ELE539A: Optimization of Communication Systems
Lecture 8: Distributed Algorithms and Decomposition
Methods

Professor M. Chiang Electrical Engineering Department, Princeton University

February 22, 2006

Lecture Outline

- Example: Distributed spectrum management in DSL
- Distributed algorithm: introduction
- Primal and dual decomposition
- Gauss-Siedel and Jacobi algorithms

Example: Spectrum Management in DSL

Crosstalk phenomena similar to interference-limited wireless networks:

$$R_i = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \log(1 + SIR_{ij})$$

i: user. j: DMT tone

Key differences:

- Channel gains not time-varying
- Frequency selective
- Spatial dependence

Rate maximization for user i:

maximize
$$R_i$$
 subject to $\sum_j P_{ij} \leq P_{i,max},$ $P_{ij} \geq 0$

Iterative Water-filling

Simultaneous update: Each user i has a target rate:

- Allocate power by water-filling over interference plus noise spectrum for a given total power (iterative margin-adaptive water-filling)
- Change total power level based on attained rate (converges if target rates are feasible)

Proof of convergence to Nash equilibrium under certain conditions for two-user case

Nash equilibrium may not be optimal

Simple method to improve performance compared to static spectrum management

Distributed Algorithms

We have seen three distributed algorithms:

- Shortest path routing: Bellman Ford algorithm
- Power control in wireless and DSL

We will see more:

- Network utility maximization
- Rate allocation and TCP congestion control
- Wireless NUM
- NUM extensions

Distributed Algorithms

Distributed algorithms are preferred because:

- It's scalable
- It's robust
- Centralized command is not feasible or is too costly

Key issues:

- Local computation vs. global communication
- Scope, scale, and physical meaning of communication overhead
- Theoretical issues: Convergence? Optimality? Speed?
- Practical issues: Robustness? Synchronization? Complexity?
 Stability?
- Problem separability structure for decomposition: vertical and horizontal

Decomposition: LP Example

LP with variables u, v:

maximize
$$c_1^T u + c_2^T v$$
 subject to $A_1 u \preceq b_1$ $A_2 v \preceq b_2$ $F_1 u + F_2 v \preceq h$

Coupling constraint: $F_1u + F_2v \leq h$. Otherwise, separable into two LP

Primal Decomposition

Introduce variable z and rewrite coupling constraint as

$$F_1u \leq z$$
, $F_2v \leq h-z$

LP decomposed into a master problem and two subproblems:

minimize_z
$$\phi_1(z) + \phi_2(z)$$

where

$$\phi_1(z) = \inf_{u} \{ c_1^T u | A_1 u \leq b_1, Fu \leq z \}$$

$$\phi_2(z) = \inf_{v} \{ c_2^T v | A_2 v \leq b_2, F_2 v \leq h - z \}$$

Subgradient of function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ at x is a vector g such that

$$f(y) \ge f(x) + g^T(y - x), \ \forall y$$

Primal Decomposition

For each iteration t:

- 1. Solve two separate LPs to obtain optimal u(t),v(t) and associated dual variables $\lambda_1(t),\lambda_2(t)$
- 2. Subgradient update: $g(t) = -\lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t)$
- 3. Mater algorithm update: $z(t+1)=z(t)-\alpha(t)g(t)$ where $\alpha(t)\geq 0, \ \lim_{t\to\infty}\alpha_t=0 \ \text{and} \ \sum_{t=1}^\infty\alpha(t)=\infty$

Interpretation:

- ullet z fixes allocation of resources between two subproblems and master problem iteratively finds best allocation of resources
- More of each resource is allocated to the subproblem with larger Lagrange multiplier at each step

Dual Decomposition

Form partial Lagrangian:

$$L(u, v, \lambda) = c_1^T u + x_2^T v + \lambda^T (F_1 u + F_2 v - h)$$

= $(F_1^T \lambda + c_1)^T u + (F_2^T + c_2)^T v - \lambda^T h$

Dual function:

$$q(\lambda) = \inf_{u,v} \{ L(u,v,\lambda) | A_1 u \leq b_1, A_2 v \leq b_2 \}$$

$$= -\lambda^T h + \inf_{u:A_1 u \leq b_1} (F_1^T \lambda + c_1)^T u + \inf_{v:A_2 u \leq b_2} (F_2^T \lambda + c_2)^T v$$

Dual problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & q(\lambda) \\ \text{subject to} & \lambda \succeq 0 \end{array}$$

Dual Decomposition

Solve the following LP in u, with minimizer $u^*(\lambda(t))$

minimize
$$(F_1^T \lambda(t) + c_1)^T u$$

subject to $A_1 u \prec b_1$

Solve the following LP in v, with minimizer $v^*(\lambda(t))$

minimize
$$(F_2^T \lambda(t) + c_2)^T v$$
 subject to $A_2 v \preceq b_2$

Use the following subgradient (to -q) to update λ :

$$g(t) = -F_1 u^*(\lambda(t)) - F_2 v^*(\lambda(t)) + h, \quad \lambda(t+1) = \lambda(t) - \alpha(t)g(t)$$

Interpretation:

Master algorithm adjusts prices λ , which regulates the separate solutions of two subproblems

Parallelization

Parallelization of iterative algorithm: x(t+1) = F(x(t))

- Gauss-Siedel algorithm
- Jacobi algorithm

Optimization problem with separable strictly convex objective:

- Cartesian product constraint set: distributed gradient algorithm
- Coupled constraint set: primal or dual decomposition

Optimization problem with separable convex objective:

- Proximal minimization algorithm
- Augmented Lagrangian method
- Distributed subgradient method

Jacobi and Gauss-Siedel Algorithms

In general, Jacobi algorithm (F_i is ith component of function F):

$$x_i(t+1) = F_i(x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t))$$

Gauss-Siedel algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = F_i(x_1(t+1), \dots, x_{i-1}(t+1), x_i(t), \dots, x_n(t))$$

Nonlinear minimization: Jacobi algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{x_i} f(x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t))$$

Gauss-Siedel algorithm:

$$x_i(t+1) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{x_i} f(x_1(t+1), \dots, x_{i-1}(t+1), x_i(t), \dots, x_n(t))$$

If f is convex, bounded below, differentiable, and strictly convex for each x_i , then Gauss-Siedel algorithm converges to a minimizer of f

Lecture Summary

- Decouple a coupling constraint: primal or dual decomposition
- Decomposition of optimization problems into subproblems for parallel algorithms: Jacobi or Gauss-Siedel algorithm

Readings: Sections 3.2-3.4, 7.5 in D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods, Athena Scientific 1999.