

# Exponential Conic Relaxations for Signomial Geometric Programming

Milad Dehghani Filabadi<sup>a</sup>, Chen Chen<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA*

---

## Abstract

Signomial geometric programming (SGP) is a computationally challenging, NP-Hard class of non-convex nonlinear optimization problems. SGP can be solved iteratively using a sequence of convex relaxations; consequently, the strength of such relaxations is an important factor to this iterative approach. Motivated by recent advances in solving exponential conic programming (ECP) problems, this paper develops a novel convex relaxation for SGP. Unlike existing work on relaxations, the base model in this paper does not assume bounded variables. However, bounded variables or monomial terms can be used to strengthen the relaxation by means of additional valid linear inequalities. We show how to embed the ECP relaxation in an iterative algorithm for SGP; leveraging recent advances in interior point method solvers, our computational experiments demonstrate the practical effectiveness of this approach.

*Keywords:* global optimization, exponential conic programming, signomial geometric programming, convex relaxations, valid inequalities

---

**Declarations of interest:** None

## 1. Introduction

Signomial geometric programming (SGP) problems are optimization problems involving both positive and negative monomials in the constraints and objective function (Duffin and Peterson, 1973) (see 2 for a definition). SGP problems have wide-ranging applications including engineering design (Avriel and Barrett, 1978; Marin-Sanguino et al., 2007; Xu, 2013), inventory control (Kim and Lee, 1998; Jung and Klein, 2005; Mandal et al., 2006), gas networks (Mishra et al., 2017), project management (Scott and Jefferson, 1995), aircraft design (Kirschen et al., 2018; Ozturk and Saab, 2019), and power control (Chiang et al., 2007).

SGP problems belong to a class of NP-hard (see Xu (2014)), nonconvex, nonlinear problems, posing computational barriers to attaining global optimality (see, e.g. (Opgeenoord et al., 2017; Murray et al., 2021)). As such, numerous local heuristic algorithms have been proposed to

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* `dehghanifilabadi.1@osu.edu` (Milad Dehghani Filabadi), `chen.8018@osu.edu` (Chen Chen)

solve SGP (see, e.g., [Kortanek et al. \(1997\)](#); [Yang and Bricker \(1997\)](#); [Toscano and Amouri \(2012\)](#); [Chiang et al. \(2007\)](#)). In this paper we propose a convex relaxation, suitable for either heuristic or global approaches. This places our work in the literature of convex approximations and relaxations for SGP, where a tractable convex formulation replaces the original. Such formulations are typically embedded in some sort of sequential procedure, detailed as follows.

In terms of convex approximations, a wide range of techniques have been explored. [Shen \(2005\)](#) uses linear approximations to construct a sequence linear programming problems for SGP. Piecewise approximation techniques have also been used in [Li and Lu \(2009\)](#); [Lundell and Westerlund \(2009\)](#); [Lin and Tsai \(2012\)](#) to convexify signomial constraints. [Xu \(2014\)](#) employed an inner approximation of the arithmetic-geometric (AM-GM) mean inequality and introduced an optimization algorithm through solving a sequence of geometric programming (GP) problems. [Li and Tsai \(2005\)](#) proposed convex underestimators for SGP problems with free-sign variables, utilizing exponential transformation, inverse transformation, and power convex transformation. Approximation via reciprocal transformation  $y_j = x_j^{-\beta}$  and linear underestimation of concave terms were proposed in [Li et al. \(2008\)](#) and [Lu et al. \(2010\)](#) for posynomial functions. [Lu \(2012\)](#) proposed a method to improve the efficiency of previous convex underestimators by finding the best value for  $\beta$ . However, determining an appropriate transformation function is non-trivial ([Tseng et al., 2015](#)). In [Lu and Yao \(2019\)](#), a convex inner approximation strategy was proposed to select an appropriate transformation.

There is also substantial literature on convex relaxations, which provide dual bounds for the (global) optimal value of SGP problems. Notably, [Maranas and Floudas \(1997\)](#) proposed an optimization algorithm that leverages convex relaxations for SGP. Linear relaxations for SGP were also proposed by [Shen and Zhang \(2004\)](#) and [Qu et al. \(2008\)](#), employing exponential variable transformations and the successive refinement of these linear relaxations. Furthermore, [Chandrasekaran and Shah \(2016\)](#); [Murray et al. \(2021\)](#); [Dressler and Murray \(2022\)](#) introduced a hierarchy of convex relaxations for a structured class of SGP with globally nonnegative signomials, and developed non-negativity certificates for solving such SGPs.

The proposed convexification techniques, i.e., convex inner approximations or relaxations, employed for solving SGP have two limitations:

First, the effectiveness of the inner approximation approach relies on the selection of weighting factors and initial feasible solutions around which the approximations are derived ([Hutter et al., 2011](#)). Alternatively, since finding feasible solutions can be challenging, some variants can initialize with non-feasible solutions at the expense of additional iterations and longer time to converge ([Xu, 2014](#)).

Secondly, the existing convex relaxations in the literature, although independent of the choice of initial feasible solutions, are tailored for specific classes of SGP and may not be applicable to the general form of SGPs. Particularly, [Maranas and Floudas \(1997\)](#); [Shen and Zhang \(2004\)](#); [Qu et al. \(2008\)](#) all rely on nonzero upper and lower bounds for all variables. Further, the convex

relaxations of [Chandrasekaran and Shah \(2016\)](#); [Murray et al. \(2021\)](#); [Dressler and Murray \(2022\)](#) are applicable only to nonnegative signomials, limiting the scope of their approach.

This paper contributes to the SGP literature and introduces novel convex relaxations for SGP, based on Exponential Conic Programming (ECP), that addresses the aforementioned limitations. ECP problems consist of a linear objective, linear constraints, and exponential cones (see [3](#) for details) and can be efficiently solved using interior point methods that deploy recent advancements for nonsymmetric cones ([Nesterov, 2012](#); [Skajaa and Ye, 2015](#); [Dahl and Andersen, 2022](#); [Papp and Yıldız, 2022](#)). As of now, MOSEK ([Mosek Aps, 2020](#)) is the only commercially available solver capable of effectively handling such problems. We note also that ECP can be interpreted as a generalization of GP (see, e.g., ([Serrano, 2015](#))).

Our ECP relaxation does not require variable bounds; it can, however, be strengthened by leveraging bounds on either variables or monomials (if available) in order to add valid linear inequalities. Notably, our strengthened ECP captures the convex hull of SGP in the projection of certain variables under the settings of [Shen and Zhang \(2004\)](#); [Qu et al. \(2008\)](#), where all variables possess both nonzero lower and upper bounds. Our strengthened relaxation may be viewed as analogous to the well-known SDP+RLT relaxation in polynomial optimization (see e.g. [Sherali and Fraticelli \(2002\)](#); [Anstreicher and Burer \(2010\)](#)). We also embed the proposed ECP relaxation in an iterative optimization algorithm. The efficacy of the proposed relaxations (both stand-alone and within the iterative algorithm) is demonstrated through our numerical experiments.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: [Section 2](#) discusses SGP. In [Section 3](#), we introduce the ECP relaxations and valid inequalities. [Section 4](#) details sequential optimization algorithms. Numerical results are discussed in [Section 5](#). Finally, the paper is concluded in [Section 6](#).

## 2. Signomial Programming Reformulation

Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$  denote a vector of real, (strictly) positive variables. A real-valued function  $f$  of  $x$ , with the form

$$f_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_k} c_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}},$$

where  $c_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}$ , is referred to as a polynomial function. The individual terms  $g_{jk}(x) = c_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}}$  within  $f_k(x)$  are monomial functions. Furthermore, if  $c_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m_k\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  in  $f_k(x)$ , the polynomial functions  $f_k(x)$  are specifically termed posynomial functions, or posynomials.

SGP can be expressed as the following non-convex nonlinear optimization problem ([Xu, 2014](#);

Kirschen, 2016):

$$\min \quad f_0(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} c_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ij0}} \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad f_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_k} c_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}} \leq 1, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\} \quad (1b)$$

$$x > 0. \quad (1c)$$

Note that equality constraints can be reduced to (1b). It is also noteworthy that in SGP (1),  $c_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$  where some  $c_{jk}$  can be negative, representing the differences among posynomials. As a special case, if we restrict  $c_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , SGP (1) reduces to geometric programming (GP) (Boyd et al., 2007), a special case that can be solved in polynomial time.

