

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 275 312

*Reproduced
by the*

ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

275312

275 312

MEMORANDUM
RM-3084-PR
APRIL 1962

CATALOGED BY ASTIA
AS AD NO.

POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION-
A NEW COMPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE
IN DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING-I.
ALLOCATION PROCESSES

Richard Bellman, Robert Kalaba and Bella Kotkin

62-3-3

PREPARED FOR:
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PROJECT RAND

The **RAND** Corporation
SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

MEMORANDUM

RM-3084-PR

APRIL 1962

**POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION-
A NEW COMPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE
IN DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING-I:
ALLOCATION PROCESSES**

Richard Bellman, Robert Kalaba and Bella Kotkin

This research is sponsored by the United States Air Force under Project RAND - Contract No. AF 49(638)-700 - monitored by the Directorate of Development Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Technology, Hq USAF. Views or conclusions contained in this Memorandum should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the United States Air Force. Permission to quote from or reproduce portions of this Memorandum must be obtained from The RAND Corporation.

The **RAND** *Corporation*

1700 MAIN ST • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

PREFACE

Part of the Project RAND research program consists of basic supporting studies in mathematics. One aspect of this is concerned with optimization processes. In this field, the technique of dynamic programming has developed into a powerful mathematical tool.

In the present Memorandum the authors investigate the applicability of polynomial approximation as an adjunct to the technique of dynamic programming.

SUMMARY

In this Memorandum the authors initiate the application of the simple yet powerful computational technique of polynomial approximation to problems in dynamic programming.

The theoretical applicability of orthogonal polynomials is first discussed and then applied to one- and two-dimensional allocation problems. Numerical results obtained from FORTRAN programs involving Legendre polynomials are presented.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
SUMMARY	v
Section	
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
2. POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION.	3
3. APPLICATION TO DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING.	6
4. THE LEGENDRE POLYNOMIALS.	7
5. EXAMPLES.	8
a. Time Estimates.	9
b. Numerical Results	9
6. TWO-DIMENSIONAL APPROXIMATION	11
7. EXAMPLES.	13
a. Time Estimate	13
b. Numerical Results	13
8. DISCUSSION.	14
Appendix	
A. FORTRAN PROGRAM — ONE-DIMENSIONAL ALLOCATION PROBLEM.	15
B. FORTRAN PROGRAM — TWO-DIMENSIONAL ALLOCATION PROBLEM.	19
REFERENCES.	25

POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION—A NEW COMPUTATIONAL TECHNIQUE
IN DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING—I: ALLOCATION PROCESSES

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of maximizing the function

$$(1.1) \quad F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = g_1(x_1) + g_2(x_2) + \dots + g_N(x_N)$$

over the domain

$$(1.2) \quad x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_N = x, \quad x_1 \geq 0$$

can be reduced via familiar dynamic programming techniques (see [1]) to that of determining the sequence of functions $\{f_n(x)\}$ generated by means of the recurrence relation

$$(1.3) \quad f_1(x) = g_1(x),$$

$$f_{n+1}(x) = \max_{0 \leq y \leq x} [g_{n+1}(y) + f_n(x - y)].$$

The problem can thus be solved numerically in a very simple fashion, regardless of the complexity of the functions $g_1(x)$. A number of important allocation processes can be resolved in this way. If we consider cases in which two distinct types of resources must be allocated, we face the problem of maximizing the function

$$(1.4) \quad F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N; y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N) \\ = g_1(x_1, y_1) + g_2(x_2, y_2) + \dots + g_N(x_N, y_N)$$

over the domain

$$(1.5) \quad x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_N = x, \quad x_1 \geq 0,$$

$$y_1 + y_2 + \cdots + y_N = y, \quad y_1 \geq 0.$$

Theoretically, there is no difficulty in applying the same techniques.

The maximization problem can be reduced to the determination of the sequence $\{f_n(x,y)\}$ generated by means of the recurrence relation

$$(1.6) \quad f_{n+1}(x,y) = \max_{\substack{0 \leq w \leq x \\ 0 \leq r \leq y}} [g_{n+1}(w,r) + f_n(x-w, y-r)].$$

In principle, this equation can be solved computationally using the same technique that applies so well to (1.3). In practice (see [1] for a discussion), questions of time and accuracy arise. There are a number of ways of circumventing these difficulties, among which the Lagrange multiplier plays a significant role.

