

A relax-fix-and-exclude algorithm for an MINLP problem with multilinear interpolations

Bruno M. Pacheco^{1*†}, Pedro M. Antunes²,
Eduardo Camponogara², Laio O. Seman², Vinícius R. Rosa³,
Bruno F. Vieira³, Cesar Longhi³

¹CIRRELT and Département d'Informatique et de Recherche
Opérationnelle, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada.

²Department of Automation and Systems Engineering, Federal University
of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC, Brazil.

³Petrobras Research Center, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

bruno.machado.pacheco@umontreal.ca;

Contributing authors: antunespedronmh@gmail.com;

eduardo.camponogara@ufsc.br; laio.seman@ufsc.br;

viniciusrr@petrobras.com.br; bfv@petrobras.com.br;

cesar.longhi@petrobras.com.br;

†The author was affiliated to the Department of Automation and Systems
Engineering of the Federal University of Santa Catarina during the time
this research was being developed.

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel algorithm for Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming (MINLP) problems with multilinear interpolations of look-up tables. These problems arise when objective or constraints contain black-box functions only known at a finite set of evaluations on a predefined grid. We derive a piecewise-linear relaxation for the multilinear constraints resulting from the multilinear interpolations used to approximate the true functions. Supported by the fact that our proposed relaxation defines the convex hull of the original problem, we propose a novel algorithm that iteratively solves the MILP relaxation and refines the solution space through variable fixing and exclusion strategies. This approach ensures convergence to an optimal solution, which we demonstrate, while maintaining computational efficiency. We apply the proposed algorithm to a real-world

offshore oil production optimization problem. In comparison to the Gurobi solver, our algorithm was able to find the optimal solution *at least* four times faster, and to consistently provide better incumbents under limited time.

Keywords: Multilinear Interpolation, Black-Box Optimization, Relax-Fix-and-Exclude Algorithm, Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming (MINLP)

1 Introduction

We consider Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming (MINLP) problems where the cost and the constraints involve black-box functions, that is, functions that are known solely at a finite number of points in their domain. Such functions arise in many different application areas [1–4] whenever the function of interest does not have a closed form (*e.g.*, simulation results) or the analytical formulation is too complex. We restrict our attention to the cases where information on the black-box functions is available through evaluations on a common rectangular grid of the domain, resulting in what is often referred to as look-up tables [5, 6]. Consequently, optimization over the entire domain requires an interpolation of the evaluation results¹.

This paper introduces a novel algorithm for handling MINLP problems with functions modeled by multilinear interpolations. We explore polyhedral tools for multilinear constraints and show that they can be used to derive the convex hull of the nonlinearities arising from the interpolation method. Our algorithm is based on the intuition that the convex hull-based relaxation is tight enough to provide good estimates of the optimal solution, and thus it is used to guide a depth-first search of the solution space through *fixing*. Furthermore, a modified no-good cut is used to compute the lower bounds of the unexplored space, providing efficient stopping criteria.

We demonstrate the performance of the proposed algorithm in an offshore oil production optimization problem. The oil and gas industry is a classical domain application of MINLP over black-box functions, since optimization problems involve complex nonlinear functions that represent processes such as reservoir pressure dynamics and multi-phase flow [7]. These functions are often derived from simulations or empirical data, making them difficult to incorporate directly into optimization problems. Furthermore, the proposed approach is well-suited for these applications, where computational efficiency and accuracy are critical.

The key contribution of this work is the development of a piecewise-linear relaxation for the nonlinear interpolated functions. This relaxation leads to an efficient mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) approximation, which provides both a tractable formulation and a reliable lower bound for the original problem. By incorporating Special Ordered Sets of type 2 (SOS2), the method ensures that adjacent grid points are selected during interpolation, preserving the convexity and efficiency of the optimization

¹To properly cover the entire domain, we would need to extrapolate the information on the look-up table. However, it is usual to assume that the optimal is within the boundaries of the table and thus interpolation suffices.

process. Furthermore, the algorithm leverages fix-and-exclude strategies to progressively refine the solution space and converge to an optimal solution.

1.1 Related work

Many real-world optimization problems involve functions with high evaluation costs, which are usually only known at finitely many points of their domain. These problems have been known for a long time [1] and have appeared in a wide range of application areas, such as machine learning [2], chemistry [3], and engineering [4].

A well-studied approach for solving such problems is to perform a piecewise-linear interpolation over the look-up tables of the black-box function [8–10]. In a grid-like partitioning of the domain, the piecewise-linear interpolation requires additional cuts to reduce the partitioning to simplices, such that the model becomes an injective mapping. This has been proposed for domains of up to three dimensions [11]. However, the number of simplices grows exponentially with the domain, requiring exponentially many more integer variables. On top of that, the choice of simplices (within the hyperrectangular partition) is not an evident design choice, and it may have significant impact on the approximation quality, *e.g.*, by overestimating or underestimating the real function.

Multilinear interpolations of look-up tables is a common practice to deal with black-box functions or complex non-linear functions, with applications in physics simulation [12, 13], automotive software [14–16], and even machine learning [17]. For example, Furlan et al. [18] and Martins et al. [19] replace phenomenological models of a chemical process with a look-up table that is interpolated during the simulation, which yielded improved efficiency at low accuracy cost.

Optimizing with multilinearly interpolated look-up tables, in contrast to piecewise-linear interpolations, introduces multilinear terms, rendering the problem, at least, a MIQCP. Optimization with multilinear constraints has been well-studied [20–22] and continues being an active area of research [23, 24]. In fact, many solvers support multilinear constraints out-of-the-box [25, 26]. However, to the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to study the optimization problem with multilinear interpolations of look-up tables, and to propose an exact algorithm for it.

1.2 Contributions

This work brings the following contributions to the technical literature:

- The identification of a class of real-world problems involving the optimization of black-box functions approximated with multilinear interpolation using data from sensitivity analysis.
- A relaxation of multilinear interpolation functions arising from piecewise-linear formulations.
- A Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm with convergence guarantee for solving optimization problems with multilinear interpolation functions, which iteratively solves piecewise-linear based relaxations (*Relax*), optimizes over a reduced domain resulting from variable fixing (*Fix*), and removes this domain from the search space (*Exclude*).

- A computational demonstration of the efficiency of the relax-fix-and-exclude algorithm and comparison with a state-of-the-art solver in an application to oil production in offshore platforms.

1.3 Organization

Section 2 introduces the baseline problem which consists of a mixed-integer nonlinear program with nonlinear functions modeled as black-box functions. The black-box functions are approximated with multilinear interpolation of look-up tables, rendering a MINLP problem. Section 3 presents the relax, fix, and exclude steps which are then combined into the proposed algorithm. The properties of the algorithm and convergence proof appear in Appendix A. Section 4 reports computational results from the application of the relax-fix-and-exclude algorithm for oil production optimization in offshore platforms, and a comparison with a state-of-the-art MINLP solver. Section 6 draws final conclusions and suggests future research directions.

2 Problem Statement

This work is concerned with the following mixed-integer nonlinear program

$$\begin{aligned}
C = \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} \quad & f_0(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{a}_0^T \mathbf{y} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & f_i(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{y} \leq b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^p
\end{aligned} \tag{P}$$

where each

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i : \mathcal{X} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
\mathbf{x} &\longmapsto f_i(\mathbf{x})
\end{aligned} \quad i = 0, \dots, m,$$

is a black-box function.

It is assumed that a *look-up table* is available with the values of the black-box functions. More precisely, there is a rectangular grid $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \implies f_i(\mathbf{x}), i = 0, \dots, m$, is known. In other words, the entries of the look-up table are tuples $(\mathbf{x}, f_i(\mathbf{x}))$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $i = 0, \dots, m$. We will write each set of *breakpoints* of the rectangular grid as $X_j = \{x_j^{(0)}, x_j^{(1)}, x_j^{(2)}, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $x_j^{(0)} < x_j^{(1)} < x_j^{(2)} < \dots$.

2.1 Multilinear interpolation

Because problem (P) is not computable, any hopes of finding an (approximate) solution rely on interpolating the values in the look-up table. In this paper, we assume that a multilinear interpolation is considered to be an ideal interpolation method.

To develop an understanding of such an interpolation method, let us consider a single function $f = f_i$ for some i . If $n = 1$, then we have a traditional linear interpolation.

For simplicity, let us write $x_1 = x$. Without loss of generality, take $x \in \text{conv}(X)$ such that $x^{(0)} \leq x \leq x^{(1)}$. Then, we can write the linear interpolation of $f(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}(x) &= f(x^{(0)}) + \frac{x - x^{(0)}}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}} (f(x^{(1)}) - f(x^{(0)})) \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{x^{(1)} - x}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}}}_{\xi^{(0)}} f(x^{(0)}) + \underbrace{\frac{x - x^{(0)}}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}}}_{\xi^{(1)}} f(x^{(1)}).\end{aligned}$$

Note that the coefficients of the linear interpolation are such that

$$x = \xi^{(0)}x^{(0)} + \xi^{(1)}x^{(1)},$$

that is, they are the weights that express x as a convex combination (CC) model of two *consecutive* breakpoints and define the function approximation $\tilde{f}(x)$ accordingly. One way to formulate such convex combination for the one-dimensional case $X = \{x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}, \dots\}$ is through the use of an SOS2 variable

$$\begin{aligned}x &= \sum_{x^{(k)} \in X} \xi^{(k)} x^{(k)} \\ 1 &= \sum_{x^{(k)} \in X} \xi^{(k)} \\ \xi &\in \text{SOS2},\end{aligned}$$

which ensures that only two consecutive breakpoints will have the respective coefficients assuming non-zero values². Therefore, we can write the linear interpolation as

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k &= \xi^{(k)}, & \forall x^{(k)} \in X \\ \tilde{f} &= \sum_{x^{(k)} \in X} \lambda_k f(x^{(k)})\end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \text{conv}(X)$.

