

Tight-and-cheap conic relaxation for the AC optimal power flow problem

C. Bingane, M.F. Anjos,
S. Le Digabel

G-2018-02

January 2018

La collection *Les Cahiers du GERAD* est constituée des travaux de recherche menés par nos membres. La plupart de ces documents de travail a été soumis à des revues avec comité de révision. Lorsqu'un document est accepté et publié, le pdf original est retiré si c'est nécessaire et un lien vers l'article publié est ajouté.

Citation suggérée: Bingane, Christian; Anjos, Miguel F.; Le Digabel, Sébastien (Janvier 2018). Tight-and-cheap conic relaxation for the AC optimal power flow problem, Rapport technique, Les Cahiers du GERAD G-2018-02, GERAD, HEC Montréal, Canada.

Avant de citer ce rapport technique, veuillez visiter notre site Web (<https://www.gerad.ca/fr/papers/G-2018-02>) afin de mettre à jour vos données de référence, s'il a été publié dans une revue scientifique.

The series *Les Cahiers du GERAD* consists of working papers carried out by our members. Most of these pre-prints have been submitted to peer-reviewed journals. When accepted and published, if necessary, the original pdf is removed and a link to the published article is added.

Suggested citation: Bingane, Christian; Anjos, Miguel F.; Le Digabel, Sébastien (January 2018). Tight-and-cheap conic relaxation for the AC optimal power flow problem, Technical report, Les Cahiers du GERAD G-2018-02, GERAD, HEC Montréal, Canada.

Before citing this technical report, please visit our website (<https://www.gerad.ca/en/papers/G-2018-02>) to update your reference data, if it has been published in a scientific journal.

La publication de ces rapports de recherche est rendue possible grâce au soutien de HEC Montréal, Polytechnique Montréal, Université McGill, Université du Québec à Montréal, ainsi que du Fonds de recherche du Québec – Nature et technologies.

Dépôt légal – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2018
– Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, 2018

The publication of these research reports is made possible thanks to the support of HEC Montréal, Polytechnique Montréal, McGill University, Université du Québec à Montréal, as well as the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Nature et technologies.

Legal deposit – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2018
– Library and Archives Canada, 2018

GERAD HEC Montréal
3000, chemin de la Côte-Sainte-Catherine
Montréal (Québec) Canada H3T 2A7

Tél. : 514 340-6053
Télec. : 514 340-5665
info@gerad.ca
www.gerad.ca

Tight-and-cheap conic relaxation for the AC optimal power flow problem

Christian Bingane^{a,b}

Miguel F. Anjos^{a,b}

Sébastien Le Digabel^{a,b}

^a GERAD, HEC Montréal, Montréal (Québec), Canada, H3T 2A7

^b Department of Mathematics and Industrial Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal (Québec) Canada, H3C 3A7

christian.bingane@polymtl.ca
anjios@stanfordalumni.org
sebastien.le-digabel@polymtl.ca

January 2018

Les Cahiers du GERAD
G–2018–02

Copyright © 2018 GERAD, Bingane, Anjos, Le Digabel

Les textes publiés dans la série des rapports de recherche *Les Cahiers du GERAD* n'engagent que la responsabilité de leurs auteurs. Les auteurs conservent leur droit d'auteur et leurs droits moraux sur leurs publications et les utilisateurs s'engagent à reconnaître et respecter les exigences légales associées à ces droits. Ainsi, les utilisateurs:

- Peuvent télécharger et imprimer une copie de toute publication du portail public aux fins d'étude ou de recherche privée;
- Ne peuvent pas distribuer le matériel ou l'utiliser pour une activité à but lucratif ou pour un gain commercial;
- Peuvent distribuer gratuitement l'URL identifiant la publication.

Si vous pensez que ce document enfreint le droit d'auteur, contactez-nous en fournissant des détails. Nous supprimerons immédiatement l'accès au travail et enquêterons sur votre demande.

The authors are exclusively responsible for the content of their research papers published in the series *Les Cahiers du GERAD*. Copyright and moral rights for the publications are retained by the authors and the users must commit themselves to recognize and abide the legal requirements associated with these rights. Thus, users:

- May download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research;
- May not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain;
- May freely distribute the URL identifying the publication.

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Abstract: The classical alternating current optimal power flow problem is highly nonconvex and generally hard to solve. Convex relaxations, in particular semidefinite, second-order cone, convex quadratic, and linear relaxations, have recently attracted significant interest. The semidefinite relaxation is the strongest among them and is exact for many cases. However, the computational efficiency for solving large-scale semidefinite optimization is lower than for second-order cone optimization. We propose a conic relaxation obtained by combining semidefinite optimization with the reformulation-linearization technique, commonly known as RLT. The proposed relaxation is stronger than the second-order cone relaxation and nearly as tight as the standard semidefinite relaxation. Computational experiments using standard test cases with up to 6515 buses show that the time to solve the new conic relaxation is up to one order of magnitude lower than for the standard semidefinite relaxation.

Keywords: Conic optimization, optimal power flow, power systems, semidefinite programming

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by the NSERC-Hydro-Quebec-Schneider Electric Industrial Research Chair. The authors thank Stéphane Alarie and Laurent Lenoir, both of the Hydro-Québec Research Institute (IREQ), for helpful comments on early drafts of this paper.

Nomenclature

Notation	
\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{C}	Set of real/complex numbers,
\mathbb{H}^n	Set of $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices,
j	Imaginary unit,
a/a	Real/complex number,
\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}	Real/complex vector,
A/A	Real/complex matrix.
Operators	
$\text{Re}(\cdot)/\text{Im}(\cdot)$	Real/imaginary part operator,
$(\cdot)^*$	Conjugate operator,
$ \cdot $	Magnitude or cardinality set operator,
$\angle(\cdot)$	Phase operator,
$(\cdot)^T$	Transpose operator,
$(\cdot)^H$	Conjugate transpose operator,
$\text{rank}(\cdot)$	Rank operator.
Input data	
$\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$	Power network,
\mathcal{N}	Set of buses,
$\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{G}_k$	Set of generators,
\mathcal{G}_k	Set of generators connected to bus k ,
\mathcal{L}	Set of branches,
p_{Dk}/q_{Dk}	Active/reactive power demand at bus k ,
g'_k/b'_k	Conductance/susceptance of shunt element at bus k ,
$y_\ell^{-1} = r_\ell + jx_\ell$	Series impedance of branch ℓ ,
b'_ℓ	Total shunt susceptance of branch ℓ ,
t_ℓ	Turns ratio of branch ℓ .
Variables	
p_{Gg}/q_{Gg}	Active/reactive power generation by generator g ,
v_k	Complex (phasor) voltage at bus k ,
$p_{f\ell}/q_{f\ell}$	Active/reactive power flow injected along branch ℓ by its <i>from</i> end,
$p_{t\ell}/q_{t\ell}$	Active/reactive power flow injected along branch ℓ by its <i>to</i> end.

