

AD609904

MEMORANDUM
RM-4345-PR
JANUARY 1965

COPY	2	3	R
HARD COPY		3.00	
MICROFILM		0.75	

88P

THE NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF THE CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM

R. J. Clasen

PREPARED FOR:
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PROJECT RAND

The **RAND** Corporation
SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

ALWAYS USE

MEMORANDUM

RM-4345-PR

JANUARY 1965

**THE NUMERICAL SOLUTION OF
THE CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM**

R. J. Clasen

This research is sponsored by the United States Air Force under Project RAND—Contract No. AF 19(638)-700 monitored by the Directorate of Development Plans, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, 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.

DDC AVAILABILITY NOTICE

Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Documentation Center (DDC).

Approved for OTS release

The **RAND** *Corporation*

1700 MAIN ST • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA • 90406

PREFACE

This Memorandum is one in a continuing series of RAND publications dealing with theoretical computational questions arising from the RAND program of research in biology and physiology. The Memorandum contributes to our ability to apply computer technology to the analysis of complex chemical systems by considering the "chemical equilibrium problem," the problem of determining the distribution of chemical species that minimizes the free energy of a system while conserving the mass of each of the chemical elements.

Solutions to the chemical equilibrium problem published up to this time [4,5] apply to those problems for which an estimate of the solution exists. This Memorandum considers a problem for which no estimated solution exists and solves that problem with the maximum precision now available.

The mathematical aspects of this Memorandum should also be of interest in other fields where computational analyses of complex chemical systems are under consideration, e.g., in studies of rocket propulsion systems, planetary atmospheres, re-entry problems, etc.

SUMMARY

In physical chemistry, the "chemical equilibrium problem" is the problem of determining the distribution of chemical species that minimizes the free energy of a system while conserving the mass of each of the chemical elements. The reactions occurring within the chemical system may be quite complex. However, in a great number of cases, the mathematical statement of the problem can be simplified to a particular mathematical form [7,8] involving the minimization of a nonlinear objective function over a set of linear constraints.

This Memorandum presents the numerical solution of the chemical equilibrium problem by describing methods for starting the solution when an initial estimate is not available, and for improving an initial estimate to make it feasible. It presents a first-order method and a second-order method for solving the chemical equilibrium problem in the context of the linear-logarithmic programming problem [4] and provides convergence criteria for the majority of problems of this type that are likely to be attempted.

FOREWORD

In deciding between the languages of mathematics and physical chemistry, we have chosen in this Memorandum to use that of mathematics. The disadvantage of this choice is that the physical chemist may experience some difficulty in immediately identifying certain concepts. The advantage is that mathematical language divorces the methods from the physical assumptions involved in constructing a mathematical model of a physical system.* The mathematical methods are, hence, free to transcend their specific chemical applications.

The methods given here do not solve every problem that is specified in the given mathematical form. The solution of a problem in which some phase vanishes (a degenerate problem) requires further work. Some work has been done on particular degenerate systems [13], but the accurate numerical solution of a large general system of this type has yet to be accomplished. Until recently, a skilled physical chemist could intuitively eliminate the degeneracies of his model and

*The reader is referred to other works for the procedure of constructing the mathematical models of biochemical systems [9-12].

obviate the need for solving a degenerate system. But, as problems grow, eliminating degeneracy becomes increasingly difficult. Frequently, the point at which the problem becomes too large for the physical chemist to decide whether or not to include a phase coincides with the point at which the problem becomes numerically unwieldy. Hopefully, the future will eliminate these difficulties.

Statements about convergence and convergence tests exist, unless otherwise indicated, in the context of finite-accuracy numerics. Statements of this kind do not mean, in the absence of qualification, that no problem exists nor that no machine would serve as a counter example. Rather they are simply descriptions of what was found to occur in actual practice.

No attempt has been made to describe those methods which were tried and found wanting. The methods presented are those which are best for the largest number of cases.

Finally, it should be pointed out that although computing time was a factor, it was considered secondary to accuracy of results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The author wishes to thank J. C. DeHaven, E. C. DeLand, F. R. Gilmore, and N. Z. Shapiro for their many constructive comments and suggestions.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
SUMMARY	v
FOREWORD	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
Section	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE INITIAL SOLUTION	5
The Projection Method	5
The Linear Programming Method	9
3. THE LINEAR-LOGARITHMIC PROGRAMMING PROBLEM, FIRST-ORDER METHOD	15
4. THE FIRST-ORDER METHOD FOR SOLVING THE CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM	21
5. THE LINEAR-LOGARITHMIC PROGRAMMING PROBLEM, SECOND-ORDER METHOD	28
6. THE SECOND-ORDER CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM ALGORITHM	33
7. SUMMARY OF THE COMPUTATION PROCEDURE	35
Appendix	
A. A FORTRAN-IV PROGRAM FOR SOLVING THE CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM	37
General Description	37
Subroutines	41
Listing	45
Calling Sequence for Simplex Subroutine	56
B. MATRIX NOTATION AND FURTHER PROOFS	67
REFERENCES	79

1. INTRODUCTION

For the purposes of this Memorandum, the chemical equilibrium problem is merely a name we use for a particular mathematical programming problem, i.e., the problem of minimizing a particular nonlinear function $F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, defined below, while satisfying the linear restraints or constraints

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j = b_i \quad i=1,2,3,\dots,m \quad (1.1)$$

with $x_j \geq 0$ for $j=1,2,\dots,n$ and a_{ij} , b_i given constants. Assuming that the equations of (1.1) are linearly independent, then in order to have a non-trivial problem it can be assumed that $m < n$. The variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n can be considered components of a vector (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) . Solving the chemical equilibrium problem then is the problem of determining this vector. The variable x_j will be referred to as the " j^{th} component"; also the numerical value of x_j may be referred to as the "component" rather than using the perhaps linguistically correct but cumbersome term "component value."

The components are partitioned into p non-empty subsets called compartments. Let us denote these compartments by $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle 2 \rangle, \dots, \langle p \rangle$. Then if the j^{th} component is in the k^{th} compartment, we will say $j \in \langle k \rangle$, where each component is in exactly one compartment. The number of the compartment that the j^{th} component is in is denoted by $[j]$. Hence $j \in \langle k \rangle$ implies $[j] = k$, and conversely. Each compartment has associated with it a sum defined by

$$S_k = \sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} x_j . \quad (1.2)$$

The component fraction \hat{x}_j is defined by $\hat{x}_j = \frac{x_j}{S_{[j]}}$ whenever $S_{[j]} > 0$.

The objective function to be minimized over (1.1) is

$$F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j (c_j + \log \hat{x}_j) \quad (1.3)$$

where c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n are given constants, called objective constants.

When an x_j is zero, $\log \hat{x}_j$ is undefined; but we define $0 \log 0$ to equal 0 so that we may evaluate F when

some components are zero. A feasible solution to the chemical equilibrium problem is defined to be any set of non-negative components that satisfies (1.1). The problem is said to be feasible if it has feasible solutions. If no feasible solution is arbitrarily large in any component, the feasible problem is said to be bounded feasible; all practical problems with which one might have occasion to deal are bounded feasible.

A solution or optimal solution to a bounded feasible problem is any feasible solution in which $F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ attains the minimum value over all feasible solutions. A problem which has optimal solutions in which some component is zero is called degenerate, and a bounded feasible problem in which the components in any optimal solution are all strictly positive is called a non-degenerate problem. It has been shown [1, Theorem 12.1] that a non-degenerate problem has exactly one optimal solution. Hence, we may speak of the solution to the problem. Furthermore, it has also been shown^{*} for the non-degenerate problem that the minimization of F is equivalent to the existence of numbers $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m$, called Lagrange multipliers, which satisfy:

^{*}Ref. 1, p. 18.

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i a_{ij} = c_j + \log \hat{x}_j \quad j=1,2,3,\dots,n \quad (1.4)$$

In the following sections we derive conditions, analogous to (1.4), which are useful in solving the problem. In Sec. 2 we are interested in finding a solution to (1.1) with all $x_j > 0$. A set of x_j which satisfies these conditions is called a positive feasible solution. If (1.1) is satisfied with $x_j \geq 0$, we have called such a result a feasible solution. The theory of linear programming gives us methods of finding feasible solutions to problems with linear restraints. In Sec. 2, we use a linear programming technique to find a positive feasible solution. In Sec. 4 we show how to modify the initial positive feasible solution to get the solution to the problem.

2. THE INITIAL SOLUTION

The algorithms presented in the following sections require an initial positive feasible solution in order that the procedure for solving the problem can be initiated. Frequently, an individual with a problem to solve will be able to give a rather accurate estimate of its optimal solution. This estimate may be the exact solution of another problem which differs from the one being considered in relatively minor ways.

THE PROJECTION METHOD

Let us suppose that such is the case, and let us denote the estimate of the components by y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n . These values, substituting y_j for x_j in Eq. (1.1), will not generally satisfy (1.1), being somewhat in error. Let us denote these errors by g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m ; that is, let

$$g_i = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m \quad (2.1)$$

Then, we wish to find corrections to y_j such that, denoting the corrections by θ_j , we have

$$b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} (y_j + \theta_j) = 0 \quad i=1, 2, \dots, m$$

or

$$g_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \theta_j \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.2)$$

The θ_j must also be chosen such that $y_j + \theta_j > 0$, for all j . We cannot guarantee this condition, but we can attempt to choose small values for θ_j . One way to do this is to minimize

$$\sum_{j=1}^n w_j \theta_j^2$$

subject to (2.2), where w_j is the "weight" or relative importance of minimizing θ_j . This reduces to the problem of finding Lagrange multipliers $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m$, such that with

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \theta_j^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \theta_j - g_i \right) \quad (2.3)$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta_j} = 0 \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2.4)$$

Equation (2.4) becomes

$$w_j \theta_j = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} \pi_i \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2.5)$$

and substituting (2.5) into (2.2) we have

$$g_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \left[\pi_{\ell} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_{\ell j} a_{ij}}{w_j} \right) \right], \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.6)$$

The terms

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_{\ell j} a_{ij}}{w_j}$$

can be immediately evaluated; let us denote these terms

by

$$q_{\ell i} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_{\ell j} a_{ij}}{w_j} \quad (2.7)$$

Note that $q_{\ell i} = q_{i \ell}$. Then, (2.6) becomes

$$g_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^m q_{\ell i} \pi_{\ell} \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.8)$$

Equation (2.8) is a set of m simultaneous equations in the m unknowns, $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m$. These equations may be solved for $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m$, and then these values may be substituted in (2.5) to get $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n$. There remains the question of choosing values for the weighting factors w_j . In tests of this method, it has been found that using

$$w_j = \frac{1}{y_j}$$

yields satisfactory results. The choice of the weighting factors depends, to some extent, on the available computers. Using these weighting factors, we can summarize the computation of θ_j in the following three equations:

$$q_{\ell i} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{\ell j} a_{ij} y_j \quad \begin{matrix} i=1,2,\dots,m \\ \ell=1,2,\dots,m \end{matrix} \quad (2.9)$$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^m q_{\ell i} \pi_{\ell} = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.10)$$

$$\theta_j = y_j \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} \pi_i \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$x_j = y_j + \theta_j \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2.12)$$

The x_j from (2.12) will satisfy (1.1). However, the x_j need not all be strictly positive. If any x_j is zero or negative, this method of obtaining the initial solution, which we shall call the projection method, has failed. If the projection method fails, or if no initial estimate is provided, then a linear programming method may be used.