In this series of papers, we wish to present a number of applications of a new, simple and quite powerful method, that of polynomial approximation. We shall begin with a discussion of the allocation process posed in the foregoing paragraphs and continue, in subsequent papers, with a treatment of realistic trajectory and guidance processes. In a separate series of papers we shall apply this fundamental attack upon

dimensionality to the solution of a number of the equations of mathematical physics.

We would like to express our appreciation to Oliver Gross for the analytic solution of some test problems we used to check the accuracy of our techniques, and for his general interest in the program.

2. POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION

In the systematic study of dynamic programming as a computational algorithm given in [1], a function $f(x)$ is considered to be a table of values at an appropriate set of grid points:

(2.1)

x	$f(x)$
0	f_0
Δ	f_1
2Δ	f_2
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$K\Delta$	f_K

In this way, the function $f(x)$ is stored in the computer. For functions of one variable with $K = 100$ or 1000 , this is a reasonably convenient way to proceed. For functions of two variables, this procedure becomes a bit inconvenient since $(K + 1)$ values for x combined with $(K + 1)$ values for y yields a total set of $(K + 1)^2$ values. Consequently, when we encounter functions of three or more variables, we must

balance accuracy against time and the limited storage of contemporary computers in our choice of K .

The storage of functional values by means of a table of values is ideally suited to the treatment of problems involving functions of quite arbitrary form. It is, on the other hand, quite wasteful and inefficient if we are dealing with functions possessing a definite structure, which is to say, situations in which there is a high correlation between the values of $f(r\Delta)$ and $f(s\Delta)$. Since functions of this type occur in many important applications, and throughout mathematical physics, it is worthwhile to develop methods which take advantage of the "smoothness" of the function.

One such method is polynomial approximation, or to be precise, generalized polynomial approximation. We represent the function in the form

$$(2.2) \quad f(x) \approx \sum_{k=1}^M a_k \varphi_k(x),$$

where the $\varphi_k(x)$ are known elementary functions such as x^k , $\sin kx$, $P_k(x)$ (the Legendre polynomial of degree k) or $T_k(x)$ (the Chebycev polynomial of degree k), and then store the function for all values of interest by means of the set of M coefficients $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_M]$.

It is important to point out that (2.2) is particularly useful in automatically furnishing the interpolation-values frequently needed in dynamic programming calculations. If

one uses a table of values of the form shown in (2.1), interpolation is frequently a source of difficulty.

To determine the coefficients a_k it is convenient to make the $\phi_k(x)$ be an orthonormal set. Then

$$(2.3) \quad a_k = \int_0^1 f(x)\phi_k(x)dx,$$

assuming for the purposes of convenience that $0 \leq x \leq 1$. We can, of course, use a Chebycev fit instead, and we will explore this in subsequent papers. A priori, we would suspect that it would be more efficient to use a mean-square fit (implied by (2.3)), and take M to be larger, than to go to the trouble of determining the a_k to minimize the function

$$(2.4) \quad \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |f(x) - \sum_{k=1}^M a_k \phi_k(x)|,$$

which for a fixed M may be expected to yield a more accurate approximation. Alternatively, one could use an approximation by polygonal functions [1].

To evaluate the a_k without requiring a knowledge of too many values of $f(x)$, we use a quadrature technique

$$(2.5) \quad a_k \approx \sum_{i=1}^R w_i f(x_i) \phi_k(\bar{x}_i),$$

where the weights w_i and the quadrature points $\bar{x}_i$ are chosen so that the equation

$$(2.6) \quad \int_0^1 g(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^R w_i g(\bar{x}_i)$$

is exact for polynomials in x of degree $(2R - 1)$ or less. This requirement narrows us down to the Gauss quadrature technique [2]. If we use generalized polynomials (expressions such as (2.6)), we will obtain different weights and quadrature points.

We may then store the function $f(x)$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ by storing the coefficients a_k or the particular values $f(\bar{x}_i)$ which enable us to compute the a_k .

3. APPLICATION TO DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING

Consider now the application of these ideas to the computational solution of the functional equations of dynamic programming. Suppose that we wish to compute the sequence $\{f_n(x)\}$ determined by

$$(3.1) \quad f_N(x) = \max_{0 \leq y \leq x} [g_N(y) + f_{N-1}(x - y)],$$

$N \geq 2$, given that $f_1(x) = g_1(x)$. To avoid the tabulation of each of the functions $f_N(x)$ at the x -grid $[0, \Delta, \dots, K\Delta]$, where K may be a large number, we approximate to each function $f_N(x)$ in the manner indicated above. Starting with $f_1(x)$, we store the values $f_1(x_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, R$, needed to evaluate $f_1(x - y)$ in the formula determining $f_2(x)$,

$$(3.2) \quad f_2(x) = \max_{0 \leq y \leq x} [g_2(x_2) + f_1(x - y)].$$

We then determine successively $f_2(x_1), f_2(x_2), \dots, f_2(x_R)$, a set of values which stores the function $f_2(x)$. This process is then repeated.