1 Introduction

The optimal power flow (OPF) problem, introduced by Carpentier in 1962 [1], seeks to find a network operating point that optimizes an objective function such as generation cost subject to power flow equations and other operational constraints. A broad survey of the history of the problem and the related optimization methods appears in [2, 3, 4].

According to [3], the general OPF problem may be modelled using linear, mixed-integer linear, nonlinear, or mixed integer nonlinear optimization. We focus on the nonlinear version, also called alternating current optimal power flow (ACOPF) problem. The ACOPF problem is nonconvex and NP-hard [5, 6]. One way to tackle it is to use convex relaxations of the nonconvex constraints.

A conic optimization problem is a class of convex optimization problem that consists in optimizing a linear function over the intersection of an affine subspace and a convex cone. When the cone is the nonnegative orthant, the second-order cone, or the positive semidefinite matrices set, the conic optimization problem is a linear, a second-order cone or a semidefinite program respectively. A large theory can be found in [7] on convex optimization or in [8] on semidefinite optimization.

Since the ACOPF problem can be cast as a quadratically constrained quadratic program (QCQP), two principal conic relaxations have been proposed in the last decade: the second-order cone programming (SOCP) relaxation [9] and the semidefinite programming (SDP) relaxation [10]. These two relaxations offer several advantages. First, they can lead to global optimality. Second, they provide a lower bound on the global optimal value of the ACOPF problem. Third, if one of them is infeasible, then the ACOPF problem is infeasible.

We should note that the SDP relaxation is stronger than the SOCP relaxation but requires heavier computation. Therefore, a chordal relaxation was proposed in [11] in order to exploit the fact that power networks are not densely connected, thus reducing data storage and increasing computation speed. A full literature review on these three relaxations can be found in [12, 13]. Other convex relaxations have been developed in [14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

For radial networks, the SOCP relaxation is tantamount to the SDP relaxation. In this case, one should always solve the first one rather than the second one. For general meshed networks, it would be interesting to develop a relaxation as fast as the SOCP relaxation and as strong as the SDP relaxation. For example, three strong SOCP relaxations were developed in [19] that are very close in quality to the SDP relaxation and are faster to solve.

In this paper, we present a new conic relaxation that offers a positive trade-off between the SOCP and the SDP relaxations for large-scale instances of ACOFP. This relaxation is obtained through a combination of semidefinite optimization and the reformulation-linearization technique, known as RLT.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the mathematical model of the ACOFP problem (without loss of generality). In Section 3, we describe principal conic relaxations of the ACOFP problem, especially semidefinite and second-order cone relaxations. In Section 4, we present the new conic relaxation, and we present computational results in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 ACOFP: Formulation

Consider a typical power network $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$ where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ denote respectively the set of buses and the set of branches (transmission lines, transformers and phase shifters). Each branch $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ has a *from* end k (on the *tap side*) and a *to* end m as modeled in [20]. We note $\ell = (k, m)$. The ACOFP problem is given as:

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} c_{g2} p_{Gg}^2 + c_{g1} p_{Gg} + c_{g0} \quad (1a)$$

over variables $\mathbf{p}_G, \mathbf{q}_G \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}|}$, $\mathbf{p}_f, \mathbf{q}_f, \mathbf{p}_t, \mathbf{q}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}|}$, and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\mathcal{N}|}$, subject to

- Kirchhoff's current law (KCL) constraints:

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k} p_{Gg} - p_{Dk} - g'_k |v_k|^2 = \sum_{\ell=(k,m) \in \mathcal{L}} p_{f\ell} + \sum_{\ell=(m,k) \in \mathcal{L}} p_{t\ell}, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k} q_{Gg} - q_{Dk} + b'_k |v_k|^2 = \sum_{\ell=(k,m) \in \mathcal{L}} q_{f\ell} + \sum_{\ell=(m,k) \in \mathcal{L}} q_{t\ell}, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (1c)$$

- Kirchhoff's voltage law (KVL) constraints:

$$p_{f\ell} + j q_{f\ell} = \frac{v_k}{t_\ell} \left[\left(j \frac{b'_\ell}{2} + y_\ell \right) \frac{v_k}{t_\ell} - y_\ell v_m \right]^*, \quad \ell = (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (1d)$$

$$p_{t\ell} + j q_{t\ell} = v_m \left[-y_\ell \frac{v_k}{t_\ell} + \left(j \frac{b'_\ell}{2} + y_\ell \right) v_m \right]^*, \quad \ell = (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (1e)$$

- Generator power capacities:

$$\underline{p}_{Gg} \leq p_{Gg} \leq \bar{p}_{Gg}, \quad \underline{q}_{Gg} \leq q_{Gg} \leq \bar{q}_{Gg}, \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (1f)$$

- Line thermal limits:

$$|p_{f\ell} + j q_{f\ell}| \leq \bar{s}_\ell, \quad |p_{t\ell} + j q_{t\ell}| \leq \bar{s}_\ell, \quad \ell \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (1g)$$

- Voltage magnitude limits:

$$\underline{v}_k \leq |v_k| \leq \bar{v}_k, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (1h)$$

- Reference bus constraint:

$$\angle v_1 = 0. \quad (1i)$$

Kichhoff's laws constraints (1b)–(1e) are power flow equations in the network. Constraint (1i) specifies bus $k = 1$ as the reference bus. We assume $\underline{v}_k > 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{N}$ in (1h). For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, c_{g2} , c_{g1} and c_{g0} are nonnegative scalars.

