

Extending MOSEK's algorithm to the general power cone

Utkarsh Detha
MOSEK ApS

International Conference on Continuous Optimization
July 23, 2025

Introduction

Scaling matrices for non-symmetric cones

Computing the search directions

Motivation for the search directions

Solving a simple problem with general power cone

Introduction

Conic programming

A cone program (CP) in *standard* form:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\star} &= \min_x && c^T x \\ &\text{s.t.} && Ax = b \\ &&& x \in \mathbf{K} \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(Primal CP)}$$

Dual conic program:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\star} &= \max_{y,s} && b^T y \\ &\text{s.t.} && A^T y + s = c \\ &&& s \in \mathbf{K}^* \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(Dual CP)}$$

Assume: $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{K}^*$ are *proper* cones and A is full row-rank.



The general power cone

Given $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$, the general power cone [1] is defined as:

$$\mathbf{K}_{\alpha}^{(m,n)} = \left\{ (x_{\mathcal{I}}, x_{\mathcal{J}}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^m \times \mathbf{R}^n : \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} x_i^{\alpha_i} \geq \|x_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2 \right\}$$

An *LHSC* barrier, with $\vartheta = m + 1$:

$$F(x) = -\log \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} x_i^{2\alpha_i} - \|x_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2 \right) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (1 - \alpha_i) \log(x_i)$$

→ can be split into $m - 1$ cones of dimension 3 each.



Homogenous self-dual embedding

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min_{x,y,s,\tau,\kappa} & 0 \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax - b\tau = 0 \\ & A^T y - c\tau + s = 0 \\ & b^T y - c^T x - \kappa = 0 \\ & x \in \mathbf{K}, \quad s \in \mathbf{K}^*, \tau \geq 0, \kappa \geq 0 \\ & \text{where, } z = (x, \tau, s, \kappa, y)\end{array}$$

- $\tau^* > 0 \implies (\frac{x^*}{\tau}, \frac{s^*}{\tau}, \frac{y^*}{\tau})$ is a primal-dual feasible solution.
- $\kappa^* > 0 \implies b^T y^* > 0$ (primal infeasible) and/or $c^T x^* < 0$ (dual infeasible)



The primal-dual central path

Given *strictly* feasible point z_0 , points along the central path are defined for $\mu \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(z_\mu) &= \mu G(z_0) \\ s &= -\mu \nabla F(x) \quad ; \quad x = -\mu \nabla F_*(s) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where,

$$F_*(s) = \sup_{x \in \text{int}(K)} \{ -\langle x, s \rangle - F(x) \} \tag{2}$$

is the conjugate to the primal barrier.

Challenge: no closed-form expression for the conjugate is known. *Solution:*[2]



Scaling for primal-dual methods

Given $W \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$ s.t. $v = Wx = W^{-T}s$ and $\tilde{v} = W\tilde{x} = W^{-T}\tilde{s}$, the central path becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} G(z_\mu) &= \mu G(z_0) \\ v &= \mu \tilde{v} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

- Symmetric cones: $W^T W = \nabla^2 F(w)$ for some $w \in K$ [3].
- Non-symmetric cones: Hessian of the power cone barrier satisfies only one secant equation. How should one define the *scaling* matrices?



Scaling matrices for non-symmetric cones

Quasi-Newton method for multiple secant equations

A BFGS-type update with *multiple* secant equations, i.e. the solution to [4, 5]:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \quad & \| (W^T W)^{-1} - (\mu_K \nabla^2 F_K(x))^{-1} \|_{W^T W} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & W^T W x = s \\ & W^T W \tilde{x} = \tilde{s} \\ & W^T W \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{PSD}} \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\mu_K = \frac{\langle x, s \rangle}{\vartheta_K}$$

for $x \in K$ and $s \in K^*$.



$$W^T W = \mu_K \nabla^2 F(x) + \frac{\delta_s q_s^T + q_s \delta_s^T}{2\mu_K \vartheta_K} - \frac{\mu_K}{\langle r, r \rangle_{\nabla^2 F}} r r^T$$

BFGS scaling for general power cones

$$W^T W = \underbrace{\mu_K \nabla^2 F(x)}_{\text{diag} + \text{rank-2}} + \overbrace{\frac{\delta_s q_s^T + q_s \delta_s^T}{2\mu_K \vartheta_K} - \frac{\mu_K}{\langle r, r \rangle_{\nabla^2 F}} r r^T}^{\text{rank-3}}$$