Although the calculation of $f_{n-1}(x - y)$ using (2.2) is far more time-consuming than taking a value from storage, we expect to gain time over-all because of the fact that we are required to calculate only a few values, $f_n(x_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, R$, at each stage.

4. THE LEGENDRE POLYNOMIALS

Since in allocation processes we have a range $[0, x_0]$ which stays constant as the process continues from stage to stage, we can normalize and consider the basic interval to be $[0, 1]$. Since the interval is finite and we want, at the moment, a polynomial approximation, we shall employ Legendre polynomials.

Let $P_k(x)$ denote the standard Legendre polynomial, defined over $[-1, 1]$, and let $\phi_k(x)$ be defined by the relation

$$(4.1) \quad \phi_k(x) = (2k + 1)^{1/2} P_k(2x - 1).$$

The sequence $\{\phi_k(x)\}$ is then orthonormal over $[0, 1]$, i.e.,

$$(4.2) \quad \int_0^1 \phi_k(x) \phi_\ell(x) dx = \delta_{k\ell}.$$

From the standard recurrence relations for $P_k(x)$, we obtain the relation

$$(4.3) \quad \varphi_1(x) = 1, \quad \varphi_2(x) = 3^{1/2}(2x - 1),$$

$$\varphi_{i+2}(x) = \frac{(2i+3)^{1/2}}{(i+1)} \left[(2i+1)^{1/2}(2x-1)\varphi_{i+1}(x) - \frac{1}{(2i-1)^{1/2}} \varphi_i(x) \right].$$

This relation makes the evaluation of the sequence of values of $\varphi_i(x)$ for any x a relatively simple matter.

5. EXAMPLES

In order to experiment with this new approximating procedure, we devised a FORTRAN program for the IBM-7090 whereby at each stage, after obtaining the new coefficients $a_k^{(1)}$, we computed $f_1(x)$ from (2.2) for a succession of as many values of x as desired, and printed the result after each computation. We used two modes of output, either a list of numerical values, $[x, f_1(x)]$, or a graphical plot (done directly by the 7090) of x versus $f_1(x)$.

We experimented with several types of functions $g_1(x)$ for which the results could be derived from analytic considerations.* Using the known analytic results as a checkpoint, we varied the parameters R , M , and the grid size H , in order to determine the degree of accuracy we might expect in general. We found remarkably good agreement to 2

* Oliver Gross was of considerable assistance to us in this respect.

or more significant figures with a relatively low order of approximation, namely $R = 5$, $M = 6$. This is encouraging from the point of view of extending the method in the experimental investigations of higher-dimensional allocation processes where, as pointed out above, time and storage aspects become significant. We also incorporated in our program restraints of the form $0 \leq a_1 \leq x_1 \leq b_1 \leq x$, since constraints of this nature often occur in applications.

a. Time Estimates

Following are some estimates of the execution time required on the 7090:

1. 10 seconds for 4 stages, $R = 5$, $M = 6$ and a grid of 0.05 both for the search and output listing.

2. 3 minutes for a total of 4 cases of 10 stages each; $R = 3$, $M = 4$; $R = 5$, $M = 6$; $R = 7$, $M = 8$; $R = 10$, $M = 11$. The grid in the search for the maximum is 0.01 and the output listing is given for every x along the grid.

3. 3 minutes for the total of 4 cases mentioned above, 10 stages per case and a grid of 0.01 for the search. The output is a graph where the independent variable x is listed at intervals of 0.025.

b. Numerical Results

1. $g_1(x) = i(x)^{1/2}$. Using the Schwarz inequality, we readily obtain the values

$$f_N(x) = \left(\frac{N}{6} (N+1)(2N+1)x \right)^{1/2}.$$

For $R = 10$, $M = 11$, $H = 0.01$ we found poor agreement at the origin. This is to be expected because of the infinite slope at $x = 0$. Agreement between exact and computed values was good as soon as x moved away from the singular value 0, as can be seen from the following table:

Function	Exact	Computed
$f_1(0)$	0.0	0.064
$f_1(2)$	0.448	0.447
$f_1(1)$	1.00	1.00
$f_{10}(0)$	0.0	3.13
$f_{10}(1)$	19.6	19.6

2. $g_1(x) = 1(x + 0.1)^{1/2}$. We avoided the previous difficulty at $x = 0$ (see the computed value of $f_{10}(0)$ above), but found the function still rather sensitive near the origin. As N (the number of stages) increased, the agreement at $x = 0$ decreased.