For $n > 1$, the multilinear interpolation over grids can be defined recursively [27]. A bidimensional example is illustrated in Figure 1a.

To develop a better intuition for the general case, let us consider the case for $n = 3$. To ease the notation, let $x_1 = x$, $x_2 = y$, and $x_3 = z$. Then, for $(x, y, z) \in \text{conv}(X \times Y \times Z)$, assume, without loss of generality, that $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)} \in X$, $y^{(0)}, y^{(1)} \in Y$, and $z^{(0)}, z^{(1)} \in Z$ are the vertices of the rectangular prism that contains (x, y, z) , *i.e.*, $x^{(0)} \leq x \leq x^{(1)}$, $y^{(0)} \leq y \leq y^{(1)}$, and $z^{(0)} \leq z \leq z^{(1)}$. By interpolating each dimension

²Note that the SOS2 constraint by itself implies that the variables are non-negative, but does not imply that they sum up to one.




Fig. 1: Example of multilinear interpolation and the respective piecewise linear relaxation for a black-box function on a two-dimensional domain. The interpolation is illustrated on a single rectangle of the sensitivity analysis grid, namely $[x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}] \times [y^{(0)}, y^{(1)}]$.

recursively, the approximation can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{f} &= \overbrace{\frac{z^{(1)} - z}{z^{(1)} - z^{(0)}} \tilde{f}_{x,y}(z^{(0)}) + \frac{z - z^{(0)}}{z^{(1)} - z^{(0)}} \tilde{f}_{x,y}(z^{(1)})}^{\xi_z^{(0)}} \\
 \tilde{f}_{x,y}(z^{(0|1)}) &= \frac{y^{(1)} - y}{y^{(1)} - y^{(0)}} \tilde{f}_x(y^{(0)}, z^{(0|1)}) + \frac{y - y^{(0)}}{y^{(1)} - y^{(0)}} \tilde{f}_x(y^{(1)}, z^{(0|1)}) \\
 \tilde{f}_x(y^{(0|1)}, z^{(0|1)}) &= \frac{x^{(1)} - x}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}} f(x^{(0)}, y^{(0|1)}, z^{(0|1)}) + \underbrace{\frac{x - x^{(0)}}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}}}_{\xi_x^{(1)}} f(x^{(1)}, y^{(0|1)}, z^{(0|1)}),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $z^{(0|1)}$ denotes either $z^{(0)}$ or $z^{(1)}$, and $y^{(0|1)}$ likewise. Expanding the approximation \tilde{f} above in terms of products, we can rewrite the interpolated function \tilde{f} as a summation over products of the basis functions for each variable x , y , and z ,

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 \prod_{\alpha=x,y,z} \xi_{\alpha}^{(p_{\alpha})} f(x^{(k)}, y^{(j)}, z^{(i)}) \tag{2}$$

where:

$$\xi_x^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \frac{x^{(1)} - x}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \frac{x - x^{(0)}}{x^{(1)} - x^{(0)}} & \text{if } k = 1. \end{cases}$$

$$\xi_y^{(j)} = \begin{cases} \frac{y^{(1)} - y}{y^{(1)} - y^{(0)}} & \text{if } j = 0, \\ \frac{y - y^{(0)}}{y^{(1)} - y^{(0)}} & \text{if } j = 1. \end{cases}$$

$$\xi_z^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \frac{z^{(1)} - z}{z^{(1)} - z^{(0)}} & \text{if } i = 0, \\ \frac{z - z^{(0)}}{z^{(1)} - z^{(0)}} & \text{if } i = 1 \end{cases}$$

and each $\xi_\alpha^{(p_\alpha)}$ serves as the basis function for each respective variable, with $p_x = k$, $p_y = j$, and $p_z = i$ iterating over 0 and 1 for the interpolation. Like in the unidimensional case, each ξ is a coefficient of the convex combination of breakpoints that results in (x, y, z) , *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \xi_x^{(0)} x^{(0)} + \xi_x^{(1)} x^{(1)} \\ y &= \xi_y^{(0)} y^{(0)} + \xi_y^{(1)} y^{(1)} \\ z &= \xi_z^{(0)} z^{(0)} + \xi_z^{(1)} z^{(1)} \\ 1 &= \xi_x^{(0)} + \xi_x^{(1)} \\ 1 &= \xi_y^{(0)} + \xi_y^{(1)} \\ 1 &= \xi_z^{(0)} + \xi_z^{(1)} \\ 0 &\leq \xi_x^{(0)}, \xi_x^{(1)}, \xi_y^{(0)}, \xi_y^{(1)}, \xi_z^{(0)}, \xi_z^{(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, \tilde{f} is a weighted sum where each term is the product of basis functions for each variable, multiplied by the corresponding function value at that grid point, $f(x^{(k)}, y^{(j)}, z^{(i)})$. We can rewrite the interpolation function (1) as

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{(k_x, k_y, k_z) \in \{0,1\}^3} \underbrace{\xi_x^{(k_x)} \xi_y^{(k_y)} \xi_z^{(k_z)}}_{\lambda_{k_x, k_y, k_z}} f(x^{(k_x)}, y^{(k_y)}, z^{(k_z)}).$$

More generally, we can express the multilinear interpolation of a function of n variables by restricting ξ_j to be an SOS2 vector variable that contains the coefficients of the convex combination of X_j into x_j , for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Precisely, we impose

$$\begin{cases} x_j = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)} x_j^{(k)} \\ 1 = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)} \\ \xi_j \in \text{SOS2}, \end{cases}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \quad (3)$$

and define the interpolation weights as

$$\lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n} = \prod_{j=1}^n \xi_j^{(k_j)}, \quad \begin{cases} x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n \end{cases}. \quad (4)$$

Finally, the formulation of \tilde{f} as a multilinear interpolation becomes

$$\tilde{f} = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n} f(x_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, x_n^{(k_n)}). \quad (5)$$

2.2 MINLP approximation

By considering the multilinear interpolation of the black-box functions over the look-up table values, as discussed in the previous section, we formulate the mixed-integer nonlinear problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C} = \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \quad & \tilde{f}_0 + \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{y} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{f}_i + \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{y} \leq b_i, & i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \tilde{f}_i = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n} f_i(x_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, x_n^{(k_n)}), & i = 0, \dots, m \\ & \lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n} = \prod_{j=1}^n \xi_j^{(k_j)}, & \begin{cases} \forall x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1 \\ \vdots \\ \forall x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n \end{cases} \\ & x_j = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)} x_j^{(k)}, & j = 1, \dots, n \\ & 1 = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)}, & j = 1, \dots, n \\ & \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \in \text{SOS2} & j = 1, \dots, n \\ & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^p, \end{aligned} \quad (\tilde{P})$$

where each $f_i(x_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, x_n^{(k_n)})$ is obtained from the look-up table.

Note that we constrain \mathbf{x} to be a convex combination of the breakpoints, that is, our formulation implies that $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv}(X)$. In other words, we implicitly assume that $\text{conv}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, which is usually the case (*e.g.*, \mathcal{X} a convex set). Thus, from this assumption, it follows that the constraint $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ can be removed from \tilde{P} because the convex combination implies it.

3 The Relax-Fix-and-Exclude Algorithm

Although computable, (\tilde{P}) is an MINLP problem, which is a notoriously hard class of problems. To achieve a lower expected runtime (compared to the worst-case scenario), we can employ implicit enumeration methods to search the solution space, such as branch-and-bound. The knowledge of a tight linear relaxation of the problem strongly impacts the efficiency of such methods. We propose to relax the nonlinear terms of (\tilde{P}) while maintaining the integrality constraints, generating a MILP relaxation which

will be used by Algorithm 1 to compute lower bounds on the unexplored region of the solution space, *i.e.*, to determine whether it is worth continue exploring.

3.1 MILP relaxation

The nonlinear terms to be relaxed are the multilinear constraints in (4), derived from multilinear interpolation of the black-box functions. For these functions, the tightest possible linear relaxation is precisely the set of all convex combinations of its extreme points [20, 23]. We formulate such relaxation by exploiting the traditional SOS2 formulation for piecewise-linear functions [21, 28]. The formulation for piecewise-linear functions constraints the solutions to be convex combinations of *at most* n extreme points³ [11], thus guaranteeing that the result is a unique mapping between input and output of the black-box functions. We remove such constraints, thus making any convex combination of all extreme points feasible. Since our multilinear interpolation is already formulated through SOS2 constraints, our relaxation requires only the substitution of constraint (4) by

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_1^{(k_1)} &= \sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \sum_{x_3^{(k_3)} \in X_3} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1 \\
\xi_2^{(k_2)} &= \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \sum_{x_3^{(k_3)} \in X_3} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2 \\
&\vdots \\
\xi_n^{(k_n)} &= \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_{n-1}^{(k_{n-1})} \in X_{n-1}} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_{n-1}^{(k_{n-1})} \in X_{n-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

A graphical example of the piecewise-linear relaxation above is illustrated in Figure 1b.