To construct our relaxation, we develop a concise reformulation of (1) by employing a series of intermediate reformulations. To this end, we first transfer the signomial objective function  $f_0(x)$  from (1) into the constraint set, using two strictly positive variables  $x_{n+1}$  and  $x_{n+2}$  as follows:

$$\min \quad x_{n+1} - x_{n+2} \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad f_0(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} c_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ij0}} \leq x_{n+1} - x_{n+2} \quad (2b)$$

$$f_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_k} c_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}} \leq 1 \quad \forall k \in 1, \dots, p, \quad (2c)$$

$$x_i > 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n+1, n+2\}. \quad (2d)$$

Furthermore, we split signomial terms as the difference of posynomials, in order that only posynomials are kept on either side of constraints. In particular, let  $C_k^+ = \{j : c_{jk} > 0, \forall j \in M_k, k \in K\}$  and  $C_k^- = \{j : c_{jk} < 0, \forall j \in M_k, k \in K\}$  be the set of monomials in constraint  $k$  (including  $k = 0$ ) with positive and negative coefficients, respectively. Defining  $c'_{jk} := -c_{jk}, \forall j \in C^-$ , SGP

(2) is reformulated as

$$\min x_{n+1} - x_{n+2} \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in C_0^+} c_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ij0}} + x_{n+2} \leq \sum_{j \in C_0^-} c'_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ij0}} + x_{n+1}, \quad (3b)$$

$$\sum_{j \in C_k^+} c_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}} \leq \sum_{j \in C_k^-} c'_{jk} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ijk}} + 1 \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \quad (3c)$$

$$x_i > 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n+2\}. \quad (3d)$$

For simplicity in notation, we define the (extended) index set  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n+1, n+2\}$  corresponding to the variable vector  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+2})$ . Additionally, within the signomial constraint (3b), indexed by  $k = 0$ , we define  $M_0 = \{1, \dots, m_0, m_0+1, m_0+2\}$  as the set of monomials for this constraint. In particular, we designate  $x_{n+1}$  and  $x_{n+2}$  as the  $(m_0+1)^{\text{th}}$  and  $(m_0+2)^{\text{th}}$  monomials, respectively. These terms are then consolidated in  $\sum_{j \in C_0^-} c'_{j0} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ij0}}$  and  $\sum_{j \in C_0^+} c_{j0} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ij0}}$ , respectively. Similarly, the index set  $M_k = \{1, \dots, m_k, m_k+1\}$  captures all monomials in signomial constraint (3c), where monomial 1 is indexed by  $j = (m_k+1)$  and is combined into  $\sum_{j \in C_k^-} c_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}$ .

Given the above definitions, SGP (1) can be reformulated as follows: (4)

$$\min_x d^T x \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad f_k^+(x) = \sum_{j \in C_k^+} c_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}} \leq f_k^-(x) = \sum_{j \in C_k^-} c'_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}, \quad \forall k \in K, \quad (4b)$$

$$x > 0, \quad (4c)$$

where  $d = (0, 0, \dots, 1, -1)$  so that  $d^T x$  recovers the objective function  $x_{n+1} - x_{n+2}$ . Moreover, we set

$$\begin{cases} c_{m_0+2,0} = 1, c'_{m_k+1,k} = 1 & \forall k \in K \\ a_{n+2,m_0+2,0} = 1, a_{i,m_0+2,0} = 0 & \forall i \in N/\{n+2\} \\ a_{n+1,m_k+1,k} = 1, a_{i,m_k+1,k} = 0 & \forall i \in N/\{n+1\}, k \in K, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

to ensure equivalence between (3) from formulation (4).

Formulation (4) is a concise representation of a reformulation for SGP (1), and serves as the foundation to develop our relaxation formulation in the subsequent section.

### 3. Proposed Exponential Conic Relaxations

In this section, we first formally define the exponential cone. Second, we propose the ECP relaxation for SGP in general setting, requiring no bounds on nonzero variables. Finally, we strengthen

the ECP relaxations by using bounds on either variables or monomials (if any are available) in order to add valid linear inequalities.

**Definition 1.** *The exponential cone is the closure (denoted by  $cl$ ) of a set of points in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  given by:*

$$K_{\text{exp}} := cl\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_2 e^{x_3/x_2} \leq x_1, x_2 \geq 0\}. \quad (6)$$

Moreover,  $K_{\text{exp}}$  can be expressed as the union of two sets  $K_1 \cup K_2$ , where  $K_1 := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_2 e^{x_3/x_2} \leq x_1, x_2 > 0\}$  and  $K_2 := \{(x_1, 0, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 \geq 0, x_3 \leq 0\}$ .

ECPs are defined with a linear objective over exponential cones and linear constraints. With variable transformations we can reformulate SGP (4) such that it yields a natural ECP relaxation. To this end, let  $\lambda_{jk}$  and  $\gamma_{jk}$  be nonnegative auxiliary variables corresponding to the monomials of  $f_k^+(x)$  and  $f_k^-(x)$ , respectively. In particular, let  $\lambda_{jk} \geq \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}, \forall j \in C_k^+, k \in K$ , and  $\gamma_{jk} \leq \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}, \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K$ ; moreover, introduce variables  $\tilde{x}_i := \log(x_i), \forall i \in N$ . We note that strict positivity of  $x$  (2d), as well as nonnegativity of the exponential function ensure equivalence across log transforms. Now, observe that

$$\prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}} = \exp\left(\log\left(\prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}\right)\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{i \in N} a_{ijk} \log(x_i)\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{i \in N} a_{ijk} \tilde{x}_i\right). \quad (7)$$

Introducing variables  $\tilde{\gamma}_{jk} := \log(\gamma_{jk})$ , the inequality  $\gamma_{jk} \leq \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}$  can be reformulated as follows (applying natural logs):

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{jk} \leq \sum_{i \in N} a_{ijk} \tilde{x}_i. \quad (8)$$

Given (7) and (8), an exact reformulation of SGP (4) is obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{x, \tilde{x}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda} \quad & d^T x & (9a) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in C_k^+} c_{jk} \lambda_{jk} \leq \sum_{j \in C_k^-} c'_{jk} \gamma_{jk} & \forall k \in K, & (9b) \\
& \exp\left(\sum_{i \in N} a_{ijk} \tilde{x}_i\right) \leq \lambda_{jk} & \forall j \in C^+, k \in K, & (9c) \\
& \tilde{\gamma}_{jk} \leq \sum_{i \in N} a_{ijk} \tilde{x}_i & \forall j \in C^-, k \in K, & (9d) \\
& e^{\tilde{x}_i} \leq x_i & \forall i \in N, & (9e) \\
& x_i \leq e^{\tilde{x}_i} & \forall i \in N, & (9f) \\
& e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{jk}} \leq \gamma_{jk} & \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K, & (9g) \\
& \gamma_{jk} \leq e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{jk}} & \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K, & (9h) \\
& x > 0. & (9i)
\end{aligned}$$

where constraints (9e) and (9f) enforce  $\tilde{x}_i = \log(x_i)$ ; likewise,  $\tilde{\gamma}_{jk} = \log(\gamma_{jk})$  is enforced in constraints (9g) and (9h).

In problem (9), constraints (9c), (9e), and (9g) can be represented with exponential conic constraints, following the definition of  $K_{\text{exp}}$  in (1). However, constraints (9f) and (9h) correspond to the hypograph of the exponential functions and are non-convex. Relaxing these constraints yields the following natural ECP relaxation (ECPR) for SGP (4):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(ECPR):} \quad & \min_{x, \tilde{x}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda} \quad d^T x & (10a) \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad (9b), (9c), (9d), (9e), (9g), (9i). & (10b)
\end{aligned}$$

This relaxation (10) is the first convex relaxation in the literature for SGP under a general setting without explicit nonzero variable bounds.

In the following subsections, we present valid inequalities designed to enhance the ECP relaxation (10) with either variable or monomial bounds, provided that they are available.

### 3.1. Strengthened ECP relaxation of SGP with variable upper and lower bounds

In this subsection, we explore a scenario in which some or all of the variables in SGP (4), denoted as  $x_i$  for  $i \in N' = 1, \dots, n$ , are subject to both upper and lower bounds. Here,  $N'$  represents the set of original variables in SGP (1). For a given  $i \in N'$  we let  $\underline{x}_i$  and  $\overline{x}_i$  represent known lower and upper bounds for a variable  $x_i$ , such that  $\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \overline{x}_i$ , and  $0 < \underline{x}_i < \overline{x}_i$ . We consider two cases:

3.1.1. Case 1:  $N' \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$

In this case, only a strict subset of variables have known nonzero upper and lower bounds. Consider a bounded variable,  $\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i$  where  $i \in N'$ . It follows that  $\log \underline{x}_i \leq \tilde{x}_i \leq \log \bar{x}_i, \forall i \in N'$ .

