

A modified two-stage search framework for constrained multi-gradient descent

Yuan-Zheng Lei^a, Yaobang Gong^{a,*}, Xianfeng Terry Yang^a

^a*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Maryland, 1173 Glenn L. Martin Hall, College Park, MD 20742, United States*

Abstract

Désidéri (2012) proposed a multi-gradient descent algorithm (MGDA) that can improve all objectives based on seeking the minimum norm point in the convex hull consisting of objectives function gradients as the common descent direction, which has become the cornerstone of the multi-task learning and multi-objective optimization. However, the logic to seek a common descent direction through finding the minimum-norm point in the gradient convex hull may fail under constraints, no matter whether taking the constraints into consideration directly or projecting it into the feasible region after finding the common descent direction with no constraints. Therefore, we proposed a two-stage search framework. In the first stage, a min-max search algorithm is implemented to minimize the upper bound of the directional derivatives under constraints, and the weak Pareto stationary can be theoretically reached in the first stage. In the second stage, the Pareto stationary can be theoretically obtained through the minimization of the lower bound of the directional derivatives under constraints. In numerical studies, we show the effectiveness of our proposed framework from the calibration of the multi-regime fundamental diagram model and large-scale multi-objective portfolio problem.

Keywords: Multi-objective optimization, Constrained optimization, Weak Pareto Stationary, Pareto Stationary

1. Introduction

Multi-objective optimization plays a crucial role in almost all science and engineering fields. Many practical problems require people to consider the overall problem from more than one aspect. Miettinen (1999) and Ehrgott (2005) give a comprehensive survey of both methodology and application multi-objective optimization. In this paper, we focus on multi-objective algorithms based on multi-gradient descent, which has broad applications in multi-task learning. The core idea of multi-gradient descent algorithms (MGDA) is to find a common update direction that can improve all objectives or, at the very least, not make them worse. The methods proposed in Désidéri (2012) and Fliege and Svaiter (2000) are the most popular for obtaining a common descent direction. We are mainly interested in the first method shown in Désidéri (2012), the minimum norm point of the convex hull consists of objective gradients is the common descent direction. Mathematically, the convex coefficient of the corresponding minimum norm point can be obtained

*Corresponding author.

Email address: ybgong@umd.edu (Yaobang Gong)

by:

$$\min_{\alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_T^*} \left\{ \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t \nabla \mathcal{F}^\top(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_2 \mid \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t = 1; \alpha^t \geq 0, \forall t \right\} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ denotes different objective functions, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are the shared variables among objective functions, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, the corresponding minimum norm point can be expressed as $\mathbf{w} = \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t \nabla \mathcal{F}^\top(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $-\mathbf{w}$ will give a direction that can improve all objectives¹. MGDA leverages gradient information effectively to guide optimization. Consequently, when all objective functions are differentiable, smooth, and Lipschitz continuous, MGDA is generally considered more efficient than evolutionary algorithms, particularly in high-dimensional optimization problems. Moreover, MGDA demonstrates the capability to handle optimization tasks involving millions of variables, as commonly encountered in neural network training (Sener and Koltun (2018)).

However, most common MGDA frameworks (Fliege and Svaiter (2000), Schäffler et al. (2002), and Désidéri (2012)) are used to handle unconstrained multi-objective optimization problems, and those frameworks cannot be utilized under constrained settings directly. This paper will show that the minimum norm point under constrained settings may not be the minimum norm point of the original convex hull that only consists of objective gradients, which will not mathematically guarantee the obtained direction will still be a common descent direction. However, many practical multi-objective optimization problems are constrained in nature, such as the multi-objective cluster ensemble problem (Aktas et al. (2024)), the multi-objective sustainable Supply Chain management problem (Tautenhain et al. (2021)), multi-criteria portfolio problem (Petchrompo et al. (2022)), etc. Therefore, the gap between MGDA and constrained MDGA needs to be fulfilled. The contribution of our work can be summarized as:

- Analysis of the potential failure of MGDA based on searching for the minimum norm point under constraints is given. A counter-example shows that MGDA may fail to work even under convex constraints.
- A two-stage search algorithm is presented, ensuring a balanced and common descent direction is found under convex constraints. Weak Pareto stationarity and Pareto stationarity can be theoretically achieved in the first and second stages, respectively.
- Numerical examples of a multi-regime model calibration problem and a large-scale multi-criteria portfolio problem have been conducted to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed methods.