3. $g_1(x) = 1(x + 1)^{1/2}$. The Schwarz inequality yields the upper bound

$$f_N(x) \leq \left(\frac{N}{6}(N + 1)(2N + 1)(x + N)\right)^{1/2}.$$

However, since the x_1 are subject to the restraint $0 \leq x_1 \leq x$, we do not necessarily achieve the upper bound. Some exact values based on an analysis by O. A. Gross are listed as check points, $R = 10$, $M = 11$, $H = 0.01$.

Function	Upper bound	Exact value	Computed value
$f_1(0)$	1.00	1.00	1.00
$f_1(1)$	1.41	1.41	1.41
$f_3(0)$	6.48	—	6.00
$f_3(.5)$	7.00	6.67	6.67
$f_7(.35)$	32.1	29.1	29.1
$f_{10}(1)$	—	59.3	59.3

4. $g_1(x) = e^{-5/(1+10x)}$, $R = 10$, $M = 11$, $H = .01$.

Function	Exact	Computed
$f_2(.2)$	0.196	0.197
$f_2(.7)$	0.659	0.659
$f_3(.2)$	0.203	0.204
$f_3(.9)$	0.860	0.862
$f_5(.2)$	0.218	0.217
$f_{10}(1)$	1.001	1.001

6. TWO-DIMENSIONAL APPROXIMATION

The problem of maximizing the function

$$(6.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N g_i(x_i, y_i)$$

over the domain

$$(6.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = x, \quad 0 \leq a_1 \leq x_1 \leq b_1, \quad x_1 \leq x,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N y_i = y, \quad 0 \leq c_1 \leq y_1 \leq d_1, \quad y_1 \leq y,$$

can be readily handled by the methods described in Secs. 2 and 3.

The dynamic programming recurrence relation is:

$$f_N(x,y) = \max_R \left[g_N(x_N, y_N) + f_{N-1}(x - x_N, y - y_N) \right],$$

where R is determined by $a_N \leq x_N \leq \min(x, b_N)$, $c_N \leq y_N \leq \min(y, d_N)$. Let $\bar{x}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, R$, be the roots of the normalized Legendre polynomial $\phi_R(x)$, and let $\{\bar{y}_j\}$ be a duplicate set of these quadrature points. Each function $f_N(x,y)$ is expressed approximately by the relation

$$(6.3) \quad f_N(x,y) = \sum_{r=1}^M \sum_{s=1}^M a_{r,s}^{(N)} \phi_r(x) \phi_s(y),$$

where the coefficients, using the quadrature method, are given by

$$(6.4) \quad a_{k,s}^{(N)} = \sum_{i=1}^R \sum_{j=1}^R w_i w_j f_N(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j) \phi_k(\bar{x}_i) \phi_s(\bar{y}_j).$$

As in the one-dimensional case, we start with the known values $f_1(x,y) = g_1(x_1, y_1)$, $x_1 = x$, $y_1 = y$. In stage n we store the values $f_n(\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j)$, for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, M$, and then compute and store the values $a_{r,s}^{(n)}$ in the storage allotted to the previous stage. The latter coefficients are utilized in the computation of $f_n(x - x_{n+1}, y - y_{n+1})$ to obtain the values of $f_{n+1}(x_1, y_1)$ in the next stage.

7. EXAMPLES

a. Time Estimate

The execution time required on the 7090 was 2 minutes for 4 stages, with $R = 5$, $M = 6$, a grid of $H = 0.05$ in the two-dimensional search, and an output listing of 3 test values of $f(x,y)$ in each stage.

b. Numerical Results

1. $g_1(x,y) = (21 - 1)^{1/2}(xy)^{1/4}$. Using the Hölder inequality, we readily obtain the exact values $f_n(x,y) = n(xy)^{1/4}$, $x_n(x,y) = (2n-1)x/n^2$, $y_n(x,y) = (2n-1)y/n^2$. Our results for $R = 5$, $M = 6$, and a grid of 0.05 in the search are:

Function	Exact	Computed
$f_2(.5,.5)$	1.40	1.40
$x_2(.5,.5)$	0.375	0.35 (to the nearest 0.05)
$f_4(1,1)$	4.00	3.91

Here again the agreement was poor at the origin, presumably because of the singular behavior of $(xy)^{1/4}$ at $x = 0$, $y = 0$. To confirm this hypothesis, we considered the next case.