³Of which there are 2^n , due to the hyperrectangular partitioning induced by the look-up table.

Our proposed MILP relaxation of (\tilde{P}) is, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{C} = \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \quad & \tilde{f}_0 + \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{y} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \tilde{f}_i + \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{y} \leq b_i, & i = 1, \dots, m \\
& \tilde{f}_i = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n} f_i(x_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, x_n^{(k_n)}), & i = 0, \dots, m \\
& \xi_1^{(k_1)} = \sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \sum_{x_3^{(k_3)} \in X_3} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1 \\
& \xi_2^{(k_2)} = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \sum_{x_3^{(k_3)} \in X_3} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2 \\
& \vdots \\
& \xi_n^{(k_n)} = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_{n-1}^{(k_{n-1})} \in X_{n-1}} \lambda_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n}, & \forall x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n \\
& x_j = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)} x_j^{(k)}, & j = 1, \dots, n \\
& 1 = \sum_{x_j^{(k)} \in X_j} \xi_j^{(k)}, & j = 1, \dots, n \\
& \boldsymbol{\xi}_j \in \text{SOS2}, & j = 1, \dots, n \\
& \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q.
\end{aligned} \tag{\bar{P}}$$

Note that the problem above contains the tightest possible relaxation of the multilinear constraints of (\tilde{P}) , given that each $\lambda_{k_1, \dots, k_n}$ must be a convex combination of the product of the $\xi_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, \xi_n^{(k_n)}$ variables at their extremes [20, 23]. For completion, we demonstrate through Proposition 1 that the solution space of (\bar{P}) is indeed a relaxation of the solution space of (\tilde{P}) , which is a necessary condition for the correctness of Algorithm 1.

Proposition 1. *Problem (\bar{P}) is a relaxation of (\tilde{P}) .*

Proof. Because the only change from (\tilde{P}) to (\bar{P}) is the removal of constraint (4) and the addition of constraint (6), it suffices for us to show that any solution of (\tilde{P}) satisfies (6), and that their cost is unchanged. Thus, let $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ be a feasible solution of (\tilde{P}) . Consider first the case for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_1$ and take any k_1 such that $x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1$. Then, because each $\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1, \dots, k_n}$ respects (4) for valid k_1, \dots, k_n , we have that

$$\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \tilde{\lambda}_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n} = \sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \prod_{j=1}^n \tilde{\xi}_j^{(k_j)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \tilde{\xi}_1^{(k_1)} \left(\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \prod_{j=2}^n \tilde{\xi}_j^{(k_j)} \right) \\
&= \tilde{\xi}_1^{(k_1)} \left(\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \tilde{\xi}_2^{(k_2)} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \tilde{\xi}_n^{(k_n)} \right) \cdots \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

But because the $\tilde{\xi}_j$ variables satisfy the SOS2 constraint in (\tilde{P}) ,

$$\sum_{x_j^{(k_j)} \in X_j} \tilde{\xi}_j^{(k_j)} = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \tilde{\lambda}_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n} &= \tilde{\xi}_1^{(k_1)} \left(\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \tilde{\xi}_2^{(k_2)} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \tilde{\xi}_n^{(k_n)} \right) \cdots \right) \right) \\
&= \tilde{\xi}_1^{(k_1)} \left(\sum_{x_2^{(k_2)} \in X_2} \tilde{\xi}_2^{(k_2)} \left(\cdots \left(\sum_{x_{n-1}^{(k_{n-1})} \in X_{n-1}} \tilde{\xi}_{n-1}^{(k_{n-1})} \right) \cdots \right) \right) \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&= \tilde{\xi}_1^{(k_1)},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that the first constraint of (6) is satisfied, given that the choice for k_1 was arbitrary. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same can be shown for $\tilde{\xi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n$, implying that all constraints in (6) are satisfied by a feasible solution of (\tilde{P}) .

Finally, note that the value of

$$\tilde{f}_0 = \sum_{x_1^{(k_1)} \in X_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n^{(k_n)} \in X_n} \tilde{\lambda}_{k_1, \dots, k_n} f_0(x_1^{(k_1)}, \dots, x_n^{(k_n)})$$

remains unchanged in both problems, given the same (feasible) assignment, as is also the case for $\mathbf{c}^T \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, such that the cost is unaltered. Therefore, the optimum cost of (\tilde{P}) has to be at least as low as that of (P) . \square

One interesting characteristic of the proposed piecewise relaxation is that it can be used to relax multilinear constraints as well. For example, suppose that function f_m in

problem (P) is not a black-box function, but rather a known function of the form

$$f_m(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{(i,j)} a_{ij} x_i x_j.$$

Then, the relaxation of f_m in (\bar{P}) matches precisely the piecewise McCormick envelopes [29] at the partitioning induced by the breakpoints of the look-up table, since that also characterizes the convex hull in such cases [30].

3.2 Fix-and-exclude

We propose an algorithm to solve (\tilde{P}) based on the intuition that (\bar{P}) , besides being a relaxation, provides a good estimate of an optimal assignment for the discrete variables. In other words, optimal solutions to (\bar{P}) are used to guide an exploration of the solution space of the target MINLP problem through *fixing* of binary variables and reduction of the domain of x_j variables to the interval chosen by the relaxation. Suppose an incumbent solution is known to be optimal in the explored region, whose objective is increased in each iteration. In that case, the MILP relaxation can be used to compute lower bounds on the unexplored region. More precisely, by *excluding* the explored region from (\bar{P}) , we can compute a lower bound for any feasible solution of (\tilde{P}) within the unexplored region. We can stop searching if the incumbent solution (*i.e.*, optimal solution for the explored region) has a better cost than this lower bound for the unexplored region. These algorithm steps are illustrated in Figure 2 and detailed in what follows.

3.2.1 Fixing

Let $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ be feasible assignments for all ξ_j and \mathbf{y} variables of (\bar{P}) where $\bar{\xi} = \{\bar{\xi}_1, \dots, \bar{\xi}_n\}$ and $\bar{\xi}_j = \{\bar{\xi}_j^{(k_j)} : x_j^{(k_j)} \in X_j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. By feasible, we indicate that there exists an assignment for all other decision variables of the problem such that $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ can be used to construct a feasible solution to (\bar{P}) . Then, consider the constraints

$$\begin{cases} \xi_j \leq \lceil \bar{\xi}_j \rceil, j = 1, \dots, n \\ \mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where the *ceiling* operator $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is applied element-wise.

By adding the above constraints, we are *fixing* all binary assignments and all zero assignments of the SOS2 variables. Because of the SOS2 constraints, at most two consecutive variables of every $\bar{\xi}_j$ will be non-zero and, thus, will not be fixed through constraints (7). Therefore, not only the integrality constraints over the \mathbf{y} variables become redundant, but also the SOS2 constraints can be dropped.

In other words, adding constraints (7) to (\tilde{P}) effectively results in an NLP problem that we will denote $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Similarly, adding the *same* constraints to (\bar{P}) results in an LP that we will refer to as $\bar{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Notice that the fixing step reduces the

domain of \mathbf{x} to a single hyperrectangle⁴, where $x_j = \xi_j^{(k_j)} x_j^{(k_j)} + \xi_j^{(k_j+1)} x_j^{(k_j+1)}$ and $1 = \xi_j^{(k_j)} + \xi_j^{(k_j+1)}$, for some k_j and all j .

The fixing operation is illustrated in Figure 2b comparing the feasible regions of \tilde{P} and $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$.

3.2.2 Excluding

Given feasible assignments $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ to (\bar{P}) , the feasible region of $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ can be excluded from (\bar{P}) through a no-good cut [31, 32] extended to SOS2 variables:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k_j=1}^{|X_j|} \left(1 - \lceil \bar{\xi}_j^{(k_j)} \rceil\right) \xi_j^{(k_j)} + \sum_{l=1}^p \left\{ \bar{y}_l (1 - y_l) + (1 - \bar{y}_l) y_l \right\} > 0. \quad (8)$$

Note that, $\forall j$, $\sum_{k_j=1}^{|X_j|} \left(1 - \lceil \bar{\xi}_j^{(k_j)} \rceil\right) \xi_j^{(k_j)}$ is the sum of all $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ that have value zero in $\bar{\xi}_j$. Therefore, for a solution with $\mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}$ to satisfy constraint (8), at least one variable $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ that had value zero in $\bar{\xi}_j$ must take a positive value. Because of the SOS2 constraints, this forces the solution to a different combination of breakpoints from the look-up table, *i.e.*, to a different hyperrectangle of the domain of the black-box functions.

In other words, constraint (8) imposes that, in a feasible solution, either a binary variable y_l will flip its value from $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ or the solution will have to be in a different section of the look-up table grid. Whichever the case, the polyhedron that is the feasible region of $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ will be excluded. The impact in the feasible region of \bar{P} of adding the cut (8) is illustrated in Figure 2c.

Nevertheless, cut (8) on SOS2 variables $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ and binary variables y_l has the drawback of relying on strict inequalities, which can elicit numerical issues arising from the use of non-strict inequalities with tolerances. An alternative to the use of a strict inequality is to exploit the branching strategy of the solver to rule out the simultaneous assignment of variables $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ and $\xi_j^{(k_j+1)}$ corresponding to the chosen region defined in $\bar{\xi}_j$. In this approach, a no-good cut over the \mathbf{y} variables is applied solely in the branches in which positive values for both $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ and $\xi_j^{(k_j+1)}$ is feasible. If $\xi_j^{(k_j)}$ or $\xi_j^{(k_j+1)}$ have been forced to 0 by branching, then the cut is already satisfied and, thus, is not applied.