2. Literature review

MGDA has emerged as a central algorithm in multi-task learning, delivering notable performance gains. Building on the view of multi-task learning as a multi-objective optimization problem, Sener and Koltun (2018) proposed an MGDA approach based on the Frank-Wolfe algorithm. To tackle high-dimensional challenges, they introduced an upper limit on the multi-objective loss and showed that optimizing this limit efficiently yields Pareto-optimal solutions under realistic assumptions. Later research has aimed at producing more evenly distributed and continuous Pareto fronts. For instance, Lin et al. (2019b) modeled the multi-objective optimization issue as several constrained subproblems, each capturing distinct trade-off

¹We will give a simple proof in the theorem 3

preferences. Expanding on this concept, [Ma et al. \(2020\)](#) developed methods to construct locally continuous Pareto sets, in contrast to previous work that yielded finite, sparse, and discrete solutions. Likewise, [Liu et al. \(2021\)](#) proposed a gradient-based algorithm utilizing Stein variational gradient descent (SVGD) to efficiently discover diverse Pareto solutions in high-dimensional spaces without needing predefined preferences. Building on that, [Phan et al. \(2022\)](#) extended its context and successfully tackled a probabilistic version of multi-objective optimization using Stochastic Multiple Target Sampling Gradient Descent (MT-SGD). Meanwhile, [Lin et al. \(2022\)](#) introduced a framework to approximate the entire Pareto front, thereby enhancing the likelihood that decision-makers identify their most preferred solution, unlike earlier methods reweaked to finite or locally continuous fronts. Furthering this research, [Momma et al. \(2022\)](#) presented a generic framework for determining Pareto-optimal solutions across various preference structures. [Mercier et al. \(2018\)](#) extended both stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and MGDA to address objective functions represented as expectations of random functions, highlighting the extensive applicability of MGDA-based methods. Additionally, numerous studies have applied MGDA in recommendation systems and other domains ([Lin et al. \(2019a\)](#); [Milojkovic et al. \(2019\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Pan et al. \(2023\)](#)).

Recent studies on MDGA emphasize the development of a comprehensive, continuous Pareto front or creating one that aligns with user preferences ([Mahapatra and Rajan \(2020\)](#)). However, there is a limited amount of literature addressing constrained multi-objective optimization. [Gebken et al. \(2019\)](#) generalized the MDGA proposed in [Fliege and Svaiter \(2000\)](#) for equality and inequality-constrained multi-objective optimization problems by using two active set strategies. [Uribe et al. \(2020\)](#) utilized the logic of MGDA for local searching, which can improve the quality of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms, etc. However, most MGDA still concentrate on unconstrained multi-objective optimization problems. Thus, a new constrained MDGA is crucial for addressing potential constraints.

3. Potential failure of MGDA under constraints

Our study focuses on a general constrained multi-objective optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_T\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \end{aligned} \tag{CMO}$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ denotes different objective functions, we have the following assumptions:

- $\mathcal{F}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are convex, $\forall t, i$.
- There exists a point $x^s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that²

$$f_i(x^s) < 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Prior to conducting a formal analysis of the potential failures of MGDA under specified constraints, it is imperative to briefly review several key definitions and theorems.

Definition 1 (Pareto dominance). *For a solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ dominates a solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \mathcal{F}^t(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\mathcal{F}^{t'}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \mathcal{F}^{t'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \exists t' \in \mathcal{T}$.*

²This assumption also known as Slater's Condition ([Ben-Tal and Nemirovski \(2004\)](#))

Definition 2 (Pareto optimal). A solution θ^* is called Pareto optimal if and only if there exists no solution θ dominates θ^* .

Definition 3 (Pareto Stationary Point). Consider the multi-objective optimization problem

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} (\mathcal{F}_1(\theta), \dots, \mathcal{F}_n(\theta)) \quad \text{subject to } f_j(\theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

where each \mathcal{F}_i and f_j is differentiable, and $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the solution domain. A feasible point θ^* is called a Pareto stationary point if there is **no** nonzero feasible direction \mathbf{d} such that

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta^*)^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

And at least exists one $k, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_k(\theta^*)^\top \mathbf{d} < 0$$

Meanwhile,

$$\nabla f_j(\theta^*)^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all active constraints } j.$$

Definition 4 (Weak Pareto Stationary Point). Consider the multi-objective optimization problem

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} (\mathcal{F}_1(\theta), \dots, \mathcal{F}_n(\theta)) \quad \text{subject to } f_j(\theta) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

where each \mathcal{F}_i and f_j is differentiable, and $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the domain. A feasible point θ^* is called a weak Pareto stationary point if there is **no** nonzero feasible direction \mathbf{d} such that

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta^*)^\top \mathbf{d} < 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$\nabla f_j(\theta^*)^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all active constraints } j.$$

Equivalently, θ^* is weak Pareto stationary if and only if every feasible direction $\mathbf{d} \neq \mathbf{0}$ fails to decrease all objectives $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}$ simultaneously to first order.

