00	0.0000E+00	1.2350E-05	8.6577E-06	0.0000E+00
	50	5.7375E+01	5.7375E+01	5.7376E+01	5.7375E+01	0.0000E+00	3.3741E-06	9.5858E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	2.2725E+02	2.2725E+02	2.2725E+02	2.2725E+02	0.0000E+00	7.0174E-06	9.7112E-06	0.0000E+00
	1000	2.2523E+04	2.2523E+04	2.2523E+04	2.2523E+04	0.0000E+00	4.0059E-05	9.8991E-06	0.0000E+00
	10000	2.2502E+06	2.2502E+06	2.2502E+06	2.2502E+06	0.0000E+00	1.0158E-05	9.9214E-06	0.0000E+00
	100000	2.2500E+08	2.2503E+08	2.2500E+08	2.2500E+08	0.0000E+00	4.6115E-05	9.9237E-06	0.0000E+00
DIAGPQB	10	-7.7488E+00	-7.7488E+00	-7.7488E+00	-7.7488E+00	3.6709E-05	9.9990E-05	1.1900E-05	5.9863E-13
	50	-4.0628E+01	-4.0628E+01	-4.0628E+01	-4.0628E+01	9.9119E-05	1.2493E-10	5.5897E-05	1.7053E-13
	100	-8.1749E+01	-8.1749E+01	-8.1749E+01	-8.1749E+01	9.9240E-05	9.9899E-10	9.0108E-07	1.5632E-13
	500	-4.1073E+02	-4.1073E+02	-4.1073E+02	-4.1073E+02	8.6515E-05	1.2437E-07	9.0810E-07	5.1159E-13
	1000	-8.2197E+02	-8.2197E+02	-8.2197E+02	-8.2197E+02	9.1731E-05	9.9000E-07	9.2842E-07	1.0232E-12
	5000	-4.1095E+03	-4.1118E+03	-4.1118E+03	-4.1118E+03	<u>1.3068E-01</u>	3.2334E-06	2.6687E-06	5.4570E-12
DIAGPQE	10000	<u>-7.3178E+03</u>	-8.2242E+03	-8.2242E+03	-8.2242E+03	<u>7.2148E+00</u>	6.4720E-09	1.4596E-05	9.0949E-12
	100000	<u>-1.5893E+04</u>	-8.2246E+04	-8.2246E+04	-8.2246E+04	<u>5.0494E+00</u>	7.2397E-05	7.0751E-05	1.0186E-10
	1000000	<u>-1.1853E+04</u>	-3.7191E+05	-3.7191E+05	-3.7191E+05	<u>1.0816E+01</u>	3.6380E-11	2.0000E-05	6.5484E-11
	10	-1.4645E+00	-1.4645E+00	-1.4645E+00	-1.4645E+00	8.0499E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	5.8864E-13
	50	-2.2496E+00	-2.2496E+00	-2.2496E+00	-2.2496E+00	6.3153E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	1.1846E-13
	100	-2.5937E+00	-2.5937E+00	-2.5937E+00	-2.5937E+00	9.6947E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	5.9619E-14
DIAGPQT	500	-3.3964E+00	-3.3964E+00	-3.3964E+00	-3.3964E+00	9.0834E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	1.2657E-14
	1000	-3.7427E+00	-3.7427E+00	-3.7427E+00	-3.7427E+00	7.4859E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	6.7724E-15
	5000	-4.5473E+00	-4.5473E+00	-4.5473E+00	-4.5473E+00	9.5299E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	2.1094E-15
	10000	-4.8938E+00	-4.8938E+00	-4.8938E+00	-4.8938E+00	9.9186E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	1.4433E-15
	100000	-6.0451E+00	-6.0451E+00	-6.0451E+00	-6.0451E+00	9.9579E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	9.9920E-16
	1000000	-7.1964E+00	-7.1964E+00	-7.1964E+00	-7.1964E+00	9.9449E-05	9.9999E-06	2.0000E-06	8.8818E-16
DIAGPQT	10	-5.8387E+00	-5.8387E+00	-5.8387E+00	-5.8387E+00	9.6965E-05	9.9990E-05	1.1900E-05	5.9863E-13
	50	-2.6285E+01	-2.6285E+01	-2.6285E+01	-2.6285E+01	7.3064E-05	1.2493E-10	5.5897E-05	1.7053E-13
	100	-5.1464E+01	-5.1464E+01	-5.1464E+01	-5.1464E+01	7.3644E-05	9.9899E-10	9.0108E-07	1.5632E-13
	500	-2.5187E+02	-2.5187E+02	-2.5187E+02	-2.5187E+02	7.9754E-05	1.2437E-07	9.0810E-07	5.1159E-13
	1000	-5.0204E+02	-5.0204E+02	-5.0204E+02	-5.0204E+02	8.9666E-05	9.9000E-07	9.2842E-07	1.0232E-12
	5000	-2.5024E+03	-2.5024E+03	-2.5024E+03	-2.5024E+03	6.5598E-05	2.4643E-06	2.6687E-06	5.4570E-12
DIAGPQT	10000	-5.0026E+03	-5.0026E+03	-5.0026E+03	-5.0026E+03	9.9161E-05	5.5607E-09	1.4596E-05	9.0949E-12
	100000	<u>-3.4501E+04</u>	-5.0003E+04	-5.0003E+04	-5.0003E+04	<u>4.0416E+01</u>	6.8371E-05	7.0581E-05	1.0186E-10
	1000000	<u>-1.4327E+02</u>	-9.5004E+04	-9.5004E+04	-9.5004E+04	<u>1.3451E+00</u>	1.7627E-09	2.2222E-06	4.9960E-16