Due to nonconvex constraints (1d)–(1e), (1) is highly nonconvex and NP-hard [5, 6]. Applying local methods to this problem provides no guarantee on the optimality of any solution found. Moreover, it is intractable to solve for large-scale instances.

3 ACOPF: Conic relaxations

3.1 Semidefinite relaxation

Let $V = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H$, the ACOPF problem (1) can be reformulated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{minimize (1a)} \\
 & \text{subject to (1f), (1g), (1i),} \\
 & \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k} p_{Gg} - p_{Dk} - g'_k V_{kk} = \sum_{\ell=(k,m) \in \mathcal{L}} p_{f\ell} + \sum_{\ell=(m,k) \in \mathcal{L}} p_{t\ell}, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2a) \\
 & \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k} q_{Gg} - q_{Dk} + b'_k V_{kk} = \sum_{\ell=(k,m) \in \mathcal{L}} q_{f\ell} + \sum_{\ell=(m,k) \in \mathcal{L}} q_{t\ell}, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2b) \\
 & p_{f\ell} + jq_{f\ell} = \frac{1}{|t_\ell|^2} \left(-j \frac{b'_\ell}{2} + y_\ell^* \right) V_{kk} - \frac{y_\ell^*}{t_\ell} V_{km}, \quad \ell = (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (2c) \\
 & p_{t\ell} + jq_{t\ell} = -\frac{y_\ell^*}{t_\ell^*} V_{mk} + \left(-j \frac{b'_\ell}{2} + y_\ell^* \right) V_{mm}, \quad \ell = (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (2d) \\
 & \underline{v}_k^2 \leq V_{kk} \leq \bar{v}_k^2, \quad k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2e) \\
 & V = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H. \quad (2f)
 \end{aligned}$$

The nonconvexity of (2) is captured by constraint (2f). We can show that $V = \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H$ if and only if $V \succeq 0$ and $\text{rank}(V) = 1$. The *semidefinite relaxation* (SDR) in Model 1 is obtained by dropping the rank constraint. It was first introduced in [10] and later, a dual relaxation was developed in [21].

Model 1 Semidefinite relaxation (SDR)

Variables:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{p}_G, \mathbf{q}_G \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}|}, \\
 & \mathbf{p}_f, \mathbf{q}_f, \mathbf{p}_t, \mathbf{q}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}|}, \\
 & V \in \mathbb{H}^{|\mathcal{N}|}.
 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Minimize: (1a)

Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), $V \succeq 0$.

If the optimal solution \hat{V} of SDR is a rank-one matrix, then there exists a complex vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$, global optimal solution of (1). In the literature, there are numerous examples where SDR is exact. However, its exactness is only guaranteed for a few classes of problems under some assumptions [13].

On the other hand, solving SDR for large-scale power systems (more than a thousand of buses) is computationally very expensive. In order to reduce data storage and increase computational speed, [11] proposes to exploit in SDR the sparsity of the OPF problem. This methodology, as we explain in Section 3.2, suggests to replace the positive semidefinite matrix V by less-sized positive semidefinite submatrices defined on a chordal extension of the power network [12, 11, 19].

3.2 Chordal relaxation

Let us interpret the network $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$ as a connected, simple and undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ represents the set of vertices and $\mathcal{E} = \{\{k, m\} : (k, m) \text{ or } (m, k) \in \mathcal{L}\}$, the set of edges. Kirchhoff's laws constraints (1b)–(1e) in (1) depend only on $V_{kk} := |v|_k^2$, $k \in \mathcal{N}$, and $V_{km} := v_k v_m^*$, $\{k, m\} \in \mathcal{E}$. In other words, except constraint $V \succeq 0$, SDR depends only on a *partial matrix* $V_{\mathcal{G}}$. A partial matrix means a matrix in which only some of entries are specified [22, 12].

A subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is a *clique* if every two distinct vertices in \mathcal{K} are adjacent in \mathcal{G} . A clique \mathcal{K} is *maximal* in \mathcal{G} if it is not a subset of larger clique \mathcal{K}' .

\mathcal{G} is *chordal* if every cycle of 4 and more vertices has a chord. A *chordal extension* of \mathcal{G} is a chordal graph $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}')$ that contains \mathcal{G} , i.e. $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$. It has been proven in [22] that constraint $V \succeq 0$ in SDR is equivalent to $V_{\mathcal{K}} \succeq 0$ for every maximal clique \mathcal{K} of a chordal extension \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G} . $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the submatrix of V in which the set of row indices that remain and the set of column indices that remain are both \mathcal{K} . Thus, the *chordal relaxation* (CHR) is given in Model 2.

Model 2 Chordal relaxation (CHR)

Initialization: $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, graph corresponding to $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$. Consider $A = L_{\mathcal{G}} + I_{|\mathcal{N}|} \succ 0$, where $L_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G} and $I_{|\mathcal{N}|}$ is the identity matrix of size $|\mathcal{N}|$.

Chordal extension:

1. Order nodes with heuristic algorithm “*approximate minimum degree*” provided by MATLAB-function `amd`.
2. Compute Cholesky decomposition LL^T of A . The sparsity pattern of L defines a chordal extension \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G} .
3. Identify $\{\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_{\kappa}\}$, family of maximal cliques of \mathcal{G}' .

Variables: (3).

Minimize: (1a)

Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), $V_{\mathcal{K}_i} \succeq 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, \kappa$.

The optimal value \hat{v}_{CHR} of CHR is not affected by the choice of the chordal extension \mathcal{G}' . However, the optimal choice that minimizes the complexity of CHR is NP-hard to compute. Given a positive definite real matrix A of size n such that $A_{km} = 0$ if $\{k, m\} \notin \mathcal{E}$, let $A = LL^T$ be its Cholesky decomposition, where L is a lower triangular matrix. A chordal extension $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}')$ of $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ is defined by $\mathcal{E}' = \{\{k, m\} : L_{km} + L_{mk} \neq 0, k \neq m\}$. The fill-in in the Cholesky decomposition depends on the ordering of the nodes $k \in \mathcal{N}$. The problem of finding the ordering that corresponds to the minimum fill-in is known to be NP-complete. See [12, 23, 24] for more details. Besides, [11, 25, 26, 27] have developed effective techniques to solve the chordal relaxation of the ACOPF problem and we observe a significant speed-up factor computationally for large-scale power systems compared to the standard SDP relaxation.