Let  $S_i^x$  be the bounded non-convex set capturing constraint (9f) and the bounds on  $x_i$  and  $\tilde{x}_i$  as follows

$$S_i^x = \{(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) : x_i \leq e^{\tilde{x}_i}, \log \underline{x}_i \leq \tilde{x}_i \leq \log \bar{x}_i, \underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i\}, \quad \forall i \in N'. \quad (11)$$

Proposition 1 establishes valid inequalities for  $S_i^x$ .

**Proposition 1.** For each  $i \in N' \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the inequality

$$x_i \leq \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{\log \bar{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i} (\tilde{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i) + \underline{x}_i \quad (12)$$

is valid for  $S_i^x$ .

*Proof.* By definition of  $N'$ , we have  $0 < \underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i$  and thus  $\log \underline{x}_i \leq \tilde{x}_i \leq \log \bar{x}_i, \forall i \in N'$ . Due to the convexity of the exponential function  $e^{\tilde{x}_i}$ , the line segment passing through points  $(\log \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_i)$  and  $(\log \bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_i)$  provides an upper bound/overestimator for  $e^{\tilde{x}_i}$ , and so

$$x_i \leq e^{\tilde{x}_i} \leq \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{\log \bar{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i} (\tilde{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i) + \underline{x}_i. \quad (13)$$

□

From Proposition 1 it follows that the set

$$R_i^x = \{(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) : (3.12), \tilde{x}_i \leq \log \bar{x}_i, \underline{x}_i \leq x_i\} \quad (14)$$


is a convex (linear) relaxation of  $S_i^x$  for all  $i \in N'$ . The following proposition shows that  $R_i^x$  is, in fact, the convex hull of  $S_i^x, \forall i \in N'$ .

**Proposition 2.**  $R_i^x = \text{conv}(S_i^x), \forall i \in N'$ .

*Proof.* For all  $i \in N'$ , we will show  $\text{conv}(S_i^x) \subseteq R_i^x$  and  $R_i^x \subseteq \text{conv}(S_i^x)$ :

Inclusion  $\text{conv}(S_i^x) \subseteq R_i^x$  follows from Proposition 1 as  $R_i^x$  is a convex relaxation of  $S_i^x$ . Conversely, to show  $R_i^x \subseteq \text{conv}(S_i^x)$ , consider the polyhedron  $R_i^x, \forall i \in N'$  defined by inequalities





**Figure 1:** Representation of non-convex set  $S_i^x$  and its corresponding convex hull  $R_i^x$ .

(15)-(17):

$$x_i \leq \frac{\bar{x}_i - \underline{x}_i}{\log \bar{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i} (\tilde{x}_i - \log \underline{x}_i) + \underline{x}_i, \quad (15)$$

$$\tilde{x}_i \leq \log \bar{x}_i, \quad (16)$$

$$\underline{x}_i \leq x_i. \quad (17)$$

We identify extreme points of  $R_i^x$  for each  $i \in N'$  by setting two inequalities among (15)-(17) binding. All three bases are enumerated below:

- a) Inequalities (15) and (16):  $(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) = (\log \bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_i)$ .
- b) Inequalities (15) and (17):  $(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) = (\log \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_i)$ .
- c) Inequalities (16) and (17):  $(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) = (\log \bar{x}_i, \underline{x}_i)$ .

Set  $E_i^x = \{(\log \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_i), (\log \bar{x}_i, \underline{x}_i), (\log \bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_i)\}$  captures all extreme points of  $R_i^x$  and satisfies the constraints of  $S_i^x$ . Thus,  $E_i^x \subseteq S_i^x$ , implying  $\text{conv}(E_i^x) \subseteq \text{conv}(S_i^x)$ . Given that any point  $(\tilde{x}_i, x_i) \in R_i^x$  can be expressed as the convex combination of its extreme points ( $E_i^x$ ), it follows  $\text{conv}(E_i^x) = R_i^x \subseteq \text{conv}(S_i^x)$ . Thus, it completes the proof.  $\square$

It follows from Propositions 1 and 2 that the ECP relaxation (10) is strengthened by incorporating the inequalities of  $R_i^x$ . Further, Figure 1 represents the non-convex set  $S_i^x$  alongside the corresponding convex hull formed by the inequalities of  $R_i^x$ . This suggests that while the bounds  $\log \underline{x}_i \leq \tilde{x}_i$  and  $x_i \leq \bar{x}_i$  are essential for deriving the valid inequality (15), they are no longer explicitly required as constraints in deriving the convex hull formulation, as they become redundant to the facet-defining inequalities.

**Remark 1.** Let  $\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i, \forall i \in N' \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ . The strengthened ECP relaxation (*s-ECPR*) of (10) is derived as follows

$$s\text{-ECPR:} \begin{cases} (10), \\ (\tilde{x}_i, x_i) \in R_i^x, \quad \forall i \in N' \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

3.1.2. Case 2:  $N' = \{1, \dots, n\}$

In this case, all original variables are bounded from below and above, characterized by  $\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i, \forall i \in N' = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , where  $0 < \underline{x}_i < \bar{x}_i$ . To enhance the ECP relaxations (10) and (18), we derive implicit bounds for the auxiliary variables  $x_{n+1}$ ,  $x_{n+2}$ , and  $\gamma$ .

By construction from (3), it is clear that  $x_{n+1} - x_{n+2}$  capture the objective function value  $\sum_{j \in C_0^+} c_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a_{ij0}} - \sum_{j \in C_0^-} c'_{j0} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{a'_{ij0}}$ . Similarly, as stated in previous section,  $\gamma_{jk}$  corresponds to the value of  $\prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}$ . For all  $j \in C_k^-, k \in K$ , letting  $A^+(j) = \{i : a_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $A^-(j) = \{i : a_i < 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ , we can easily establish nonzero lower and upper bounds for  $x_{n+1}$ ,  $x_{n+2}$ , and  $\gamma$  as follows

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \underline{x}_{n+1} = \sum_{j \in C_0^+} c_{j0} \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}}, \\ \bar{x}_{n+1} = \sum_{j \in C_0^+} c_{j0} \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a_{ijk}}, \\ \underline{x}_{n+2} = \sum_{j \in C_0^-} c'_{j0} \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a'_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a'_{ijk}}, \\ \bar{x}_{n+2} = \sum_{j \in C_0^-} c'_{j0} \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a'_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a'_{ijk}}, \\ \underline{\gamma}_{jk} = \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \quad \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K, \\ \bar{\gamma}_{jk} = \prod_{i \in A^+(j)} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \prod_{i \in A^-(j)} \underline{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} \quad \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K. \end{array} \right. \quad (19)$$

Using the established bounds for variables  $x_{n+1}$  and  $x_{n+2}$ , we can derive the valid inequalities of  $R_i^x$  in (14) for these variables, thereby improving the relaxation associated with the constraints (9f).

Further, the bounded non-convex set corresponding to constraint (9h) is expressed as

$$S_{jk}^\gamma = \left\{ (\tilde{\gamma}_{jk}, \gamma_{jk}) : \begin{array}{l} \gamma_{jk} \leq e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{jk}}, \\ \underline{\gamma}_{jk} \leq \gamma_{jk} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{jk}, \\ \log(\underline{\gamma}_{jk}) \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{jk} \leq \log(\bar{\gamma}_{jk}) \end{array} \right\}, \quad \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K. \quad (20)$$

Proposition 3 finds the convex hull of  $S_{jk}^\gamma, \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K$

**Proposition 3.** *Set*

$$R_{jk}^\gamma = \left\{ (\tilde{\gamma}_i, \gamma_i) : \gamma_{jk} \leq \frac{\bar{\gamma}_{jk} - \underline{\gamma}_{jk}}{\log \bar{\gamma}_{jk} - \log \underline{\gamma}_{jk}} (\tilde{\gamma}_{jk} - \log \underline{\gamma}_{jk}) + \underline{\gamma}_{jk}, \right. \\ \left. \tilde{\gamma}_{jk} \leq \log \bar{\gamma}_{j,k}, \underline{\gamma}_{j,k} \leq \gamma_{jk} \right\} \quad (21)$$

is the convex hull of  $S_{jk}^\gamma, \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K$ .