Table 6: The optimal function value and projected gradient of the different methods.

Problem	N	Optimal Function Value				Projected Gradient			
		LFBGSB	TR	IP	MB	LFBGSB	TR	IP	MB
OBSTCLAE	16	7.5366E-01	7.5367E-01	7.5367E-01	7.5366E-01	0.0000E+00	2.0424E-05	4.7116E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	7.8193E-05	9.0901E-05	2.6964E-05	6.3654E-05
	529	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	6.1430E-05	7.6159E-05	5.1159E-05	6.1439E-05
	1024	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	9.1460E-05	9.8639E-05	7.7406E-05	6.1454E-05
	5625	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	8.3798E-05	9.4932E-05	9.0148E-05	3.2049E-05
	10000	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	8.8751E-05	9.9703E-05	9.7857E-05	3.1211E-05
	15625	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	9.8175E-05	6.0950E-05	9.1632E-05	6.2138E-05
OBSTCLAL	16	7.5366E-01	7.5366E-01	7.5367E-01	7.5366E-01	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	4.7117E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	1.3979E+00	7.3281E-05	1.0669E-05	5.9181E-06	6.3654E-05
	529	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	1.6780E+00	7.4865E-05	8.1719E-06	4.6474E-05	6.1439E-05
	1024	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	1.7483E+00	8.6225E-05	2.1486E-05	4.6438E-05	6.1454E-05
	5625	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	1.8630E+00	9.7775E-05	3.1912E-05	8.9490E-05	3.2049E-05
	10000	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	1.8865E+00	7.8293E-05	9.9313E-05	9.7869E-05	3.1211E-05
	15625	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	1.9010E+00	7.0327E-05	2.5531E-05	9.1643E-05	6.2138E-05
OBSTCLBL	16	-8.1108E-03	-8.1108E-03	-8.1026E-03	-8.0908E-03	0.0000E+00	1.3380E-07	2.2497E-05	5.5109E-05
	100	2.8750E+00	2.8750E+00	2.8751E+00	2.8752E+00	2.3696E-05	5.1037E-06	2.0591E-05	5.7530E-05
	529	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.4515E-05	5.2783E-05	3.4980E-05	6.2067E-05
	1024	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	7.6929E-05	3.9570E-05	4.6177E-05	5.9680E-05
	5625	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	9.4226E-05	9.1447E-05	8.4696E-05	6.9110E-05
	10000	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	8.0552E-05	8.8283E-05	7.3389E-05	7.0571E-05
	15625	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	9.2623E-05	8.0163E-05	7.0235E-05	7.0984E-05
OBSTCLBM	16	-8.1108E-03	-8.1076E-03	-8.1026E-03	-8.0908E-03	0.0000E+00	9.6202E-06	2.2491E-05	5.5109E-05
	100	2.8750E+00	2.8750E+00	2.8751E+00	2.8752E+00	1.8496E-05	9.8939E-05	2.0489E-05	5.7530E-05
	529	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	8.8378E-05	7.6312E-05	3.5006E-05	6.2067E-05
	1024	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	8.8496E-05	9.9553E-05	4.6071E-05	5.9680E-05
	5625	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	8.9276E-05	9.0082E-05	9.4779E-05	6.9110E-05
	10000	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.4735E-05	7.5121E-05	9.9054E-05	7.0571E-05
	15625	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	9.2806E-05	4.8740E-05	6.9997E-05	7.0984E-05

Table 7: The optimal function value and projected gradient of the different methods.