3.3 Second-order cone relaxation

If we relax constraint $V \succeq 0$ in SDR by $|\mathcal{L}|$ constraints of the form

$$V_{\{k,m\}} := \begin{bmatrix} V_{kk} & V_{km} \\ V_{km}^* & V_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (4)$$

we obtain the standard *second-order cone relaxation* (SOCR) in Model 3. In fact, (4) represents a rotated second-order cone constraint in the $(\text{Re}(V_{km}), \text{Im}(V_{km}), V_{kk}, V_{mm})$ -space for each branch $(k, m) \in \mathcal{L}$.

Model 3 Second-order cone relaxation (SOCR)

Variables: (3).

Minimize: (1a)

Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), (4).

Proposition 1 ([12]) *Let \hat{v} , \hat{v}_{SDR} , \hat{v}_{CHR} , \hat{v}_{SOCR} be the optimal values of the ACOPF Problem (1), SDR, CHR and SOCR. Then $\hat{v}_{SOCR} \leq \hat{v}_{CHR} = \hat{v}_{SDR} \leq \hat{v}$. Moreover, for radial networks, $\hat{v}_{SOCR} = \hat{v}_{CHR} = \hat{v}_{SDR} \leq \hat{v}$.*

SOCR is of significant interest because it is computationally more efficient than SDR, and is thus more amenable for large-scale instances. It was first proposed in [9] for radial networks, and was extended in [28] to meshed networks by including a trigonometric functional constraint for the voltage angle spread on each line in the network. Later, [19] proposed three strong SOCP relaxations and showed their computational advantages over SDR.

4 New conic relaxation

For two real variables x, y such that $\underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}$, $\underline{y} \leq y \leq \bar{y}$ where $\underline{x}, \bar{x}, \underline{y}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{x} < \bar{x}$, $\underline{y} < \bar{y}$, if $z = xy$ then

$$z \leq \underline{xy} + \bar{x}\bar{y} - \bar{x}\underline{y}, \quad (6a)$$

$$z \leq \underline{x}\bar{y} + \bar{x}\underline{y} - \underline{x}\underline{y}, \quad (6b)$$

$$z \geq \underline{xy} + \underline{x}\bar{y} - \underline{x}\underline{y}, \quad (6c)$$

$$z \geq \underline{x}\bar{y} + \bar{x}\underline{y} - \bar{x}\underline{y}. \quad (6d)$$

Inequalities (6) are called reformulation-linearization technique (RLT) inequalities. They describe the convex envelop of $\{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x}, \underline{y} \leq y \leq \bar{y}, z = xy\}$ [29]. For a general nonconvex QCQP with bounded real variables, it has been shown in [30] that the use of SDP and RLT constraints together can produce better optimal bounds than either technique used alone. Earlier, it has been proven in [31] that the convex hull of $\{(\mathbf{x}, X) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2 : X = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T, \underline{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \bar{\mathbf{x}}\}$ is given by SDP constraint $X \succeq \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T$ together with the RLT inequalities on X_{11}, X_{12}, X_{22} . Hence, one might be tempted to transform ACOPF problem (1) with complex variables \mathbf{v} into a problem with real variables $\mathbf{v}^r := \text{Re}(\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{v}^i := \text{Im}(\mathbf{v})$ and consider a relaxation based on SDP and RLT. Such a relaxation would not be as effective as might be expected due to nonrectangular bounds on \mathbf{v} [32].

On the other hand, it has been shown in [33] that relaxing nonconvex constraints of the ACOPF problem before converting from complex to real variables is more advantageous than doing the operations in opposite order. Thus, assuming $|\angle v_k - \angle v_m| \leq \pi/2$ for every branch $(k, m) \in \mathcal{L}$ in the network, equivalent valid inequalities have been proposed in [32, 34] in order to strengthen the SDP relaxation.

4.1 Tight-and-cheap relaxation

For all $(k, m) \in \mathcal{L}$, if $V_{km} := v_k v_m^*$, a relaxation of (1) based on RLT yields

$$|V_{km}| \leq |v_k| \underline{v}_m + \bar{v}_k |v_m| - \bar{v}_k \underline{v}_m, \quad (7a)$$

$$|V_{km}| \leq |v_k| \bar{v}_m + \underline{v}_k |v_m| - \underline{v}_k \bar{v}_m, \quad (7b)$$

$$|V_{km}| \geq |v_k| \underline{v}_m + \underline{v}_k |v_m| - \underline{v}_k \underline{v}_m, \quad (7c)$$

$$|V_{km}| \geq |v_k| \bar{v}_m + \bar{v}_k |v_m| - \bar{v}_k \bar{v}_m. \quad (7d)$$

As, for all $k \in \mathcal{N}$, if $V_{kk} := |v_k|^2$, we have

$$V_{kk} \leq (\underline{v}_k + \bar{v}_k) |v_k| - \underline{v}_k \bar{v}_k \quad (7e)$$

All RLT inequalities (7) are nonconvex, except the constraint (7e) corresponding to the reference bus $k = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{11} &\leq (\underline{v}_1 + \bar{v}_1) \text{Re}(v_1) - \underline{v}_1 \bar{v}_1, \\ \text{Im}(v_1) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Therefore, we define a new formulation of the SDP relaxation in Model 4. We denote nSDR. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that nSDR with $V \succeq \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H$ is proposed for the ACOPF problem.

Lemma 1 *Let $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\ell \leq y \leq u$, where $0 \leq \ell < u < +\infty$. If $x = \sqrt{y}$, then $x \geq \frac{y + \sqrt{\ell} \sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\ell} + \sqrt{u}}$.*

Model 4 New semidefinite relaxation (nSDR)

Variables: (3), $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\mathcal{M}|}$.