BFGS scaling for general power cones

$$W^T W = \mu_K \mathbf{D} + U \mathbf{R} U^T - V \mathbf{S} V^T$$

$$\text{where, } \mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_K & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{4\mu_K \vartheta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{4\mu_K \vartheta_K} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\mu_K}{\langle r_N, r_N \rangle_{\nabla^2 F}} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{and, } \mathbf{D} = \text{Diagonal} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{s} \\ - \\ x \end{pmatrix}$$



Computing the search directions

Computing search directions

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A & -b \\ -A^T & 0 & c \\ b^T & -c^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta y \\ \Delta x \\ \Delta \tau \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \Delta s \\ \Delta \kappa \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_p \\ r_d \\ r_g \end{bmatrix}$$

$$W\Delta x + W^{-T}\Delta s = r_{xs}$$

$$\tau\Delta\kappa + \kappa\Delta\tau = r_{\tau\kappa}$$



Computing search directions

$$\begin{bmatrix} W^T W & -A^T & c \\ A & 0 & -b \\ -c^T & b^T & \tau^{-1} \kappa \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \\ \Delta \tau \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_d + W^T r_{xs} \\ r_p \\ r_g + \tau^{-1} r_{\tau \kappa} \end{bmatrix}$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} -W^T W & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{D} - U\mathbf{R}U^T + V\mathbf{S}V^T & A^T \\ A & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

→ use modified Schur complement method originally introduced for handling dense columns in LPs[6].



Exploiting sparsity

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{D} & A^T & U & V & -c \\ A & 0 & 0 & 0 & -b \\ U^T & 0 & \mathbf{R}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ V^T & 0 & 0 & -\mathbf{S}^{-1} & 0 \\ -c^T & b^T & 0 & 0 & \tau^{-1}\kappa \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x \\ \Delta y \\ \Delta t_u \\ \Delta t_v \\ \Delta \tau \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -r_d - W^T r_{xs} \\ r_p \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ r_g + \tau^{-1} r_{\tau\kappa} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U} & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{R}^{-1} + \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U} & \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{U} & -\mathbf{S}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{V} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}^{-1} + U^T \mathbf{D}^{-1} U - \overline{U}^T A \mathbf{D}^{-1} U & U^T \mathbf{D}^{-1} V - \overline{U}^T A \mathbf{D}^{-1} V \\ V^T \mathbf{D}^{-1} U - \overline{V}^T A \mathbf{D}^{-1} U & -\mathbf{S}^{-1} + V^T \mathbf{D}^{-1} V - \overline{V}^T A \mathbf{D}^{-1} V \end{bmatrix}$$

where,

$$\overline{U} = (A \mathbf{D}^{-1} A^T)^{-1} A \mathbf{D}^{-1} U$$

$$\overline{V} = (A \mathbf{D}^{-1} A^T)^{-1} A \mathbf{D}^{-1} V$$



Motivation for the search directions

Centrality condition:

$$s + \Delta s = -\mu \nabla F(x + \Delta x)$$

use linear approximation for gradient and pre-multiply W^{-T} ,

$$W^{-T} \Delta s + \underbrace{\mu W^{-T} \nabla^2 F(x)}_{\approx W \text{ near central}} \Delta x = -v + \mu \tilde{v}$$



Affine and centering directions

For a given centering parameter γ ,

$$\underbrace{W^{-T}\Delta s + W\Delta x}_{\text{Affine + Centering}} = \underbrace{-v}_{\text{Affine}} + \gamma\mu\tilde{v} \quad (5)$$



Centrality condition:

$$s + \Delta s = -\mu \nabla F(x + \Delta x)$$

use quadratic approximation and pre-multiply with W^{-T} ,

$$W^{-T} \Delta s + W \Delta x = -v + \mu \tilde{v} - \frac{1}{2} \mu W^{-T} \nabla^3 F(x) [\Delta x, \Delta x]$$



Higher-order correction

A full affine step $(\Delta x_a, \Delta s_a)$ would make the higher-order term:

$$\begin{aligned}& -\frac{1}{2}\mu\nabla^3 F(x)[\Delta x_a, \Delta x_a] \\&= -\frac{1}{2}\mu\nabla^3 F(x)[\Delta x_a, -x - W^{-1}W^{-T}\Delta s_a] \\&= \frac{\mu}{2}\nabla^3 F(x)[\Delta x_a, x] + \frac{\mu}{2}\nabla^3 F(x)\left[\Delta x_a, \frac{\nabla^2 F(x)^{-1}}{\mu}\Delta s_a\right] \\&= -\mu\nabla^2 F(x)\Delta x_a + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\nabla^3 F(x)[\Delta x_a, \nabla^2 F(x)^{-1}\Delta s_a]}_{-\eta}\end{aligned}$$