*Proof.* First, it follows from Proposition 1 that  $R_{jk}^\gamma$  is a convex relaxation of  $S_{jk}^\gamma, \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K$ . Further, considering the inequalities defining polyhedron  $R_{jk}^\gamma$ , set

$$E_{jk}^\gamma = \{(\log \underline{\gamma}_{j,k}, \underline{\gamma}_{j,k}), (\log \bar{\gamma}_{j,k}, \underline{\gamma}_{j,k}), (\log \bar{\gamma}_{j,k}, \bar{\gamma}_{j,k})\}$$

contains all the extreme points of  $R_{jk}^\gamma$ . Since  $E_{jk}^\gamma \subseteq S_{jk}^\gamma$ , similar to the proof of Proposition 2 it follows that  $R_{jk}^\gamma = \text{conv}(S_{jk}^\gamma), \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Let  $\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i, \forall i \in N' = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . The strengthened ECPR (*s-ECPR*) (22) includes the convex hull representation of problem (9).

$$s\text{-ECPR}: \begin{cases} (10) \\ (\tilde{x}_i, x_i) \in R_i^x, & \forall i \in N, \\ (\tilde{\gamma}_{jk}, \gamma_{jk}) \in R_{jk}^\gamma, & \forall j \in C_k^-, k \in K. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

### 3.2. Strengthened ECP relaxation with nonzero monomial bounds

In this section, we address scenarios where monomial bounds can be established from the bounds of variables and present valid inequalities for such settings. Namely, we consider the case where some monomial terms  $g_{jk}(x) = c_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}$  are bounded either from above or below and utilize the structure of the problem in two certain cases as follows:

#### 3.2.1. Case 1: Monomial lower bounds

In signomial constraint set (1b), let  $K' \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$  be the set of monomial constraints  $g_{1k}(x) = c_{1k} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{i1k}} \leq 1$  for which there exists a lower bound, represented by  $\underline{X}_k$ . Index  $j = 1$  indicates that there is only one monomial term in such constraints. Therefore, the monomial constraints can be written as

$$\underline{X}_k \leq g_{1k}(x) = c_{1k} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{i1k}} \leq 1, \forall k \in K', \quad (23)$$

where such monomial lower bounds exist only if there are lower bounds for variables with nonzero  $a_{i1k}$  for all  $k \in K' \subseteq K$  and are obtained as  $\underline{X}_k = c_{1k} \prod_{i \in N} \underline{x}_i^{a_{i1k}}$  for all  $k \in K'$ .

We now reformulate monomial constraints to derive valid inequalities. Introducing non-negative variables  $X_k$  and  $\tilde{X}_k$ , let  $X_k = c_{1k} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{i1k}}$  and  $\tilde{X}_{1k} = \log X_k$ . An extended formulation of

monomial constraints (23) is given by:

$$\underline{X}_k \leq X_k \leq 1, \quad \forall k \in K', \quad (24a)$$

$$\exp(\tilde{X}_k) \leq X_k, \quad \forall k \in K', \quad (24b)$$

$$X_k \leq \exp(\tilde{X}_k), \quad \forall k \in K', \quad (24c)$$

$$\tilde{X}_k = c_{1k} \sum_{i \in N} a_{i1k} \tilde{x}_i, \quad \forall k \in K', \quad (24d)$$

$$\log(\underline{X}_k) \leq \tilde{X}_k \leq 0, \quad \forall k \in K'. \quad (24e)$$

Constraints (24b)-(24d) enforce  $X_k = \exp(\tilde{X}_k) = c_{1k} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{i1k}}$ , and (24e) is implied from (24a) and the definition of  $\tilde{X}_k$ . It follows from Proposition 1 that we can derive valid inequalities for the non-convex constraint (24c) with bounded variables  $X_k$  and  $\tilde{X}_k$  as follows:

$$X_k \leq \frac{X_k - 1}{\log \underline{X}_k} \left( \tilde{X}_k - \log \underline{X}_k \right) + \underline{X}_k, \quad \forall k \in K'. \quad (25)$$

**Remark 3.** *The strengthened SGP relaxation with monomial lower bounds is obtained as follows:*

$$s\text{-ECPR:} \begin{cases} (10), \\ (24a), (24b), (24d), (24e), (25). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

### 3.2.2. Case 2. Monomial upper bounds

In (4b), we have  $f_k^-(x) = \sum_{j \in C_k^-} g_{jk}$  where  $g_{jk} = c'_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}}$  are monomial terms. Let  $\bar{X}_{jk} = c'_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}}$  represent the upper bound of monomial terms  $g_{jk}(x)$  for  $j$  in a subset of  $C_k^-$ , denoted as  $J_k$ , and  $k \in K$ . Such upper bound exists, for a given  $j \in C_k^-, k \in K' \subseteq K$ , only if there exist  $\bar{x}_t$  for all  $t \in T_{jk} = \{i \in N : a_{ijk} \neq 0\}$ . The following proposition describes valid inequalities for SGP of (9) using these upper bounds.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\bar{X}_{jk} = c'_{jk} \prod_{i \in N} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}}$  be the upper bound of monomial  $g_{jk}(x)$  for  $j \in J_k \subseteq C_k^-$  and  $k \in K' \subset K$ . For a given  $k \in K'$ , inequality*

$$\gamma_{jk} \leq \frac{\bar{X}_{jk}}{c'_{jk}}, \quad \forall j \in J_k \subseteq C_k^-, k \in K' \subset K \quad (27)$$

*is valid for SGP (9). Further, if  $J_k = C_k^-$ , the following inequality*

$$\sum_{j \in C_k^+} c_{jk} \lambda_{jk} \leq \sum_{j \in C_k^-} \bar{X}_{jk}, \quad \forall k \in K' \subset K \quad (28)$$

*is also valid for SGP (9).*

*Proof.* Given the definition of  $\gamma_{jk}$  in (9), we have

$$\gamma_{jk} \leq \prod_{i \in N} x_i^{a_{ijk}} \leq \prod_{i \in N} \bar{x}_i^{a_{ijk}} = \frac{\bar{X}_{jk}}{c'_{jk}}, \quad \forall j \in J_k \subseteq C_k^-, k \in K' \subset K.$$

This implies that inequality (27) is valid for SGP (9). Further, from (9b), it follows that if  $J_k = C_k^-$  for a  $k \in K' \subset K$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in C_k^+} c_{jk} \lambda_{jk} \leq \sum_{j \in C_k^-} c'_{jk} \gamma_{jk} \leq \sum_{j \in C_k^-} \bar{X}_{jk}.$$

This demonstrates the validity of inequality (28).  $\square$

**Remark 4.** *The strengthened SGP relaxation with monomial upper bounds is obtained as follows:*

$$s\text{-ECPR:} \begin{cases} (10), \\ (28), (27). \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

#### 4. Sequential Optimization Algorithms for SGP

The sequential optimization algorithms in the literature generally aim to solve SGP (4) by solving a sequence of subproblems where the non-convex terms in  $f_k^-(x)$  are convexified. Given an initial solution  $x^{(0)}$ , SGP is iteratively solved through a sequence of subproblems at each iteration  $t$  as follows:

$$(\text{sub } t): \quad \min_x \quad d^T x \quad (30a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad f_k^+(x) \leq \hat{f}_k^-(x; x^{(t-1)}), \quad \forall k \in K, \quad (30b)$$

$$x > 0. \quad (30c)$$

In a given subproblem  $t$ , we have the solution from the previous iteration  $x^{(t-1)}$  from which we derive  $\hat{f}_k^-(x; x^{(t-1)})$  in order to convexify  $f_k^-(x)$  around the point  $x^{(t-1)}$ . The construction of the convex term  $\hat{f}_k^-(x; x^{(t-1)})$  varies across different methodologies, primarily relying on inner approximations. Notably, approaches such as Li and Lu (2009); Lundell and Westerlund (2009); Lin and Tsai (2012) employ piece-wise inner approximations for  $\hat{f}_k^-(x; x^{(t-1)})$ . However, in the work of (Xu, 2014),  $\hat{f}_k^-(x; x^{(t-1)})$  is derived as the local monomial estimator of the posynomial  $f_k^-(x)$  at the point  $x^{(t-1)}$ , utilizing Taylor's approximation. Subsequently, these algorithms proceed by iteratively searching for new solutions, with termination occurring when  $|x^{(t)} - x^{(t-1)}| \leq \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  denotes a specified solution accuracy.