Minimize: (1a)

Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), (8), $V \succeq \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H$.

Proof. Let $g(y) = \sqrt{y}$ a concave function on its domain. For all $0 \leq \ell < u < +\infty$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$g((1-\alpha)\ell + \alpha u) \geq (1-\alpha)g(\ell) + \alpha g(u) = (1-\alpha)\sqrt{\ell} + \alpha\sqrt{u}.$$

In particular, when $\alpha = \frac{y-\ell}{u-\ell}$, $\ell \leq y \leq u$, we have

$$\sqrt{y} = x \geq \frac{y + \sqrt{\ell}\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\ell} + \sqrt{u}}.$$

□

Lemma 2 Let $A \in \mathbb{H}^m$, $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. If $A \succeq 0$, then $B^H A B \succeq 0$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbf{y} = B\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^m$. Therefore, $\mathbf{x}^H B^H A B \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}^H A \mathbf{y} \geq 0$.

□

Proposition 2 nSDR is equivalent to SDR.

Proof. We are going to prove that for every feasible solution V of SDR, there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that (\mathbf{v}, V) is feasible for nSDR.

Given V feasible solution of SDR, let $\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} V \mathbf{e}_1$ where \mathbf{e}_1 is the n -dimensional vector with 1 in the first entry and 0 elsewhere. For all $k \in \mathcal{N}$, $v_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} V_{k1}$. In particular, $v_1 = \sqrt{V_{11}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and from Lemma 1,

$$\operatorname{Re}(v_1) = \sqrt{V_{11}} \geq \frac{V_{11} + v_1 \bar{v}_1}{v_1 + \bar{v}_1}.$$

Now, let $B = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mathbf{e}_1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} & I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+1)}$, where I_n is the identity matrix of size n . From Lemma 2,

$$B^T V B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{v}^H \\ \mathbf{v} & V \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \Leftrightarrow V \succeq \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H.$$

□

Now, we are going to replace constraint $V \succeq \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^H$ in Model 4 by $|\mathcal{L}|$ constraints of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & v_k^* & v_m^* \\ v_k & V_{kk} & V_{km} \\ v_m & V_{km}^* & V_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (9)$$

to obtain the relaxation given in Model 5. We will refer to this relaxation as “tight-and-cheap relaxation” (TCR). It is evident that TCR dominates SOCR and is dominated by SDR.

Model 5 Tight-and-cheap relaxation (TCR)

Variables: (3), $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\mathcal{M}|}$.

Minimize: (1a)

Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), (8), (9).

4.2 Strengthening

Considering $k = 1$ as the reference bus, if constraint $V \succeq 0$ in SDR holds, then

$$V_{\{1,k,m\}} := \begin{bmatrix} V_{11} & V_{1k} & V_{1m} \\ V_{1k}^* & V_{kk} & V_{km} \\ V_{1m}^* & V_{km}^* & V_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \forall (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (10)$$

We define another relaxation given in Model 6. We call this relaxation “*strong tight-and-cheap relaxation*” (STCR).

Model 6 Strong tight-and-cheap relaxation (STCR)

Variables: (3).
 Minimize: (1a)
 Subject to: (1f), (1g), (2a)–(2e), (10).

Proposition 3 *STCR is stronger than TCR.*

Proof. We show that for every V feasible solution of STCR, there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that (\mathbf{v}, V) is feasible for TCR. For all $k \in \mathcal{N}$, let $v_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} V_{k1}$. In particular, $v_1 = \sqrt{V_{11}} \in \mathbb{R}$ and from Lemma 1,

$$\operatorname{Re}(v_1) = \sqrt{V_{11}} \geq \frac{V_{11} + v_1 \bar{v}_1}{v_1 + \bar{v}_1}.$$

Now, for all $(k, m) \in \mathcal{L}$, if (10) holds, then by Lemma 2,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} & \mathbf{0}^T \\ \mathbf{0} & I_2 \end{bmatrix} V_{\{1,k,m\}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{11}}} & \mathbf{0}^T \\ \mathbf{0} & I_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & v_k^* & v_m^* \\ v_k & V_{kk} & V_{km} \\ v_m & V_{km}^* & V_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

□

Proposition 4 *Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ a graph corresponding to a power network $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$. Suppose bus $k = 1$ is the reference bus. If the induced subgraph $\mathcal{G} - \{1\}$ has no cycle, then STCR is equivalent to SDR.*

Proof. Consider $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E}')$ where $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \cup \{\{1, m\} : \{1, m\} \notin \mathcal{E}\}$. Since $\mathcal{G} - \{1\}$ has no cycle, every cycle in \mathcal{G}' contains vertex $k = 1$. Also, since for all $m \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{1\}$, $\{1, m\} \in \mathcal{E}'$, every cycle $1 - m_1 - m_2 - m_3 - 1$ of 4 vertices has a chord $\{1, m_2\}$. Thus, \mathcal{G}' is a chordal extension of \mathcal{G} .

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{G} - \{1\}$ has no cycle, every maximal clique \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{G}' contains vertex $k = 1$ and has at most 3 vertices, i.e. $\mathcal{K} = \{1, k, m\}$ for all $\{k, m\} \in \mathcal{E}$. Then, constraint $V \succeq 0$ in SDR is equivalent to $V_{\{1,k,m\}} \succeq 0$ for all $\{k, m\} \in \mathcal{E}$. □

5 Computational results

In this section, we evaluate the accuracy and the computational efficiency of TCR and STCR as compared to SOCR, CHR and SDR.