2. $g_1(x,y) = (x + iy)/(1 + x + iy)$. This case, as well as the theoretical values, was suggested by O. A. Gross, and he determined the exact values.

Function	Exact	Computed
$f_2(1,1)$	1.17	1.17
$f_2(1,0)$	0.667	0.647

8. DISCUSSION

As can be seen, the agreement in general is quite satisfactory. We can obtain reasonably accurate values of the maximum return and of the optimal allocation policy using small amounts of machine time.

Combining these techniques with the method of the Lagrange multiplier, we can expect to solve three- and four-dimensional resource allocation problems. Extending the method to cover the approximation of functions of 3, 4, 5 and 6 variables, we can treat Hitchcock-Koopmans allocation processes of quite high dimension.

Finally, if we combine these techniques—polynomial approximations and Lagrange multipliers—with that of successive approximations, there should be very few allocation processes which still resist our efforts.

Appendix A

C 1 DIMENSIONAL ALLOCATION VIA DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING, APPROXIMATIONS

• LIST

• LABEL

C649501

COMMON N,M,JR,H,IH,L,Y,XL,W,A,P,G,NI,A1,B1

X ,IH1,L1,L2,H1,S,S1,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT

DIMENSION XL(20),W(20),A(20),P(20),F(20),X(20),A1(10),B1(10)

1 CALL INPUT

IF(N-100)2,3,3

C STAGE 1

2 NI =1

DO 4 K=1,M

SUM=0.

DO 5 J=1,JR

Y=XL(J)

CALL RETG

CALL POLY

F(J)=G

X(J)=Y

5 SUM=SUM+W(J)*F(J)*P(K)

A(K)=SUM

4 CONTINUE

OUTPUT 42,60,NI,JR,M

60 FORMAT(20H1 ITERATIVE STAGE 15,5H R=13,5H M=13)

OUTPUT 42,661

661 FORMAT(53H0 DECISION RETURN AT R ROOT VALUES)

OUTPUT 42,61,(X(J),F(J),J=1,JR)

61 FORMAT(1H 2E20.8)

OUTPUT 42,550

550 FORMAT (30H0 COEFFICIENTS A(K))

OUTPUT 42,50,(A(K),K=1,M)

50 FORMAT(1H E20.8)

CALL OUT

C STAGE NI GREATER THAN 1

DO 6 N2=2,N

NI=N2

DO 7 J=1,JR

Y=0.

CALL RETG

Y=XL(J)-0.

CALL POLY

SUM=0.

DO 8 K=1,M

8 SUM=SUM+A(K)*P(K)

F(J)=G+SUM

X(J)=0.

DO 9 I=2,IH

XI=I

IF((XI-1.)*H-A1(N2))9,110,110

110 CONTINUE

IF((XI-1.)*H-B1(N2))111,111,11

111 CONTINUE

IF((XI-1.)*H-XL(J))10,10,11

10 Y=(XI-1.)*H

CALL RETG

Y=XL(J)-(XI-1.)*H

CALL POLY

SUM=0.