Another approach is to emulate the SOS2 constraints with auxiliary binary variables that are added to vector \mathbf{y} , allowing the cut's reformulation as a classic combinatorial cut that uses only binary variables and a nonstrict inequality. Among the formulations for SOS2 constraints from the literature [8, 9], the convex combination is selected here for its simplicity. Let $\varphi_j(k_j)$ be an injective mapping from the indices of the intervals $[\xi_j^{(k_j-1)}, \xi_j^{(k_j)}]$ associated with the SOS2 variables to the domain of the binary variables

⁴In other words, to a single set of the partitioning induced by the breakpoints of the look-up table.

y_l . Namely, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$\varphi_j : \{1, \dots, |X_j| - 1\} \mapsto \{p + 1, \dots, p + \sum_{j=1}^n (|X_j| - 1)\} \quad (9)$$

such that $\varphi_j(k_j) = l$ returns the index l of the variable y_l corresponding to the interval. Then, the SOS2 constraint on $\{\xi_j^{(k_j)} : x_j^{(k_j)} \in X_j\}$ can be expressed with the following convex combination model:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j^{(0)} &\leq y_{\varphi_j(1)} \\ \xi_j^{(k_j)} &\leq y_{\varphi_j(k_j)} + y_{\varphi_j(k_j+1)}, \quad k_j \in \{1, \dots, |X_j| - 2\} \\ \xi_j^{(k_j)} &\leq y_{\varphi_j(k_j)}, \quad k_j = |X_j| - 1 \\ 1 &= \sum_{k_j=1}^{|X_j|-1} y_{\varphi_j(k_j)} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Given a feasible assignment $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ to (\bar{P}) representing the SOS2 constraints with binary variable, the feasible region of $\bar{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ can be excluded from (\bar{P}) by the following combinatorial cut:

$$\sum_{l=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} \left\{ \bar{y}_l(1 - y_l) + (1 - \bar{y}_l)y_l \right\} \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

Notice that the cut holds if a variable $y_{\varphi_j(k_j)}$ flips from $\bar{y}_{\varphi_j(k_j)} = 1$ to 0, respectively from $\bar{y}_{\varphi_j(k_j)} = 0$ to 1.


3.2.3 Algorithm

The proposed relax-fix-and-exclude approach is formalized in Algorithm 1. Our algorithm progressively explores the solution space of the MINLP problem (\tilde{P}) guided by the solutions of its MILP relaxation (\bar{P}) . Given an optimal solution to (\bar{P}) , we fix (\tilde{P}) to the section of the grid selected by this solution (line 6) and compute candidate solutions, effectively exploring the solution space similar to a depth-first search in a branch-and-bound tree. At the same time, the *cuts* added in line 12 ensure that (\bar{P}) is always the relaxation of (\tilde{P}) over the *unexplored* region, which allows us to compute a lower bound for upcoming candidate solutions. Therefore, if this lower bound \bar{C} is worse than the cost \tilde{X} of the best candidate solution of the explored region (current incumbent), we guarantee that we have found a global optimum. Figure 2 illustrates the main steps of the algorithm. A rigorous proof of the algorithm's convergence is established through Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 terminates in a finite number of steps and returns either (i) ∞ , if the problem is infeasible, (ii) $-\infty$ if the problem is unbounded, or (iii) an optimal solution to (\tilde{P}) .*


Proof. See Appendix A. □

■ \bar{P}
 ■ \tilde{P}
 ■ $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$
 \bar{x}^* $(\bar{x}^*, \bar{y}^*, \bar{\xi}^*, \bar{\lambda}^*)$
 \tilde{x}^* $(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$



(a) Before the first iteration, a solution \bar{x}^* for the MILP relaxation \bar{P} is computed (Line 4)

(b) In the loop, at Line 6, $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ is built by *fixing* the integer variables of (\tilde{P}) with the values of \bar{P} . The new NLP problem is solved to optimality (\tilde{x}^*) , which we note results in a feasible solution for (\tilde{P}) .



(c) The exclude step (Line 12) adds a cut to \bar{P} that removes the relaxation of the feasible space of $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$. Note that \bar{P} is now an MILP relaxation of the *unexplored* region.

(d) Finally, a new optimal is computed for \bar{P} which is a lower bound of the unexplored region, and, thus, induces a stopping criteria.

Fig. 2: Illustration of fixing and excluding in Algorithm 1. The orange and blue regions represent, respectively, the feasible regions of (\tilde{P}) and (\bar{P}) , whereas $(\bar{x}^*, \bar{y}^*, \bar{\xi}^*, \bar{\lambda}^*)$ and $(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$ represent optimal solutions for (\bar{P}) and the fixed problem $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$.

Algorithm 1 Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm for MINLP problems over multilinear interpolations. MILPSolver is a global solver for MILP problems that returns a feasible solution even if the problem is unbounded (with $\bar{C} = -\infty$). NLPSolver is a global NLP solver that returns $\tilde{C} = -\infty$ if the problem is unbounded.

Require: Grid point sets $X_j = \{x_j^{(0)}, x_j^{(1)}, \dots\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and look-up tables $D_i = \{(x, f_i(x)) : x \in X\}$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$ where $X = X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$.

- 1: $\tilde{C} \leftarrow \infty$ (infeasible)
- 2: Build the MINLP problem (\tilde{P}) using the look-up tables $\{D_i\}_{i=0, \dots, n}$
- 3: Build (\bar{P}) , the MILP relaxation of (\tilde{P}) , using the look-up table D_i
- 4: $\bar{C}, (\bar{x}^*, \bar{y}^*, \bar{\xi}^*, \bar{\lambda}^*) \leftarrow \text{MILPSolver}(\bar{P})$
- 5: **while** $\bar{C} < \tilde{C}$ **do**
- 6: (Fix) Build the NLP problem $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$
- 7: $\tilde{C}, (\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*) \leftarrow \text{NLPSolver}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*))$
- 8: **if** $\tilde{C} < \bar{C}$ **then**
- 9: $\bar{C} \leftarrow \tilde{C}$
- 10: $(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*) \leftarrow (\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$
- 11: **end if**
- 12: (Exclude) Add constraints (8) to (\bar{P}) using $\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil$ and \bar{y}^*
- 13: $\bar{C}, (\bar{x}^*, \bar{y}^*, \bar{\xi}^*, \bar{\lambda}^*) \leftarrow \text{MILPSolver}(\bar{P})$
- 14: **end while**
- 15: **if** $|\tilde{C}| < \infty$ **then return** $(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{y}^*, \tilde{\xi}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$
- 16: **elsereturn** \bar{C}
- 17: **end if**

In Algorithm 1, the relax-fix-and-exclude approach for the MINLP problem has three potential outcomes: feasibility (yielding an optimal solution), infeasibility, or unboundedness.

1. Infeasibility (∞): The algorithm outputs ∞ if the MILP relaxation continues to provide feasible solutions (*i.e.*, lower bound $\bar{C} < \infty$), but the NLP solution in the fixed region proves infeasible. Given the constraints imposed in each fixed region, this infeasibility indicates that no valid solution exists in the problem's feasible set. Additionally, if the lower bound of the unexplored region becomes ∞ or all feasible regions are examined with no solution, the algorithm halts and reports that (\tilde{P}) is infeasible.
2. Optimal Solution: An optimal solution is reached when the lower bound over the unexplored region converges to the objective of the best-known feasible solution (the incumbent). This convergence implies that no further improvement is possible, confirming the incumbent as the global optimum of the problem.
3. Unbounded Solution ($-\infty$): If at any point the NLP solution within a fixed region reveals an unbounded solution (where $\tilde{C} = -\infty$), the algorithm returns $-\infty$, signifying that the original MINLP problem is unbounded in that region. This

outcome occurs when certain regions yield solutions that are unbounded in the objective due to either the problem structure or insufficient constraints.

4 Oil Production Optimization

Oil Production Optimization (OPO) [33] is essential for maximizing economic gains in the petroleum industry while adhering to operational and regulatory constraints. Short-term production optimization focuses on control decisions with a planning horizon from hours to days, manipulating the production system to achieve an optimal steady-state operation [34]. Such optimization problems involve the complexities of fluid flow physics and the subtleties of various artificial-lifting technologies (such as gas-lift systems and electrical submersible pumps) while addressing the discrete decisions of having multiple sources [35].

4.1 Problem Statement

The problem’s objective rests on maximizing the oil production of a subsea system consisting of sources (oil wells), connections (flowlines, pipelines, and manifolds), and a single sink (offshore platform). Sources and sink establish pressure references: reservoir pressure, in the case of wells, and separator pressure at the platform on the topside. Choke valves and lift-gas injection⁵ increase and decrease (resp.) the pressure at specific network points. The operators aim to maximize oil production by determining which wells will be open and which will be closed, the optimal opening of the valves, and the rate of lift-gas injected into the oil wells, while honoring flow assurance constraints and maintaining network balance [35]. We refer the reader to Müller et al.[34] for a recent work on short-term production optimization of complex production systems, considering flow assurance constraints, flow routing decisions, and multiple artificial lifting techniques, among other features.