We tested the models 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 on standard test cases available from MATPOWER [20, 35, 36]. *It is important to note that, unlike what was done in [21, 25, 26, 27], we did not make any modification or simplification to the data.*

We solved all the relaxations in MATLAB using CVX 2.1 [37, 38] with the solver MOSEK 8.0.0.60 and default precision (tolerance $\epsilon = 1.49 \times 10^{-8}$). All the computations were carried out on an Intel Core i7-6700 CPU @ 3.40 GHz computing platform. When solving SOCR for instances with at least 1000 buses,

MOSEK ended its computation with message `Mosek error: MSK_RES_TRM_STALL()`. For these test cases, we replace constraints (4) by equivalent ones

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_{kk} + V_{mm} & 0 & 2V_{km} \\ 0 & V_{kk} + V_{mm} & V_{kk} - V_{mm} \\ 2V_{km}^* & V_{kk} - V_{mm} & V_{kk} + V_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, (k, m) \in \mathcal{L}.$$

We considered two objective functions: the cost generation [\$/h] (1a) and the active loss [MW] where $c_{g2} = 0$, $c_{g1} = 1$ and $c_{g0} = 0$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ in (1a). Both objective functions of test cases from [36] are the same. We denote \underline{v} the best lower bound which is the maximum value among \hat{v}_{SOCR} , \hat{v}_{TCR} , \hat{v}_{STCR} , \hat{v}_{CHR} , \hat{v}_{SDR} , respective optimal values of SOCR, TCR, STCR, CHR and SDR. The optimality gap is measured as $100(1 - \hat{v}_R/\bar{v})$, where \bar{v} is the upper bound provided by the MATPOWER-solver ‘‘MIPS’’ and \hat{v}_R is the relaxation optimal value. For some test cases: `1888rte`, `1951rte`, `2848rte`, `2868rte`, `6468rte`, `6470rte`, `6495rte` and `6515rte`, MIPS failed to find a local optimal solution, so we considered the upper bounds reported in [36].

Table 1 and Table 2 summarize the optimality gaps of the five relaxations for cost minimization and loss minimization respectively. The results support the following keypoints:

1. CHR is equivalent to SDR as predicted by Proposition 1.
2. TCR and STCR are stronger than SOCR. When compared to SOCR, TCR reduces the optimality gap from 0.17% to 0.06% on average for large-scale instances in Table 2.
3. Optimality gaps of TCR and STCR are very close to CHR or SDR. We observe significant optimality gaps of TCR and STCR when the optimality gap of CHR or SDR is not close to zero, e.g. `case5` and `case_ACTIV_SG_500` instances in Table 1.
4. STCR is stronger than TCR as predicted by Proposition 3. For example, STCR reduces substantially the optimality gap of TCR from 12.75% to 5.22% on `case5` instance in Table 1.

The computation times reported by MOSEK are shown in Table 1 and Table 2. The time CVX took to pre-compile a model is not included. For CHR, the computation time does not take into account the time of building the chordal extension of an instance’s graph. We did not solve SDR for the extra large-scale instances (those with at least 6,000 buses) because of the high computational cost. In Tables 1 and 2, we note:

1. Among all relaxations, SOCR is the fastest and SDR is the slowest.
2. CHR is on average around 30 times faster than SDR for large-scale instances.
3. TCR is on average around 30 times faster than CHR for large-scale instances and 55 times for extra large-scales instances.
4. TCR is on average around 3 times faster than STCR for large-scale instances and 7 times for extra large-scales instances.

6 Conclusion

We proposed a new formulation of the semidefinite relaxation for the ACOPF problem. This formulation is based on a positive semidefiniteness constraint combined with reformulation-linearization technique (RLT) constraints defined on the reference (slack) bus. We proved that it is equivalent to the standard SDP relaxation. Thereafter, we derived a tight-and-cheap semidefinite relaxation (TCR) stronger than the standard SOCP relaxation. Experiments on unmodified MATPOWER instances show that the proposed relaxation offers an interesting trade-off between the standard SDP and SOCP relaxations for large-scale power systems because it is very close to the SDP relaxation in terms of optimality gap, but computationally it is much faster than the chordal relaxation (which is equivalent to the SDP relaxation).

A strong TCR (STCR) was also proposed. We showed that, under some assumption, it is tantamount to the standard SDP relaxation. Although faster than the chordal relaxation, it is not as fast as TCR.

Table 1: Cost minimization

Test case	\bar{v} [\$/h]	\underline{v} [\$/h]	Optimality gap [%]					Computation time [s]				
			SOCR	TCR	STCR	CHR	SDR	SOCR	TCR	STCR	CHR	SDR
<i>Small-scale instances</i>												
LMBD3_50	5 812.64	5 789.91	1.32	0.74	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
LMBD3_60	5 707.11	5 707.11	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.05
case5	17 551.89	16 635.78	14.54	12.75	5.22	5.22	5.22	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
case6ww	3 143.97	3 143.97	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
case9	5 296.69	5 296.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
case14	8 081.53	8 081.52	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.07
case24.ieeee.rts	63 352.21	63 352.20	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.13
case30	576.89	576.89	0.57	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.14	0.16	0.13	0.16
case.ieeee30	8 906.14	8 906.14	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.08	0.10
case39	41 864.18	41 862.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.19	0.18	0.11	0.25
case57	41 737.79	41 737.78	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.25
case89pegase	5 819.81	5 819.65	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.68	0.83	0.90	1.08
Average			0.39	0.23	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.30	0.34	0.34	0.43
<i>Medium-scale instances</i>												
case118	129 660.70	129 654.54	0.25	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.33	0.42	0.32	1.09
case_ACTIV.SG_200	27 557.57	27 557.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.56	0.65	0.72	4.66
case_illinois200	36 748.39	36 748.33	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.83	0.92	0.87	6.28
case300	719 725.11	719 710.63	0.15	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.97	1.20	0.95	10.52
case_ACTIV.SG_500	72 578.30	71 048.04	5.38	4.39	4.20	2.11	2.11	0.75	3.21	4.04	3.14	103.35
Average			2.10	1.67	1.60	0.80	0.80	0.40	1.68	2.08	1.68	43.36
<i>Large-scale instances</i>												
case1354pegase	74 069.35	74 061.72	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	5.73	6.34	13.23	9.72	1 657.85
case1888rte	59 805.1	59 601.29	0.39	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.34	8.88	10.61	26.64	17.88	4 629.31
case1951rte	81 737.7	81 725.16	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	11.24	12.49	31.78	23.31	5 595.59
case2383wp	1 868 511.83	1 861 214.70	1.07	0.50	0.48	0.40	0.39	11.55	11.60	33.76	216.38	9 420.67
case2736sp	1 307 883.13	1 307 695.31	0.31	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	10.24	12.28	36.42	303.63	10 786.69
case2737sop	777 629.30	777 517.52	0.27	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	8.90	11.47	35.68	242.92	10 601.37
case2746wop	1 208 279.81	1 208 182.18	0.40	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	9.87	11.51	35.57	343.90	10 480.83
case2746wp	1 631 775.10	1 631 665.81	0.33	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	11.34	13.00	36.68	340.18	11 654.59
case2848rte	53 021.8	53 005.20	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	12.17	14.36	44.56	46.64	14 567.98
case2868rte	79 794.7	79 787.67	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	14.05	17.03	55.08	47.20	16 933.60
case2869pegase	133 999.29	133 983.11	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	15.45	18.76	60.18	49.29	14 866.00
case3012wp	2 591 706.57	2 587 512.73	0.82	0.38	0.37	0.17	0.16	12.88	14.33	49.39	1 276.67	16 051.95
case3120sp	2 142 703.76	2 140 385.00	0.56	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.11	14.98	16.55	52.77	765.39	14 636.04
case3375wp	7 412 030.68	7 407 116.46	0.30	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.07	15.23	17.64	66.37	1 216.15	18 229.90
Average			0.36	0.12	0.12	0.08	0.08	12.03	13.94	43.71	402.09	12 336.09
<i>Extra large-scale instances</i>												
case6468rte	86 860.0	86 808.12	0.27	0.08	0.08	0.06	–	35.47	40.79	314.92	1 990.53	–
case6470rte	98 345.5	98 333.90	0.18	0.06	0.03	0.01	–	53.34	51.88	371.42	2 729.29	–
case6495rte	106 283.4	106 072.44	0.46	0.23	0.23	0.20	–	50.50	65.15	431.65	3 592.15	–
case6515rte	109 804.2	109 688.71	0.38	0.16	0.14	0.11	–	48.02	59.60	427.22	3 523.01	–
Average			0.32	0.13	0.12	0.09	–	46.84	54.38	386.42	2 960.41	–