THE LINEAR PROGRAMMING METHOD

The terminology used in linear programming is similar to the terminology used above in describing the chemical equilibrium problem. The statement of a linear programming problem includes a set of linear restraints

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j = b_i \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.13)$$

together with a set of constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, \dots, C_n$, called costs. A feasible solution to a linear programming problem is any set of non-negative x_j such that (2.13) is satisfied. The costs are used to form the following expression, L , which is called the objective function

$$L = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j x_j . \quad (2.14)$$

For every set of feasible x_j , we can evaluate L . The set of feasible x_j for which L has the minimum value that it can have with any set of feasible x_j , is called a solution of the linear programming problem. A problem which has sets of feasible x_j is called a feasible problem, and a problem in which there are no sets of feasible x_j is called an infeasible problem. An infeasible problem has no solutions, while a feasible problem has at least one solution. In this discussion, we will not be concerned as to whether a problem has more than one solution: we will only be concerned with finding a solution to the problem. Since the means of finding a solution to a linear programming problem has been the subject of many papers and books, we will not give an actual method of solving the linear programming problem here. The reader may refer to Dantzig [2] for a complete discussion of the problem.

The problem of finding a feasible solution to a linear programming problem is itself a linear programming problem--that is, it involves finding a solution to the

problem with all C_j equal to zero. With all $C_j = 0$, L in (2.14) is zero for any set of feasible x_j ; hence, L is at its minimum value for any set of feasible x_j . Since L is at its minimum value for any feasible set of x_j , any feasible set of x_j is, by the above definition, a solution to the linear programming problem.

However, we must not only find a feasible solution to the linear programming problem, we must also find a positive feasible solution to the problem. In order to do this, we let

$$x_j = y_j + y_{n+1} \quad j=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2.15)$$

If we can find non-negative values of y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} which satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(y_j + y_{n+1}) = b_i \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.16)$$

then x_j , as defined by (2.15), will be a feasible solution. If we can somehow assure that y_{n+1} is positive, then all x_j will be positive. Rewriting (2.16), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \right) y_{n+1} = b_i \quad i=1,2,\dots,m \quad (2.17)$$

If we now specify C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{n+1} , we have a linear programming problem in $n+1$ unknowns. In order to guarantee that y_{n+1} is positive, if it is possible for it to be positive, we can maximize y_{n+1} . It is easy to see that we can maximize y_{n+1} by setting

$$L = - y_{n+1} \quad (2.18)$$

which is equivalent to setting $C_1=C_2=C_3=\dots=C_n=0$, $C_{n+1} = -1$. If the solution to the resulting linear programming problem is feasible and $y_{n+1} > 0$, then we have, by (2.15), a positive feasible solution to the analogous chemical equilibrium problem (1.1). If the linear programming problem is feasible but $y_{n+1} = 0$, then the analogous chemical equilibrium problem is degenerate, since there is no strictly positive solution to the problem. However, this is a rather trivial kind of degeneracy, and its occurrence usually indicates that a mistake was made in setting up the problem. Hence, this linear programming method gives us a way of finding a positive feasible solution to the chemical equilibrium problem if the chemical equilibrium problem is non-degenerate.

The positive feasible solution that we obtain by this method will generally not resemble the final solution of the chemical equilibrium problem. The initial positive feasible solution can be improved by the following technique. Define b_{m+1} to be some multiple, between zero and one, of the value of y_{n+1} that was obtained above. Then, adjoin to the linear restraints (2.17) one more restraint of the form $y_{n+1} = b_{m+1}$. Next, solve the linear programming problem with these restraints and with $C_1=c_1$, $C_2=c_2$, ..., $C_n=c_n$, $C_{n+1}=0$ (recall that the lower-case c's here refer to the c's in the chemical equilibrium problem (1.3)). The solution to this linear programming problem will give a set of components more nearly resembling the solution to the chemical equilibrium problem than did the components calculated from Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18). This new solution, in turn, may be improved by solving another linear programming problem (the details of which can be seen in SUBROUTINE LP in Appendix A) and averaging the new solution with the old solution.

In order to solve an elaborate chemical equilibrium problem it is not sufficient to simply use a method which we can prove converges to the correct solution. Proofs of convergence generally assume infinite computational accuracy, but since we are usually limited in practice to

about eight significant digits, the numerical solution will not always converge. However, it has been observed that the closer we can get to the solution by the initial solution methods described above, the greater will be the probability that the numerical procedure will converge. Furthermore, not only will the probability of convergence be greater, but the number of iterations to get to the solution will be fewer, and hence--when an improved initial solution is used--the computation time will be shorter. Unfortunately, the mathematical methods that are available for analyzing convergence of iterative processes do not, in the case of the chemical equilibrium problem, enable us to prove convergence when we are limited to finite mathematical accuracy. Only experience with a particular method will tell us whether it is a useful numerical procedure to use.

In the next section we consider a somewhat more general problem than the chemical equilibrium problem. This problem is considered first because the numerical results take on an especially simple form when the additional generality is admitted.

3. THE LINEAR-LOGARITHMIC PROGRAMMING PROBLEM,
FIRST-ORDER METHOD

In this section we consider the problem of minimizing

$$F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{j=1}^N x_j (c_j + d_j \log x_j) \quad (3.1)$$

while satisfying the linear restraints

$$\sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j = b_i \quad i=1, 2, 3, \dots, M \quad (3.2)$$

The symbols a_{ij} , b_i , c_j , and d_j denote constants, and x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N are the unknowns that we seek. We restrict the problem to the case that $d_j \neq 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$. We note that if $x_j < 0$, the term in (3.1), $x_j(c_j + d_j \log x_j)$, is undefined, whereas if $x_j > 0$ this term is defined. If $x_j = 0$ we define $x_j(c_j + d_j \log x_j) = 0$, since this expression approaches zero as $x_j > 0$ approaches zero. From this discussion, we see that, in order for a solution of Eqs. (3.1) and (3.2) to be defined, we must assume that $x_j \geq 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$.

We may attempt to solve this problem using Lagrange multipliers.* In this method we let

$$L = F(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N) - \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\pi_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j - b_i \right) \right]$$

and then set

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial x_j} = 0$$

for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$. Performing the partial differentiation, we get

$$c_j + d_j \log x_j + d_j - \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i a_{ij} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

$j=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$

or, when rearranged,

$$\log x_j = d_j^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i a_{ij} - c_j - d_j \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

$j=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$

* See Kaplan, Ref. 3, p. 128, or Dantzig, Ref. 2, p. 140.

Exponentiating both sides of (3.4), we get

$$x_j = \exp \left[d_j^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i a_{ij} - d_j^{-1} c_j - 1 \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

$j=1, 2, 3, \dots, N$

Note that for (3.5) to be a solution to the problem, we must have all $x_j > 0$. We assume, in the remainder of this section, that the solution does have all $x_j > 0$. Then, the problem reduces to the problem of determining the M π_i so that the x_j from (3.5) satisfy (3.2). Equivalently, the $M + N$ equations (3.2) and (3.5) must be satisfied simultaneously by the proper choice of the $M + N$ unknowns, $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$. We now consider two methods of approximating the solution.

In the first method, we suppose that we have an estimate of the x_j which may or may not satisfy (3.2). We denote this estimate by y_j , and, in this method, solve Eqs. (3.2) and (3.4) simultaneously by making a linear approximation to $\log x_j$. Since we have the estimate that x_j is near y_j , we note that the first-order Taylor expansion of $\log x_j$ about y_j is

$$\log x_j = \log y_j + \frac{x_j - y_j}{y_j} + (\text{higher-order terms}) . \quad (3.6)$$

Dropping the higher-order terms, and substituting (3.6) into (3.4) and solving for x_j , we have

$$x_j = y_j \left[d_j^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^M \pi_i a_{ij} - d_j^{-1} c_j - \log y_j \right] . \quad (3.7)$$

$j=1,2,3,\dots,N$

Now, if we substitute these x_j into (3.2), we get

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^M \left(\sum_{j=1}^N d_j^{-1} a_{ij} a_{\ell j} y_j \right) \pi_{\ell} = b_i + \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} y_j (\log y_j + d_j^{-1} c_j) .$$

$i=1,2,3,\dots,M$

Denoting

$$r_{i\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^N d_j^{-1} a_{ij} a_{\ell j} y_j \quad \begin{matrix} \ell=1,2,3,\dots,M \\ i=1,2,3,\dots,M \end{matrix} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$s_i = b_i + \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} y_j (\log y_j + d_j^{-1} c_j) \quad (3.9)$$

$i=1,2,3,\dots,M$

we have

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^M r_{i\ell} \pi_{\ell} = s_i \quad i=1,2,3,\dots,M \quad (3.10)$$

Equation (3.10) is a set of simultaneous equations which can be solved for $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$.

With the above results, we can now define the iterative process for the first method. At each iteration we have a set of values for x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N . At the beginning of the iteration these values are called y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N , and at the end of the iteration the values are x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N . If

$$\frac{x_j - y_j}{y_j}$$

is small for each j , then we say we have converged. The magnitude of "small" depends on the nature of the problem.

If

$$\frac{x_j - y_j}{y_j}$$

is not small for some j , then we have not converged and the iteration must be repeated. One iteration consists of the following three steps:

- 1) Evaluate terms in Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9), these terms depending on y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N ;
- 2) Solve Eq. (3.10) for $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$;
- 3) Substitute $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$ into (3.7) to get x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N .

For this problem, in this generality, we can say nothing about whether this iterative process converges. In the next section we will show that the chemical equilibrium problem is a special case of this problem, and one for which, with appropriate modification, this method does converge.

4. THE FIRST-ORDER METHOD FOR SOLVING THE
CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM

The chemical equilibrium problem is a special case of the linear-logarithmic programming problem. In order to put Eqs. (3.1) and (3.2) into the form of Eqs. (1.1) and (1.3), we first define

$$N = n+p$$

$$M = m+p$$

where, as stated previously, p is the number of compartments in the problem. Then we define a_{ij} , b_i , x_j , and c_j , for $i > m$ and $j > n$, as follows

$$b_i = 0 \quad i=m+1, m+2, \dots, M \quad (4.1)$$

$$c_j = 0 \quad j=n+1, n+2, \dots, N \quad (4.2)$$

$$x_{k+n} = S_k \quad k=1, 2, \dots, p \quad (4.3)$$

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \leq m, j > n \\ 1 & \text{if } i > m, j \leq n, \text{ and } [j] = i-m \\ 0 & \text{if } i > m, j \leq n, \text{ and } [j] \neq i-m \\ -1 & \text{if } i > m, j > n, \text{ and } i-m = j-n \\ 0 & \text{if } i > m, j > n, \text{ and } i-m \neq j-n . \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

For all j , we define

$$d_j = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } j \leq n \\ -1 & \text{if } j > n . \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

With these definitions, it has been shown [4] that the two problems are identical. Next, we let

$$x_j = y_j + \theta_j \quad (4.6)$$

$$\pi_i = \begin{cases} \pi'_i & i \leq m \\ \pi'_i + \log S_{i-m} + 1 . & i > m \end{cases}$$

Substituting Eqs. (4.1) through (4.6) into (3.7) through (3.10) and simplifying, we have

$$\theta_j = y_j \left[\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} \pi'_i - c_j - \log \hat{y}_j + \pi'_{[j]+m} \right] \quad (4.7)$$

$j=1, 2, \dots, n$

$$r_{i\ell} = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} a_{\ell j} y_j & \ell \leq m, i \leq m \\ \sum_{j \in \langle i-m \rangle} a_{\ell j} y_j & \ell \leq m, i > m \\ \sum_{j \in \langle \ell-m \rangle} a_{ij} y_j & \ell > m, i \leq m \\ 0 & \ell > m, i > m \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

$$s'_i = \begin{cases} b_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j - 1) & i \leq m \\ \sum_{j \in \langle i-m \rangle} y_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) & i > m \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^M r_{i\ell} \pi'_i = s'_i \quad i=1, 2, \dots, M \quad (4.10)$$

The directional derivative of F in the direction $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ is given by [1, Theorem 8.11] to be

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) . \quad (4.11)$$

But, if we compute $\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2 d_j}{y_j}$ where by (3.7)

$$\theta_{k+n} = S_k \left[\pi_{m+k} - \log S_k - 1 \right] = S_k \pi'_{m+k} \quad (4.12)$$

k=1,2,...,p

we show, in Appendix B, that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2 d_j}{y_j} = - \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) + \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i \left(b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j \right) . \quad (4.13)$$

Thus, if we assume that (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is feasible, we get the interesting result that the directional derivative of F in the direction $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ is

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) = - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2 d_j}{y_j} \leq 0 . \quad (4.14)$$

However, it is also shown in Appendix B that the equality on the right side of (4.14) holds if and only if the values for y_j are optimal. We further note that if (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is feasible, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \theta_j = 0$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Hence, if (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is feasible, then $(y_1 + \lambda \theta_1, y_2 + \lambda \theta_2, \dots, y_n + \lambda \theta_n)$ will be feasible for any λ for which each $y_j + \lambda \theta_j$ is positive.