Theorem 1. If a solution θ is Pareto-stationary, it is weak Pareto-stationary.

Proof. From the definitions, the theorem obviously holds. □

Definition 5 (Convex hull). The convex hull of a set of points S in n dimensions is the intersection of all convex sets containing S . For N points $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N$, the convex hull $\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N)$ is then given by the expression:

$$\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j \mathbf{p}_j : \lambda_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j = 1 \right\}$$

Theorem 2 (Wolfe's criterion (Wolfe (1976))). Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the convex hull of finitely many points, $p = \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n)$, then $\mathbf{x} \in P$ is the minimum norm point in P if and only if:

$$\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_j \geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2, \forall j \in [n] \tag{2}$$

Proof. See Wolfe (1976). □

Theorem 3. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the convex hull of different objective functions' gradients, $P = \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n)$. If \mathbf{x} is the minimum norm point, then $-\mathbf{x}$ is a direction that can improve all objectives.

Proof. See appendix 9.1. □

As shown in figure 1, we conduct a simple 2-dimensional case of $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{F}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \mathcal{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ under constraints. $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$ are negative gradient vectors of two objective functions and $\mathbf{u}_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 > 0$. The direction must be located in the shadow blue area to achieve a common decent direction, which is equivalent to $\mathbf{u}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d} \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 \cdot \mathbf{d} \leq 0$, and in this case, a common descent direction do exist since there is an overlap area of the blue and gray shadow area which represents the feasible region. If we stick with the idea that finds the minimum norm point as the descent direction, we can try to find a descent gradient direction by solving the following constrained optimization problem, where $f(\cdot)$ are convex, and ϵ is a small step size. Recall that direction $-\sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_t^\top \nabla \mathcal{F}^\top(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ will be used for iteration, therefore, the last two types of constraint of CMGDA-I ensure that there exists a small positive feasible step at least.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{\alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_T^*} & \quad \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t \nabla \mathcal{F}^\top(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|_2^2 \\
 \text{s.t.} & \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t = 1 \\
 & \quad \alpha^t \geq 0, t = 1, 2, \dots, T \\
 & \quad f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \epsilon \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t \nabla \mathcal{F}^\top(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m
 \end{aligned} \tag{CMGDA-I}$$

However, the solution to this optimization problem may not yield a common decent direction due to the constraints.

Theorem 4. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the convex hull of different objective functions' gradients, $P = \mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n)$, if $\mathbf{x} \in P$, and \mathbf{x} is not the minimum norm point, then $-\mathbf{x}$ may not be a direction that can improve all objectives.

Proof. See appendix 9.2 □

Based on theorem 4, solving such an optimization problem may not find a direction that can decrease all objective functions (at least not increase) since the minimum norm point in $\mathbf{conv}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)$ become unreachable under constraints. As shown in figure 1, the corresponding update direction obtained from the CMGDA-I is \mathbf{w}_2 , which is not a common decent direction since it is outside the blue area.

4. Modified two-stage search framework for constrained multi-gradient descent

Based on the information covered in the previous sections and acknowledging the potential limitations of MGDA when faced with constraints, it is clear that an algorithm is necessary to identify a common descent direction when these constraints are incorporated. Thus, we propose a two-stage search framework aimed at ultimately achieving Pareto stationarity.




Figure 1: Potential failure of update direction

In the first stage, we will determine the common descent direction through the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{w} &= \min_{\mathbf{d}} \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{d}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\
 & \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, t \\
 & \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{CMGDA-II}$$

In [CMGDA-II](#), we aim to identify a direction that minimizes the upper bound of all directional derivatives while adhering to specified constraints. For the first two types of constraints, we ensure that the candidate direction \mathbf{d} remains feasible for a step size of at least one. This approach creates ample room for selecting step sizes later on. $\nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, t$ ensure the candidate direction \mathbf{d} must be a common descent direction, and $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1$ ensures the search direction remains within the closed unit ball in Euclidean space, keeping the step size or direction length bounded.