Table 2: Loss minimization

Test case	\bar{v} [MW]	\underline{v} [MW]	Optimality gap [%]					Computation time [s]				
			SOCR	TCR	STCR	CHR	SDR	SOCR	TCR	STCR	CHR	SDR
<i>Small-scale instances</i>												
LMBD3_50	317.38	317.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06
LMBD3_60	316.75	316.75	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.06
case5	1 001.06	1 001.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09
case6ww	216.84	216.84	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.06
case9	317.32	317.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
case14	259.55	259.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05
case24_ieee_rts	2 875.75	2 875.74	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.16
case30	191.09	191.09	0.23	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.15	0.10	0.18
case_ieee30	284.77	284.77	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.27
case39	6 284.15	6 283.90	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.19	0.18	0.12	0.22
case57	1 262.10	1 262.10	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.21
case89pegase	5 819.81	5 819.65	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.68	0.83	0.90	1.08
Average			0.09	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.44
<i>Medium-scale instances</i>												
case118	4 251.23	4 251.03	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.31	0.35	0.25	0.83
case_ACTIV_SG_200	1 483.92	1 483.92	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.52	0.65	0.56	4.07
case_illinois200	2 246.49	2 246.48	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.79	0.90	0.83	5.80
case300	23 737.72	23 737.55	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.91	1.05	0.86	9.93
case_ACTIV_SG_500	7 817.46	7 817.41	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.75	4.04	5.03	3.75	127.07
Average			0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.40	1.97	2.41	1.85	52.04
<i>Large-scale instances</i>												
case1354pegase	74 069.35	74 061.72	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	5.73	6.34	13.23	9.72	1 657.85
case1888rte	59 805.1	59 601.29	0.39	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.34	8.88	10.61	26.64	17.88	4 629.31
case1951rte	81 737.7	81 725.16	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	11.24	12.49	31.78	23.31	5 595.59
case2383wp	24 991.40	24 979.30	0.21	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.05	10.83	10.88	32.25	188.90	7 758.35
case2736sp	18 335.95	18 334.71	0.19	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	9.27	11.01	31.96	290.60	10 768.88
case2737sop	11 397.39	11 396.61	0.18	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	8.46	11.38	29.65	216.13	9 715.82
case2746wop	19 212.35	19 211.42	0.21	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.00	10.15	11.26	30.92	320.35	9 093.47
case2746wp	25 269.45	25 268.43	0.19	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.01	10.76	12.34	33.78	336.99	11 785.35
case2848rte	53 021.8	53 005.20	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	12.17	14.36	44.56	46.64	14 567.98
case2868rte	79 794.7	79 787.67	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	14.05	17.03	55.08	47.20	16 933.60
case2869pegase	133 999.29	133 983.11	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	15.45	18.76	60.18	49.29	14 866.00
case3012wp	27 645.97	27 637.25	0.22	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.03	16.80	17.57	55.82	1 448.81	17 689.12
case3120sp	21 513.52	21 495.85	0.24	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.08	15.08	17.09	58.92	830.41	15 981.61
case3375wp	49 004.69	48 995.70	0.15	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03	15.07	16.85	70.58	1 229.45	17 306.68
Average			0.17	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	12.17	13.97	43.70	416.32	12 230.42
<i>Extra large-scale instances</i>												
case6468rte	86 860.0	86 808.12	0.27	0.08	0.08	0.06	–	35.47	40.79	314.92	1 990.53	–
case6470rte	98 345.5	98 333.90	0.18	0.06	0.03	0.01	–	53.34	51.88	371.42	2 729.29	–
case6495rte	106 283.4	106 072.44	0.46	0.23	0.23	0.20	–	50.50	65.15	431.65	3 592.15	–
case6515rte	109 804.2	109 688.71	0.38	0.16	0.14	0.11	–	48.02	59.60	427.22	3 523.01	–
Average			0.32	0.13	0.12	0.09	–	46.84	54.38	386.42	2 960.41	–

