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1980 for discussions of the usefulness of meta-models
in simulation.

Specifically, if \( Y \) represents the simulation
response and \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p \)
are the inputs, then the
response is given by,

\[
E(Y) = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \beta_j t_j
\]  

where

\( Y \)

is the response

\( t_1, \ldots, t_q \)

are possible terms in the

polynomial model; they are

products of non-negative

integral powers of

continuous parameters

\( x_1, \ldots, x_p \).

\( \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_q \)

are real-valued

coefficients.

Initially the experiment specifies a prospective
polynomial response surface model, say, all terms of
order less than some number, \( k \). An experimental
procedure for identifying the functional form of the
meta-model in (1) is presented in Schruben and
Cogliano, 1986. That methodology was developed for
continuous input variables only. Extensions to
discrete input variables will be discussed later in
this paper. We next summarize this procedure.

1.1 Meta-Model Identification Procedure:

Briefly, frequency domain meta-model
identification experiments are run as follows.

(1) Select a range of interest,

\[
\{x_1, \ldots, x_p\} | L_i \leq x_i \leq U_i, \]

for each continuous input factor. Here \( L_i \)

is a lower limit and \( U_i \) is an upper limit

on the values of factor \( x_i \). The larger the

experimental region, the more precisely

there will be in detecting input factor effects.

However, just as in dealing with electrical

systems one must take care that the

simulation does not "blow a fuse". That is,

the values taken on by the input

variables do not put the simulation in an

unstable region for too much of the time.
(2) Select \( p \) driving frequencies, \( \omega_i \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, p \), for each continuous input variable in the simulation. These frequencies are between 0 and 1/2 cycles per output observation. Partial confounding of indicator frequencies may occur if driving frequencies are selected carelessly. Independent spectrum estimates for different indicator frequencies are desirable, so indicator frequencies should be as widely separated as possible in the interval \([0, 1/2]\). The frequency selection problem depends on the number of input factors and the list of terms in the prospective response model. The problem of selecting driving frequencies can be formulated as a mixed integer linear program [Cogliano, 1982]. However, frequency selection is not critical. Term indicator frequencies and their aliases should be at least one bandwidth apart. The selection of bandwidth is under the control of the experimenter. If bandwidth is decreased the same estimator precision can be obtained by increasing the run length. Determine the indicator frequencies for each term in the prospective polynomial response model. These frequencies are in the sets given by,

\[
S_i = \{a_{ij} \omega_i, (a_{ij} - 2) \omega_i, \ldots, -a_{ij} \omega_i \}, \quad i = 1,\ldots, q.
\]

for each term involving the \( a_{ij} \)th power of the single variable \( x_i \) in the prospective response model given by (1). For terms involving the interactions of powers of more than one input variable, the indicator frequencies are given as the direct sum of the sets, \( S \) for each term in the interaction. Compute the minimum spacing, \( b \), between these frequencies evaluated at their principle aliases. The value of \( b \) will be the bandwidth necessary for the spectrum estimators. Some effort should be made to select driving frequencies that maximize this bandwidth. The problem of maximizing the minimum spacing between term indicator frequencies is rather difficult. A method that involves nesting two univariable integer optimization programs has been developed [Jacobson and Schruben, 1980]. This method, while heuristic, has resulted in the optimal selection of driving frequencies each time it has been tried and the optimal solution is known. The problem of selecting driving frequencies for frequency domain simulation experiments is a current topic of research underway.

(3) Choose a window size of \( m \) and a run length of \( n \) observations such that \( m \geq 4/3b \) if using the Tukey spectral window and \( m \geq 1.86/b \) if using the Parzen spectral window in step (5) below. Also it is recommended in [Chatfield, 1976] that \( 20m \geq n \geq 3m \). See the book by Chatfield for an introductory discussion of window size selection (note that Chatfield revised his recommendation as to window truncation point in the second edition of his book...the selection of the truncation point \( m \) is an art form; try several values). I further recommend that \( n \) include at least 10 full cycles of the lowest term indicator frequency.

(4) Run \( p \) independently seeded replications of the simulation program using a Latin square design to assign input factors to driving frequencies for each run as described in Schruben and Cogliano. For each run the input factors oscillate according to

\[
x_i(t) = \frac{1}{2}(U_i + L_i) + \frac{1}{2}(U_i - L_i) \cos 2\pi \omega_i t.
\]

(5) Compute the sample spectrum

\[
f(\omega) = \sum_{k=-m}^{m} \lambda_k c_k \cos(2\pi nk) \quad 0 \leq |\omega| \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

for each response series. The \( \lambda_k \) are the weightings for a particular spectral window. The Parzen and the Tukey windows have both been successfully used for frequency domain experiments with very little difference in the results.