We now state the first-order chemical equilibrium algorithm:

- 1) Calculate $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ using Eqs. (4.7) through (4.10).
- 2) Calculate the directional derivative of F in the direction $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$ as given by Eq. (4.11); if this quantity is not negative, we are done.
- 3) Calculate

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\theta_j}{y_j} \right)^2}$$

ϵ is a number that represents the root-mean-square error in (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) . If ϵ is less than some given number (say, 0.001), we are done.

4) Calculate the ratio $-y_j/\theta_j$ for every j for which $\theta_j < 0$. Let λ_1 be the minimum of all such ratios and let $\lambda = \min(1, \beta\lambda_1)$, where β is a number less than 1 but close to 1 (say, 0.99). We now perform the following steps until the test at c) below is satisfied:

a) Let $z_j = y_j + \lambda\theta_j$;

b) Compute the directional derivative of F at z_j in the direction $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)$: $f(\lambda) = \theta_j(c_j + \log \hat{z}_j)$;

c) If $f(\lambda) \leq 0$, go directly to step 5);

d) Replace λ by $\gamma\lambda$, where $0 < \gamma < 1$, e.g., $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2}$.

5) Finally, replace y_j by $y_j + \lambda\theta_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Steps 1-5 are repeated until either the test in step 2 or the test in step 3 is satisfied.

If this process terminates, the solution will be optimal within the specified limits of accuracy. It may happen that the process does not terminate. Since the objective function F is convex^{*} and assuming infinite computational accuracy, non-termination can occur only because the values chosen for λ become smaller on every

^{*}Ref. 1, Theorem 8.13; Ref. 5.

iteration. This will occur only if some y_j is approaching zero, and hence (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is approaching a point at which, if it were the optimal solution, the problem would be degenerate. It is possible for this to happen for a non-degenerate problem for which the initial solution chosen was too far from the optimal solution. Convergence can be guaranteed by imposing the condition that the value of F at the initial solution be less than the value of F at any feasible, degenerate point. However, it is not practical to impose this condition on the initial solution since it may be very difficult to find such a point. In practice, it has been found that round-off errors cause more difficulty than the possible selection of a poor initial solution.

5. THE LINEAR-LOGARITHMIC PROGRAMMING PROBLEM,
SECOND-ORDER METHOD

In the first-order method, presented in Sec. 3, the iterative process was initiated with an estimate of the value of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N . In the second-order method, we assume that the problem is as defined by Eqs. (3.1) and (3.2), but that we have initial estimates for the values of $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$. Let us denote these estimates by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_M$. The x_j can then be evaluated by Eq. (3.5), substituting λ_i for π_i . These x_j , however, probably will not satisfy Eq. (3.2). The problem of the second-order method is to find numbers $\Delta\lambda_1, \Delta\lambda_2, \dots, \Delta\lambda_M$, such that

$$\pi_i = \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i \quad i=1,2,\dots,M \quad (5.1)$$

when substituted into (3.5) will give x_j that satisfy (3.2).

In order to accomplish this, we first use the x_j calculated from Eq. (3.5) to get

$$g_i = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}x_j \quad i=1,2,\dots,M \quad (5.2)$$

where g_i represents the amount that equation i is in error.

Next, we evaluate

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_\ell}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_\ell} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_\ell} \left[b_i - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j \right] = - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \frac{\partial x_j}{\partial \lambda_\ell} \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_\ell} \left[\exp \left(d_j^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^M \lambda_h a_{hj} - d_j^{-1} c_j - 1 \right) \right] \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} d_j^{-1} x_j a_{\ell j} = - r_{\ell i} \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where $r_{\ell i}$ is given by Eq. (3.8). If we make a very small change, $d\lambda_1, d\lambda_2, \dots$, in $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$, the change in g_1, g_2, \dots , is given by dg_1, dg_2, \dots , where

$$dg_i = + \sum_{\ell=1}^M \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_\ell} d\lambda_\ell \quad i=1, 2, \dots, M$$

or

$$dg_i = - \sum_{\ell=1}^M r_{\ell i} d\lambda_{\ell} . \quad i=1,2,\dots,M \quad (5.4)$$

We would want dg_i to be equal to $-g_i$ as computed by Eq. (5.2). If we make the approximation that

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_{\ell}}$$

is constant over the domain considered, we can set

$dg_i = -g_i$, let $d\lambda_{\ell} = \Delta\lambda_{\ell}$, and write

$$g_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^M r_{\ell i} \Delta\lambda_{\ell} . \quad i=1,2,\dots,M \quad (5.5)$$

Equation (5.5) consists of M equations in the M unknowns $\Delta\lambda_1, \Delta\lambda_2, \dots, \Delta\lambda_M$. We may thus solve Eq. (5.5) for $\Delta\lambda_1, \Delta\lambda_2, \dots, \Delta\lambda_M$ and compute $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$ from (5.1). If the assumption about

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_{\ell}}$$

being constant over the domain considered was correct, then

the x_j computed from (3.5) with these values for π_i will satisfy (3.2). However, in general, they will not satisfy (3.2), but, if we were close enough to the solution so that the

$$\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial \lambda_i}$$

did not vary greatly in the domain considered, then the new values for x_j should come closer to satisfying (3.2) than did the first set of x_j .

With this assumption, we may now state the iterative process:

- a) Using the values at hand for $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$, evaluate (3.5).
- b) Using the values for x_j obtained in step a, evaluate (5.2). If the $|g_i|$ are sufficiently small, we are done.
- c) Compute $r_{i'}$ using (3.8) and solve (5.5) for $\Delta \lambda_i$.
- d) Denoting the π_i in step a by λ_i , we get new π_i by (5.1).

Steps a-d are repeated until the $|g_i|$, computed in step b, are sufficiently small, or until they show no more improvement.

There is no proof of convergence for this method.

In fact, the method presented here is unlikely to converge unless the starting values of $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M$ are very good, and even then there may be no convergence. This method may be used on the chemical equilibrium problem after the first-order method has resulted in a reasonably good solution.

If the π_i obtained from (3.10) in the final iteration of the first-order method are used to initiate the second-order method, the accuracy produced by the second-order method will generally be better than that which could be achieved by use of the first-order method only.

6. THE SECOND-ORDER CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM ALGORITHM

In order that the second-order linear-logarithmic method be set in the form of a chemical equilibrium problem, the same definitions as given in Sec. 4--i.e., Eqs. (4.1) through (4.5)--are used here. Since the second-order method is best used after the first-order method has been applied, the initial values of π_i for the second-order method must be specified. The first-order method gives a set of π'_i which are related to π_i by Eq. (4.6). The π_i computed by means of (4.6) are appropriate initial values for the second-order method. Using these initial values for π_i , the second-order chemical equilibrium algorithm is an iterative process for which each iteration consists of the following steps:

- 1) Using the current values for $(\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M)$, evaluate x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n by means of (3.5).
- 2) Calculate g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m by means of (5.2) and set $g_{m+1}, g_{m+2}, \dots, g_M$ equal to zero.
- 3) Compute $r_{i\ell}$ from (4.8) and solve (5.5) for $\Delta\lambda_1, \Delta\lambda_2, \dots, \Delta\lambda_M$.
- 4) Let

$$P = \max_{i=1}^M |\Delta\lambda_i| .$$

If $P < \delta$, where δ is a small positive number such as 10^{-5} , we are done; otherwise, let $Q = \min\left(\frac{1}{P}, 1\right)$.

5) Replace π_i by $\pi_i + Q \Delta\lambda_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$.

Steps 1-5 are repeated until the test at 4) is satisfied.

P should decrease at every iteration; however, when the values for π_i get close to their optimal values, P may not become zero due to round-off error. In order to prevent an endless repetition of steps 1-5 due to the selection of too small a δ , we can test P against the value of P at the previous iteration. If this value has increased over the previous iteration, it can be assumed that this method has obtained as accurate a solution as possible, and we can terminate the iteration process. The reason for inserting the factor Q above is to prevent the π_i from varying too much on one iteration.

7. SUMMARY OF THE COMPUTATION PROCEDURE

The best method for starting the solution of the chemical equilibrium problem depends on whether an estimate for the solution vector is available. The projection method should be used when the problem being solved is a slight variation from a problem previously solved, and in this case, the values used for y_j in (2.9 - 2.12) should be the solution vector to the previous problem. Even when the estimate is no better than an intuitive guess, the projection method may still be used. The linear programming method, then, may be used as a back-up if the projection method produces a non-positive component. Of course, if no estimate is available, the linear programming method would be used immediately to provide an estimate.

The recommended procedure is, then, to use the first-order method until either no further progress can be made with this method or until the amount of change becomes small from iteration to iteration, and then to use the second-order method. It has been found that, for reasonably large problems (say $m = 30$, $n = 100$), the point at which progress ceases in the first-order method usually occurs when the indicated corrections to the components

of the solution vector average about one per cent of the components; that is, when (3.5) is accurate to about two significant digits. A switch to the second-order method at this point usually yields quite accurate results in two iterations of the second-order method. The second-order method usually satisfies (1.1) to an accuracy of about five significant digits on a machine that carries eight significant digits. This accuracy is typically about three orders of magnitude above what is usually obtained in experimental data.

To summarize, the typical procedure for solving a chemical equilibrium problem is the following:

- 1) If an estimate is available, use the projection method to obtain a feasible estimate.

- 2) If step 1 yields a strictly positive estimate, go to step 3, but if the projection method yields non-positive components, or if there was no initial estimate, then use the linear programming method to get an estimate.

- 3) Use the first-order method until one of the tests described in Section 4 is satisfied.

- 4) Use the second-order method as described in Section 6.

Appendix A

A FORTRAN-IV PROGRAM FOR SOLVING THE
CHEMICAL EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The program described here is a set of FORTRAN-IV subroutines for solving chemical equilibrium problems.

The calling sequence used is merely the statement:

CALL SOLVE

Communication of data into and out of the subroutines is accomplished by a block common statement:

```
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121),  
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65),  
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65)
```

The data that must be input before CALL SOLVE is executed consist of the following:

<u>COMMON Location</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
IV(1)	m
IV(2)	M (= m+p)
IV(3)	p
IV(4)	n
IV(6)	Number of the output unit.