References

- [1] J. Carpentier. Contribution to the economic dispatch problem. *Bulletin de la Société française des électriciens*, 3(8):431–447, 1962.
- [2] Mary B Cain, Richard P O'Neill, and Anya Castillo. History of optimal power flow and formulations. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, pages 1–36, 2012.
- [3] Stephen Frank, Ingrida Steponavice, and Steffen Rebennack. Optimal power flow: A bibliographic survey I. *Energy Systems*, 3(3):221–258, 2012.
- [4] Stephen Frank, Ingrida Steponavice, and Steffen Rebennack. Optimal power flow: A bibliographic survey II. *Energy Systems*, 3(3):259–289, 2012.
- [5] Abhinav Verma. Power grid security analysis: An optimization approach. Columbia University, 2010.
- [6] Karsten Lehmann, Alban Grastien, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. AC-feasibility on tree networks is NP-hard. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 31(1):798–801, 2016.
- [7] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [8] Christoph Helmberg. *Semidefinite Programming for Combinatorial Optimization*. Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik Berlin, 2000.
- [9] R. A. Jabr. Radial distribution load flow using conic programming. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 21(3):1458–1459, Aug 2006.
- [10] Xiaoqing Bai, Hua Wei, Katsuki Fujisawa, and Yong Wang. Semidefinite programming for optimal power flow problems. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 30(6):383–392, 2008.
- [11] R. A. Jabr. Exploiting sparsity in SDP relaxations of the OPF problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(2):1138–1139, May 2012.
- [12] S. H. Low. Convex relaxation of optimal power flow—Part I: Formulations and equivalence. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(1):15–27, March 2014.
- [13] S. H. Low. Convex relaxation of optimal power flow—Part II: Exactness. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(2):177–189, June 2014.
- [14] Hassan Hijazi, Carleton Coffrin, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Convex quadratic relaxations for mixed-integer nonlinear programs in power systems. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, pages 1–47, 2014.
- [15] Hassan Hijazi, Carleton Coffrin, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Polynomial SDP cuts for optimal power flow. In *Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, 2016, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2016.
- [16] Cédric Josz, Jean Maeght, Patrick Panciatici, and Jean Charles Gilbert. Application of the moment-SOS approach to global optimization of the OPF problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 30(1):463–470, 2015.
- [17] Carleton Coffrin, Hassan Hijazi, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Network flow and copper plate relaxations for AC transmission systems. In *Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, 2016, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2016.
- [18] Sleiman Mhanna, Gregor Verbič, and Archie C Chapman. Tight LP approximations for the optimal power flow problem. In *Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, 2016, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2016.
- [19] Burak Kocuk, Santanu S Dey, and X Andy Sun. Strong SOCP relaxations for the optimal power flow problem. *Operations Research*, 64(6):1177–1196, 2016.
- [20] R. D. Zimmerman, C. E. Murillo-Sanchez, and R. J. Thomas. MATPOWER: Steady-state operations, planning, and analysis tools for power systems research and education. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 26(1):12–19, Feb 2011.
- [21] Javad Lavaei and Steven H. Low. Zero duality gap in optimal power flow problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(1):92–107, 2012.
- [22] Robert Grone, Charles R Johnson, Eduardo M Sá, and Henry Wolkowicz. Positive definite completions of partial Hermitian matrices. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 58:109–124, 1984.
- [23] Mituhiro Fukuda, Masakazu Kojima, Kazuo Murota, and Kazuhide Nakata. Exploiting sparsity in semidefinite programming via matrix completion I: General framework. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(3):647–674, 2001.
- [24] Kazuhide Nakata, Katsuki Fujisawa, Mituhiro Fukuda, Masakazu Kojima, and Kazuo Murota. Exploiting sparsity in semidefinite programming via matrix completion II: Implementation and numerical results. *Mathematical Programming*, 95(2):303–327, 2003.
- [25] Daniel K Molzahn, Jesse T Holzer, Bernard C Lesieutre, and Christopher L DeMarco. Implementation of a large-scale optimal power flow solver based on semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4):3987–3998, 2013.
- [26] Martin S Andersen, Anders Hansson, and Lieven Vandenbergh. Reduced-complexity semidefinite relaxations of optimal power flow problems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 29(4):1855–1863, 2014.

- [27] R Madani, M Ashraphijuo, and J Lavaei. OPF solver, 2014.
- [28] R. A. Jabr. A conic quadratic format for the load flow equations of meshed networks. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 22(4):2285–2286, Nov 2007.
- [29] Garth P McCormick. Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs—Part I: Convex underestimating problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 10(1):147–175, 1976.
- [30] Kurt M Anstreicher. Semidefinite programming versus the reformulation-linearization technique for nonconvex quadratically constrained quadratic programming. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 43(2–3):471–484, 2009.
- [31] Kurt M Anstreicher and Samuel Burer. Computable representations for convex hulls of low-dimensional quadratic forms. *Mathematical programming*, 124(1):33–43, 2010.
- [32] Chen Chen, Alper Atamtürk, and Shmuel S Oren. A spatial branch-and-cut method for nonconvex QCQP with bounded complex variables. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–29, 2017.
- [33] Cédric Jozs and Daniel K Molzahn. Moment/sum-of-squares hierarchy for complex polynomial optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.02068, 2015.
- [34] Carleton Coffrin, Hassan L Hijazi, and Pascal Van Hentenryck. Strengthening the SDP relaxation of AC power flows with convex envelopes, bound tightening, and valid inequalities. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 32(5):3549–3558, 2017.
- [35] A. B. Birchfield, T. Xu, K. M. Gegner, K. S. Shetye, and T. J. Overbye. Grid structural characteristics as validation criteria for synthetic networks. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 32(4):3258–3265, July 2017.
- [36] Cédric Jozs, Stéphane Fliscounakis, Jean Maeght, and Patrick Panciatici. AC power flow data in MATPOWER and QCQP format: iTesla, RTE snapshots, and PEGASE. arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01533, 2016.
- [37] CVX Research, Inc. CVX: MATLAB software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, August 2012.
- [38] M. Grant and S. Boyd. Graph implementations for nonsmooth convex programs. In V. Blondel, S. Boyd, and H. Kimura, editors, *Recent Advances in Learning and Control*, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, pages 95–110. Springer-Verlag Limited, 2008. http://stanford.edu/~boyd/graph_dcp.html.