Theorem 5. 1. When the optimal solution of [CMGDA-II](#) optimization problem is $\mathbf{0}$, and the resulting solution achieves weak Pareto stationary and the KKT conditions. 2. Otherwise, \mathbf{w} gives a descent direction that improves all objectives.

Proof. See appendix [9.3](#). □

From [Theorem 5](#), we establish that when the optimal solution of the [CMGDA-II](#) is $\mathbf{0}$, the resulting solution achieves weak Pareto stationarity. However, even in convex settings³, weak Pareto stationarity does not ensure Pareto optimality. Specifically, if we alter the objective function from $\mathbf{w} = \min_{\mathbf{d}} \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}$ to $\mathbf{w} = \min_{\mathbf{d}} \left(\min_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \right)$, then when the optimal solution of [CMGDA-III](#) is $\mathbf{0}$, the resulting solution achieves Pareto stationarity, which guarantees Pareto optimality under our assumptions.

Theorem 6. 1. When the optimal solution of [CMGDA-III](#) optimization problem is $\mathbf{0}$, and the resulting

³All objective functions and inequality constraints are convex.




Figure 2: Different update directions conducted by [CMGDA-III](#) and [CMGDA-II](#)

solution achieves Pareto stationary and the KKT conditions. 2. Otherwise, \mathbf{w} gives a descent direction that improves all objectives.

Proof. See appendix 9.4. □

The rationale for not implementing our directional search algorithm in the same manner is that if we use [CMGDA-III](#) in the initial stage, we may eventually reach Pareto stationarity, but it is likely that we would identify common directions that strictly minimize only one or two objective functions during the iterations. Conversely, by employing a min-max search framework as outlined in [CMGDA-II](#), we may not achieve Pareto stationarity in the first stage, but we can acquire a more balanced common descent direction in each step. Let us consider two vectors: $\mathbf{g}_1 = (1, -2)$ and $\mathbf{g}_2 = (-3, -1)$. These vectors represent the negative gradients of two objective functions. Figure 2 illustrates the different update directions determined by the methods labeled [CMGDA-III](#) and [CMGDA-II](#). The update direction generated by [CMGDA-III](#) is given as $\mathbf{d} = \left(-\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}\right)$, while the update direction from [CMGDA-II](#) is $\mathbf{d} = \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{17}}, -\frac{4}{\sqrt{17}}\right)$. It is evident that [CMGDA-II](#) yields a more balanced common descent direction.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{w} &= \min_{\mathbf{d}} \left(\min_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \right) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{d}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\
 & \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, t \\
 & \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{CMGDA-III}$$

After reaching weak Pareto stationary, in the second stage, we will determine the common descent direction through [CMGDA-III](#), and when the optimal solution of the [CMGDA-III](#) is $\mathbf{0}$, the resulting solution achieves Pareto stationarity, which will ensure Pareto optimal under our assumptions.

The overall two-stage search framework can be succinctly described in Algorithms 1. Algorithm 1 is employed to determine the common descent direction and the generally constrained multiple-gradient descent algorithm. In equation 5 and 7, we adhere to the step-size selection policy as stated in Désidéri (2012), which indicates that the interval $(0, h)$ serves as the maximum monotone decreasing interval for all objectives with respect to the step length h .

Algorithm 1: CONSTRAINED MIN-MAX SEARCH

Input: θ_0 , Gradient vectors $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n] |_{\theta=\theta_0} = [\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_1}{\partial \theta}, \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_2}{\partial \theta}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_n}{\partial \theta}] |_{\theta=\theta_0}$, M

1 $k = 0, \theta = \theta_0$

2 **while** $k < M$ **or** $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq tol$ **do**

3

$$\eta = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \left(\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta)^\top \mathbf{d} \right) \quad (3)$$

4 Solve:

5

$$\mathbf{w} = \min_{\mathbf{d}} \left\{ \eta | f_i(\theta + \mathbf{d}) \leq 0, \forall i; \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\theta)^\top \mathbf{d} \leq \eta, \forall t; \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \quad (4)$$

6

$$h = \max\{h' > 0 \mid \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta + t\mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{w} \leq 0, \forall t \in (0, h'), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \quad (5)$$

7 $\theta = \theta + h\mathbf{w}$

8 **while** $k < M$ **or** $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq tol$ **do**