<u>COMMON Location</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
IV(7)	Print flag: -1 = minimal amount of messages; 0 = one message per iteration step; +1 = all messages.
IV(9)	Maximum number of iterations to be allowed.
B(i)	b_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
X(j)	y_j , $j=1, 2, \dots, m$, where y_j is the initial estimate of the solution. If no estimate is available, set $X(J) = 0$.
C(j)	c_j , $j=1, 2, \dots, n$.
A(i,j)	a_{ij} , $i=1, 2, \dots, m$; $j=1, 2, \dots, n$.

In addition, all components in one compartment must have consecutive subscripts. That is, components $1, 2, 3, \dots, k_1$ must be in compartment 1; components k_1+1, k_1+2, \dots, k_2 must be in compartment 2; ...; and components $k_{p-1}+1, k_{p-1}+2, \dots, k_p$ must be in compartment p. These k's are communicated to the subroutines by setting

$$KL(1) = 1$$

$$KL(2) = k_1+1$$

$$KL(3) = k_2+1$$

⋮

$$KL(p) = k_{p-1}+1$$

$$KL(p+1) = k_p+1$$

In other words, $KL(k)$ is the number of the first component in compartment k , and $KL(p+1)$ is equal to $n+1$.

The above are the only numbers that need be set in order that CALL SOLVE will solve the chemical equilibrium problem. However, in order that the program can write messages, in cases of infeasibility, etc., names for the rows, components, and compartments may be input:

<u>COMMON Location</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
NR(I,1), NR(I,2)	Two-word row name for row I.
KN(J)	One-word component name for component J.
NAM (K,1), NAM(K,2)	Two-word compartment name for compartment K.

In addition, TOL(1) through TOL(5) are tolerances used by the program. If they are zero when the program is entered, they are set by the subroutines to nominal values. These values may also be set by the user of the subroutines, in which case the nominal values will not be set in the subroutines. These tolerances are the following:

<u>Tolerance</u>	<u>Nominal Value</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
TOL(1)	0.01	ϵ in step 3 of the first-order method (see Sec. 4).

<u>Tolerance</u>	<u>Nominal Value</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
TOL(2)	10^{-5}	δ in step 4 of the second-order method (see Sec. 6).
TOL(3)	10^{-12}	Minimum value any x_j is allowed to have.
TOL(4)	10^{-6}	Minimum starting value that any component will have is the lesser of TOL(4) and $\frac{1}{2}y_{n+1}$ (see Sec. 2).
TOL(5)	10^{-8}	Problem is assumed to be degenerate if any S_k becomes less than TOL(5).

With the above as input, the statement CALL SOLVE will cause an attempt to solve the chemical equilibrium problem. If, upon completion of this attempt, a solution is obtained, the cell

IV(10)

will contain a 1 and the following data will be in storage:

<u>COMMON Location</u>	<u>Data</u>
X(i)	x_i , $i=1,2,\dots,n$ (the solution).
XBAR(k)	S_k , $k=1,2,\dots,p$.
PIE(i)	π_i , $i=1,2,\dots,m$.
XMF(i)	\hat{x}_i , $i=1,2,\dots,n$.

If IV(10) is not 1, the subroutines have failed to solve the chemical equilibrium problem. The reason for this failure is written on output unit IV(6). In such a case, X(i) will contain the latest value of these quantities.

SUBROUTINES

There are nine subroutines in the set used for the solution of the chemical equilibrium problem. A brief description of these subroutines follows.

1. Subroutine SOLVE

SOLVE is the master subroutine, and is divided into four functional segments. Each segment calls other subroutines which do specific tasks. The four segments are:

- a) The projection and linear programming routines for obtaining the initial solution (lines 18-42).
- b) The first-order method (lines 43-122).
- c) The second-order method (lines 123-163).
- d) Output messages (lines 164-203).

2. Subroutine BAR

BAR calculates the S_k .

3. Subroutine BERROR

BERROR calculates

$$g_i = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j \quad i=1,2,\dots,M$$

4. Subroutine DEL

DEL sets

$$w_j = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} q_i \quad j=1,2,\dots,n$$

5. Subroutine RCALC

RCALC calculates the r_{ij} array (4.8).

6. Subroutine CLOG

CLOG computes

$$\alpha_j = c_j + \log \hat{x}_j \quad j=1,2,\dots,n$$

7. Subroutine LP

LP sets up the linear programming problems.

8. Subroutine SIMPLE

SIMPLE solves the linear programming problems.

Information is communicated to this routine via a

calling sequence rather than by `COMMON` as in subroutines 1-7. The dimension of `A` in `SIMPLE` should agree with the dimension of `A` in the first seven subroutines, but all other dimensions are dummy statements.

9. Subroutine `MATINV`

`MATINV` solves simultaneous equations. As in `SIMPLE`, no `COMMON` is used. The dimension of `A` in `MATINV` should agree with that of `R` (not `A`) in `SOLVE`. All other dimensions are singly subscripted and are irrelevant as to magnitude.

* * *

Each of the first seven subroutines has a `COMMON` statement which should be the same in all seven. The dimensions of the variables in this `COMMON` statement may be set to the values for the largest problem to be solved. With `m`, `M`, `p`, and `n` as previously defined, these dimensions must be at least:

<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Minimum Dimension</u>
IV	30
TOL	20
NR	(m, 2)
B	m
KN	n
X	n+1
C	n+1
KL	p+1
NAM	(p, 2)
A	(m, n+1)
PIE	M
V1, V2, V3, V4	M
XMF	n
X1, X2, X3	n+1
XBAR	p
R	(M, M) .

A listing of these subroutines follows. This listing does not necessarily represent an actual program. The language used was that version of FORTRAN described in [6]. The machine used for the solution of chemical equilibrium problems was the IBM-7044, which uses a floating-point number with eight bits for the exponent and 28 bits for the sign and mantissa.