Although Xu (2014)'s sequential optimization algorithm is effective, its reliance on an arbitrary initial solution  $x^{(0)}$  can potentially result in increased iterations and increased solving times, es-

pecially when such a solution is infeasible or of poor quality (Xu, 2014). In contrast, we present adapt Xu (2014)'s framework to our ECP relaxation and avoid such issues. At iteration  $t = 0$ , our proposed relaxation is used for an initial solution, denoted as  $\tilde{x}^{(0)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(0)}$ . Subsequently, for each iteration  $t \geq 1$ , we solve an ECP subproblem, represented as (31), incorporating our proposed valid inequalities to enhance the subproblem formulation, leveraging the solutions obtained from the previous iteration.

#### 4.1. Proposed Sequential Optimization Algorithm

Let  $\tilde{x}^{(0)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(0)}$  be the initial solution obtained from the proposed relaxations. Formulation (31) is subproblem  $t$  given the optimal solution at iteration  $t - 1$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{x}^{(t-1)}$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}$ :

$$\text{(ECP sub-}t\text{): } \min_{x, \tilde{x}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda, \eta, \eta'} d^T x + w\eta + w'\eta' \quad (31a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (9b), (9c), (9d), (9e), (9g), \quad (31b)$$

$$(14), (21), \quad (31c)$$

$$x_i \leq \hat{f}(\tilde{x}; \tilde{x}^{(t-1)}) + \eta_i, \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (31d)$$

$$\gamma_{jk} \leq \hat{f}(\tilde{\gamma}; \tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}) + \eta'_{jk}, \quad \forall j \in M_k, k \in K, \quad (31e)$$

$$\eta, \eta' \geq 0. \quad (31f)$$

In a subproblem (31), we incorporate the inequalities from (14) and (21), assuming that all variables have upper and lower bounds. In scenarios where this assumption does not hold, these two constraints can be substituted with valid inequalities derived for alternative cases.

Further, constraints (31d) and (31e) convexify non-convex constraints (9f) and (9h), using affine estimators

$$\hat{f}(\tilde{x}; \tilde{x}^{(t-1)}) = e^{\tilde{x}^{(t-1)}} + e^{\tilde{x}^{(t-1)}} (\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}^{(t-1)}), \quad (32)$$

$$\hat{f}(\tilde{\gamma}; \tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}) = e^{\tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}} + e^{\tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}} (\tilde{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}) \quad (33)$$

to approximate the functions  $f(\tilde{x}) = e^{\tilde{x}}$  and  $f(\tilde{\gamma}) = e^{\tilde{\gamma}}$  centered at points  $\tilde{x}^{(t-1)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}$ , respectively.

The Taylor's approximation implies  $\hat{f}$  is an underestimator function so that  $x \leq \hat{f}(\tilde{x}; \tilde{x}^{(t-1)}) \leq f(\tilde{x})$  and  $\gamma \leq \hat{f}(\tilde{\gamma}; \tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}) \leq f(\tilde{\gamma})$ . Furthermore, constraints (9e) and (9g) enforce  $f(\tilde{x}) \leq x$  and  $f(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq \gamma$ . Thus, to ensure the feasibility of subproblem (31) given these underestimators, auxiliary variables  $\eta \geq 0$  and  $\eta' \geq 0$  are introduced in constraints (31d) and (31e). These variables are integrated into the objective function with penalty weight matrices  $w$  and  $w'$ , respectively. It is noteworthy that, with the penalty terms, these auxiliary variables converge to 0 at optimality.

Algorithm 1 presents the steps of the proposed iterative algorithm.

Using the first-order Taylor approximation, (Boyd et al., 2007) demonstrated that finding a

---

**Algorithm 1** Sequential ECP Algorithm

---

a) **Initial Relaxation:**

- (a) Set iteration counter  $t = 0$ .
- (b) Obtain  $\tilde{x}^{(0)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(0)}$  through solving ECPR (10) or s-ECPR (18), (22), (26), or (29) depending on problem structure.
- (c) Set solution accuracy  $\epsilon$ .

b) **Iterative Subproblems:**

- (a) Update  $t \leftarrow t + 1$ .
- (b) Solve ECP sub- $t$  problem (31) and obtain  $\tilde{x}^{(t)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(t)}$ .

c) **Convergence Check**

- (a) If  $\|\tilde{x}^{(t)} - \tilde{x}^{(t-1)}\| \leq \epsilon$  and  $\|\tilde{\gamma}^{(t)} - \tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}\| \leq \epsilon$ , stop.
  - (b) Else, go to step 2.(a).
- 

monomial approximation of  $f_k^-(x)$  in the vicinity of  $x^{(t-1)}$  in Xu (2014)'s algorithm (i.e., subproblem (30)) is equivalent to searching for an affine approximation of  $e^{\tilde{x}}$  and  $e^{\tilde{\gamma}}$  near  $\tilde{x}^{(t-1)}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(t-1)}$ , respectively, in our proposed subproblem (31). Thus the iterative algorithm we propose retains the convergence properties of Xu (2014)'s algorithm to a KKT point. Moreover, through numerical validation in the next section, we demonstrate that fewer iterations are needed thanks to our tightened relaxations.

## 5. Numerical Results

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed relaxations in comparison to existing methods. Subsequently, we apply the iterative algorithm to solve a set of test SGP instances. All instances are implemented in version 1.17.0 of the Julia modeling programming language (JuMP) Kwon (2019) and solved using MOSEK Mosek Aps (2020) version 10.1.3 on a 1.5 GHz laptop with 16 GB RAM. MOSEK is chosen as the solver due to its status as the sole globally convergent software available for ECP problems.

### 5.1. Evaluation of Proposed Relaxations

In this section, we compare the quality of our proposed relaxation method by the existing relaxations on benchmark test instances used in Qu et al. (2008).

We provide an overview of the test sets and examine the resulting relaxations in detail for Problem 1. Subsequently, complete results are presented for other instances.

**Problem 1** (Qu et al., 2008):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P1)} \quad & \min \quad 6x_1^2 + 4x_2^2 - 2.5x_1x_2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad -x_1x_2 \leq -8, \\ & \quad \quad 1 \leq x_1 \leq 10, \quad 1 \leq x_2 \leq 10. \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 2** (Rijckaert and Martens, 1978)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P2)} \quad & \min \quad 168x_1x_2 + 3651.2x_1x_2x_3^{-1} + 40000x_4^{-1} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad 1.0425x_1x_2^{-1} \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 0.00035x_1x_2 \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 1.25x_1^{-1}x_4 + 41.63x_1^{-1} \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 40 \leq x_1 \leq 44, \quad 40 \leq x_2 \leq 45, \\ & \quad \quad 60 \leq x_3 \leq 70, \quad 0.1 \leq x_4 \leq 1.4. \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 3** (Floudas et al., 2013)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(P3)} \quad & \min \quad 0.4x_1^{0.67}x_7^{-0.67} + 0.4x_2^{0.67}x_8^{-0.67} + 10 - x_1 - x_2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad 0.0588x_5x_7 + 0.1x_1 \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 0.0588x_6x_8 + 0.1x_1 + 0.1x_2 \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 4x_3x_5^{-1} + 2x_3^{-0.71}x_5^{-1} + 0.0588x_3^{-1.3}x_7 \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 4x_4x_6^{-1} + 2x_4^{-0.71}x_6^{-1} + 0.0588x_4^{-1.3}x_8 \leq 1, \\ & \quad \quad 0.1 \leq x_i \leq 10, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 8. \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 4** (Floudas et al., 2013)



$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(P4)} \quad & \min \quad x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad 833.33252x_1^{-1}x_4x_6^{-1} - 833.333x_1^{-1}x_6^{-1} + 100x_6^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 1250(x_2^{-1}x_5x_7^{-1} - x_2^{-1}x_4x_7^{-1}) + x_4x_7^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 1250000x_3^{-1}x_8^{-1} - 2500x_3^{-1}x_5x_8^{-1} + x_5x_8^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.0025(x_4 + x_6) \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.0025(-x_4 + x_5 + x_7) \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.01(x_8 - x_5) \leq 1, \\
& \quad 100 \leq x_1 \leq 10000, \\
& \quad 1000 \leq x_i \leq 10000 \quad i = 2, 3, \\
& \quad 10 \leq x_i \leq 1000 \quad i = 4, 5, \dots, 8.
\end{aligned}$$