9

$$\eta = \min_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \left(\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta)^\top \mathbf{d} \right) \quad (6)$$

10 Solve:

11

$$\mathbf{w} = \min_{\mathbf{d}} \left\{ \eta | f_i(\theta + \mathbf{d}) \leq 0, \forall i; \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\theta)^\top \mathbf{d} \geq \eta, \forall t; \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1 \right\} \quad (7)$$

12

$$h = \max\{h' > 0 \mid \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\theta + t\mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{w} \leq 0, \forall t \in (0, h'), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \quad (8)$$

13 $\theta = \theta + h\mathbf{w}$

Output: θ

5. Numerical example

In this section, We test our framework in two cases: the calibration of the multi-regime fundamental diagram model and the large multi-criteria portfolio problem. The first model is a fundamental model in traffic flow theory, and the multi-regime fundamental diagram model generally serves as a standard of traveling time when dealing with network-level control in transportation engineering.

5.1. Calibration of the multi-regime fundamental diagram model

For the first cases, the multi-regime fundamental diagram model, which can be written as:

$$v = \begin{cases} a_1 - b_1\rho, & \rho \leq 40, \\ a_2 - b_2\rho, & 40 < \rho \leq 65, \\ a_3 - b_3\rho, & \rho > 65. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3$ are parameters that need to be calibrated. Since the speed-density ($v - \rho$) relation is a decreasing function and the minimum speed shown in a speed-density fundamental diagram should be nonnegative, we also have the following constraints when calibrating, where $\max \rho$ is the maximum density shown in the dataset⁴.

$$a_1 - b_1 \times 40 \geq 0 \quad (10)$$

$$a_1 - b_1 \times 40 \geq a_2 - b_2 \times 40 \quad (11)$$

$$a_2 - b_2 \times 40 \geq a_2 - b_2 \times 65 \quad (12)$$

$$a_2 - b_2 \times 65 \geq a_3 - b_3 \times 65 \quad (13)$$

$$a_3 - b_3 \times 65 \geq a_3 - b_3 \times \max \rho \quad (14)$$

Consequently, during the calibration process, each component of the model shall be regarded as a separate objective, subject to various constraints among them. We shall employ the weighted least squares method, whereby the overall problem can be articulated as follows:

$$\min_{f_1, f_2, f_3} \{f_1 = w_i \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} [v_i - (a_1 - b_1\rho_i)]^2, f_2 = w_j \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} [v_j - (a_2 - b_2\rho_j)]^2, f_3 = w_k \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} [v_k - (a_3 - b_3\rho_k)]^2\} \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{s.t. eq 10 - 14} \quad (15b)$$

where (v_i, ρ_i) is corresponding speed-density pairs for $\rho \leq 40$, (v_j, ρ_j) is corresponding speed-density pairs for $40 < \rho \leq 65$, and (v_k, ρ_k) is corresponding speed-density pairs for $\rho > 65$. The weights are calculated based on Qu et al. (2015). We randomly generated 300 initial guess parameters. Using the proposed framework, a Pareto front is generated as shown in figure 3 and the calibration results of all Pareto solutions are shown in figure 4a to 4v:

⁴Dataset is collected on the Georgia State Route 400, which consist of three columns: flow (veh/h), density (veh/km), and speed (km/h). The data were aggregated/averaged at a highway cross-section over four lanes. The dataset is available at <https://github.com/EdisonYLei/Weighted-the-least-square-method-for-single-regime-fundamental-diagram-models/blob/main/GA400.txt>




Figure 3: Pareto front of case I

5.2. Large scale multi-criteria portfolio problem

In the second numerical example, we examine our algorithm in the large-scale multi-criteria portfolio problem. Consider an investment universe consisting of n assets. The decision variable

$$x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top \quad (16)$$

represents the portfolio weight vector, where $x_i \geq 0$ denotes the proportion of capital allocated to asset i . We impose

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1 \quad (17)$$

to ensure all weights sum to 1, and short selling is disallowed.