(6) Compute the spectrum ratios

\[
F(\omega) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{1}{v_j} \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{f_j(a_i)}{c_j(a_i)}
\]

The spectral estimators with the superscript \( c \), are for frequencies that are not changed during a particular run. The \( c \) is for "control" and this spectrum estimator measures the ambient noise in the response at a particular frequency. The spectral ratios above will have an approximate \( F \) distribution if the term, \( c_j \), has a zero coefficient in the meta-model. This can be used to compute the observed significance, denoted as \( p(\omega_j) \), of each term in the meta-model. This significance level can be computed for several such "signal to noise" ratios in the Latin Square experiment. Finally, these observed significance levels are combined into an overall significance level for each term in the prospective meta-model. Fisher's method of computing an overall significance level is used by the author, but other methods might be considered (see Rosenthal, 1976).
1.2 Frequency Domain Experiments with Discrete Variables:

Three techniques for dealing with discrete variables in frequency domain experiments. The most straightforward technique would be to use the discrete driving functions given by the Walsh basis to vary the values of these parameters during each run [Sanchez and Schruben, 1968]. This approach has the problem that the Walsh spectrum is not invariant to time lags. Since most simulation responses to changes in input variables are delayed this makes the direct application of Walsh analysis of little use in simulation experiments. A second technique would be to use a conventional run-oriented design for the discrete factors and embed a frequency domain experiment involving the continuous factors in each run of a design. This approach would not take advantage of the main benefit of frequency domain simulation experiments; frequency bands rather than simulation runs are the experimental units.

A general method for incorporating discrete valued variables in a frequency domain experiment that takes full advantage of the frequency domain approach is to simply map a continuous variable into the discrete valued variable. Then the continuous variable is considered as the input to the simulation; that is, this new variable is oscillated with a sinusoidal driving frequency. There are several examples of techniques of making this continuous variable to discrete variable mapping. One example of such a mapping is to pick the values for a discrete variable by inverting a uniform discrete cumulative distribution function. The argument of the inverse uniform distribution function would be a continuous variable between zero and one that takes on values according to a sinusoidal function during the simulation. This is just a deterministic version of the common technique of generating the value of a random variable by taking the inverse of a distribution function with a uniform pseudorandom number as its argument.

A stochastic mapping that could be used for converting a discrete input variable to a continuous variable would be to consider the value of each discrete variable as determined by an indicator function. The probabilities for the indicator function are then oscillated according to sinusoidal driving functions. The actual value of the discrete variable used in the simulation program is randomly drawn from a distribution with oscillating probabilities. These continuous probabilities are now the inputs to the simulation. This second technique of selecting the values of discrete variables randomly according to oscillating probabilities has been found to work quite well in the limited testing so far.

Regardless of the method for varying discrete valued variables during a simulation run there remains a serious issue that the experimenter must address. How are discrete variables to be changed during a run if their values alter the logic of the simulation? For example, if a queuing simulation is being run and the number of servers is being oscillated, what happens to customers of a server that is removed? The best approach to this problem found so far is to let the system change “naturally” when values of such variables are changed. In the queueing example just mentioned the logic of a server breakdown (or coffee break) is followed when a server is removed. This may mean that the current customer (if any) is served or it may mean that the current customer may have service terminated. The server may also simply hang out a “this line closed” sign depending on the natural server break behavior in the real system being simulated.

2. USING FREQUENCY DOMAIN EXPERIMENTS IN RESPONSE OPTIMIZATION:

There are several ways that frequency domain experiments can be useful in simulation optimization. For example: in classical Response Surface Methodology frequency domain experiments can be used to assess lack of fit by a linear model and indicate when phase II of RSW (quadratic model fitting) should be started.

Here we discuss a more direct use of frequency domain experiments in simulation optimization. A criterion for local optimality in the frequency domain is first presented and illustrated. This is followed by some approaches to optimization in the frequency domain.

2.1 A Criterion for Optimality:

When a frequency domain experiment is centered in a small region about a local optimum, the spectral amplification at indicator frequencies of all terms involving the unit power of the input variables disappear. Intuitively, this is because the first partial derivatives of the response function are zero. These partial derivatives for unit powers of variables are directly proportional to the coefficients of linear terms in the response surface polynomial meta-model.

To illustrate: consider the response surface given by the function given by

\[ E[X] = -2x_1^2 - 5x_2^2 - 4x_1x_2 + 96x_1 + 48x_2 - 960. \]

This function was used in [Smith, 1976] as a test function for an automated RSW procedure for optimizing a simulation response. In Figure 1 we have the spectrum of the output of a single run at the initial (non-optimal) point of the RSW procedure in Smith’s experiment. The frequency assigned to the factor \( x_1 \) was .07 cycles per observation and the frequency assigned to factor \( x_2 \) was .28 cycles per observation. Note that in Figure 1 spikes at frequencies corresponding to the linear terms dominate the spectrum.

![Figure 1](image-url)
Now consider the same experiment but with the oscillations centered at the optimal values of $x_1$ and $x_2$. The spectrum of a single frequency domain run centered at the optimum is given in Figure 2. Note the shift in the spectrum. All linear terms have no spectral amplification at the optimum as expected.

2.2 Optimization Techniques:

Research is still underway on optimization techniques using frequency domain methods at the time of the writing of this paper. Adaptations of classical non-linear algorithms to the frequency domain as well as completely new approaches are under study. The latest results in this area will be reported at the conference.

3. SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCH:

In this paper we have reviewed the application of frequency domain methods to simulation experiments. We have also presented a new approach for including discrete valued factors in such experiments as well as a new frequency domain criterion for local optimality of a simulation response surface. Using frequency domain methods in simulation experiments is a relatively new idea that holds much promise. The adaptation of these experiments in simulation optimization is a particularly interesting area of research.

The author wishes to acknowledge the help of Sheldon Jacobson who ran the experiments presented in this paper.
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