Figure 3 depicts an offshore platform that produces from satellite wells (connected directly to the platform) and wells connected to a subsea manifold, from which the mixed flow is transferred by risers to the platform. At the topside, the production is processed by separators that split the flow into streams of i) water treated before being reinjected or discarded, ii) oil transferred to onshore terminals by tankers, and iii) gas which is exported by subsea pipelines, used for artificial lifting or consumed by turbo generators.

4.2 Vertical Lift Performance (VLP) curve

The Vertical Lift Performance (VLP) curve is a fundamental tool used to model the pressure drop across various components in an oil production system. It describes the relationship between the flow rate of fluids and the pressure required to transport them through these components. The VLP curve encapsulates the complex interactions of multiphase fluid flow, accounting for factors like fluid properties, gas-oil ratio (GOR), water cut (WCT), component geometry, and operational conditions. For this reason, it is often impractical to model VLP curves analytically in optimization problems;

⁵In this work, lift-gas injection is the only artificial lifting method modeled.




Fig. 3: Platform diagram based on Müller et al.[34]. The platform coordinates the production from satellite wells, which flow directly to the platform, and wells connected to a subsea manifold, which collects the production and then sends it to the platform through riser pipelines. At the platform, the mixed production is processed by separators that split the production flow into water, oil, and gas streams.

instead, high-fidelity simulations are employed to approximate the complex nonlinear relationships inherent in multiphase fluid flow within the network. In other words, practical considerations deem the VLP curve a black-box function accessible only through expensive, single-point evaluations.

In this work, we employ the VLP curve to compute the *upstream* pressure of a component as a function of its downstream pressure, the liquid flow rate, the mixture components (shares of water, oil, and gas), and the rate of lift-gas injected. For a component n of the system, we formulate the VLP curve as a function:

$$p_{\text{us}}^n : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$$

$$q_{\text{liq}}^n, p_{\text{ds}}^n, \text{iglr}^n, \text{gor}^n, \text{wct}^n \longmapsto p_{\text{us}}^n(q_{\text{liq}}^n, p_{\text{ds}}^n, \text{iglr}^n, \text{gor}^n, \text{wct}^n),$$

in which q_{liq}^n is the liquid flow rate at that component, p_{ds}^n is its downstream pressure, iglr^n is the injected-gas to liquid ratio, and gor^n and wct^n are, respectively, the gas-oil ratio and the water-cut ratio of the flowing mixture. Note that, for every component, p_{ds}^n and iglr^n are directly controlled. The former is done by opening and closing choke valves, and the latter by lift-gas injection.

VLP curves are computed for each oil well in the system, taking as reference the reservoir pressure (p_{us}^n) and the pressure at the choke valve just upstream of the nearest connection. Therefore, for satellite wells, which are connected directly to the production platform, p_{ds}^n is the pressure at the separator inlet to which the well is

connected, whereas for manifold wells, which are connected to subsea manifolds, p_{ds}^n is the pressure at its manifold valve. VLP is also computed for the manifolds to account for the pressure drop along the riser pipeline, such that the upstream pressure is the pressure after the wells' valves, and the downstream pressure is the pressure at the valve connected to the separator.

4.3 Network Modeling

Let \mathcal{N} be the set of all oil wells and \mathcal{M} , the set of all subsea manifolds. Further specializing, let \mathcal{N}_{sat} be the set of all satellite wells (*i.e.*, those that are connected directly to the production platform) and $\mathcal{N}_{\text{man}} = \bigcup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m$ be the set of manifold wells, where $\mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m$ are the wells connected to manifold m . The oil production optimization problem is formalized in Eq. (12).

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} q_{\text{oil}}^n \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left. \begin{aligned} \text{wct}^c &= q_{\text{water}}^c / q_{\text{liq}}^c \\ q_{\text{oil}}^c &= q_{\text{liq}}^c - q_{\text{water}}^c \\ \text{gor}^c &= q_{\text{gas}}^c / q_{\text{oil}}^c \\ \text{iglr}^c &= q_{\text{inj}}^c / q_{\text{liq}}^c \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{M} \quad (12a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} q_{\text{oil}}^m &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m} q_{\text{oil}}^n \\ q_{\text{water}}^m &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m} q_{\text{water}}^n \\ q_{\text{gas}}^m &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m} q_{\text{gas}}^n \\ q_{\text{inj}}^m &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m} q_{\text{inj}}^n \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \quad (12b)$$

$$p_{\text{us}}^c = p_{\text{us}}^c(q_{\text{liq}}^c, p_{\text{ds}}^c, \text{iglr}^c, \text{gor}^c, \text{wct}^c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{M} \quad (12c)$$

$$q_{\text{liq}}^n = \text{PI}^n \cdot (p_{\text{res}}^n \cdot y^n - p_{\text{us}}^n) \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (12d)$$

$$y^m \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m} y^n \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \quad (12e)$$

$$y^n \leq y^m \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m, \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \quad (12f)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} q_{\text{liq}}^n \leq \mathbf{q}_{\text{liq}}^{\max} \quad (12\text{g})$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} q_{\text{inj}}^n \leq \mathbf{q}_{\text{inj}}^{\max} \quad (12\text{h})$$

$$\Delta p_{\text{choke}}^n = p_{\text{ds}}^n - p_{\text{sep}} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{sat}} \quad (12\text{i})$$

$$\Delta p_{\text{choke}}^n = p_{\text{ds}}^n - p_{\text{us}}^m \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{man}}^m, \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \quad (12\text{j})$$

$$\Delta p_{\text{choke}}^m = p_{\text{ds}}^m - p_{\text{sep}} \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \quad (12\text{k})$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} p_{\text{us}}^c - p_{\text{ds}}^c \geq -\text{BigM} \cdot (1 - y^c) \\ y^c \in \{0, 1\} \end{array} \right\} \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{M} \quad (12\text{l})$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} t_{\text{GL}}^n \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\text{inj},\text{min}}^n \leq q_{\text{inj}}^n \leq t_{\text{GL}}^n \cdot \mathbf{q}_{\text{inj},\text{max}}^n \\ t_{\text{GL}}^n \in \{0, 1\} \end{array} \right\} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (12\text{m})$$

where PI^n is the productivity index of well n , p_{res}^n is the reservoir pressure, $\mathbf{q}_{\text{liq}}^{\max}$ and $\mathbf{q}_{\text{inj}}^{\max}$ establish the platform's processing capacity, p_{sep} is the separator pressure, $\mathbf{q}_{\text{inj},\text{min}}^n$ and $\mathbf{q}_{\text{inj},\text{max}}^n$ gas-injection bounds on wells when operating, and BigM is a sufficiently large constant. The terms are parameters of the model, which are differentiated from variables by a monospaced typography.

The objective aims to maximize the total oil production, which promotes economic gain. All variables are restricted to be non-negative, which is omitted for simplicity. Effectively, the only decision variables are the lift-gas injection rates q_{inj}^n and the pressure drops $\Delta p_{\text{choke}}^c$ across choke valves, as all the others are uniquely determined by assignments of those. Exceptions are the y^c binary variables, which determine whether component c is active (open) or not (closed), and the binary variables t_{GL}^n that impose limits on lift-gas injection when a well is operating.

A brief description of each constraint follows:

(12a) Ensures that the mixture fractions correspond to the flow rates in each component of the network. However, the relations are modeled with bilinear terms to avoid numerical problems involving the division operation, *e.g.*, the relation $wct^n = q_{\text{water}}^n / q_{\text{liq}}^n$ is modeled as $wct^n \cdot q_{\text{liq}}^n = q_{\text{water}}^n$.

(12b) Models the mixture of the production streaming into a manifold from its connected wells without flow splitting, which is allowed in very peculiar conditions [36].

(12c) VLP curve for each component of the network.

(12d) Inflow Performance Relationship (IPR), modeled here as a linear constraint, but could be treated as another black-box function for increased precision (see, for example, [37]).⁶

⁶Considering the approximation of the black-box function p_{us}^n as a multilinear interpolation model, notice that $p_{\text{us}}^n = 0$ when well n is inactive because the convex combination of well n 's variables add up to y^n . Consequently, well n is closed $\implies y^n = 0 \implies p_{\text{us}}^n = q_{\text{liq}}^n = q_{\text{oil}}^n = q_{\text{water}}^n = q_{\text{gas}}^n = 0$. Therefore, constraint (12d) is satisfied with $q_{\text{liq}}^n = 0$.

(12e-12f) Ensures that the manifold is active if, and only if, at least one of the connected wells is active.

(12g-12h) Platform constraints that limit the liquid production (separator capacity) and the total lift-gas injected (compressor capacity).

(12i-12k) Establish the pressure relations between the components through choke valves, ensuring pressure balance.

(12l) Controls the activation ($y^c = 1$) and deactivation ($y^c = 0$) of each component, ensuring feasibility of the model when the choke valves are completely closed.

(12m) Ensures that, if well n is operating with lift-gas injection ($t_{GL} = 1$), the operational limits are respected.

Note that problem (12) can be reformulated to fit the format of problem (P), enabling the use of our relax-fix-and-exclude algorithm to compute a global optimum. The black-box functions are the VLP curves $p_{\text{us}}^c(\cdot)$ that model the pressure drop through the components, for which multilinear interpolation renders a good approximation. Although (12) contains linear and bilinear constraints not explicitly present in (P), the former are trivially handled by the algorithm, and the latter can be treated as black-box functions, as discussed in Section 3.1.