We identify three objectives to capture different aspects of the portfolio's performance: maximizing return, minimizing risk, and minimizing transaction costs. Let $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the expected return vector for the n assets. To maximize total return $r^\top x$, we transform it into the minimization of

$$f_1(x) = -r^\top x \quad (18)$$

For the second objective, we model the portfolio risk by its variance:

$$f_2(x) = x^\top \Sigma x \quad (19)$$

where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the covariance matrix of asset returns. Finally, let $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the cost coefficient




Figure 4: Calibration results

vector (e.g., trading fees, market impact). Then the third objective can be expressed as:

$$f_3(x) = c^\top x \tag{20}$$

In addition to the non-negativity ($x_i \geq 0, \forall i$) and full-investment constraints, we introduce industry-related allocation bounds. Suppose the n assets are partitioned into m industries, and let

$$S_j \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \tag{21}$$

be the set of asset indices belonging to industry j . For each industry j , we require

$$L_j \leq \sum_{i \in S_j} x_i \leq U_j \tag{22}$$

where L_j and U_j are the minimum and maximum fraction of capital allowed in industry j . Such constraints prevent the portfolio from being overly concentrated or excessively diversified in any single industry.

In the numerical experiments, we established that $n = 2000$ and $m = 10$. The assets are categorized into 10 distinct industries, each with its respective subset S_j . We selected $L_j = 0.05$ and $U_j = 0.25$ for each industry j . The return vector r is sampled uniformly from the interval $[0.05, 0.15]$, while the cost vector c is derived from $[0.01, 0.1]$. Furthermore, we construct Σ utilizing

$$\Sigma = AA^\top + \epsilon I \tag{23}$$

where A is an $n \times k$ random matrix (with $k \approx n/10$ or any chosen dimension), and ϵ is a small regularization constant (e.g. 10^{-6}). This ensures Σ is positive-definite. These synthetic parameters yield a flexible testing environment to study the effects of returns, risk, transaction costs, and industry constraints on multi-objective portfolio allocation.

Following case 1, we still randomly generated 300 initial guesses for the initial investment proportion. As shown in the figure 5, we obtain a Pareto front consisting of 49 Pareto solutions.

6. Conclusion and Discussion

This research presents a two-stage search framework designed to enhance the multi-gradient descent algorithm for solving convex-constrained multi-objective optimization problems. In the first stage, our framework achieves weak Pareto stationarity by utilizing a relatively balanced common descent direction. In the second stage, we can theoretically reach Pareto stationarity by the end of the process. When all constraints are linear, the core algorithms used to determine the common descent direction in both stages simplify to a linear programming problem, thereby increasing the overall clarity and accessibility of the framework. We evaluated our framework on two distinct scale cases, with both successfully yielding a relatively balanced Pareto front. Notably, the larger-scale numerical example demonstrated the framework’s efficiency and effectiveness. Looking forward, future research endeavors may explore the integration of additional methodologies into multi-gradient descent algorithms to effectively tackle nonconvex multi-objective optimization problems. In our study, because all constraints are convex (and linear in the numerical examples) and we aim to achieve a larger feasible step size, we ensure feasibility by directly verifying the full set of constraints rather than employing a Taylor linear approximation. In contrast, for more complex constraints, a Taylor




Figure 5: Pareto front of Case II

linear approximation could be used as an alternative approach. For the searching algorithms presented in our framework, when it comes to more complicated constraints, they can be reformulated as:

First Stage:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{w} &= \min_{\mathbf{d}} \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \eta \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\
 & \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, t \\
 & \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{CMGDA-IV}$$

where η is a small positive number, ensuring the feasibility of linear approximation.

Second Stage:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{w} &= \min_{\mathbf{d}} \left(\min_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \right) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \eta \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \\
 & \nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, t \\
 & \|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1
 \end{aligned} \tag{CMGDA-V}$$

7. CRediT

Yuan-Zheng Lei: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - original draft. **Yaobang Gong:** Conceptualization, Writing - original draft. **Xianfeng Terry Yang:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - original draft.

8. Acknowledgement

This research is supported by the award "CAREER: Physics Regularized Machine Learning Theory: Modeling Stochastic Traffic Flow Patterns for Smart Mobility Systems (# 2234289)" which is funded by the National Science Foundation. All authors would like to thank Dr. Daiheng Ni of the University of Massachusetts Amherst for sharing the dataset kindly.