**Problem 5** (Qu et al., 2008):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(P5)} \quad & \min \quad 5x_1 + 50000x_1^{-1} + 46.2x_2 + 72000x_2^{-1} + 144000x_3^{-1}, \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad 4x_1^{-1} + 32x_2^{-1} + 120x_3^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 1 \leq x_1, x_2, x_3 \leq 220.
\end{aligned}$$

**Problem 6** (Qu et al., 2008):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(P6)} \quad & \min \quad 5.3578x_3^2 + 0.8357x_1x_5 + 37.2392x_1, \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad 0.00002584x_3x_5 - 0.00006663x_2x_5 - 0.0000734x_1x_4 \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.00085307x_2x_5 + 0.00009395x_1x_4 - 0.00033085x_3x_5 \leq 1, \\
& \quad 1330.3294x_2^{-1}x_5^{-1} - 0.42x_1x_5^{-1} - 0.30586x_2^{-1}x_3^2x_5^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.00024186x_2x_5 + 0.00010159x_1x_2 + 0.00007379x_3^2 \leq 1, \\
& \quad 2275.1327x_3^{-1}x_5^{-1} - 0.2668x_1x_5^{-1} - 0.40584x_4x_5^{-1} \leq 1, \\
& \quad 0.00029955x_3x_5 + 0.00007992x_1x_3 - 0.00012157x_3x_4 \leq 1, \\
& \quad 78.0 \leq x_1 \leq 102.0, \quad 33.0 \leq x_2 \leq 45.0, \quad 27.0 \leq x_3 \leq 45.0, \\
& \quad 27.0 \leq x_4 \leq 45.0, \quad 27.0 \leq x_5 \leq 45.0.
\end{aligned}$$

**Table 1:** Detained formulation of various relaxations for problem P1

Relaxation of <a href="#">Qu et al. (2008)</a>	Relaxation of <a href="#">Shen and Zhang (2004)</a>	Relaxation of <a href="#">Maranas and Floudas (1997)</a>
$\min z_3 = 1.0235\tilde{x}_1 + 5.9967\tilde{x}_2 + 40.997$ s.t: $-1.001\tilde{x}_1 - 2.995\tilde{x}_2 \leq -6.0172$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_1 \leq \log(10)$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_2 \leq \log(10)$	$\min z_2 = 204.227\tilde{x}_1 + 118.237\tilde{x}_2 - 28.290$ s.t: $-21.4976(\tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2) \leq -7$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_1 \leq \log(10)$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_2 \leq \log(10)$	$\min z_1 = 6e^{2\tilde{x}_1} + 4e^{2\tilde{x}_2} + 5 - 53.744(\tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2)$ s.t: $-21.4976(\tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2) \leq -6$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_1 \leq \log(10)$ $0 \leq \tilde{x}_2 \leq \log(10)$
$\tilde{x}^* = (2.30258, 1.23943)$	$\tilde{x}^* = (0.0, 0.32562)$	$\tilde{x}^* = (0.9, 1)$
$LB_3 = 50.7862$	$LB_2 = 10.2094$	$LB_1 = -31.2595$

**Problem 7** ([Qu et al., 2008](#)):

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{P7}) \quad & \min \quad 0.5x_1x_2^{-1} - x_1 - 5x_2^{-1} \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad 0.01x_2x_3^{-1} + 0.01x_2 + 0.0005x_1x_3 \leq 1, \\
& \quad 70 \leq x_1 \leq 150, 1 \leq x_2 \leq 30, 0.5 \leq x_3 \leq 21.
\end{aligned}$$

In problem 1, the optimal solution is  $x^* = (2.5558, 3.1302)$ , which yields an objective function value of  $z^* = 58.38488$ . Letting  $\tilde{x}_i = \log(x_i) \forall i = 1, 2$ , Table 1 presents three relaxations produced by the methods of [Maranas and Floudas \(1997\)](#), [Shen and Zhang \(2004\)](#), and [Qu et al. \(2008\)](#) for problem P1. The relaxation of [Maranas and Floudas \(1997\)](#) can be solved as an ECP in MOSEK by transferring the exponential terms of the objective function into constraints. In Table 1,  $LB_i$  represents the optimal solution of each relaxation, providing a lower bound of the optimal objective function value of problem P1. As observed from the table, the linear relaxation of [Qu et al. \(2008\)](#) provides a tighter lower bound, i.e.,  $LB_3$ , for problem P1.

We also derive our ECP relaxation of P1 based on (10). First, given the variable domain  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , the objective function of P1 is non-negative, requiring only one auxiliary variable  $x_3 > 0$  to transfer the term into the constraints. Introducing variable vectors  $\lambda, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}$  with appropriate

dimensions, we derive the proposed ECP relaxation for problem P1 as follows:

$$\text{(ECPR): } \min x_3 \tag{34a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } 6\lambda_{11} + 4\lambda_{12} \leq 2.5\gamma_{13} + \gamma_{14}, \tag{34b}$$

$$8 \leq \gamma_{21}, \tag{34c}$$

$$e^{2\tilde{x}_1} \leq \lambda_{11}, \tag{34d}$$

$$e^{2\tilde{x}_2} \leq \lambda_{12}, \tag{34e}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{13} \leq \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2, \tag{34f}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{14} \leq \tilde{x}_3, \tag{34g}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{21} \leq \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2, \tag{34h}$$

$$e^{\tilde{x}_i} \leq x_i \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{34i}$$

$$e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{1j}} \leq \gamma_{1j} \quad \forall j = 3, 4, \tag{34j}$$

$$e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{2j}} \leq \gamma_{2j} \quad \forall j = 1, \tag{34k}$$

$$1 \leq x_i \leq 10 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \tag{34l}$$

$$0 \leq \tilde{x}_i \leq \log(10) \quad \forall i = 1, 2. \tag{34m}$$

The ECPR problem (34) yields the optimal solution  $x^* = (2.4817, 1.000, 7.4998)$ ,  $\tilde{x}^* = (0.3791, 0, 2.0149)$ ,  $\lambda^* = (2.4783, 1.4279)$ ,  $\gamma^* = (5.2324, 7.5, 100)$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}^* = (0.2942, 2.0149, 0.3791)$ , providing the lower bound value  $LB_4 = z^* = 7.4998$  for the objective function of P1.

Using the constraints derived from (19), we establish bounds for auxiliary variables:  $x_3 \in [7.5, 750]$ ,  $\gamma_{13} \in [1, 100]$ ,  $\gamma_{14} \in [7.5, 750]$ , and  $\gamma_{21} \in [1, 100]$ . Subsequently, we construct s-ECPR (34) for P1 by incorporating valid inequalities (14) and (21) given the above bounds. The s-ECPR relaxation of problem P1 yields an optimal solution of  $x^* = (2.62, 3.18, 56.7598)$ ,  $\tilde{x}^* = (0.5018, 0.6376, 3.3943)$ ,  $\lambda^* = (3.0987, 4.0934)$ ,  $\gamma^* = (9.7002, 10.7157, 100)$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}^* = (0.79327, 2.1049, 1.1394)$ . This results in a substantially improved lower bound value of  $LB_5 = z^* = 56.7598$  for the objective function of P1.