For a given centering parameter γ ,

$$W^{-T}\Delta s + W\Delta x = -v + \gamma\mu\tilde{v} - W^{-T}\eta \quad (6)$$



Outline of the algorithm

Key steps in the primal-dual algorithm for non-symmetric cones [7]

1. Starting point: $x_0 = s_0 = -\nabla F(x_0)$
2. Scaling info: compute $\mathbf{D}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{S}^{-1}$, U and V .
3. Pure affine step + Corrector evaluation
4. Affine step-length to boundary (α_a) and centering parameter γ
5. Combined step and largest step within $N\beta$ neighbourhood.
6. Check termination and loop back to step 2.



Solving a simple problem with general power cone

MLE of a convex density function

Given outcomes $y_1 < \dots < y_n$, estimate underlying convex density function [8]

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u, x} \quad & u \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{x_{i+1} - x_i}{y_{i+1} - y_i} - \frac{x_{i+2} - x_{i+1}}{y_{i+2} - y_{i+1}} \leq 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n-2 \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_{i+1} - y_i) \frac{x_{i+1} + x_i}{2} = 1 \\ & (x, u) \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha^{(n,1)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Conic MLE})$$

→ **Weighted** MLE (for clustered y_i 's) is modelled using different α_i 's.



Impact of higher-order correction

dim(K)	η	μ	Status	Iter
500	off	8.8e-10	Optimal	113
	on	2.5e-09	NearOpt	127
750	off	1.4e-09	NearOpt	112
	on	3.2e-09	NearOpt	142
1000	off	9.7e-10	Optimal	90
	on	0.0022621	Unknown	301
1500	off	7.2e-10	Optimal	98
	on	0.000246772	Unknown	301
2000	off	7.4e-10	Optimal	101
	on	0.000151739	Unknown	301



N-D vs 3D Power cone

dim(K)	Solver	μ	Status	Iter	Time (s)
500	ND (:off)	8.8e-10	Optimal	113	1.8
	3D (:on)	4.7e-11	NearOpt	81	16.0
750	ND (:off)	1.4e-09	NearOpt	112	2.6
	3D (:on)	4.5e-09	NearOpt	52	21.0
1000	ND (:off)	9.7e-10	Optimal	90	2.7
	3D (:on)	2.3e-08	NearOpt	50	40.0
1500	ND (:off)	7.2e-10	Optimal	98	4.4
	3D (:on)	3.1e-08	NearOpt	67	150.0
2000	ND (:off)	7.4e-10	Optimal	101	5.8
	3D (:on)	2.8e-08	NearOpt	86	430.0



Summary

- Outlined MOSEK's algorithm for non-symmetric conic problems
- Extension to general power cone benefits from modified Schur complement approach
- The higher-order correction can be motivated analogously to the linear case
- Effectiveness of the higher-order correction does not scale to larger cones directly



References

- [1] Robert Chares. “Cones and interior point algorithms for structured convex optimization involving powers and exponentials”. PhD. Universite catholique de Louvain Ecole Polytechnique de Louvain, 2009.
- [2] Lea Kapelevich et al. “Computing Conjugate Barrier Information for Nonsymmetric Cones”. en. In: *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* (Aug. 2022).
- [3] Yu. E. Nesterov and M. J. Todd. “Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods for Self-Scaled Cones”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 8.2 (May 1998). Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp. 324–364.

- [4] Levent Tunçel. “Generalization of Primal—Dual Interior-Point Methods to Convex Optimization Problems in Conic Form”. en. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 1.3 (July 2001), pp. 229–254.
- [5] Robert B. Schnabel. *Quasi-Newton Methods Using Multiple Secant Equations ; CU-CS-247-83*.
<http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/iso639-2/eng>.
- [6] Knud D. Andersen. “A modified Schur-complement method for handling dense columns in interior-point methods for linear programming”. en. In: *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 22.3 (Sept. 1996). Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), pp. 348–356.
- [7] Joachim Dahl and Erling D. Andersen. “A primal-dual interior-point algorithm for nonsymmetric exponential-cone optimization”. en. In: *Mathematical Programming* 194.1 (July 2022), pp. 341–370.

- [8] T. Terlaky and J Vial. “Computing Maximum Likelihood Estimators of Convex Density Functions”. en. In: *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* 19.2 (1998), pp. 675–694.