5 Computational Experiments

For our computational experiments, we consider the oil production optimization problem on offshore production platforms based on real-world cases from Petr leo Brasileiro S.A. (Petrobras). We compare our proposed algorithm, Relax-Fix-and-Exclude, with the Gurobi optimization software [25].

5.1 Problem Instances

Three scenarios of increasing complexity are considered. For each scenario, we run experiments with progressively lower platform capacity, *i.e.*, we tighten constraints (12g) and (12h), which makes feasible operational conditions (other than the naive solution with all valves closed) hard to estimate. In all scenarios, the platform is connected to multiple oil wells, but all of them have the same geometry. Nevertheless, because the wells are drilled at different locations of the reservoir, each has a unique VLP. Further details on the problem instances considered can be seen in the first (left-most) columns of Table 1.

The VLP curves are computed through a simulation software, which produces the look-up tables. We consider the GOR and WCT of each well’s as fixed. All other dimensions of the VLP curve are sampled with x , y and z breakpoints, resulting in a look-up table with (x, y, z) entries for each well. The manifolds also require a VLP curve to model the pressure drop in the pipeline that connects the manifold to the oil platform (riser), as seen in Figure 3. Because the oil-water-gas ratios of the mixture flowing out of the manifold is a function of the respective manifold wells, the VLP curve of the manifold must account for changes in the GOR and WCT inputs. However, we consider that the choke valve downstream of the manifolds is always completely open, such that $p_{\text{ds}}^m = p_{\text{sep}}$ for every manifold m , which renders VLP curves with 4

input dimensions. Similarly to the VLP curves for the wells, each manifold VLP curve contain x , y , z , and w breakpoints for each dimension, resulting in a look-up table with (x, y, z, w) entries, which correspond to the liquid flow rate, the downstream pressure, the injected-gas to liquid ratio, the gas-oil ratio, and the water-cut ratio.

5.2 Relax-Fix-and-Exclude Implementation

Our algorithm was implemented in Julia [38], using the JuMP library [39] to manipulate the mathematical programming models. We used Gurobi as the `NLPSolver` and the `MILPSolver`. Note that Gurobi provides global optimality guarantees (up to specified tolerance) for non-convex quadratic problems, thus fulfilling our algorithm requirements.

We opt to implement the exclusion cut through a custom SOS2 emulation using auxiliary binary variables, as discussed in Section 3.2.2. This approach has the advantage of not being invasive in the solver’s branching rules, although it results in larger MILP problems. Nevertheless, the comparison is made with Gurobi’s implementation of the SOS2 constraint.

5.3 Results and Discussion

In our computational experiments, we measure the performance of both Relax-Fix-and-Exclude and Gurobi in terms of the best solution found within a 1-hour budget. All experiments reported below were performed on a workstation equipped with a 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-12700 processor (20 cores, 40 threads), 64 GB of RAM, and running Ubuntu 24.04.2 LTS 64-bit.

Table 1 shows the detailed results from all experiments. Notably, the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm outperformed Gurobi on all instances of the oil production optimization problem by a significant margin. Our algorithm solved to optimality all eight instances with a single manifold, whereas Gurobi only did so in four of them. Even when optimality was achieved by both algorithms, Gurobi was, at least, four times slower. Additionally, the instances with two manifolds are significantly harder, and neither of the two approaches solved them to optimality within the time budget. However, Relax-Fix-and-Exclude achieved an overall gain of 104.11% on the objective value concerning the incumbent solutions.

Another noteworthy aspect of Relax-Fix-and-Exclude is its ability to find good incumbent solutions fast. This behavior is illustrated in Figure 4, which depicts the progression of upper and lower bounds over time for both Relax-Fix-and-Exclude and Gurobi on a single instance of our experiments. It is noticeable that the first incumbent solution (other than the naïve solution of closing every valve) found by Relax-Fix-and-Exclude is very close to the optimum, with a gap smaller than 1.3%. Indeed, this behavior was observed in all of our experiments, that is, in all of our experiments, the largest gap observed for the first feasible solution found by our algorithm was 1.3%, as can be seen in Appendix B.

Table 1: Comparison of Relax-Fix-and-Exclude and Gurobi.

| | | Constraints | | | | | Relax-Fix-and-Exclude | | | | | Gurobi | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|--|--|
| $ \mathcal{N} $ | $ \mathcal{M} $ | q_{fix}^{\max} | q_{fix}^{\max} | q_{fix}^{\max} | q_{fix}^{\max} | Objective | Bound | Gap [%] | Iterations | Time [s] | Objective | Bound | Gap [%] | Time [s] | | |
| 4 | 1 | 4000 | - | 2917.46 | 2917.46 | 0.0 | 16 | 147.84 | 2917.44 | 2917.72 | 0.0 | 2455.78 | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | 3500 | - | 2611.29 | 2611.29 | 0.0 | 24 | 223.83 | 2611.29 | 2612.08 | 0.03 | 3600 | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | - | 600 | 3051.69 | 3051.69 | 0.0 | 32 | 227.93 | 3051.69 | 3078.57 | 0.88 | 3600 | | | | |
| 4 | 1 | - | 500 | 3000.27 | 3000.27 | 0.0 | 4 | 38.57 | 3000.26 | 3000.53 | 0.0 | 473.20 | | | | |
| 6 | 1 | 4250 | - | 3382.70 | 3382.70 | 0.0 | 16 | 232.21 | 3382.70 | 3397.72 | 0.44 | 3600 | | | | |
| 6 | 1 | 3750 | - | 3133.14 | 3133.14 | 0.0 | 8 | 106.63 | 3133.14 | 3133.14 | 0.0 | 813.39 | | | | |
| 6 | 1 | - | 650 | 3580.30 | 3580.30 | 0.0 | 52 | 690.54 | 3578.05 | 3595.68 | 0.49 | 3600 | | | | |
| 6 | 1 | - | 550 | 3536.84 | 3536.84 | 0.0 | 18 | 255.11 | 3536.94 | 3537.30 | 0.0 | 1231.47 | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | 8500 | - | 6150.67 | 6160.68 | 0.16 | 43 | 3600 | 2374.78 | 6276.53 | 164.30 | 3600 | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | 7000 | - | 5353.77 | 5362.08 | 0.16 | 64 | 3600 | 3945.45 | 5566.10 | 41.08 | 3600 | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | - | 1100 | 6569.05 | 6612.02 | 0.65 | 35 | 3600 | 4377.95 | 7462.94 | 70.47 | 3600 | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | - | 900 | 6452.12 | 6483.69 | 0.49 | 14 | 3600 | 2374.79 | 7279.47 | 206.53 | 3600 | | | | |




Fig. 4: Progress of the incumbent solution from Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm and Gurobi in the instance of the oil optimization problem with one manifold, four wells, and $q_{inj}^{max} = 500$. The vertical axis indicates objective function value, while the horizontal axis is time in seconds. Dashed lines indicate upper bounds. Markers indicate the first feasible solution found and the optimal.

6 Conclusions

This paper introduced a novel algorithm for Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming (MINLP) problems involving multilinear interpolations of look-up tables. The algorithm leverages a piecewise-linear relaxation that defines the convex hull of the multilinear constraints, enabling efficient exploration of the solution space through variable fixing and exclusion strategies. We have provided a rigorous proof of convergence for the algorithm, demonstrating it always returns the optimal solution, or a valid statement of infeasibility or unboundedness.

Our computational experiments on oil production optimization problems demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed method, which consistently outperformed the state-of-the-art solver Gurobi. In fact, the results show that our algorithm not only was able to provide optimal solutions faster, but also that it is a better heuristic approach (*i.e.*, when used with a limited time budget) by providing better incumbent solutions. We highlight that these results corroborate with our initial intuition that the proposed piecewise-linear relaxation results in a better enumeration of the combinatorial solution space.

While the results are promising, several avenues for future research could further enhance the performance and applicability of the algorithm. First, the proposed relaxation can be applied to a broader range of nonlinearities, as it is not inherently tailored to multilinear constraints. Second, solving the MILP relaxations remains the primary computational bottleneck, consuming, on average, 85% of the total runtime. To mitigate this, future implementations could explore methods for reusing solver information across iterations. For instance, generating warm-starts using incumbent solutions or recycling parts of the branch-and-bound tree unaffected by exclusion cuts could significantly reduce computational overhead.

Additionally, we expect the runtime to be considerably reduced by a more efficient implementation of the exclusion cuts over the SOS2 constraints. For example, implementing the cut through modifications of the branching rules, as discussed in Section 3.2.2, could result in a more efficient formulation of the MILP relaxation, as it would have a significantly reduced number of integer variables. Another approach would be through alternative formulations for SOS2 constraints, as they might suit combinatorial cuts better than the one used in our experiments.

Acknowledgments. This research was funded in part by Petr leo Brasileiro S.A. (Petrobras) under grant SAP N  4600677797.

Code and Data Availability. Our complete implementation of the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm as well as all necessary data to reproduce our results is available at <https://github.com/gos-ufsc/pwnl-oil>.

Appendix A Proof of Theorem 1

The proof to Theorem 1 rests on the intuition that the algorithm searches over the space of feasible solutions of (\tilde{P}) . To this end, we will define the unexplored and the explored region at any iteration, and show that the ‘‘Fix’’ step (at line 6) guarantees that an optimum is always computed for the explored region, while the ‘‘Exclude’’ step (at line 12) allows the computation of a lower bound for the unexplored region.