DO 12 K=1,M

12 SUM=SUM+A(K)*P(K)

```

      PH=G+SUM
      IF(PH-F(J))9,9,15
15  F(J)=PH
      X(J)=(X1-1.)*H
      9 CONTINUE
11  CONTINUE
      7 CONTINUE
      OUTPUT 42,60,NI,JR,M
      OUTPUT 42,661
      OUTPUT 42,61,(X(J),F(J),J=1,JR)
      DO 16 K=1,M
      SUM=0.
      DO 17 J=1,JR
      Y=XL(J)
      CALL POLY
17  SUM=SUM+W(J)*F(J)*P(K)
      A(K)=SUM
16  CONTINUE
      OUTPUT 42,550
      OUTPUT 42,50,(A(K),K=1,M)
      CALL OUT
      6 CONTINUE
      GO TO 1
      3 CALL EXIT
      STOP
      END
      • LIST
      • LABEL
C649502
C      INPUT ALL CONSTANTS
      SUBROUTINE INPUT
      COMMON N,M,JR,H,IH,L,Y,XL,W,A,P,G,NI,A1,B1
      X ,IH1,L1,L2,H1,S,S1,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT
      DIMENSION XL(20),W(20),A(20),P(20),F(20),X(20),A1(10),B1(10)
      INPUT 41,20,N,M,JR,IH,L
      INPUT 41,21,(XL(J),J=1,JR),(W(I),I=1,JR),H,(A1(I),I=1,N),
      X (B1(J),J=1,N)
      OUTPUT 42,22,N,M,JR,IH,L
      OUTPUT 42,23,(XL(J),J=1,JR),(W(I),I=1,JR),C,H,(A1(I),I=1,N),
      X (B1(J),J=1,N)
      INPUT 41,1001,IH1,L1,L2
      INPUT 41,1002,H1,S,S1
      INPUT 41,1000,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT
      RETURN
1000 FORMAT(3A1)
1001 FORMAT(110)
1002 FORMAT(F10.3)
      20 FORMAT(5110)
      21 FORMAT(E20.8)
      22 FORMAT(1H15110)
      23 FORMAT(1H E20.8)
      END
      • LIST
      • LABEL
C649503
C      COMPUTE RETURN G AS FUNCTION OF Y
      SUBROUTINE RETG
      COMMON N,M,JR,H,IH,L,Y,XL,W,A,P,G,NI,A1,B1
      X ,IH1,L1,L2,H1,S,S1,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT
      DIMENSION XL(20),W(20),A(20),P(20),F(20),X(20),A1(10),B1(10)

```

```

XNI=NI
G=XNI*SQRTF(Y+1.)
RETURN
END
• LIST
• LABEL
C649504
C NORMALIZED POLYNOMIALS P(K) AS FUNCTIONS OF Y
SUBROUTINE POLY
COMMON N,M,JR,H,IH,L,Y,XL,W,A,P,G,NI,A1,B1
X ,IH1,L1,L2,H1,S,S1,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT
DIMENSION XL(20),W(20),A(20),P(20),F(20),X(20),A1(10),B1(10)
P(1)=1.
P(2)=SQRTF(3.)*(2.*Y-1.)
M1=M-2
DO 40 I=1,M1
BI=I
D=SQRTF(2.*BI+3.)/(BI+1.)
E=SQRTF(2.*BI+1.)
B=BI/SQRTF(2.*BI-1.)
40 P(I+2)=D*(E*(2.*Y-1.)*P(I+1)-B*P(I))
RETURN
END
• LIST
• LABEL
C649505
C COMPUTE AND OUTPUT TOTAL RETURN FUNCTION AT STAGE NI
SUBROUTINE OUT
COMMON N,M,JR,H,IH,L,Y,XL,W,A,P,G,NI,A1,B1
X ,IH1,L1,L2,H1,S,S1,HOLAST,HOLBL,HOLDOT
DIMENSION XL(20),W(20),A(20),P(20),F(20),X(20),A1(10),B1(10)
DIMENSION Z(110)
OUTPUT 42,75,NI,JR,M
75 FORMAT(20H1 ITERATIVE STAGE 15,5H R=13,5H M=13)
IF(L-1)13,18,18
13 OUTPUT 42,774
774 FORMAT(40H0 RESOURCE RETURN
DO 72 I9=1,IH
XI=I9
Y=(XI-1.)*H
CALL POLY
SUM=0.
DO 73 K=1,M
73 SUM=SUM+A(K)*P(K)
FF=SUM
OUTPUT 42,74,Y,FF
74 FORMAT(1H F15.3,E20.8)
72 CONTINUE
GO TO 71
18 CONTINUE
CO 772 I9=1,IH1
XI=I9
Y=(XI-1.)*H1
CALL POLY
SUM=0.
DO 773 K=1,M
773 SUM=SUM+A(K)*P(K)
FF=SUM
N5=FF*S+S1
DO 1003 I5=1,110

```

```
1003 Z(I5)=HOLBL
      DO 1004 I5=1,L2
        IF(I9-L1*L5-1)76,77,76
      77 DO 78 I6=1,I10
        Z(I6)=HOLDOT
      78 CONTINUE
      76 CONTINUE
1004 CONTINUE
      DO 1005 I5=1,I10,I0
1005 Z(I5)=HOLDOT
      Z(N5)=HCLAST
      OUTPUT 42,1006,Y,(Z(I7),I7=1,I05)
      772 CONTINUE
      71 CONTINUE
      RETURN
1006 FORMAT(1H F10.3,109A1)
      FNC
```