LISTING

```
SUBROUTINE SOLVE                                S0001
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121), S0002
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65), S0003
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65) S0004
  INTEGER PF S0005
  EQUIVALENCE (TOL(3),XMIN),(TOL(4),XSTART),(TOL(5),BARMIN) S0006
  EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NTOT), S0007
1  (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),ITMAX), S0008
2  (IV(10),IERROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE) S0009
  DIMENSION DX(1),ALPHA(1),TH(1),G(1) S0010
  EQUIVALENCE (G,V1),(DX,X1),(ALPHA,X2),(TH,X3) S0011
  IF (TOL(1).LE.0.0) TOL(1) = 0.01 S0012
  IF (TOL(2).LE.0.0) TOL(2) = 1.E-5 S0013
  IF (XMIN.LE.0.0) XMIN = 1.E-12 S0014
  IF (BARMIN.LE.0.0) BARMIN = 1.E-8 S0015
  IF (ITMAX.LE.0) ITMAX = 40 S0016
  DO 152 J = 1, NTOT S0017
    IF (X(J).LE.0.) GO TO 5 S0018
  152 CONTINUE S0019
  C IF X IS STRICTLY POSITIVE, BEGIN PROJECTION S0020
    CALL BAR(X,XBAR) S0021
    2 CALL BERROR(ERR) S0022
    CALL RCALC S0023
    CALL MATINV(R,MEND,G,-1,V2,V3,V4,KE) S0024
    IF (KE.NE.0) GO TO 5 S0025
    CALL DEL(DX,G) S0026
    DO 3 K = 1,NCOMP S0027
      KTA = KL(K) S0028
      KTB = KL(K+1)-1 S0029
      MK = M + K S0030
      DO 4 J = KTA,KTB S0031
        X(J) = X(J) * ( 1. + DX(J) + G(MK) ) S0032
        IF (X(J).LE.0.) GO TO 5 S0033
      4 CONTINUE S0034
    3 CONTINUE S0035
    GO TO 7 S0036
  C LINEAR PROGRAMMING ROUTINE S0037
    5 CALL LP(KF) S0038
    IF (KF.NE.0) GO TO 10006 S0039
    7 CALL BAR(X,XBAR) S0040
    CALL CLOG(X,XBAR) S0041
    FE2 = 1.E+20 S0042
  C FIRST ORDER METHOD LOOP S0043
    DO 899 ITER=1,ITMAX S0044
      CALL BERROR(ERR) S0045
      DO 7110 I=1,MEND S0046
        PIE(I) = 0. S0047
      7110 CONTINUE S0048
      DO 7111 K = 1, NCOMP S0049
        KTA = KL(K) S0050
        KTB = KL(K+1) - 1 S0051
        MK = M + K S0052
        DO 7112 J = KTA, KTB S0053
          AX = ALPHA(J) * X(J) S0054
          PIE(MK) = PIE(MK) + AX S0055
          DO 7113 I = 1,M S0056
            PIE(I) = PIE(I) + AX * A(I,J) S0057
          7113 CONTINUE S0058
        7112 CONTINUE S0059
      7111 CONTINUE S0060
```

```
DO 7114 I = 1,4                                S0061
  PIE(I) = G(I) + PIE(I) *                    S0062
7114 CONTINUE                                  S0063
  CALL RCALC                                   S0064
  CALL MATINV(R,MEND,PIE,-1,V2,V3,V4,KE)      S0065
  IF(KE.NE.0) GO TO 10003                      S0066
  DMAX = 1.E+20                               S0067
  CALL DEL(TH,PIE)                             S0068
7105 GNORM=0.                                  S0069
  TDA = 0.                                     S0070
  FE = 0.                                       S0071
DO 7104 K=1,NCOMP                              S0072
  MK = M + K                                    S0073
  KTA = KL(K)                                  S0074
  KTB = KL(K+1) -1                            S0075
  DO 7103 J = KTA, KTB                        S0076
    TH(J) = TH(J) +PIE(MK)- ALPHA(J)         S0077
    GNORM = GNORM + TH(J) **2                 S0078
    TH(J) = TH(J) * X(J)                     S0079
    TDA = TDA + TH(J) * ALPHA(J)             S0080
    IF (X(J).LT.-DMAX*TH(J)) DMAX = -X(J)/TH(J) S0081
    FE = FE + X(J) * ALPHA(J)                S0082
7103 CONTINUE                                  S0083
7104 CONTINUE                                  S0084
  EPS= SQRT ( GNORM/FLOAT (NTOT) )           S0085
  DFE = FE - FE2                               S0086
  FE2 = FE                                       S0087
  IF (ITER.EQ.1) GO TO 7120                   S0088
  ITR = ITER - 1                               S0089
  IF(PF.GE.0) WRITE(NOT,799) ITR, DFE,OPTL,EPS S0090
7120 OPTL =AMIN1 ( 1., .99*DMAX )             S0091
  IF(PF.GT.0)WRITE(NCT,8241)                  S0092
  IF (EPS.LE.TOL(1)) GO TO 8259              S0093
  826 IF (TDA.GE.0.) GO TO 8267                S0094
  826 DO 8265 II =1,54                          S0095
    DO 8301 J = 1,N                             S0096
      DX(J) = AMAX1(X(J) + OPTL*TH(J) ,XMIN)   S0097
  8301 CONTINUE                                  S0098
    CALL BAR(DX,XBAR)                            S0099
    CALL CLOG(DX,XBAR)                            S0100
    TDA = 0.                                       S0101
    DO 8266 J = 1,NTOT                             S0102
      TDA = TDA + TH(J)*ALPHA(J)                S0103
  8266 CONTINUE                                  S0104
    IF(PF.GT.0)WRITE(NCT, 8262)II,OPTL, TDA    S0105
    IF ( TDA.LT.0.) GO TO 828                  S0106
  8264 OPTL = OPTL /1.4142                       S0107
  8265 CONTINUE                                  S0108
    CALL BAR(X,XBAR)                              S0109
    GO TO 8271                                    S0110
  828 DO 8281 J =1,NTOT                          S0111
    X(J) = DX(J)                                  S0112
  8281 CONTINUE                                  S0113
    FE = 0.                                       S0114
    DO 8231 J=1,N                                 S0115
      FE = FE + ALPHA(J)*X(J)                   S0116
  8231 CONTINUE                                  S0117
  8288 CALL SSWTCH(5,LABEL)                      S0118
    IF (LABEL.NC.2) GO TO 10004                S0119
  899 CONTINUE                                  S0120
```

```
C END OF FIRST ORDER METHOD LOOP                                S0121
GO TO 10002                                                    S0122
6000 ITER1 = ITER + 1                                          S0123
    PMAX = 1.E+20                                              S0124
    PMAX1 = 1.E+21                                             S0125
C SECOND ORDER METHOD LOOP                                      S0126
DO 6002 ITER = ITER1,ITMAX                                     S0127
    CALL DEL(DX,PIE)                                          S0128
    DO 6003 K = 1,NCOMP                                       S0129
        MTA = KL(K)                                           S0130
        MTB = KL(K+1) - 1                                       S0131
        DO 6010 J = MTA,MTB                                     S0132
            XMF(J) = EXP ( DX(J) -C(J) )                       S0133
            X(J) = XMF(J)*XBAR(K)                               S0134
6010 CONTINUE                                                S0135
        IF (XBAR(K).LE.SARMIN) GO TO 10005                     S0136
6003 CONTINUE                                                S0137
        IF (PMAX.LE.TOL(2).OR.(PMAX.GE.PMAX1.AND.PMAX.GE.PMAX2) ) S0138
            1 GO TO 10001                                       S0139
        CALL BERROR(ERR)                                       S0140
6006 CALL RCALC                                               S0141
        CALL MATINV(R,MEND,G, -1,V2,V3,V4,KE)                 S0142
        IF(KE.NE.0) GO TO 10003                                 S0143
        PMAX2 = PMAX1                                          S0144
        PMAX1 = PMAX                                           S0145
        PMAX = 0.                                              S0146
        DO 6004 I = 1,MEND                                     S0147
            PMAX =AMAX1 ( PMAX, ABS ( G(I) ) )                 S0148
6004 CONTINUE                                                S0149
        IF (PMAX.EQ.0.0) GO TO 10001                           S0150
        ZM =AMIN1 ( 1./PMAX,1.)                               S0151
        DO 6005 I = 1,M                                       S0152
            PIE(I) = PIE(I) + ZM* G(I)                         S0153
6005 CONTINUE                                                S0154
        DO 6011 K = 1,NCOMP                                     S0155
            MK = M+K                                           S0156
            XBAR(K) = XBAR(K)* EXP ( ZM * G(MK) )             S0157
6011 CONTINUE                                                S0158
            IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE(NOT,6099) ITER,PMAX,ERR        S0159
            CALL SSWTCH(5,LABEL)                                S0160
            IF (LABEL.NE.2) GO TO 10004                         S0161
6002 CONTINUE                                                S0162
C END OF SECOND ORDER METHOD LOOP                              S0163
10002 IERROR = 2                                             S0164
    WRITE(NOT,20002)                                           S0165
20002 FORMAT(27H ITERATION LIMIT EXCEEDED )                   S0166
    ITER = ITMAX                                              S0167
    GO TO 10000                                               S0168
10003 IERROR = 3                                             S0169
    WRITE(NOT,20003) KE                                        S0170
20003 FORMAT(21H R MATRIX HAS NULLITY,I3)                     S0171
    GO TO 10000                                               S0172
10004 IERROR = 4                                             S0173
    WRITE(NOT,20004)                                           S0174
20004 FORMAT(56H SOLVE ROUTINE TERMINATED BECAUSE SENSE SWITCH 5 IS DOWN S0175
1)                                                            S0176
    GO TO 10000                                               S0177
10005 IERROR = 5                                             S0178
    WRITE(NOT,20005)      NAM(K,1),NAM(K,2)                   S0179
20005 FORMAT(13H COMPARTMENT ,2A6,10H TOO SMALL )           S0180
```

```
      LASTCP = K
      GO TO 10000
10006 IERROR = 6
      GO TO 10000
10001 IERROR = 1
10000 RETURN
      8241 FORMAT(15H      LAMBDA MAX=1PE12.4,13H, OPT LAMBDA=E10.3,6H, TDA=E12
           1.5,16H, MAX ROW ERROR=E12.5)
      8267 IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE (NOT,8268) ITER
      8268   CRMAT(10H ITERATION,14,30H POSITIVE IDA, GO TO METHOD 2 )
           GO TO 6000
      8269 IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE (NOT,8270) ITER
      8270 FORMAT(10H ITERATION,14,42H AV THETA LESS THAN TOL(1), GO TO METHO
           ID 2)
           GO TO 6000
      8271 IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE (NOT,8272) ITER
      8272 FORMAT(10H ITERATION,14,36H STEP SIZE TOO SMALL, GO TO METHOD 2)
           GO TO 6000
      8262   FORMAT(10X, 4HSTEP,12, 9H LAMBDA=1PE10.3,6H, TDA=E15.8)
           759   FORMAT(10H ITERATION,14,24H CHANGE IN FREE ENERGY=1PE15.8,12H
           1STEP SIZE=E15.8,10H AV THETA=E12.5)
      6099 FORMAT(10H ITERATION,14,19H MAX CHANGE IN PIE=1PE15.8,15H MAX ROW
           1ERROR=E15.8
           END
```

```
S0181
S0182
S0183
S0184
S0185
S0186
S0187
S0188
S0189
S0190
S0191
S0192
S0193
S0194
S0195
S0196
S0197
S0198
S0199
S0200
S0201
S0202
S0203
S0204
```



```
SUBROUTINE BAR(W,WBAR)                                W0001
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121), W0002
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65), W0003
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65) W0004
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NIO1), W0005
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),IIR),(IV(9),ITMAX), W0006
2 (IV(10),IERROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE) W0007
DIMENSION W(1),WBAR(1) W0008
7 DO 701 K = 1,NCOMP W0009
  KTA = KL(K) W0010
  KTB = KL(K+1) - 1 W0011
  WBAR(K) = 0. W0012
  DO 702 J = KTA,KTB W0013
    WBAR(K) = WBAR(K) + W(J) W0014
702 CONTINUE W0015
701 CONTINUE W0016
END W0017
```

```
SUBROUTINE BERROR(BMAX)                                B0001
COMMON/BLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),R(65),KN(120),X(121),C(121), B0002
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65), B0003
2  V4(65),XMF(121),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65) B0004
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NTOT), B0005
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NCT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),LIMAX), B0006
2 (IV(10),IERROR),(IV(11),LASICP),(IV(12),KE) B0007
DIMENSION G(1) B0008
EQUIVALENCE (G,V1) B0009
DO 101 I = 1,M B0010
  ZT = 0. B0011
  DO 102 J = 1,N B0012
    IF(A(I,J).NE.0.) ZT = ZT - X(J) * A(I,J) B0013
102 CONTINUE B0014
  G(I) = ZT + B(I) B0015
101 CONTINUE B0016
DO 110 K = 1,NCOMP B0017
  ZT = 0. B0018
  MTA = KL(K) B0019
  MTB = KL(K+1) - 1 B0020
  DO 111 J = MTA,MTB B0021
    ZT = ZT + X(J) B0022
111 CONTINUE B0023
  MK = M + K B0024
  G(MK) = XBAR(K) - ZT B0025
110 CONTINUE B0026
BMAX = 0. B0027
DO 120 I = 1,MEND B0028
  IF (ABS(G(I)).GT. ABS(BMAX) ) BMAX = G(I) B0029
120 CONTINUE B0030
RETURN B0031
END B0032
```

```
SUBROUTINE DEL(W,Q)                                D0001
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121), D0002
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIL(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65), D0003
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65) D0004
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,N101), D0005
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),ITMAX), D0006
2 (IV(10),ILERROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE) D0007
DIMENSION W(1),Q(1) D0008
DO 20 J = 1,N D0009
  WW=0. D0010
  DO 10 I = 1,M D0011
    IF (A(I,J).NE.0.) WW = WW + A(I,J) * Q(I) D0012
10  CONTINUE D0013
    W(J) = WW D0014
20  CONTINUE D0015
RETURN D0016
END D0017
```

```

SUBROUTINE RCALC
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121),
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65),
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65)
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NIO1),
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),ITMAX),
2 (IV(10),IERROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE)
COMPUTE R
DO 1 I = 1,MEND
DO 2 J = 1,I
R(I,J) = 0.0
2 CONTINUE
1 CONTINUE
DO 10 K = 1,NTOT
DO 11 I = 1,M
IF (A(I,K).EQ.0.) GO TO 11
AIKX = A(I,K) * X(K)
DO 12 J = 1,I
IF (A(J,K).NE.0.) R(I,J) = A(J,K) * AIKX + R(I,J)
12 CONTINUE
11 CONTINUE
10 CONTINUE
DO 20 K = 1,NCOMP
IH = K + M
MTA = KL(K)
MTB = KL(K+1) - 1
DO 21 L = MTA,MTB
DO 22 J = 1,M
IF (A(J,L).NE.0.) R(IH,J) = R(IH,J) + A(J,L) * X(L)
22 CONTINUE
21 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE
DO 30 J = 2,MEND
JL = J-1
DO 31 I = 1,JL
R(I,J) = R(J,I)
31 CONTINUE
30 CONTINUE
50 RETURN
END
R0001
R0002
R0003
R0004
R0005
R0006
R0007
R0008
R0009
R0010
R0011
R0012
R0013
R0014
R0015
R0016
R0017
R0018
R0019
R0020
R0021
R0022
R0023
R0024
R0025
R0026
R0027
R0028
R0029
R0030
R0031
R0032
R0033
R0034
R0035
R0036
R0037
R0038
R0039
R0040
```

```
SUBROUTINE CLOG(W,WBAR)                                C0001
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TCL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KN(120),X(121),C(121), C0002
1  KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,121),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65), C0003
2  V4(65),XMF(120),X1(121),X2(121),X3(121),XBAR(25),R(65,65) C0004
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),MEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NTOT), C0005
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),ITMAX), C0006
2 (IV(10),IEPROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE) C0007
DIMENSION W(1),WBAR(1),ALPHA(1) C0008
EQUIVALENCE (X2,ALPHA) C0009
DO 1 K = 1, NCOMP C0010
  KLA = KL(K) C0011
  KLB = KL(K+1)-1 C0012
  DO 2 J = KLA,KLB C0013
    ALPHA(J) = C(J) C0014
    XXX = W(J)/WBAR(K) C0015
    IF(XXX.GT.0.0) ALPHA(J) = C(J)+ALOG(XXX) C0016
2  CONTINUE C0017
1  CONTINUE C0018
RETURN C0019
END C0020
```

```

SUBROUTINE LP (PCN)
COMMON/SLVE/IV(30),TOL(20),NR(55,2),B(55),KA(12),X(12),C(12),
1 KL(26),NAM(25,2),A(55,12),PIE(65),V1(65),V2(65),V3(65),
2 V4(65),XMF(12),X1(12),X2(12),X3(12),XBAR(25),R(65,65)
INTEGER PF
EQUIVALENCE (TOL(3),XMIN),(TOL(4),XSTART),(TOL(5),BARMIN)
EQUIVALENCE (IV(1),M),(IV(2),NEND),(IV(3),NCOMP),(IV(4),N,NTOT),
1 (IV(5),NIT),(IV(6),NOT),(IV(7),PF),(IV(8),ITER),(IV(9),ITMAX),
2 (IV(10),IERROR),(IV(11),LASTCP),(IV(12),KE)
DIMENSION XX(1),KOUT(7),CC(1),P(1)
EQUIVALENCE(CC,XMF),(XX,X2),(P,V1)
MON= 0
IF (XSTART.LE.0.0) XSTART = 1.E-6
DO 10 I = 1,M
P(I) = B(I)
A(I,NTOT+1) = 0.0
DO 15 J = 1,NTOT
A(I,NTOT+1) = A(I,NTOT+1) + A(I,J)
15 CONTINUE
10 CONTINUE
DO 1 J = 1,NTOT
CC(J) = 0.0
1 CONTINUE
CC(N+1) = -1.0
C ZERO-TH SIMPLEX IS TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY
CALL SIMPLE(0,M,N+1,A,P,CC,KOUT,XX,PIE,V2,V3,V4,X3,R)
ZT = XX(N+1)
IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE (NOI,106)KOUT(2),ZT,KOUT(1)
106 FORMAT(12HCSIMPLEX 0,14,29H ITERATIONS, MAX MIN ELEMENT=1PE15.8,
1 12H, CONDITION ,I3)
ZZT =AMIN1(ZT/2.0, XSTART)
DO 104 I = 1,M
P(I) = P(I) - ZZT*A(I,N+1)
104 CONTINUE
200 DO 201 J = 1,NTOT
X(J) = XX(J)
XMF(J) = 1.0
201 CONTINUE
IF (ZT.LE.0.0.OR.KOUT(1).NE.0) GO TO 40
C SIMPLEX LOOP
FR2=1.E+20
DO 301 NN = 1, NCOMP
DO 302 J = 1, NTOT
CC(J) = C(J) + XMF(J) - 1.0
302 CONTINUE
FN = FLOAT(NN) - 1.0
CALL SIMPLE(1,M,N,A,P,CC,KOUT,XX,PIE,V2,V3,V4,X3,R)
IF (KOUT(1).NE.0) GO TO 50
300 DO 303 J = 1,NTOT
X(J) = XX(J)
X(J) = ( FN*X1(J) + X(J) ) / (FN + 1.0)
X1(J) = X(J)
303 CONTINUE
CALL BAR(X,XBAR)
K = 1
FR = 0.0
DO 310 J = 1,N
IF (J.GE.KL(K+1)) K = K + 1
IF (J.EQ.KL(K).AND.XBAR(K).GT.0.0)FR=FR-XBAR(K)*ALOG(XBAR(K))
IF (X(J).GT.0.0) FR = FR + X(J)*(ALOG(X(J)) + C(J) )
L0001
L0002
L0003
L0004
L0005
L0006
L0007
L0008
L0009
L0010
L0011
L0012
L0013
L0014
L0015
L0016
L0017
L0018
L0019
L0020
L0021
L0022
L0023
L0024
L0025
L0026
L0027
L0028
L0029
L0030
L0031
L0032
L0033
L0034
L0035
L0036
L0037
L0038
L0039
L0040
L0041
L0042
L0043
L0044
L0045
L0046
L0047
L0048
L0049
L0050
L0051
L0052
L0053
L0054
L0055
L0056
L0057
L0058
L0059
L0060
```

```

      XMF(J) = 0.
      IF ( XBAR(K).NE.0.) XMF(J) = X(J) / XBAR(K)
310  CONTINUE
      IF (PF.GE.0) WRITE(NOT,305) NN,KOUT(2),FR
305  FORMAT(8H SIMPLEX,13,1H,,14,12H ITERATIONS ,8H FR ENG=1PE15.6)
      IF (FR.GE.FR2) GO TO 399
      FR2=FR
301  CONTINUE
399  DO 400 J = 1,N
      X(J) = X(J) + ZZT
400  CONTINUE
      RETURN
40  IF (KOUT(1).GT.1) GO TO 50
      WRITE (NOT,41)
41  FORMAT(72H THIS PROBLEM IS INFEASIBLE. THE FOLLOWING LINEAR COMBI
INATION OF ROWS, /1X)
      DO 140 I =1,M
      IF (PIE(I).NE.0.) WRITE(NOT,141) PIE(I),NR(I,1),NR(I,2)
141  FORMAT(10X,3H+ (,F15.8,5H ) * ,2A6)
140  CONTINUE
      WRITE (NOT,142)
142  FORMAT(48H0 LEADS TO THE FOLLOWING INFEASIBLE EQUATION, /1X)
      DO 150 K =1,NCOMP
      MTA = KL(K)
      MTB = KL(K+1) - 1
      DO 151 J = MTA, MTB
      D = 0.
      DO 152 I =1,M
      D = PIE(I)* A(I,J) + D
152  CONTINUE
      IF (D.NE.0.) WRITE (NOT,143) D,KN(J),NAM(K,1),NAM(K,2)
143  FORMAT(10X,3H+ (,F15.8,5H ) * ,A6,4H IN ,2A6)
151  CONTINUE
150  CONTINUE
      D = 0.
      DO 160 I =1,M
      D = PIE(I)*B(I) + D
160  CONTINUE
      WRITE (NOT,144) D
144  FORMAT(1H0,15X, 7H+ 0.0 =,F15.8)
70  MON = 1
      RETURN
50  IF (KOUT(1).NE.2) GO TO 60
      JT = KOUT(7)
      DO 51 K = 1,NCOMP
      IF ( JT.GE.KL(K)) GO TO 52
51  CONTINUE
52  WRITE (NOT,952) KN(JT),NAM(K,1),NAM(K,2)
952  FORMAT(14H THE VARIABLE ,A6,4H IN ,2A6,33H IS UNBOUNDED AND MUST B
      IE REMOVED)
      GO TO 70
60  WRITE (NOT,960)
960  FORMAT(60H SIMPLEX ROUTINE HAS FAILED DUE TO EXCESSIVE ROUND-OFF E
      RROR)
      GO TO 70
      END
```