First, note that (\tilde{P}) admits a bilevel formulation in which all integrality constraints belong to the upper level so that the lower level is an NLP. More precisely, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P} : \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n, \boldsymbol{y}} \quad \tilde{C}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{y}) \\ \text{subj. to} \quad & \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \in \text{SOS2}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{X}_j|}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \\ & \boldsymbol{y} \in \{0, 1\}^p, \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where $\tilde{C}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is the optimum cost of $\tilde{P}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{y})$, if it exists⁷. Recall from Section 3.2.1 that $\tilde{P}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{y})$ is problem (\tilde{P}) with every integer variable fixed to \boldsymbol{y} and every SOS2 variable $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j$ constrained such that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_j \leq \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j, j = 1, \dots, n$. Note that the upper-level binary

⁷We assume that, if the lower-level problem is infeasible (resp. unbounded), then its cost is ∞ ($-\infty$). Nevertheless, an infeasible (unbounded) lower-level problem implies in an infeasible (unbounded) upper-level.

variables ϵ_j are equivalent to a rounding of a feasible assignment for the variables ξ_j in the original problem formulation, *i.e.*, $\epsilon_j = \lceil \xi_j \rceil, j = 1, \dots, n$ ⁸.

Let us denote $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P})$ the feasible region of problem (\tilde{P}) . Then, we can write

$$\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}) = \bigcup_{\substack{\epsilon_j \in \text{SOS2}(\{0,1\}^{|X_j|}), \forall j \\ \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^p}} \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})),$$

in which $\text{SOS2}(\{0,1\}^{|X_j|}) = \{\epsilon_j \in \{0,1\}^{|X_j|} : \epsilon_j \in \text{SOS2}\}$.

We will denote $E^{(i)}$ and $U^{(i)}$ the *explored* and *unexplored* regions of $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P})$ at iteration i of the while-loop of Algorithm 1, respectively. Initially, we have $E^{(0)} = \emptyset$ and $U^{(0)} = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P})$. Then, at the *beginning* of the i -th iteration of the while loop, the sets are updated as

$$\begin{cases} E^{(i)} \leftarrow E^{(i-1)} \cup \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^*)) \\ U^{(i)} \leftarrow U^{(i-1)} \setminus \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^*)) \end{cases},$$

i.e., the region corresponding to the optimum of the current MILP relaxation (\bar{P}) is moved from unexplored to explored.

Note that (\bar{P}) can also be formulated as a bilevel program

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P} : \quad & \min_{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \mathbf{y}} \quad \bar{C}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y}) \\ \text{subj. to} \quad & \epsilon_j \in \text{SOS2}, \epsilon_j \in \{0,1\}^{|X_j|}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \\ & \mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^p \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where $\bar{C}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$ is the optimum cost of $\bar{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$, similar to the MINLP problem. Furthermore, the bilevel formulation (A2) of (\bar{P}) contains the same upper-level variables and constraints as the bilevel formulation (A1) of (\tilde{P}) , *i.e.*, only the lower-level problem changes between both.

Lemma 1. *At any given iteration i of the while loop, by the time the execution reaches line 13, (\bar{P}) is always a relaxation of (\tilde{P}) in the unexplored region $U^{(i)}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1, (\bar{P}) is a relaxation of (\tilde{P}) . Therefore, as $U^{(0)} = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P})$, the lemma is obviously true before the execution of the algorithm enters the while loop.

Assume that at the beginning of the i -th loop iteration, (\bar{P}) is a relaxation of (\tilde{P}) for the unexplored region $U^{(i-1)}$. Because the lower-level problems (A1) and (A2) are constructed by adding the same constraints to the original problem formulations, we can state that $\bar{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$ is a relaxation of $\tilde{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$. Therefore, for all $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})) \subseteq U^{(i-1)}$, we have that $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\bar{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi} \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}})) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\bar{P})$ at the beginning of the i -th iteration.

Then, at line 12, the exclusion constraint (8) makes *only* $\bar{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^*)$ infeasible in (\bar{P}) , which is precisely the relaxation of (\tilde{P}) at the end of iteration i . Further, $\bar{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^*)$ is precisely the relaxation of $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^*)$. As $U^{(i-1)} \setminus U^{(i)} =$

⁸Recall that the SOS2 constraint does *not* impose that the elements add up to one.

$\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*))$, after line 12, (\bar{P}) remains a relaxation of (\tilde{P}) for $U^{(i)}$ at the end of iteration i . \square

Lemma 2. *At any given iteration i of the while loop, by the time the execution reaches line 13, \tilde{C} is the cost associated to an optimum of (\tilde{P}) in the explored region $E^{(i)}$, if such optimum exists.*

Proof. This lemma is trivially satisfied at $i = 0$ as the explored region is empty, and $\tilde{C} = \infty$, implying (correctly) that (\tilde{P}) is infeasible in $E^{(0)}$.

By induction, assume that at the beginning of iteration $i \geq 1$, \tilde{C} is the cost associated to an optimum of (\tilde{P}) in the explored region $E^{(i-1)}$ (*invariance*). The solution $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ in line 7 yields three possible outcomes: (i) If $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ is infeasible, then $\tilde{C}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*) = \infty$ and \tilde{C} is not updated in lines 8-11, implying that \tilde{C} is the optimal cost of (\tilde{P}) within the explored region $E^{(i)}$; (ii) If $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ is unbounded, $\tilde{C}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*) = -\infty$ and \tilde{C} is correctly updated to $-\infty$ in lines 8-11, maintaining the invariance—notice that, at the beginning of iteration i , $\tilde{C} > -\infty$; (iii) If $\tilde{P}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ has a finite optimum value $\tilde{C}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$, \tilde{C} is updated to $\tilde{C}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*)$ if $\tilde{C}(\lceil \bar{\xi}^* \rceil, \bar{y}^*) < \tilde{C}$ and otherwise it remains unchanged; whichever the case, \tilde{C} is the optimal cost of (\tilde{P}) within the explored region $E^{(i)}$, implying that the invariance is maintained at iteration i . This completes the proof by induction, showing that the invariance holds. \square

Below, we demonstrate the properties of Algorithm 1 stated in our main theorem with support from the lemmas above.

Proof of Theorem 1. (Termination) To show that the algorithm terminates after a finite number of steps, it suffices to show that it eventually exits the while loop. As already discussed in the proof of Lemma 1, at every iteration one of the polyhedra that comprises the feasible space of (\bar{P}) is rendered infeasible (excluded from the feasible set). As there are finitely many of such polyhedra, even in the worst case, the feasible space of (\bar{P}) eventually becomes empty, which leads to $\bar{C} = \infty$ and breaks the while loop, ensuring that the algorithm terminates in a finite number of steps.

Now, we show that the algorithm correctly reports the properties regarding the infeasibility, unboundedness, and optimality of (\tilde{P}) .

(i) Problem (\tilde{P}) is infeasible if, and only if, every subproblem $\tilde{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$ is infeasible. Therefore, even if the linear relaxation is not infeasible, we will always have $\tilde{C} = \infty$ at line 7, implying that $\tilde{C} = \infty$ will be returned. If $\tilde{C} = \infty$ is returned, then either we fall in the previous case of the NLP solver never finding a solution, or (\bar{P}) is also infeasible, which proves the infeasibility of (\tilde{P}) , as the former is a relaxation of the latter per Proposition 1.

(ii) If problem (\tilde{P}) is unbounded, then some subproblem $\tilde{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$ is unbounded (*i.e.*, $\tilde{C} = -\infty$ is returned by the NLP solver). As long as the unbounded subproblem belongs to the unexplored region, the relaxation problem (\bar{P}) will also be unbounded and $\bar{C} = -\infty$, implying that the while loop will only be interrupted when $\bar{C} = -\infty$. When

an unbounded subproblem $\tilde{P}(\epsilon, \mathbf{y})$ is moved to the explored region, then the NLP solver will return $\tilde{C} = -\infty$, which will further interrupt the while loop and return $\tilde{C} = -\infty$.

(iii) Assuming the problem is neither infeasible nor unbounded, then, by the previous results, we have that $|\tilde{C}| < \infty$ and, thus, solution the $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^*)$ is returned. Suppose that, by the time the algorithm reaches the return statement, there is a different solution $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\times, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\times)$ with a strictly lower objective than $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^*)$. Let i' be the number of iterations of the while loop. Because $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{P}) = E^{(i')} \cup U^{(i')}$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\times, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\times)$ must be in either $E^{(i')}$ or $U^{(i')}$. If $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\times, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\times) \in U^{(i')}$, then $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\times, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\times) \in \mathcal{F}(\tilde{P})$ as seen in Lemma 1. But that leads to a contradiction, as $\bar{C} \geq \tilde{C}$ is necessary for the while loop to be exited. On the other hand, if $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\times, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\times, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\times) \in E^{(i')}$, then, by Lemma 2, \tilde{C} is the cost associated to an optimum of $E^{(i')}$, which contradicts our hypothesis. Therefore, if the problem is neither infeasible nor unbounded, there is no solution for (\tilde{P}) better than the one returned by the algorithm. \square

Appendix B Convergence behavior of the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm

This appendix presents the lower and upper progression induced by the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm and Gurobi. Figures B1, B2, and B3 illustrate the convergence behavior of the algorithms for scenarios 1, 2, and 3 respectively (see Table 1). These results clearly demonstrate that the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm was able to find a nearly-optimal optimal incumbent solution within the first iterations, whereas Gurobi struggled to close the gap between the lower and upper bounds.