Problem	N	Optimal Function Value				Projected Gradient			
		LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB
OBSTCLBU	16	-8.1108E-03	-8.1108E-03	-8.1026E-03	-8.0908E-03	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	2.2488E-05	5.5109E-05
	100	2.8750E+00	2.8750E+00	2.8751E+00	2.8752E+00	3.8464E-05	7.3274E-05	1.8691E-05	5.7530E-05
	529	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	6.5193E+00	9.6207E-05	3.5900E-05	3.2829E-05	6.2067E-05
	1024	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	6.8871E+00	9.5532E-05	5.1539E-05	4.6043E-05	5.9680E-05
	5625	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2309E+00	7.2300E-05	4.3083E-05	7.8737E-05	6.9110E-05
	10000	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.2722E+00	7.9233E-05	5.8248E-05	8.6888E-05	7.0571E-05
	15625	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	7.2958E+00	9.5588E-05	2.8789E-05	7.0250E-05	7.0984E-05
TORSION1	16	-5.1852E-01	-5.1852E-01	-5.1851E-01	-5.1843E-01	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	1.4370E-05	9.8964E-05
	36	-5.2000E-01	-5.2000E-01	-5.2000E-01	-5.1999E-01	2.2204E-16	8.3447E-08	5.7382E-05	8.7009E-05
	64	-5.0410E-01	-5.0410E-01	-5.0409E-01	-5.0398E-01	2.4299E-05	6.5150E-05	2.8349E-05	8.9750E-05
	100	-4.9234E-01	-4.9234E-01	-4.9234E-01	-4.9233E-01	5.7005E-05	1.1483E-05	3.9920E-06	7.2607E-05
	484	-4.5609E-01	-4.5609E-01	-4.5609E-01	-4.5607E-01	4.8294E-05	1.5384E-05	4.4425E-05	5.4818E-05
	1024	-4.4498E-01	-4.4498E-01	-4.4498E-01	-4.4496E-01	9.6244E-05	8.4971E-05	4.7275E-05	5.8714E-05
	5476	-4.3026E-01	-4.3028E-01	-4.3027E-01	-4.3026E-01	9.4467E-05	2.7543E-06	8.3329E-05	4.8779E-05
TORSION2	10000	-4.2722E-01	-4.2726E-01	-4.2725E-01	-4.2724E-01	8.9837E-05	8.7071E-05	8.6088E-05	7.9309E-05
	14884	-4.2562E-01	-4.2570E-01	-4.2568E-01	-4.2568E-01	9.0821E-05	7.5921E-05	8.7862E-05	7.1904E-05
	16	-5.1852E-01	-5.1846E-01	-5.1851E-01	-5.1843E-01	0.0000E+00	6.2709E-05	1.4378E-05	9.8964E-05
	100	-4.9234E-01	-4.9234E-01	-4.9234E-01	-4.9233E-01	4.7336E-05	9.0497E-05	4.5352E-06	7.2607E-05
	484	-4.5609E-01	-4.5609E-01	-4.5609E-01	-4.5607E-01	9.8391E-05	3.2455E-05	4.4636E-05	5.4818E-05
	1024	-4.4498E-01	-4.4498E-01	-4.4498E-01	-4.4496E-01	8.8612E-05	4.0488E-05	4.7360E-05	5.8714E-05
	5476	-4.3026E-01	-4.3028E-01	-4.3027E-01	-4.3026E-01	8.7256E-05	8.4363E-05	8.9286E-05	4.8779E-05
TORSION3	10000	-4.2721E-01	-4.2726E-01	-4.2725E-01	-4.2724E-01	9.7085E-05	9.9057E-05	8.7247E-05	7.9309E-05
	14884	-4.2563E-01	-4.2570E-01	-4.2568E-01	-4.2568E-01	8.4918E-05	9.6476E-05	8.8753E-05	7.1904E-05
	16	-1.2593E+00	-1.2593E+00	-1.2592E+00	-1.2593E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	2.0142E-05	0.0000E+00
	100	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	3.3307E-16	1.5994E-05	3.6072E-05	6.5213E-05
	484	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	6.1741E-05	5.2687E-05	7.4464E-05	5.6795E-05
	1024	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	9.3091E-05	7.9718E-06	5.4350E-05	6.1682E-05
	5476	-1.2170E+00	-1.2170E+00	-1.2169E+00	-1.2169E+00	8.0552E-05	4.6303E-05	9.5755E-05	7.8092E-05
10000	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	9.9348E-05	1.4581E-05	7.9931E-05	7.7798E-05	
14884	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	7.1148E-05	6.0266E-05	9.2843E-05	6.2884E-05	

Table 8: The optimal function value and projected gradient of the different methods.