Appendix B

```

C      2 DIMENSIONAL ALLOCATION VIA DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING, APPROXIMATIONS
*      LIST
*      LABEL
C649500
      COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
      DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
      X      ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
      X      ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      1 CALL INPUT
      IF(N-100)2,3,3
C      STAGE 1
      2 NI=1
      OUTPUT 42,60,NI,JR,M
      60 FORMAT(20H1 ITERATIVE STAGE I5,5H R=I3,5H M=I3)
      OUTPUT 42,54
      54 FORMAT(90H0 X Y F
      X      XDEC YDEC )
      DO 4 I=1,JR
      X=XL(I)
      CALL POLY
      DO 600 K=1,M
      600 PX(K,I)=P(K)
      DO 41 J=1,JR
      Y=YL(J)
      CALL PHOLY
      DO 601 L=1,M
      601 PY(L,J)=PH(L)
      CALL RETG
      F(I,J)=G
      XDEC=XL(I)
      YDEC=YL(J)
      OUTPUT 42,61,X,Y,F(I,J),XDEC,YDEC
      61 FORMAT(1H 3E20.6,2F10.3)
      41 CONTINUE
      4 CONTINUE
      DO 5 K=1,M
      DO 51 L=1,M
      DO 52 I=1,JR
      SUM(I)=0.
      DO 402 J=1,JR
      402 SUM(I)=SUM(I)+V(J)*F(I,J)*PY(L,J)
      52 CONTINUE
      SUM1=0.
      DO 70 I=1,JR
      70 SUM1=SUM1+W(I)*PX(K,I)*SUM(I)
      A(K,L)=SUM1
      51 CONTINUE
      5 CONTINUE
      OUTPUT 42,50
      50 FORMAT(30H1 COEFFICIENTS A(K,L)
      OUTPUT 42,53,((A(I,J),I=1,M),J=1,M)
      53 FORMAT(1H 20.6)
      OUTPUT 42,556
      DO 55 I=1,3
      X=B(I)

```

```
Y=C(I)
CALL OUT
55 CONTINUE
C STAGE N1 GREATER THAN 1
DO 6 N2=2,N
NI=NI+1
OUTPUT 42,60,NI,JR,M
OUTPUT 42,54
DO 8 I=1,JR
DO 80 J=1,JR
X=0.
Y=0.
CALL RETG
X=XL(I)-0.
Y=YL(J)-0.
CALL TOTRET
F(I,J)=F1
XDEC=0.
YDEC=0.
DO 9 I1=1,IH
XI=I1
IF((XI-1.)*H-A1(I))9,99,99
99 CONTINUE
IF((XI-1.)*H-B1(I))991,991,11
991 CONTINUE
IF((XI-1.)*H-XL(I))10,10,11
10 CONTINUE
DO 91 J1=1,IH
XJ=J1
IF((XJ-1.)*H-C1(J))91,992,992
992 CONTINUE
IF((XJ-1.)*H-D1(J))993,993,9
993 CONTINUE
IF((XJ-1.)*H-YL(J))100,100,9
100 X=(XI-1.)*H
Y=(XJ-1.)*H
CALL RETG
X=XL(I)-(XI-1.)*H
Y=YL(J)-(XJ-1.)*H
CALL TOTRET
F2=F1
IF(F2-F(I,J))91,91,15
15 F(I,J)=F2
XDEC=(XI-1.)*H
YDEC=(XJ-1.)*H
91 CONTINUE
9 CONTINUE
11 CONTINUE
OUTPUT 42,61, XL(I),YL(J),F(I,J),XDEC,YDEC
80 CONTINUE
8 CONTINUE
DO 400 K=1,M
DO 401 L=1,M
DO 502 I=1,JR
```

```

SUM(I)=0.
DO 500 J=1,JR
500 SUM(I)=SUM(I)+V(J)*F(I,J)*PY(L,J)
502 CONTINUE
SUM1=0.
DO 501 I=1,JR
501 SUM1=SUM1+W(I)*SUM(I)*PX(K,I)
A(K,L)=SUM1
401 CONTINUE
400 CONTINUE
OUTPUT 42,50
OUTPUT 42,53,((A(I,J),I=1,M),J=1,M)
OUTPUT 42,556
556 FORMAT(54H0 TEST X Y F )
DO 555 I=1,3
X=B(I)
Y=C(I)
CALL OUT
555 CONTINUE
6 CONTINUE
GO TO 1
3 CALL EXIT
STOP
END
* LIST
* LABEL
C649501
C INPUT ALL CONSTANTS
SUBROUTINE INPUT
COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
X ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
X ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
INPUT 41,20,N,M,JR,IH
INPUT 41,21,(XL(J),J=1,JR),(W(I),I=1,JR),(YL(J),J=1,JR),
X (V(I),I=1,JR),H,(B(I),I=1,3),(C(J),J=1,3)
OUTPUT42,22,N,M,JR,IH
OUTPUT42,23,(XL(J),J=1,JR),(W(I),I=1,JR),(B(I),I=1,3),H
INPUT 41,233,(A1(I),I=1,JR),(B1(I),I=1,JR),(C1(I),I=1,JR),
X (D1(I),I=1,JR)
233 FORMAT(F10.3)
20 FORMAT(4I10)
21 FORMAT(E20.8)
22 FORMAT(1H14I10)
23 FORMAT(1H E20.8)
RETURN
END
* LIST
* LABEL
C649502
C COMPUTE RETURN G AS FUNCTION OF X AND Y
SUBROUTINE RETG
COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)