9. Appendix

9.1. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. If \mathbf{x} is the minimum norm point in the convex hull P , it satisfies Wolfe's criterion:

$$\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_j \geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (24)$$

We can further obtain the following:

$$-\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_j \leq -\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (25)$$

Recall that \mathbf{p}_j is the gradient with respect to j th objective function. For all objective functions, the corresponding directional derivatives with $-\mathbf{x}$ are all non-positive. Therefore, if \mathbf{x} is the minimum norm point, then $-\mathbf{x}$ is a direction that can improve all objectives. Especially when \mathbf{x} is not a zero vector, then $-\mathbf{x}$ is a direction that can strictly improve all objectives. \square

9.2. Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Recall that if \mathbf{x} is the minimum norm point in the convex hull P , it satisfies Wolfe's criterion:

$$\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_j \geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (26)$$

Since $\mathbf{x} \in P$, and \mathbf{x} is not the minimum norm point. Then, there exists at least one gradient \mathbf{p}_k such that:

$$\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_k < \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad (27)$$

Consider the rate of change of the objective function associated with the gradient \mathbf{p}_k when using the update direction $-\mathbf{x}$. The dot product gives the rate of change in the objective function:

$$(-\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{p}_k = -\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_k \quad (28)$$

Since we assumed that $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_k < \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$, it follows that:

$$-\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_k > -\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad (29)$$

This inequality implies that $-\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{p}_k$ could be positive, meaning that the direction $-\mathbf{x}$ might actually increase the value of the objective function associated with \mathbf{p}_k .

Therefore, if \mathbf{x} is not the minimum norm point, the update direction $-\mathbf{x}$ cannot be guaranteed to improve all objectives, as at least one objective might worsen. \square

9.3. Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. 1. Case $\mathbf{d}^* = \mathbf{0}$. Since $\mathbf{0}$ is trivially feasible, its objective value is

$$\max_i \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{0} = 0.$$

If $\mathbf{d}^* = \mathbf{0}$ is optimal, then no feasible $\mathbf{d} \neq \mathbf{0}$ can make all directional derivatives $\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}$ negative. Hence, no feasible direction weakly decreases all objectives simultaneously, implying that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a weak Pareto-stationary point. The KKT conditions are clearly satisfied in the this case, taking into account all the assumptions.

2. Case $\mathbf{d}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$. If the minimizer is a nonzero vector \mathbf{d}^* , then its objective value must satisfy

$$\max_i \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}^* = \mathbf{w} \leq 0.$$

However, if $\mathbf{w} = 0$, one could scale \mathbf{d}^* to obtain a smaller (negative) value, contradicting optimality (or equating the trivial solution at $\mathbf{0}$). Thus $\mathbf{w} < 0$ and

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}^* < 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since \mathbf{d}^* is also feasible with respect to [CMGDA-II](#), it provides a weak common descent direction that improves all objectives at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. \square

9.4. Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. Suppose the solution to [\(CMGDA-III\)](#) is $\mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{0}$. By optimality, for any feasible \mathbf{d} (i.e., any \mathbf{d} satisfying the constraints $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1$, $f_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{d}) \leq 0$, $g_j(\boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{d}) = 0$, and $\nabla \mathcal{F}^t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \leq 0$), we must have

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{0} \leq \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since $\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{0} = 0$, it follows that

$$\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all feasible } \mathbf{d}, \text{ and for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Hence, there is *no* feasible direction \mathbf{d} (other than the trivial $\mathbf{0}$) that achieves strictly negative values in $\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}$ simultaneously for all i . In multi-objective optimization, this precisely implies that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a Pareto-stationary point: there is no single direction that can reduce all objectives simultaneously without leaving the feasible region. The KKT conditions are clearly satisfied in the this case, taking into account all the assumptions.

Now suppose that the optimal solution $\mathbf{w}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$. By construction of [\(CMGDA-III\)](#), we have

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \arg \min_{\|\mathbf{d}\|_2 \leq 1, \text{ feasible } \mathbf{d}} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d} \quad (\text{across } i = 1, \dots, n).$$

If

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, n} \nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{w}^*$$

is strictly negative, then $\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{w}^* < 0$ for *every* i , indicating that \mathbf{w}^* *strictly reduces* all objectives. Equivalently, starting at $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and moving a small step $\alpha \mathbf{w}^*$ (with sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$) decreases each \mathcal{F}_i

while still respecting the feasibility constraints (due to how \mathbf{w}^* was chosen).

If the minimal value for $\nabla \mathcal{F}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{d}$ turns out to be zero (and yet $\mathbf{w}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$), one often interprets this as either a boundary or corner case. But in standard multi-objective treatments, it still implies that there is no feasible direction that uniformly achieves values below zero for all i . Thus, the direction \mathbf{w}^* remains the strongest candidate for simultaneously *improving* the objectives (even if in a marginal sense).