Problem	N	Optimal Function Value				Projected Gradient			
		LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB	LBFGSB	TR	IP	MB
TORSION4	16	-1.2593E+00	-1.2591E+00	-1.2592E+00	-1.2593E+00	0.0000E+00	5.1033E-05	1.8739E-05	0.0000E+00
	100	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	-1.2705E+00	3.3307E-16	6.4616E-05	4.1071E-05	6.5213E-05
	484	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	-1.2422E+00	9.4393E-05	6.5955E-05	7.4704E-05	5.6795E-05
	1024	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	-1.2317E+00	9.6424E-05	3.7433E-05	5.5724E-05	6.1682E-05
	5476	-1.2170E+00	-1.2170E+00	-1.2169E+00	-1.2169E+00	7.5637E-05	6.7726E-05	9.6322E-05	7.8092E-05
	10000	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	-1.2138E+00	9.1174E-05	6.7135E-05	8.1052E-05	7.7799E-05
	14884	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	-1.2122E+00	8.0278E-05	8.3097E-05	8.9361E-05	6.2884E-05
TORSION5	16	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	5.8555E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	-2.8971E+00	-2.8971E+00	-2.8970E+00	-2.8971E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	8.8914E-05	5.5908E-05
	484	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	4.6799E-06	4.9876E-06	1.4525E-05	9.3589E-05
	1024	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	7.8041E-05	1.4969E-05	3.6394E-05	8.3180E-05
	5476	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	7.6678E-05	8.2056E-06	5.4512E-05	8.0780E-05
	10000	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	7.4309E-05	4.9532E-06	9.3705E-05	8.0198E-05
	14884	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	9.7128E-05	6.2184E-05	6.9937E-05	8.2179E-05
TORSION6	16	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	-2.7407E+00	0.0000E+00	2.2204E-14	5.7433E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	-2.8971E+00	-2.8971E+00	-2.8970E+00	-2.8971E+00	0.0000E+00	8.6189E-05	8.9613E-05	5.5908E-05
	484	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	-2.8847E+00	7.2934E-05	5.3724E-06	1.4749E-05	9.3589E-05
	1024	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	-2.8765E+00	7.0369E-05	2.5515E-05	3.2082E-05	8.3180E-05
	5476	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	-2.8634E+00	7.8825E-05	2.9530E-05	5.2827E-05	8.0780E-05
	10000	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	-2.8604E+00	8.8475E-05	6.6920E-05	9.4986E-05	8.0198E-05
	14884	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	-2.8588E+00	9.0591E-05	9.1293E-05	7.0139E-05	8.2179E-05
TORSIONA	16	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	1.1102E-16	5.8945E-05	3.3136E-05	6.5878E-11
	100	-4.0570E-01	-4.0570E-01	-4.0570E-01	-4.0569E-01	9.6816E-05	5.9726E-05	2.2177E-05	8.7275E-05
	484	-4.1611E-01	-4.1611E-01	-4.1611E-01	-4.1610E-01	7.9472E-05	7.3736E-05	8.3660E-05	6.2527E-05
	1024	-4.1739E-01	-4.1740E-01	-4.1739E-01	-4.1738E-01	8.3103E-05	8.2332E-05	6.8433E-05	6.3897E-05
	5476	-4.1828E-01	-4.1830E-01	-4.1829E-01	-4.1827E-01	8.8724E-05	8.6447E-06	8.1847E-05	9.3502E-05
	10000	-4.1831E-01	-4.1839E-01	-4.1837E-01	-4.1837E-01	8.2799E-05	8.4397E-05	9.1412E-05	7.4569E-05
	14884	-4.1840E-01	-4.1842E-01	-4.1840E-01	-4.1840E-01	8.0395E-05	4.3266E-05	9.1540E-05	7.2112E-05

Table 9: The optimal function value and projected gradient of the different methods.