The results for all test problems can be found in Table 2, where for each instance,  $z^*$  refers to the optimal solution of the true problem, column  $LB$  corresponds to the optimal solution of relaxations (a lower bound for the corresponding  $z^*$ ) and columns  $rgap$  correspond to the relaxation gap percentage obtained from  $\frac{100(z^* - LB)}{LB}$ . The following observations are obtained from Table 2:

- s-ECPR provides significantly smaller gaps, demonstrating that it is substantially tighter for the SGP problems considered. Our proposed valid inequalities provide significant advantage, as demonstrated.
- Linear relaxations Shen and Zhang (2004) and Qu et al. (2008) have the same number of variables and constraints as the original SGP problems. However, our proposed relaxations

**Table 2:** Comparison of various relaxations for Problems 1-7

Instance	Relaxation	$LB$	rgap(%)	vars.	const.	$K_{exp}$	Time (s)
P1 ( $z^* = 58.38488$ )	ECPR (10)	7.4998	87.15	14	5	8	0.1
	s-ECPR (22)	56.7598	<b>2.78</b>	14	11	8	0.1
	Qu et al. (2008)	50.7862	12.94	2	2	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	10.2094	82.51	2	2	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	-31.2595	153.54	4	2	2	< 0.1
P2 ( $z^* = 468479.9969$ )	ECPR (10)	296032.51004	36.81	19	5	13	0.2
	s-ECPR (22)	464029.43693	<b>0.95</b>	19	11	13	0.1
	Qu et al. (2008)	445430.78105	4.92	4	3	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	281644.36436	39.88	4	3	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	111263.99926	76.25	7	3	3	< 0.1
P3 ( $z^* = 3.95116$ )	ECPR (10)	2.01193	49.08	40	8	27	0.9
	s-ECPR (22)	3.70697	<b>6.18</b>	40	21	27	0.8
	Qu et al. (2008)	3.03844	23.10	8	4	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	2.78004	29.64	8	4	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	-4.41660	211.78	10	4	2	0.1
P4 ( $z^* = 7049.24803$ )	ECPR (10)	2153.54527	69.45	28	10	17	1.1
	s-ECPR (22)	6760.93408	<b>4.09</b>	28	21	17	1.1
	Qu et al. (2008)	5794.48188	17.80	8	5	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	4718.76663	33.06	8	5	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	1463.42389	79.24	8	5	-	< 0.1
P5 ( $z^* = 6217.46549$ )	ECPR (10)	3471.83273	44.16	18	3	13	0.1
	s-ECPR (22)	6019.75009	<b>3.18</b>	18	8	13	0.1
	Qu et al. (2008)	5537.89651	10.93	3	1	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	5833.22612	21.12	3	1	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	1922.44032	69.08	8	5	3	< 0.1
P6 ( $z^* = 10122.85643$ )	ECPR (10)	4139.23598	59.11	43	16	28	1.9
	s-ECPR (22)	9865.73588	<b>2.54</b>	43	31	28	1.6
	Qu et al. (2008)	7591.13004	25.01	5	6	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	6614.27439	34.66	5	6	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	5038.14564	50.23	11	6	1	< 0.1
P7 ( $z^* = -83.66157$ )	ECPR (10)	-31.364723	62.51	21	5	13	0.3
	s-ECPR (22)	-75.54639	<b>9.70</b>	21	13	13	0.2
	Qu et al. (2008)	-67.22207	19.65	3	1	-	< 0.1
	Shen and Zhang (2004)	-58.01929	30.65	3	1	-	< 0.1
	Maranas and Floudas (1997)	-12.76675	84.74	4	3	2	< 0.1

rgap: root gap      vars.: number of variables      const.: number of constraints

$K_{exp}$ : number of exponential conic constraints

involve additional variables and constraints as well as (nonlinear) cones. This results in long per-relaxation solve times for larger instances such as P4 or P6. Note, however, that the size of the proposed relaxation increases only linearly with respect to the original formulation.

## 5.2. Sequential Convergence

In the previous section we demonstrated that our proposed relaxation is substantially stronger, but takes more time to solve compared to linear relaxations. Such a tradeoff may be favorable when in SGP algorithms where relaxation strength governs the total number of iterations involved. This section compares the performance of the proposed sequential ECP optimization algorithm with that of Xu (2014). For illustration, consider the following problem:

**Problem 8:**

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(P8)} \quad \min \quad & x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \\
 & 1 \leq x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3, \\
 & 0.5 \leq x_1, x_2, x_3 \leq 10.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds on  $x$ , we derive the following s-ECP relaxation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_x \quad & x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \\
 & 1 \leq \gamma_{11} + \gamma_{12}, \\
 & \tilde{\gamma}_{11} \leq \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_2, \\
 & \tilde{\gamma}_{12} \leq \tilde{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_3, \\
 & e^{\tilde{x}_i} \leq x_i \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
 & e^{\tilde{\gamma}_{1j}} \leq \gamma_{1j} \quad j = 1, 2, \\
 & x_i \leq \frac{9.5}{\log(20)} \left( \tilde{x}_i - \log(0.5) \right) + 0.5 \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
 & \gamma_{1j} \leq \frac{99.75}{\log(400)} \left( \tilde{\gamma}_{1j} - \log(0.25) \right) + 0.25, \\
 & 0.5 \leq x_i \leq 10, \quad \log(0.1) \leq \tilde{x}_i \leq \log(10) \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\
 & 0.25 \leq \gamma_{1j} \leq 100, \quad \log(0.25) \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{1j} \leq \log(100) \quad j = 1, 2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Solving this yields an initial solution  $x^{(0)} = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ ,  $\tilde{x}^{(0)} = (-0.69, -0.69, -0.69)$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(0)} = (-1.39, -1.39)$ . Applying this to ECP subproblem (31), we achieve the optimal solution  $x^* = (1, 0.5, 0.5)$  after 4 iterations.

Now we shall compare this to the sequential GP method of Xu (2014). We test various initializations. Table 3 provides a summary of the results. The first row corresponds to the outcomes

of sequential ECP with the initial solution  $x^{(0)}$  obtained from the convex hull relaxation of the presented SGP. Subsequent rows display the results of Xu (2014) with different starting points  $x^{(0)}$ , as specified below.

**Table 3:** Convergence Results for Problem 8

Method	$x^0$	Feasible?	$z^0$	$x^*$	$z^*$	Gap	Iter.	Time (s)
Our work	(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)	No	1.5	(1,0.5,0.5)	2	0.25	4	0.7
Xu (2014)	(1.0, 1.0, 1.0)	Yes	3.0	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	0.50	5	0.5
	(2.0, 2.0, 0.5)	Yes	4.5	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	1.25	5	0.7
	(0.5, 1.0, 0.5)	No	2	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	0.0	6	0.5
	(0.5, 1.4, 0.5)	No	3.4	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	0.70	7	0.9
	(0.5, 5, 10)	Yes	15.5	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	6.75	7	0.8
	(10, 10, 10)	Yes	30	(1, 0.5, 0.5)	2	14	8	0.8

In Table 3, the "Gap" column is defined as  $|\frac{z^0 - z^*}{z^*}|$ , capturing the difference of the initial solution and the optimal solution in each instance. In the case of sequential ECP, the algorithm converges after a few iterations. In contrast, in Xu (2014), the convergence of the algorithm depends on the quality of the predetermined starting solution  $x^{(0)}$ , and infeasible starting points can adversely affect the algorithm's performance, requiring additional iterations for convergence (Xu, 2014).


Obtaining a feasible solution for the sequential GP is not always straightforward, suggesting that a readily available feasible solution may not always be at hand for the sequential GP to commence. Thus, sequential GP may require more iterations if initialized with infeasible solutions. To explore this phenomenon, we conducted numerical experiments by generating 100 initial solutions  $x^{(0)}$  within the range  $0.5 \leq x \leq 100$  for problem 8 and recorded the performance statistics of the sequential GP in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Statistics for sequential GP of Xu (2014) for 100 instances of initial solutions

% of feasible solutions	Iterations			Time (s)		
	max	min	average	max	min	average
12	9	3	6.7	0.1	1.3	0.88

It can be observed that 88% of experiments start with infeasible initial solutions, resulting in 6.7 iterations on average to solve SGP problem 8.

To further expand our numerical experiment for other instances, we generated 10 random initial solutions  $x^{(0)}$  within the variable bounds to initialize the sequential algorithm proposed by Xu (2014). Our proposed algorithm does not require a user-defined initialization, and uses the solution of the convex hull relaxation. Figure 2 presents the corresponding the iteration count, on the left axis, and solution times, on the right axis, for both approaches. The variability over all 10 instances for Xu (2014)'s approach, depending on the initial solutions  $x^{(0)}$ , is indicated by the bars. Conversely, our approach relies solely on the relaxation solution, representing a single point for each



**Figure 2:** Comparison of the iteration count, on the left axis, and solution times, on the right axis, between Xu (2014)’s approach and our proposed approach.

instance. Figure 2 reveals that the proposed algorithm exhibits higher efficiency in the conducted problem instances, showcasing a reduction in both the number of iterations and solution time. This superiority can be attributed primarily to the quality of the proposed ECP relaxations, which offer tight initial convex relaxations to bootstrap the algorithm.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper has introduced a novel convex relaxation for Signomial Geometric Programming (SGP) based on Exponential Conic Programming (ECP), setting our work apart from existing relaxations by not requiring bounded variables in the base model. Additionally, we developed a flexible method of strengthening the relaxation, exploiting any bounded variables or monomial terms available to enhance the strength of relaxations by means of valid linear inequalities.