In either scenario, \mathbf{w}^* is a *common descent direction* in the sense that it leads to a (weak or strict) improvement in all objectives simultaneously. \square

References

- Aktaş, D., Lokman, B., İnkaya, T., Dejaegere, G., 2024. Cluster ensemble selection and consensus clustering: A multi-objective optimization approach. *European Journal of Operational Research* 314, 1065–1077.
- Ben-Tal, A., Nemirovski, A., 2004. Lecture notes, optimization i-ii, convex analysis, non-linear programming theory, non-linear programming algorithms. https://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2004/05/1011.html.
- Chen, Z., Ge, J., Zhan, H., Huang, S., Wang, D., 2021. Pareto self-supervised training for few-shot learning, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 13663–13672.
- Désidéri, J.A., 2012. Multiple-gradient descent algorithm (mgda) for multiobjective optimization. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 350, 313–318.
- Ehrgott, M., 2005. *Multicriteria optimization*. volume 491. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fliege, J., Svaiter, B.F., 2000. Steepest descent methods for multicriteria optimization. *Mathematical methods of operations research* 51, 479–494.
- Gebken, B., Peitz, S., Dellnitz, M., 2019. A descent method for equality and inequality constrained multiobjective optimization problems, in: *Numerical and Evolutionary Optimization–NEO 2017*, Springer. pp. 29–61.
- Lin, X., Chen, H., Pei, C., Sun, F., Xiao, X., Sun, H., Zhang, Y., Ou, W., Jiang, P., 2019a. A pareto-efficient algorithm for multiple objective optimization in e-commerce recommendation, in: *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on recommender systems*, pp. 20–28.
- Lin, X., Yang, Z., Zhang, X., Zhang, Q., 2022. Pareto set learning for expensive multi-objective optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35, 19231–19247.
- Lin, X., Zhen, H.L., Li, Z., Zhang, Q.F., Kwong, S., 2019b. Pareto multi-task learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32.
- Liu, X., Tong, X., Liu, Q., 2021. Profiling pareto front with multi-objective stein variational gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34, 14721–14733.
- Ma, P., Du, T., Matusik, W., 2020. Efficient continuous pareto exploration in multi-task learning, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR. pp. 6522–6531.
- Mahapatra, D., Rajan, V., 2020. Multi-task learning with user preferences: Gradient descent with controlled ascent in pareto optimization, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR. pp. 6597–6607.

- Mercier, Q., Poirion, F., Désidéri, J.A., 2018. A stochastic multiple gradient descent algorithm. *European Journal of Operational Research* 271, 808–817.
- Miettinen, K., 1999. *Nonlinear multiobjective optimization*. volume 12. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Milojkovic, N., Antognini, D., Bergamin, G., Faltings, B., Musat, C., 2019. Multi-gradient descent for multi-objective recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00846* .
- Momma, M., Dong, C., Liu, J., 2022. A multi-objective/multi-task learning framework induced by pareto stationarity, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR. pp. 15895–15907.
- Pan, Z., Wang, S., Li, C., Wang, H., Tang, X., Zhao, J., 2023. Fedmdfg: Federated learning with multi-gradient descent and fair guidance, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 9364–9371.
- Petchrompo, S., Wannakrairot, A., Parlikad, A.K., 2022. Pruning pareto optimal solutions for multi-objective portfolio asset management. *European Journal of Operational Research* 297, 203–220.
- Phan, H., Tran, N., Le, T., Tran, T., Ho, N., Phung, D., 2022. Stochastic multiple target sampling gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35, 22643–22655.
- Qu, X., Wang, S., Zhang, J., 2015. On the fundamental diagram for freeway traffic: A novel calibration approach for single-regime models. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 73, 91–102.
- Schäffler, S., Schultz, R., Weinzierl, K., 2002. Stochastic method for the solution of unconstrained vector optimization problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 114, 209–222.
- Sener, O., Koltun, V., 2018. Multi-task learning as multi-objective optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31.
- Tautenhain, C.P., Barbosa-Povoa, A.P., Mota, B., Nascimento, M.C., 2021. An efficient lagrangian-based heuristic to solve a multi-objective sustainable supply chain problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* 294, 70–90.
- Uribe, L., Lara, A., Schütze, O., 2020. On the efficient computation and use of multi-objective descent directions within constrained moeas. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 52, 100617.
- Wolfe, P., 1976. Finding the nearest point in a polytope. *Mathematical Programming* 11, 128–149.