L0061
L0062
L0063
L0064
L0066
L0066
L0067
L0068
L0069
L0070
L0071
L0072
L0073
L0074
L0075
L0076
L0077
L0078
L0079
L0080
L0081
L0082
L0083
L0084
L0085
L0086
L0087
L0088
L0089
L0090
L0091
L0092
L0093
L0094
L0095
L0096
L0097
L0098
L0099
L0100
L0101
L0102
L0103
L0104
L0105
L0106
L0107
L0108
L0109
L0110
L0111
L0112
L0113
L0114
L0115
L0116

Calling Sequence for Simplex Subroutine

The simplex subroutine, SIMPLE, may be used to solve a general linear programming problem of the form: Minimize

$$\sum_{j=1}^n C_j x_j \quad (1)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j = b_i \quad i=1,2,3,\dots,m \quad (2)$$

The a_{ij} is stored in a two-dimensional array, A, with a_{ij} in cell A(i,j); C_j is stored in a one-dimensional array, C, with C_j in cell C(j); and b_i is stored in a one-dimensional array, B, with b_i in cell B(i).

The calling sequence is

CALL SIMPLE(II,M,N,A,B,C,KO,X,P,JH,XX,Y,PE,E)

where

II = 0;

M = No. of rows, m;

N = No. of variables, n;

A, B, C Are as above;

KO = A subscripted variable of
dimension 7;

X = A subscripted variable of dimen-
sion n or more;

P, JH, XX, Y, and PE = Subscripted variables of
dimension m or more; and

E = A subscripted variable of
dimension m^2 or more.

Upon exiting from the subroutine,

X(1),X(2),...,X(n) Contains x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n (the solution);

P(1),P(2),...,P(m) Contains the shadow prices;

KO(1) Contains an 0 if the problem was
feasible, 1 if the problem was
infeasible, 2 if the problem had
an infinite solution, and 3, 4, or
5 if the algorithm did not terminate;

KO(2) The number of iterations taken;

KO(3) The number of pivots performed since
the last inversion;

KO(4) The number of inversions performed;

KO(5) The number of pivot steps performed;

KO(6) A logical variable that is "true" if and only if the problem was feasible; and

KO(7) Contains, if the problem had an infinite solution, the number of the variable that was infinite.

The dimension of A (line X0009) must agree (at least in the first subscript) with the dimension of A in the calling program. The other dimensions need not agree with those of the calling program.

If an initial basis is available, this basis may be communicated to the subroutine by letting

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &= 1, \\ \text{X}(i) &= \begin{cases} 0.0 & \text{if variable } i \text{ is not in basis,} \\ (\text{non-zero}) & \text{if variable } i \text{ is in basis,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and the other quantities remain as above.

This subroutine differs from other linear programming routines in several respects. If the restraints (2) are linearly dependent, the problem is considered to be infeasible. This is the case because the chemical equilibrium problem cannot be solved if the restraints are dependent. In addition, this subroutine was written to be as scale-free

as possible; this was accomplished by computing tolerances internally in the subroutine.

```

C  AUTOMATIC SIMPLEX      REDUNDANT EQUATIONS CAUSE INFEASIBILITY      X0001
  SUBROUTINE SIMPLE(INFLAG,MX,NN,A,B,C,KOUT,KB,P,JH,X,Y,PE,E)      X0002
  DIMENSION      B(1),C(1),KOUT(7),JH(1),X(1),P(1),Y(1),      X0003
  1  KB(1),E(1),PE(1),KO(7)      X0004
  EQUIVALENCE      (K,KO(1)),(ITER,KO(2)),(INVC,KO(3)),      X0005
  2  (NUMVR,KO(4)),(NUMPV,KO(5)),(FEAS,KO(6)),(JT,KO(7))      X0006
  EQUIVALENCE (XX,LL)      X0007
C  THE FOLLOWING DIMENSION SHOULD BE THE SAME HERE AS IT IS IN CALLER.      X0008
  DIMENSION A(55,121)      X0009
  LOGICAL FEAS,VER,NEG,TRIG,KL,ABSC      X0010
C      X0011
C      MOVE INPUTS ... ZERO OUTPUTS      X0012
  DO 1341 I = 1,7      X0013
    KC(I) = 0      X0014
  1341 CONTINUE      X0015
  M = MX      X0016
  N = NN      X0017
  TEXP = .5**16      X0018
  NCUT = 4*M + 10      X0019
  NVER = M/2 + 5      X0020
  M2 = M**2      X0021
  IF (INFLAG.NE.0) GO TO 1400      X0022
C* 'NEW'      START PHASE ONE WITH SINGLETON BASIS      X0023
  DO 1402 J = 1,N      X0024
    KB(J) = 0      X0025
    KQ = .FALSE.      X0026
    DO 1403 I = 1,M      X0027
      IF (A(I,J).EQ.0.0) GO TO 1403      X0028
      IF (KQ.OR.A(I,J).LT.0.0) GO TO 1402      X0029
      KQ = .TRUE.      X0030
  1403 CONTINUE      X0031
    KB(J) = 1      X0032
  1402 CONTINUE      X0033
  1400 IF (INFLAG.GT.1 ) GO TO 1320      X0034
  DO 1401 I = 1,M      X0035
    JH(I) = -1      X0036
  1401 CONTINUE      X0037
C* 'VER'      CREATE INVERSE FROM 'KB' AND 'JH'      X0038
  1320 VER = .TRUE.      X0039
  1121 INVC = 0      X0040
  1122 NUMVR = NUMVR + 1      X0041
  DO 1101 I = 1,M2      X0042
    E(I) = 0.0      X0043
  1101 CONTINUE      X0044
  MM=1      X0045
  DO 1113 I = 1,M      X0046
    E(MM) = 1.0      X0047
    PE(I) = 0.0      X0048
    X(I) = B(I)      X0049
    IF (JH(I) .NE.0) JH(I) = -1      X0050
    MM = MM + M + 1      X0051
  1113 CONTINUE      X0052
C      FORM INVERSE      X0053
  DO 1102 JT = 1,N      X0054
    IF (KB(JT).EQ.0) GO TO 1102      X0055
    GO TO 600      X0056
C 600 CALL JMY      X0057
C      CHOOSE PIVOT      X0058
  1114 TY = 0.0      X0059
  DO 1104 I = 1,M      X0060