Problem	N	Optimal Function Value				Projected Gradient			
		LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB	LBFGBS	TR	IP	MB
TORSIONB	16	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	-3.0864E-01	1.1102E-16	9.5096E-07	3.3215E-05	3.3307E-16
	100	-4.0570E-01	-4.0570E-01	-4.0570E-01	-4.0569E-01	9.1601E-05	4.9096E-05	2.2632E-05	8.7275E-05
	484	-4.1611E-01	-4.1611E-01	-4.1611E-01	-4.1610E-01	8.4080E-05	7.5153E-05	8.4724E-05	6.2527E-05
	1024	-4.1740E-01	-4.1740E-01	-4.1739E-01	-4.1738E-01	8.1777E-05	8.8648E-05	6.8616E-05	6.3897E-05
	5476	-4.1829E-01	-4.1829E-01	-4.1829E-01	-4.1827E-01	9.8695E-05	8.6701E-05	8.5754E-05	9.3502E-05
	10000	-4.1834E-01	-4.1839E-01	-4.1837E-01	-4.1837E-01	6.0746E-05	9.5136E-05	9.2585E-05	7.4569E-05
14884	-4.1835E-01	-4.1842E-01	-4.1840E-01	-4.1840E-01	9.5534E-05	9.6261E-05	9.1977E-05	7.2112E-05	
TORSIONC	16	-1.0370E+00	-1.0370E+00	-1.0370E+00	-1.0370E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	5.7885E-06	8.5120E-05
	100	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	6.6613E-16	4.3389E-06	7.7788E-05	6.9268E-05
	484	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	9.8195E-05	6.4273E-06	7.4489E-05	5.6840E-05
	1024	-1.2023E+00	-1.2023E+00	-1.2022E+00	-1.2022E+00	4.4313E-05	3.1365E-05	5.4101E-05	6.1684E-05
	5476	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	9.8922E-05	1.3190E-05	8.6189E-05	7.8091E-05
	10000	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	8.4016E-05	7.8485E-05	8.2158E-05	7.5932E-05
14884	-1.2045E+00	-1.2045E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	9.3838E-05	6.9033E-05	9.2819E-05	5.7976E-05	
TORSIOND	16	-1.0370E+00	-1.0369E+00	-1.0370E+00	-1.0369E+00	0.0000E+00	6.2709E-05	5.7836E-06	8.5120E-05
	100	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	-1.1766E+00	4.6856E-05	4.1141E-05	9.4897E-05	6.9268E-05
	484	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	-1.1995E+00	9.3624E-05	7.6364E-05	7.4728E-05	5.6840E-05
	1024	-1.2023E+00	-1.2023E+00	-1.2022E+00	-1.2022E+00	9.4850E-05	8.2456E-05	5.5437E-05	6.1684E-05
	5476	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	-1.2042E+00	7.8179E-05	6.8127E-05	8.7205E-05	7.8091E-05
	10000	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	8.7226E-05	9.8489E-05	8.2999E-05	7.5932E-05
14884	-1.2045E+00	-1.2045E+00	-1.2044E+00	-1.2044E+00	9.4901E-05	9.7241E-05	8.9308E-05	5.7976E-05	
TORSIONE	16	-2.5185E+00	-2.5185E+00	-2.5185E+00	-2.5185E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	7.5765E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	-2.7984E+00	-2.7984E+00	-2.7982E+00	-2.7983E+00	0.0000E+00	0.0000E+00	8.9896E-05	5.5931E-05
	484	-2.8406E+00	-2.8406E+00	-2.8405E+00	-2.8406E+00	1.1102E-16	4.6036E-06	6.0382E-05	9.3589E-05
	1024	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	8.0529E-05	1.5703E-05	3.6125E-05	8.3180E-05
	5476	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	6.3349E-05	1.5019E-05	5.5869E-05	8.0780E-05
	10000	-2.8507E+00	-2.8507E+00	-2.8506E+00	-2.8507E+00	7.5359E-05	6.5592E-06	8.6267E-05	8.0198E-05
14884	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	6.9144E-05	6.0483E-05	6.9920E-05	8.2201E-05	
TORSIONF	16	-2.5185E+00	-2.5181E+00	-2.5185E+00	-2.5185E+00	0.0000E+00	6.3265E-05	8.3443E-06	0.0000E+00
	100	-2.7984E+00	-2.7983E+00	-2.7982E+00	-2.7983E+00	0.0000E+00	9.4250E-05	9.0822E-05	5.5931E-05
	484	-2.8406E+00	-2.8406E+00	-2.8405E+00	-2.8406E+00	4.3783E-05	5.0063E-06	6.0863E-05	9.3589E-05
	1024	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	-2.8461E+00	8.1940E-05	2.1902E-05	3.1763E-05	8.3180E-05
	5476	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	-2.8502E+00	6.8487E-05	9.8861E-05	5.4314E-05	8.0780E-05
	10000	-2.8507E+00	-2.8507E+00	-2.8506E+00	-2.8507E+00	8.3133E-05	4.8587E-05	8.6742E-05	8.0198E-05
14884	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	-2.8508E+00	7.2507E-05	8.8486E-05	7.0135E-05	8.2201E-05	

Table 10: The optimal function value and projected gradient of the different methods.