arXiv:2404.17541v1 [math.OC] 26 Apr 2024

Applications of Lifted Nonlinear Cuts to Convex Relaxations of the AC Power Flow Equations

Sergio I. Bugosen, Robert B. Parker, Carleton Coffrin

Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA

May 2024

Abstract

We demonstrate that valid inequalities, or lifted nonlinear cuts (LNC), can be projected to tighten the Second Order Cone (SOC), Convex DistFlow (CDF), and Network Flow (NF) relaxations of the AC Optimal Power Flow (AC-OPF) problem. We conduct experiments on 36 cases from the PGLib-OPF library for two objective functions, (1) power generation maximization and (2) generation cost minimization. Significant optimality gap improvements are shown for the maximization problem, where the LNC strengthen the SOC and CDF relaxations in 100% of the test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 23.1% and 93.5% respectively. The NF relaxation is strengthened in 79.2% of test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 3.45% and 21.2% respectively. We also study the trade-off between relaxation quality and solve time, demonstrating that the strengthened CDF relaxation outperforms the strengthened SOC formulation in terms of runtime and number of iterations needed, while the strengthened NF formulation is the most scalable with the lowest relaxation quality provided by these LNC.

Nomenclature

N	The set of nodes in the network
E	The set of **from** edges in the network
E^R	The set of **to** edges in the network
I	AC current
$\mathbf{i}$	Imaginary number constant
L	Current magnitude squared, $\|I\|^2$
$V = v\angle\theta$	AC voltage
$S = p + \mathbf{i}q$	AC power
$S^d = p^d + \mathbf{i}q^d$	AC power demand
$S^g = p^g + \mathbf{i}q^g$	AC power generation
s^u	Line apparent power thermal limit
$Y = g + \mathbf{i}b$	Line admittance
$Y^s = g^s + \mathbf{i}b^s$	Bus shunt admittance
$Y^c = g^c + \mathbf{i}b^c$	Line charging
$Z = r + \mathbf{i}x$	Line impedance
$W = w^R + \mathbf{i}w^I$	Product of two AC voltages
$T = t\angle\theta^t$	Transformer properties
θ_{ij}	Phase angle difference (i.e., $\theta_i - \theta_j$)
ϕ_{ij}, δ_{ij}	Phase angle difference center and offset
$(\cdot)^*$	Conjugate of a complex number
$\|\cdot\|$	L2-norm of a complex number
$\Re(\cdot)$	Real part of a complex number
$\Im(\cdot)$	Imaginary part of a complex number
x^σ	Sum of the bounds (i.e., $x^l + x^u$)
$\mathbf{x}$	A constant value

1 Introduction

The AC Optimal Power Flow problem (AC-OPF) is fundamental in power systems computations. It seeks to determine the operating conditions of an electric network such that an objective function (often generation cost minimization) is optimized, electricity demand is met, and AC power flow equalities are satisfied. This problem contains nonconvex and nonlinear constraints, and is known to be NP-hard [1].

Convex relaxations such as the Semi-definite Programming (SDP), Second Order Cone (SOC), Convex DistFlow (CDF), Quadratic Convex (QC) and Network Flow (NF) formulations are useful to provide bounds on the AC-OPF objective function, prove infeasibility of particular instances, and produce a solution that, if found feasible in the original nonconvex problem, guarantees that it is a global optimum [2]. Convex relaxations are also useful to provide bounds in contexts where using a nonconvex model is intractable. Strengthened convex relaxations provide better performance in global optimization algorithms by reducing the number of partitions required in branch-and-bound, or reducing the number of iterations needed in multi-tree methods [3, 4, 5].

Convex relaxations must balance solution quality (tightness) with tractability. Coffrin et al. [2] develops a novel approach to derive lifted nonlinear cuts for the AC power flow equations, specifically to strengthen the SDP and QC relaxations, without significantly increasing solve time. In this paper, we extend the lifted nonlinear cuts to the SOC [6], CDF [7] and NF [8] relaxations. We demonstrate the improved quality of the relaxations and show the trade-off between relaxation quality and solve time that exists among the tightened versions of these three formulations. The computational study is conducted on 36 test cases from the PGLib-OPF benchmark library [9], which features realistic datasets incorporating bus shunts, line charging, and transformers.

2 Strengthening Convex Relaxations

The AC-OPF problem is NP-hard due to the nonconvex product of voltage variables $V_i V_j^*$. This product can be lifted into a higher-dimensional space (i.e. the W-space), where voltage phase information is lost. The absolute square of the voltage product is then relaxed (Eq. (1d)) to obtain the basis for the SOC, CDF, and NF relaxations,

$$w_i = |V_i|^2 \quad \forall i \in N \tag{1a}$$

$$W_{ij} = V_i V_j^* \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{1b}$$

$$|W_{ij}|^2 = w_i w_j \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{1c}$$

$$|W_{ij}|^2 \leq w_i w_j \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{1d}$$