```

```

        IF (JH(I).NE.-1) GO TO 1104
        IF ( ABS(Y(I)).LE.TY) GO TO 1104
        IR = I
        TY = ABS(Y(I))
1104  CONTINUE
        KB(JT) = 0
C          TEST PIVOT
        IF (TY.LE.TPIV) GO TO 1102
C          PIVOT
        JH(IR) = JT
        KB(JT) = IR
        GO TO 900
C 900  CALL PIV
1102 CONTINUE
C          RESET ARTIFICIALS
        DO 1109 I = 1,M
        IF (JH(I).EQ.-1) JH(I) = 0
1109 CONTINUE
1200 VER = .FALSE.
C          PERFORM ONE ITERATION
C* 'XCK'  DETERMINE FEASIBILITY
        FEAS = .TRUE.
        NEG = .FALSE.
        DO 1201 I = 1,M
        IF (X(I).LT.C.C) GO TO 1250
        IF (JH(I).EQ.C) FEAS = .FALSE.
1201 CONTINUE
C* 'GET'  GET APPLICABLE PRICES
        IF (.NOT.FEAS) GO TO 501
C          PRIMAL PRICES
        DO 503 I = 1,M
        P(I) = PE(I)
503  CONTINUE
        ABSC = .FALSE.
        GO TO 599
C          COMPOSITE PRICES
1250 FEAS = .FALSE.
        NEG = .TRUE.
501  DO 504 J = 1, M
        P(J) = 0.
504  CONTINUE
        ABSC = .TRUE.
        DO 505 I = 1,M
        MM = I
        IF (X(I).GE.C.C) GO TO 507
        ABSC = .FALSE.
        DO 508 J = 1,M
        P(J) = P(J) + E(MM)
        MM = MM + 1
508  CONTINUE
        GO TO 505
507  IF (JH(I).NE.0) GO TO 505
        IF (X(I).NE.C.C) ABSC = .FALSE.
        DO 510 J = 1,M
        P(J) = P(J) - E(MM)
        MM = MM + 1
510  CONTINUE
505  CONTINUE
C* 'MIN'  FIND MINIMUM REDUCED COST
599  JT = 0
```

```
BB = 0.0 X0121
DO 701 J = 1,M X0122
C SKIP COLUMNS IN BASIS X0123
IF (KB(J).NE.0) GO TO 701 X0124
DT = 0.0 X0125
DO 303 I = 1,M X0126
IF (A(I,J).NE.0.0) DT = DT + P(I) * A(I,J) X0127
303 CONTINUE X0128
IF (FEAS) DT = DT + C(J) X0129
IF (ABSC) DT = - ABS(DT) X0130
IF (DT.GE.00) GO TO 701 X0131
BB = DT X0132
JT = J X0133
701 CONTINUE X0134
C TEST FOR NO PIVOT COLUMN X0135
IF (JT.LE.0) GO TO 203 X0136
C TEST FOR ITERATION LIMIT EXCEEDED X0137
IF (ITER.GE.NCUT) GO TO 160 X0138
ITER = ITER + 1 X0139
C* 'JMY' MULTIPLY INVERSE TIMES A(.,JT) X0140
600 DO 610 I = 1,M X0141
Y(I) = 0.0 X0142
610 CONTINUE X0143
LL = 0 X0144
COST = C(JT) X0145
DO 605 I = 1,M X0146
AIJT = A(I,JT) X0147
IF (AIJT.EQ.0.) GO TO 602 X0148
COST = COST + AIJT * PE(I) X0149
DO 606 J = 1,M X0150
LL = LL + 1 X0151
Y(J) = Y(J) + AIJT * E(LL) X0152
606 CONTINUE X0153
GO TO 605 X0154
602 LL = LL + M X0155
605 CONTINUE X0156
C COMPUTE PIVOT TOLERANCE X0157
YMAX = 0.0 X0158
DO 620 I = 1,M X0159
YMAX = AMAX1( ABS(Y(I)),YMAX ) X0160
620 CONTINUE X0161
TPIV = YMAX * TEXP X0162
C RETURN TO INVERSION ROUTINE, IF INVERTING X0163
IF (VER) GO TO 1114 X0164
C COST TOLERANCE CONTROL X0165
IF (TRIG.AND.00.GE.-TPIV) GO TO 203 X0166
TRIG = .FALSE. X0167
IF (00.GE.-TPIV) TRIG = .TRUE. X0168
C* 'ROW' SELECT PIVOT ROW X0169
C AMONG EQS. WITH X=0, FIND MAXIMUM Y AMONG ARTIFICIALS, OR, IF NONE, X0170
C GET MAX POSITIVE Y(I) AMONG REALS. X0171
1000 IR = 0 X0172
AA = 0.0 X0173
KG = .FALSE. X0174
DO 1050 I = 1,M X0175
IF (X(I).NE.0.0.OR.Y(I).LE.TPIV) GO TO 1050 X0176
IF (JH(I).EQ.0) GO TO 1044 X0177
IF (KQ) GO TO 1050 X0178
1045 IF (Y(I).LE.AA) GO TO 1050 X0179
GO TO 1047 X0180
```

```
1044 IF (KQ) GO TO 1045 X0181
      KQ = .TRUE. X0182
1047 AA = Y(I) X0183
      IR = I X0184
1050 CONTINUE X0185
      IF (IR.NE.0) GO TO 1099 X0186
1001 AA = 1.0E+20 X0187
C FIND MIN. PIVOT AMONG POSITIVE EQUATIONS X0188
      DO 1010 I = 1,M X0189
        IF (Y(I).LE.TPIV.OR.X(I).LE.0.0.OR.Y(I)*AA.LE.X(I) ) GO TO 1010 X0190
        AA = X(I)/Y(I) X0191
        IR = I X0192
1010 CONTINUE X0193
      IF (.NOT.NEG) GO TO 1099 X0194
C FIND PIVOT AMONG NEGATIVE EQUATIONS, IN WHICH X/Y IS LESS THAN THE X0195
C MINIMUM X/Y IN THE POSITIVE EQUATIONS, THAT HAS THE LARGEST ABSF(Y) X0196
1016 BB = - TPIV X0197
      DO 1030 I = 1,M X0198
        IF (X(I).GE.0..OR.Y(I).GE.BB.OR.Y(I)*AA.GT.X(I) ) GO TO 1030 X0199
        BB = Y(I) X0200
        IR = I X0201
1030 CONTINUE X0202
C TEST FOR NO PIVOT ROW X0203
1099 IF (IR.LE.0) GO TO 207 X0204
C* 'PIV' PIVOT ON (IR,JT) X0205
C LEAVE TRANSFORMED COLUMN IN Y(I) X0206
900 NUMPV = NUMPV + 1 X0207
      YI = -Y(IR) X0208
      Y(IR) = -1.0 X0209
      LL = 0 X0210
C TRANSFORM INVERSE X0211
      DO 904 J = 1,M X0212
        L = LL + IR X0213
        IF (E(L).NE.0.0) GO TO 905 X0214
        LL = LL + M X0215
        GO TO 904 X0216
905 XY = E(L) / YI X0217
        PE(J) = PE(J) + COST * XY X0218
        E(L) = 0.0 X0219
        DO 906 I = 1,M X0220
          LL = LL + 1 X0221
          E(LL) = E(LL) + XY * Y(I) X0222
906 CONTINUE X0223
904 CONTINUE X0224
C TRANSFORM X X0225
      XY = X(IR) / YI X0226
      DO 908 I = 1, M X0227
        XNEW = X(I) + XY * Y(I) X0228
        IF (.VER.OR.XNEW.GE.0..OR.Y(I).GT.TPIV.OR.X(I).LT.0.) GO TO 907 X0229
        X(I) = 0.0 X0230
        GO TO 908 X0231
907 X(I) = XNEW X0232
908 CONTINUE X0233
C RESTORE Y(IR) X0234
      Y(IR) = -YI X0235
      X(IR) = -XY X0236
      IF (VER) GO TO 1102 X0237
221 IA = JH(IR) X0238
      IF (IA.GT.0) KB(IA) = 0 X0239
213 KB(JT) = IR X0240
```

```
JH(IR) = JT                                X0241
IF (NUMPV.LE.M) GO TO 1200                  X0242
C TEST FOR INVERSION ON THIS ITERATION      X0243
  INVC = INVC + 1                           X0244
  IF (INVC.EQ.NVER) GO TO 1320              X0245
  GO TO 1200                                 X0246
C* END OF ALGORITHM, SET EXIT VALUES      X0247
C      INFINITE SOLUTION                    X0248
  207 K = 2                                  X0249
  GO TO 250                                  X0250
C      PROBLEM IS CYCLING                   X0251
  160 K = 4                                  X0252
  GO TO 250                                  X0253
C      FEASIBLE OR INFEASIBLE SOLUTION     X0254
  203 K = 0                                  X0255
  250 IF (.NOT.FEAS) K = K + 1              X0256
  DO 1399 J = 1,N                            X0257
    XX = 0.0                                  X0258
    KBJ = KB(J)                               X0259
    IF (KBJ.NE.0) XX = X(KBJ)                 X0260
    KB(J) = LL                               X0261
  1399 CONTINUE                               X0262
C      SET 'KOUT'                           X0263
  1392 DO 1393 I = 1,7                       X0264
    KOUT(I) = K(I)                           X0265
  1393 CONTINUE                               X0266
  RETURN                                     X0267
  END                                        X0268
```



```
C      MATRIX INVERSION WITH ACCOMPANYING SOLUTION OF LINEAR EQUATIONS      M0001
SUBROUTINE MATINV(A,N,B,M,INA,INB,IP,ISING)      M0002
C      M0003
      DIMENSION B(1),INA(1),INB(1),IP(1)      M0004
      LOGICAL IP      M0005
      DIMENSION A(65,65)      M0006
C      M0007
C      INITIALIZATION      M0008
      DO 20 J = 1,N      M0009
        IP(J) = .FALSE.      M0010
20  CONTINUE      M0011
C  BIG LOOP ON I      M0012
      DO 575 I = 1,N      M0013
        AMAX = 0.0      M0014
C      SEARCH FOR PIVOT ELEMENT      M0015
        DO 105 J = 1,N      M0016
          IF (IP(J)) GO TO 105      M0017
          DO 100 K = 1,N      M0018
            IF (IP(K) .OR. ABS(AMAX).GE.ABS(A(J,K))) GO TO 100      M0019
            IROW = J      M0020
            ICOL = K      M0021
            AMAX = A(J,K)      M0022
100      CONTINUE      M0023
105      CONTINUE      M0024
          IF (AMAX.EQ.0.0) GO TO 750      M0025
          IP(ICOL) = .TRUE.      M0026
C      INTERCHANGE ROWS TO PUT PIVOT ELEMENT ON DIAGONAL      M0027
          IF (IROW.EQ.ICOL) GO TO 260      M0028
          DO 200 L = 1,N      M0029
            SWAP = A(IROW,L)      M0030
            A(IROW,L) = A(ICOL,L)      M0031
            A(ICOL,L) = SWAP      M0032
200      CONTINUE      M0033
          IF (M.EQ.0) GO TO 260      M0034
          SWAP = B(IROW)      M0035
          B(IROW) = B(ICOL)      M0036
          B(ICOL) = SWAP      M0037
260      INA(I) = IROW      M0038
          INB(I) = ICOL      M0039
C      DIVIDE PIVOT ROW BY PIVOT ELEMENT      M0040
          A(ICOL,ICOL) = 1.0      M0041
          DO 350 L = 1,N      M0042
            A(ICOL,L) = A(ICOL,L) / AMAX      M0043
350      CONTINUE      M0044
          IF (M.NE.0) B(ICOL) = B(ICOL) / AMAX      M0045
C      COMPLETE THE PIVOT      M0046
280      DO 550 LL = 1,N      M0047
          IF (LL.EQ.ICOL) GO TO 550      M0048
          SWAP = A(LL,ICOL)      M0049
          A(LL,ICOL) = 0.0      M0050
          DO 450 L = 1,N      M0051
            A(LL,L) = A(LL,L) - A(ICOL,L) * SWAP      M0052
450      CONTINUE      M0053
          IF (M.NE.0) B(LL) = B(LL) - B(ICOL) * SWAP      M0054
550      CONTINUE      M0055
575  CONTINUE      M0056
600  IF (M.LT.0) RETURN      M0057
C      INTERCHANGE COLUMNS      M0058
      DO 710 I = 1,N      M0059
```

```
L = N + 1 - I
IF (INA(L).EQ.INB(L)) GO TO 710
IROW = INA(L)
ICOL = INB(L)
DO 705 K = 1,N
  SWAP = A(K,IROW)
  A(K,IROW) = A(K,ICOL)
  A(K,ICOL) = SWAP
705 CONTINUE
710 CONTINUE
740 RETURN
C SINGULARITY FLAG
750 ISING = 1 + N - I
GO TO 600
END
```

```
M0060
M0061
M0062
M0063
M0064
M0065
M0066
M0067
M0068
M0069
M0070
M0071
M0072
M0073
M0074
```