Through computational experiments, we substantiated the effectiveness of our relaxation approach, demonstrating relatively small optimality gaps. Furthermore, we integrated the proposed relaxation into a sequential optimization algorithm designed to solve SGP instances. Compared with a GP method, we demonstrated fewer iterations and overall time needed to convergence. Our method is further distinguished in that it does not rely on a user-provided starting point.

For future work, it is worth exploring the implementation of our proposed relaxations within a branch and cut algorithm, incorporating recent developments in dynamic inequality generation for SGP (Xu et al., 2022). This could leverage bound-tightening strategies in preprocessing to enhance the solution procedure, potentially further improving the efficiency and applicability of our methodology.

## Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

Statement: During the preparation of this work the author(s) used no AI-assisted tools.

## References

- Anstreicher, K.M., Burer, S., 2010. Computable representations for convex hulls of low-dimensional quadratic forms. *Mathematical programming* 124, 33–43.
- Avriel, M., Barrett, J., 1978. Optimal design of pitched laminated wood beams. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 26, 291–303.
- Boyd, S., Kim, S.J., Vandenberghe, L., Hassibi, A., 2007. A tutorial on geometric programming. *Optimization and engineering* 8, 67–127.
- Chandrasekaran, V., Shah, P., 2016. Relative entropy relaxations for signomial optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 26, 1147–1173.
- Chiang, M., Tan, C.W., Palomar, D.P., O’neill, D., Julian, D., 2007. Power control by geometric programming. *IEEE transactions on wireless communications* 6, 2640–2651.
- Dahl, J., Andersen, E.D., 2022. A primal-dual interior-point algorithm for nonsymmetric exponential-cone optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 194, 341–370.
- Dressler, M., Murray, R., 2022. Algebraic perspectives on signomial optimization. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry* 6, 650–684.
- Duffin, R.J., Peterson, E.L., 1973. Geometric programming with signomials. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 11, 3–35.
- Floudas, C.A., Pardalos, P.M., Adjiman, C., Esposito, W.R., Gümüs, Z.H., Harding, S.T., Klepeis, J.L., Meyer, C.A., Schweiger, C.A., 2013. *Handbook of test problems in local and global optimization*. volume 33. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hutter, F., Hoos, H.H., Leyton-Brown, K., 2011. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration, in: *Learning and Intelligent Optimization: 5th International Conference, LION 5, Rome, Italy, January 17-21, 2011. Selected Papers* 5, Springer. pp. 507–523.
- Jung, H., Klein, C.M., 2005. Optimal inventory policies for an economic order quantity model with decreasing cost functions. *European Journal of Operational Research* 165, 108–126.
- Kim, D., Lee, W.J., 1998. Optimal joint pricing and lot sizing with fixed and variable capacity. *European Journal of Operational Research* 109, 212–227.
- Kirschen, P.G., 2016. *Signomial programming for aircraft design*. Ph.D. thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kirschen, P.G., York, M.A., Ozturk, B., Hoburg, W.W., 2018. Application of signomial programming to aircraft design. *Journal of Aircraft* 55, 965–987.
- Kortanek, K.O., Xu, X., Ye, Y., 1997. An infeasible interior-point algorithm for solving primal and dual geometric programs. *Mathematical programming* 76, 155–181.
- Kwon, C., 2019. *Julia Programming for Operations Research*. Changhyun Kwon.
- Li, H.L., Lu, H.C., 2009. Global optimization for generalized geometric programs with mixed free-sign variables. *Operations Research* 57, 701–713.
- Li, H.L., Tsai, J.F., 2005. Treating free variables in generalized geometric global optimization programs. *Journal of Global Optimization* 33, 1–13.
- Li, H.L., Tsai, J.F., Floudas, C.A., 2008. Convex underestimation for posynomial functions of positive variables. *Optimization letters* 2, 333–340.
- Lin, M.H., Tsai, J.F., 2012. Range reduction techniques for improving computational efficiency in global optimization of signomial geometric programming problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* 216, 17–25.



- Lu, H.C., 2012. An efficient convexification method for solving generalized geometric problems. *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization* 8, 429–455.
- Lu, H.C., Li, H.L., Gounaris, C.E., Floudas, C.A., 2010. Convex relaxation for solving posynomial programs. *Journal of Global Optimization* 46, 147–154.
- Lu, H.C., Yao, L., 2019. Efficient convexification strategy for generalized geometric programming problems. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 31, 226–234.
- Lundell, A., Westerlund, T., 2009. On the relationship between power and exponential transformations for positive signomial functions. *Chemical Engineering Transactions* 17, 1287–1292.
- Mandal, N.K., Roy, T.K., Maiti, M., 2006. Inventory model of deteriorated items with a constraint: A geometric programming approach. *European journal of operational research* 173, 199–210.
- Maranas, C.D., Floudas, C.A., 1997. Global optimization in generalized geometric programming. *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 21, 351–369.
- Marin-Sanguino, A., Voit, E.O., Gonzalez-Alcon, C., Torres, N.V., 2007. Optimization of biotechnological systems through geometric programming. *Theoretical Biology and Medical Modelling* 4, 1–16.
- Mishra, S., Das, D., Paul, S., 2017. A comprehensive review on power distribution network reconfiguration. *Energy Systems* 8, 227.
- Mosek Aps, ., 2020. Mosek modeling cookbook .
- Murray, R., Chandrasekaran, V., Wierman, A., 2021. Signomial and polynomial optimization via relative entropy and partial dualization. *Mathematical Programming Computation* 13, 257–295.
- Nesterov, Y., 2012. Towards non-symmetric conic optimization. *Optimization methods and software* 27, 893–917.
- Opgenoord, M.M., Cohen, B.S., Hoburg, W.W., 2017. Comparison of algorithms for including equality constraints in signomial programming. *Aerospace Computational Design Lab., Massachusetts Inst. of Technology, TR-17-1, Cambridge, MA* .
- Ozturk, B., Saab, A., 2019. Optimal aircraft design decisions under uncertainty via robust signomial programming, in: *AIAA Aviation 2019 Forum*, p. 3351.
- Papp, D., Yıldız, S., 2022. alfonso: Matlab package for nonsymmetric conic optimization. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 34, 11–19.
- Qu, S.J., Zhang, K.C., Wang, F.S., 2008. A global optimization using linear relaxation for generalized geometric programming. *European Journal of Operational Research* 190, 345–356.
- Rijckaert, M., Martens, X., 1978. Comparison of generalized geometric programming algorithms. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 26, 205–242.
- Scott, C.H., Jefferson, T.R., 1995. Allocation of resources in project management. *International Journal of Systems Science* 26, 413–420.
- Serrano, S.A., 2015. Algorithms for unsymmetric cone optimization and an implementation for problems with the exponential cone. *Stanford University*.
- Shen, P., 2005. Linearization method of global optimization for generalized geometric programming. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 162, 353–370.
- Shen, P., Zhang, K., 2004. Global optimization of signomial geometric programming using linear relaxation. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 150, 99–114.
- Sherali, H.D., Fraticelli, B.M., 2002. Enhancing rlt relaxations via a new class of semidefinite cuts. *Journal of Global Optimization* 22, 233–261.
- Skajaa, A., Ye, Y., 2015. A homogeneous interior-point algorithm for nonsymmetric convex conic optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 150, 391–422.
- Toscano, R., Amouri, S.B., 2012. Some heuristic approaches for solving extended geometric programming problems. *Engineering Optimization* 44, 1425–1446.
- Tseng, C.L., Zhan, Y., Zheng, Q.P., Kumar, M., 2015. A milp formulation for generalized geometric programming

- using piecewise-linear approximations. *European Journal of Operational Research* 245, 360–370.
- Xu, G., 2013. Steady-state optimization of biochemical systems through geometric programming. *European Journal of Operational Research* 225, 12–20.
- Xu, G., 2014. Global optimization of signomial geometric programming problems. *European journal of operational research* 233, 500–510.
- Xu, L., d'Ambrosio, C., Liberti, L., Vanier, S.H., 2022. Cutting planes for signomial programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.02857* .
- Yang, H.H., Bricker, D.L., 1997. Investigation of path-following algorithms for signomial geometric programming problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* 103, 230–241.