Fig. B1: Comparison of the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm and Gurobi in solving the four instances corresponding to Scenario 1 (one manifold and four wells). The vertical axis indicates objective function value, while the horizontal axis is time in seconds. Dashed lines indicate upper bounds. Markers indicate the first feasible solution found and the optimal.




Fig. B2: Comparison of the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm and Gurobi in solving the four instances corresponding to Scenario 2 (one manifold and six wells). The vertical axis indicates objective function value, while the horizontal axis is time in seconds. Dashed lines indicate upper bounds. Markers indicate the first feasible solution found and the optimal.




Fig. B3: Comparison of the Relax-Fix-and-Exclude algorithm and Gurobi in solving the four instances corresponding to Scenario 3 (two manifolds and nine wells). The vertical axis indicates objective function value, while the horizontal axis is time in seconds. Dashed lines indicate upper bounds. Markers indicate the first feasible solution found and the optimal.

References

- [1] Jones, D.R., Schonlau, M., Welch, W.J.: Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions. *Journal of Global Optimization* **13**(4), 455–492 (1998) <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008306431147>
- [2] Bischl, B., Binder, M., Lang, M., Pielok, T., Richter, J., Coors, S., Thomas, J., Ullmann, T., Becker, M., Boulesteix, A.-L., Deng, D., Lindauer, M.: Hyperparameter optimization: Foundations, algorithms, best practices, and open challenges. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **13**(2), 1484 (2023)

<https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1484>

- [3] Shields, B.J., Stevens, J., Li, J., Parasram, M., Damani, F., Alvarado, J.I.M., Janey, J.M., Adams, R.P., Doyle, A.G.: Bayesian reaction optimization as a tool for chemical synthesis. *Nature* **590**(7844), 89–96 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03213-y>
- [4] Rao, S.S.: *Engineering Optimization: Theory and Practice*, 1st edn. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119454816>
- [5] Epelle, E.I., Gerogiorgis, D.I.: A computational performance comparison of MILP vs. MINLP formulations for oil production optimisation. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **140**, 106903 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2020.106903>
- [6] Grimstad, B., Foss, B., Heddle, R., Woodman, M.: Global optimization of multi-phase flow networks using spline surrogate models. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **84**, 237–254 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2015.08.022>
- [7] Beale, E.M.L.: A mathematical programming model for the long term development of an off-shore gas field. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **5**(1), 1–9 (1983) [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(83\)90011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(83)90011-2)
- [8] Vielma, J.P., Ahmed, S., Nemhauser, G.L.: Mixed-integer models for nonseparable piecewise linear optimization: Unifying framework and extensions. *Operations Research* **58**(2), 303–315 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1090.0721>
- [9] Silva, T.L., Camponogara, E.: A computational analysis of multidimensional piecewise-linear models with applications to oil production optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research* **232**(3), 630–642 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2013.07.040>
- [10] Huchette, J., Vielma, J.P.: Nonconvex piecewise linear functions: Advanced formulations and simple modeling tools. *Operations Research* **71**(5), 1835–1856 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2019.1973>
- [11] Misener, R., Floudas, C.A.: Piecewise-linear approximations of multidimensional functions. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **145**(1), 120–147 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-009-9626-0>
- [12] Gastellu-Etchegorry, J.P., Gascon, F., Estève, P.: An interpolation procedure for generalizing a look-up table inversion method. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **87**(1), 55–71 (2003) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257\(03\)00146-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(03)00146-9)
- [13] Pini, M., Spinelli, A., Persico, G., Rebay, S.: Consistent look-up table interpolation method for real-gas flow simulations. *Computers & Fluids* **107**, 178–188 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compfluid.2014.11.001>

- [14] Nelles, O., Fink, A.: Grid-Based Look-Up Table Optimization Toolbox. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* **33**(15), 839–844 (2000) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670\(17\)39857-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670(17)39857-9)
- [15] Nelles, O.: Linear, polynomial, and look-up table models. In: Nelles, O. (ed.) *Nonlinear System Identification: From Classical Approaches to Neural Networks, Fuzzy Models, and Gaussian Processes*, pp. 249–278. Springer, Cham (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47439-3_10
- [16] Bohn, C., Stober, P., Magnor, O.: An optimization-based approach for the calibration of lookup tables in electronic engine control. In: *2006 IEEE Conference on Computer Aided Control System Design, 2006 IEEE International Conference on Control Applications, 2006 IEEE International Symposium on Intelligent Control*, pp. 2315–2320 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1109/CACSD-CCA-ISIC.2006.4777001>
- [17] Gupta, M., Cotter, A., Pfeifer, J., Voevodski, K., Canini, K., Mangylov, A., Moczydlowski, W., Esbroeck, A.: Monotonic Calibrated Interpolated Look-Up Tables. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17**(109), 1–47 (2016)
- [18] Furlan, F.F., de Andrade Lino, A.R., Matugi, K., Cruz, A.J.G., Secchi, A.R., de Campos Giordano, R.: A simple approach to improve the robustness of equation-oriented simulators: Multilinear look-up table interpolators. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **86**, 1–4 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2015.12.014>
- [19] Martins, C.d.O., Furlan, F.F., Giordano, R.d.C.: Implementation of multilinear look-up tables as surrogate models for the ethyl transesterification reactor in equation-oriented simulator EMSO. *The Journal of Engineering and Exact Sciences* **6**(4), 0467–0473 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.18540/jcecvl6iss4pp0467-0473>
- [20] Rikun, A.D.: A convex envelope formula for multilinear functions. *Journal of Global Optimization* **10**(4), 425–437 (1997) <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008217604285>
- [21] Keha, A.B., de Farias, I.R., Nemhauser, G.L.: Models for representing piecewise linear cost functions. *Operations Research Letters* **32**(1), 44–48 (2004) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377\(03\)00059-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377(03)00059-2)
- [22] McCormick, G.P.: Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part i – convex underestimating problems. *Mathematical Programming* **10**(1), 147–175 (1976) <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01580665>
- [23] Sundar, K., Nagarajan, H., Linderoth, J., Wang, S., Bent, R.: Piecewise polyhedral formulations for a multilinear term. *Operations Research Letters* **49**(1), 144–149 (2021) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2020.12.002>
- [24] Kim, J., Richard, J.-P.P., Tawarmalani, M.: Piecewise polyhedral relaxations of multilinear optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 3167–3193 (2024)

<https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1507486>

- [25] Gurobi Optimization, LLC: Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual (2024). <https://www.gurobi.com>
- [26] Gleixner, A.M.: Exact and Fast Algorithms for Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Programming. Logos Verlag Berlin, Berlin, Germany (2015)
- [27] Weiser, A., Zarantonello, S.E.: A note on piecewise linear and multilinear table interpolation in many dimensions. *Mathematics of Computation* **50**(181), 189–196 (1988) <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1988-0917826-0>
- [28] Beale, E., Tomlin, J.: Special facilities in a general mathematical programming system for nonconvex problems using ordered sets of variables. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Operational Research*, pp. 447–454 (1970)
- [29] Castro, P.M.: Tightening piecewise McCormick relaxations for bilinear problems. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **72**, 300–311 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2014.03.025>
- [30] Al-Khayyal, F.A., Falk, J.E.: Jointly constrained biconvex programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **8**(2), 273–286 (1983) <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.8.2.273>
- [31] D’Ambrosio, C., Frangioni, A., Liberti, L., Lodi, A.: On interval-subgradient and no-good cuts. *Operations Research Letters* **38**(5), 341–345 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2010.05.010>
- [32] Balas, E., Jeroslow, R.: Canonical cuts on the unit hypercube. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **23**(1), 61–69 (1972) <https://doi.org/10.1137/0123007>
- [33] Foss, B., Jenson, J.P.: Performance analysis for closed-loop reservoir management. *SPE Journal* **16**(01), 183–190 (2010) <https://doi.org/10.2118/138891-PA>
- [34] Müller, E.R., Camponogara, E., Seman, L.O., Hülse, E.O., Vieira, B.F., Miyatake, L.K., Teixeira, A.F.: Short-term steady-state production optimization of offshore oil platforms: wells with dual completion (gas-lift and ESP) and flow assurance. *TOP* **30**(1), 152–180 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11750-021-00604-2>
- [35] Codas, A., Camponogara, E.: Mixed-integer linear optimization for optimal lift-gas allocation with well-separator routing. *European Journal of Operational Research* **217**(1), 222–231 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2011.08.027>
- [36] Camponogara, E., Seman, L.O., Muller, E.R., Gaspari, L.K., Eduardo F. Miyatake, Vieira, B.F.: A ReLU-based linearization approach for maximizing oil production in subsea platforms: An application to flow splitting. *Chemical Engineering Science* **295**, 120165 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2024.120165>

- [37] Vogel, J.V.: Inflow performance relationships for solution-gas drive wells. *Journal of Petroleum Technology* **20**(01), 83–92 (1968)
- [38] Bezanson, J., Edelman, A., Karpinski, S., Shah, V.B.: Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing. *SIAM Review* **59**(1), 65–98 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1137/141000671>
- [39] Lubin, M., Dowson, O., Dias Garcia, J., Huchette, J., Legat, B., Vielma, J.P.: JuMP 1.0: Recent improvements to a modeling language for mathematical optimization. *Mathematical Programming Computation* (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12532-023-00239-3>