Appendix B

MATRIX NOTATION AND FURTHER PROOFS

The derivations in the preceding sections would be facilitated by the use of matrix notation rather than subscripted variables. We introduce the following symbols to correspond to the subscripted variables used in Sec. 3.

<u>Subscripted Variable</u>	<u>Matrix</u>	<u>Size of Matrix</u>
a_{ij}	A	MxN
b_i	B	Mx1
y_j	Y	Nx1
d_j	D	Nx1
c_j	C	Nx1
π_i	π	Mx1
$r_{i'}$	R	MxM
x_j	X	Nx1

The single-column matrices may also be thought of as vectors. We use here the convention that an operator applied to a matrix means that the operator operates on each element of the matrix. For example, $\log Y$ is the Nx1 matrix consisting of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \log y_1 \\ \log y_2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \log y_N \end{pmatrix}$$

The superscript τ indicates the transposition of a matrix.

We assume that the elementary results of matrix theory are known. For example, it is known that the inverse of an invertible symmetric matrix is symmetric. The square diagonal matrix whose diagonal is one of the vectors previously defined will be denoted by the previously defined vector in elongated type; that is,

$$D = \text{diag } (D)$$

and

$$Y = \text{diag } (Y)$$

Equations (3.2) and (3.7) in matrix notation are

$$AX = B \tag{B.1}$$

$$X = Y (D^{-1} A^{\tau} \pi - D^{-1} C - \log Y) . \tag{B.2}$$

To see the ease of matrix notation, we may substitute (B.2) into (B.1) to get

$$AYD^{-1}A^T\pi = B + AY(D^{-1}C + \log Y) . \quad (B.3)$$

By letting

$$R = AYD^{-1}A^T \quad (B.4)$$

and

$$S = B + AY(D^{-1}C + \log Y) , \quad (B.5)$$

we see that

$$R\pi = S \quad (B.6)$$

corresponds to (3.10).

In Sec. 4, we evaluated

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_{d_j}^2}{y_j} \quad (B.7)$$

but we did not give the details of the computation. The algebra of this evaluation is very difficult unless matrix algebra is used. In matrix notation, (B.7) is $\theta^T D Y^{-1} \theta$, where $\theta = X - Y$. From (B.2) we have

$$\theta = Y (D^{-1} A^T \pi - D^{-1} C - \log Y) - Y . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^T D Y^{-1} \theta &= (\pi^T A D^{-1} - C^T D^{-1} - \log Y^T) Y D Y^{-1} \theta - Y^T D Y^{-1} \theta \\ &= \pi^T A (D^{-1} Y D Y^{-1}) \theta - (C^T D^{-1} + \log Y^T) D Y Y^{-1} \theta - Y^T Y^{-1} D \theta \\ &= \pi^T A \theta - (C^T D^{-1} + \log Y^T) D \theta - D^T \theta . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Since $AX = B$, $A\theta = AX - AY = B - AY$. Also, in the chemical equilibrium formulation,

$$D^T \theta = \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j - \sum_{j=n+1}^N \theta_j = \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} \theta_j - \theta_{k+m} \right) = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (C^T D^{-1} + \log Y^T) D \theta \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^n (c_j + \log y_j) \theta_j + \sum_{j=n+1}^N \log y_j (-\theta_j) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^P \left(\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} \theta_j (c_j + \log y_j) - \theta_k \log S_k \right) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^P \left(\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} \theta_j (c_j + \log y_j - \log S_k) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) .
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2 d_j}{y_j} = \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i \left(b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} y_j \right) - \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

in the context of the chemical equilibrium problem used in Sec. 4.

Next we wish to show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} \geq 0$$

as stated in (4.14). First, we prove

Lemma 1: Let y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r be positive numbers and let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_r$ be any real numbers. Let

$$G = \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} - \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j \right)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^r y_j}.$$

Then,

- i) $G \geq 0$
- ii) $G = 0$ if and only if

$$\frac{\theta_1}{y_1} = \frac{\theta_2}{y_2} = \dots = \frac{\theta_r}{y_r}.$$

Proof: Let $\alpha_j = \theta_j/y_j$, $j=1, 2, \dots, r$. Then,

$$G = \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j^2 y_j - \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j y_j \right)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^r y_j}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^r y_j \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^r y_j \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j^2 y_j \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j y_j \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^r y_j \right)^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^r \left(\alpha_j^2 y_i y_j - \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j \right) \right) \right] \\
 &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^r y_j \right)^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^i \left(\alpha_j^2 y_i y_j - 2\alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j + \alpha_i^2 y_i y_j \right) \right) \right] \\
 &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^r y_j \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j < i} y_i y_j (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)^2 \right) \geq 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

which is result i). The proof is completed by noting that $G = 0$ if and only if $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$ for all i and j ; this proves ii).

Now we can prove

Theorem 1: In the chemical equilibrium problem

$$\text{i) } \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_{ij}^2}{y_j} > 0$$

$$\text{ii) } \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_{ij}^2}{y_j} = 0 \quad \text{if and only if there exist}$$

numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_p$ such that

$$a) \quad \theta_j = \alpha_{[j]} y_j \quad j \leq n$$

$$b) \quad \theta_j = \alpha_{j-n} S_{j-n} \quad j > n$$

Proof: The proof follows by noting that for $i > n$

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j \in \langle i-n \rangle} \theta_j .$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} &= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} - \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\theta_{k+n}^2}{S_k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} - \frac{\left(\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} \theta_j \right)^2}{\sum_{j \in \langle k \rangle} y_j} \right) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by lemma 1. Furthermore, by lemma 1, if the equality holds, then for each k there is a number α_k such that $\theta_j = \alpha_k y_j$ if $j \in k$. This, noting that b) follows from the fact that

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j \in \langle i-n \rangle} \theta_j \quad \text{for } i > n ,$$

completes the proof of the theorem.

Our final result is

Theorem 2: In the chemical equilibrium problem, with (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) feasible and $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n$ calculated as in (4.7)

$$\text{i) } \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) \leq 0$$

$$\text{ii) } \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if}$$

(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is optimal.

Proof: i) follows from Theorem 1, (B.10), and the fact that (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) is feasible.

To prove ii), we assume that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \theta_j (c_j + \log \hat{y}_j) = 0 .$$

Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\theta_j^2}{y_j} = 0 ,$$

and θ_j is as in ii) of Theorem 1. Combining b) of Theorem 1 and (4.12) we have

$$\theta_{k+n} = S_k \pi'_{m+k} = \alpha_k S_k$$

or

$$\alpha_k = \pi'_{m+k} .$$

Next, we combine a) of Theorem 1 with (4.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j &= y_j \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \pi'_i a_{ij} - c_j - \log \hat{y}_j + \pi'_{[j]+m} \right] \\ &= y_j \alpha_{[j]} = y_j \pi'_{[j]+m} \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \pi'_i a_{ij} - c_j - \log \hat{y}_j = 0 .$$

This last result is the optimality condition for (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) as given by (1.4), and this demonstrates the forward implication of ii). The converse follows from the fact that optimality implies that the objective function cannot be decreased.

REFERENCES

1. Shapiro, N. Z., and L. S. Shapley, Mass Action Laws and the Gibbs Free Energy Function, The RAND Corporation, RM-3935-1-PR, September 1964.
2. Dantzig, G. B., Linear Programming and Extensions, The RAND Corporation, R-366-PR, August 1963. Also published by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1963.
3. Kaplan, Wilfred, Advanced Calculus, Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952.
4. Clasen, R. J., The Linear-Logarithmic Programming Problem, The RAND Corporation, RM-3707-PR, June 1963.
5. White, W. B., S. M. Johnson, and G. B. Dantzig, Chemical Equilibrium in Complex Mixtures, The RAND Corporation, P-1059, October 8, 1957. Also published in J. Chem. Phys., 28 (1958) 751-755.
6. International Business Machines Corporation, "IBM 7040/7044 Operating System, FORTRAN IV Language," IBM Systems Reference Library, Form C28-6329, Poughkeepsie, New York, 1963.
7. Dantzig, G. B., and J. C. DeHaven, "On the Reduction of Certain Multiplicative Chemical Equilibrium Systems to Mathematically Equivalent Additive Systems," J. Chem. Phys., 36 (1962) 2620-2627.
8. Shapiro, N. Z., A Generalized Technique for Eliminating Species in Complex Chemical Equilibrium Calculations, The RAND Corporation, RM-4205-PR, August 1964.
9. Dantzig, G. B., J. C. DeHaven, I. Cooper, S. M. Johnson, E. C. DeLand, H. E. Kanter, and C. F. Sams, "A Mathematical Model of the Human External Respiratory System," Perspectives in Biol. & Med., 4 (1961) 324-376.
10. Maloney, J. V., Jr., M.D., J. C. DeHaven, E. C. DeLand, and G. B. Bradham, M.D., Analysis of Chemical Constituents of Blood by Digital Computer, The RAND Corporation, RM-3541-PR, April 1963.

11. DeHaven, J. C., and E. C. DeLand, Reactions of Hemoglobin and Steady States in the Human Respiratory System: An Investigation Using Mathematical Models and an Electronic Computer, The RAND Corporation, RM-3212-PR, December 1962.
12. DeHaven, J. C., E. C. DeLand, N. S. Assali, and W. Manson, Physiochemical Characteristics of Placental Transfer, The RAND Corporation, P-2565, March 1962.
13. Warga, J., "A Convergent Procedure for Solving the Thermo-Chemical Equilibrium Problem," J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math., 11 (1963) 594-606.