```

```

X      ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
X      ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      XNI=NI
      G=SQRTF(2.*XNI-1.)*SQRTF(SQRTF((X+.1)*(Y+.1)))
      RETURN
      END
*      LIST
*      LABEL
C649503
C      NORMALIZED POLYNOMIALS P(K) AS FUNCTIONS OF X
      SUBROUTINE POLY
      COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
      DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
X      ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
X      ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      P(1)=1.
      P(2)=SQRTF(3.)*(2.*X-1.)
      M1=M-2
      DO 40 I1=1,M1
      BI=I1
      D=SQRTF(2.*BI+3.)/(BI+1.)
      E=SQRTF(2.*BI+1.)
      T=BI/SQRTF(2.*BI-1.)
40    P(I1+2)=D*(E*(2.*X-1.)*P(I1+1)-T*P(I1))
      RETURN
      END
*      LIST
*      LABEL
C649504
C      NORMALIZED POLYNOMIALS PH(K) AS FUNCTIONS OF Y
      SUBROUTINE PHOLY
      COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
      DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
X      ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
X      ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      PH(1)=1.
      PH(2)=SQRTF(3.)*(2.*Y-1.)
      M1=M-2
      DO 90 I1=1,M1
      BI=I1
      D=SQRTF(2.*BI+3.)/(BI+1.)
      E=SQRTF(2.*BI+1.)
      T=BI/SQRTF(2.*BI-1.)
90    PH(I1+2)=D*(E*(2.*Y-1.)*PH(I1+1)-T*PH(I1))
      RETURN
      END
*      LIST
*      LABEL
C649505
C      COMPUTE TOTAL RETURN AS FUNCTION OF X,Y
      SUBROUTINE TOTRET
      COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
      DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
X      ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)

```

```

      X ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      CALL POLY
      CALL PHOLY
      DO 81 IL=1,M
      SUM2(IL)=0.
      DO 83 IK=1,M
83    SUM2(IL)=SUM2(IL)+P(IK)*A(IK,IL)
81    CONTINUE
      SUM3=0.
      DO 84 IL=1,M
84    SUM3=SUM3+PH(IL)*SUM2(IL)
      F1=G+SUM3
      RETURN
      END
*      LIST
*      LABEL
C649506
C      TOTAL RETURN FROM POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATION,FUNCTION OF X,Y
      SUBROUTINE CUT
      COMMON N,M,JR,NI,X,Y,G,F1,W,V,XL,YL,A,P,PH,F,B,C,IH,H,A1,B1,C1,D1
      DIMENSION W(20),V(20),XL(20),YL(20),A(20,20),P(20),PH(20),F(20,20)
      X ,B(3),C(3),SUM(20),SUM2(20),PX(20,20),PY(20,20)
      X ,B1(20),A1(20),C1(20),D1(20)
      CALL POLY
      CALL PHOLY
      DO 281 IL=1,M
      SUM2(IL)=0.
      DO 283 IK=1,M
283    SUM2(IL)=SUM2(IL)+P(IK)*A(IK,IL)
281    CONTINUE
      SUM3=0.
      DO 284 IL=1,M
284    SUM3=SUM3+PH(IL)*SUM2(IL)
      FF=SUM3
      OUTPUT 42,261,X,Y,FF
      RETURN
261  FORMAT(1H 3E20.6)
      END

```

000255

000255

REFERENCES

1. Bellman, R., and S. Dreyfus, Applied Dynamic Programming, The RAND Corporation, Report R-352, to appear; also to be published by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
2. Bellman, R., R. Kalaba, and M. Prestrud, "On a New Computational Solution of Time-dependent Transport Processes—I: One-dimensional Case," Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, Vol. 47, 1961, pp. 1072-1074.