Coffrin et al. [2] propose a novel approach to derive valid inequalities in the W-space. These valid inequalities, referred as lifted nonlinear cuts (LNC), have been proven to strengthen the SDP and QC relaxations. The LNC are shown in Eqs. (2)-(3), where $\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} = (\boldsymbol{\theta^u_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{\theta^l_{ij}})/2$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}} = (\boldsymbol{\theta^u_{ij}} - \boldsymbol{\theta^l_{ij}})/2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{v^\sigma_i} \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_j} (w^R_{ij} \cos \boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w^I_{ij} \sin \boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) \\
&- \boldsymbol{v^u_j} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_j} w_i - \boldsymbol{v^u_i} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_i} \frac{(w^R_{ij})^2 + (w^I_{ij})^2}{w_i} \\
&\geq \boldsymbol{v^u_i} \boldsymbol{v^u_j} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \times (\boldsymbol{v^l_i} \boldsymbol{v^l_j} - \boldsymbol{v^u_i} \boldsymbol{v^u_j}) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{v^\sigma_i} \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_j} (w^R_{ij} \cos \boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w^I_{ij} \sin \boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) \\
&- \boldsymbol{v^l_j} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_j} w_i - \boldsymbol{v^l_i} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \boldsymbol{v^\sigma_i} \frac{(w^R_{ij})^2 + (w^I_{ij})^2}{w_i} \\
&\geq \boldsymbol{v^l_i} \boldsymbol{v^l_j} \cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}}) \times (\boldsymbol{v^u_i} \boldsymbol{v^u_j} - \boldsymbol{v^l_i} \boldsymbol{v^l_j}) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

These LNC are nonlinear, but can be linearized by lifting them to the $\mathbb{R}^4$ space $\{w_i,\ w_j,\ w^R_{ij},\ w^I_{ij}\}$ using Eq. (1c). The goal of this work is to project these LNC into the variable space of the CDF and NF relaxations, and demonstrate that they provide tighter optimality gaps. Note that the LNC are by default expressed in the W-space, thus they are directly applicable to strengthen the SOC relaxation. To highlight the effectiveness of these LNC, we run an optimization-based bound tightening (OBBT) algorithm for the voltage (v_i) and phase angle difference (θ_{ij}) variables using the QC relaxation [10, 11]. The LNC benefits from these procedure as they are derived using the bounds on these variables.

2.1 Strengthened NF relaxation

The voltage product defined as $W_{ij} = w^R_{ij} + \boldsymbol{i} w^I_{ij}$ is not a variable in the NF relaxation. Instead, this formulation is defined in the space of the following variables: $\{w_i,\, S_{ij}\}$. The AC line flow equation, solved for the voltage product term, yields $W_{ij} = w_i - Z^*_{ij} S_{ij}$; this equation is the basis to derive expressions for w^R_{ij} and w^I_{ij} in terms of the NF variables. These are shown in Eqs. (4)-(5), and are used to replace w^R_{ij} and w^I_{ij} in Eqs. (2)-(3). The extended expressions are shown in Appendix A.

$$w^R_{ij} = \Re(w_i - \boldsymbol{Z^*_{ij}} S_{ij}) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{4}$$

$$w^I_{ij} = \Im(w_i - \boldsymbol{Z^*_{ij}} S_{ij}) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{5}$$

2.2 Strengthened CDF relaxation

This relaxation is defined in the space of the following variables: $\{w_i,\, L_{ij},\, S_{ij}\}$. The expression for w^R_{ij} in terms of the CDF variables is shown in Eq. (6) and is obtained by computing the absolute square of the AC current, namely $L_{ij} = I_{ij} I^*_{ij} = |Y_{ij}|^2 (w_i - W_{ij} - W^*_{ij} + w_j)$. The expression for w^I_{ij} is equivalent to Eq. (5). These equations are meant to replace w^R_{ij} and w^I_{ij} in Eqs. (2)-(3). The extended expressions are shown in Appendix B. Even though Eq. (4) is also in the variable space of the CDF relaxation, preliminary experiments demonstrated that the inclusion of the L_{ij} variable in w^R_{ij} is necessary to improve the runtime performance of this formulation.

$$w^R_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\left(w_i + w_j - \frac{L_{ij}}{|\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}}|^2} \right) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{6}$$

3 Computational Evaluation

This section presents the benefits of strengthening the SOC, CDF, and NF relaxations with their associated LNC projections, which were extended and implemented with bus shunts, line charging, and transformers. The formulations for the SOC and CDF relaxations can be found in [12], while the formulation for NF is in [8]. Computations are conducted on a machine with an Apple M2 Max processor and 64 GB of RAM. IPOPT 3.14 [13] with linear solver MA27 was used for finding locally optimal solutions to the extended nonconvex AC-OPF formulated in JuMP v1.20 [14] using PowerModels v0.21 [15]. JuMP and Gurobi v10.0 [16] were used to model and solve the original and strengthened relaxations. A parallelized implementation of the OBBT algorithm in [10] was used to precompute tight variable bounds for the datasets. We present results for the objective of minimizing generation cost and, given that the LNC are equivalent to an upper bound on branch line losses (see Appendix C), we also present results for the objective of maximizing power generation. These types of problems are present in a range of applications, such as robust optimization [17] and determination of voltage stability margins [18]. Results are shown in Tables 1-4 and summarized below.

(1) For the maximization problem: the LNC strengthen the SOC and CDF relaxations in 100% of the test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 23.1% and 93.5% respectively. The NF relaxation is strengthened in 79.2% of test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 3.45% and 21.2% respectively.

(2) For the minimization problem: the LNC strengthen the SOC and CDF relaxations in 41.7% of the test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 0.13% and 0.66% respectively. The NF relaxation is strengthened in 75% of test cases, with average and maximum differences in the optimality gaps of 1.05% and 6.67% respectively.

Table 1: Optimality gaps and runtime results for the power generation maximization problem. Test cases preprocessed with OBBT.

	% Optimality Gap						Runtime (s)					
Test Case	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC
case14_ieee__sad	15.28	10.06	15.28	10.06	22.14	17.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
case24_ieee_rts__sad	40.19	16.98	40.19	16.98	53.86	53.15	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case30_ieee__sad	14.63	13.38	14.63	13.38	15.51	14.86	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case39_epri__sad	23.47	10.63	23.47	10.63	31.28	31.28	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case57_ieee__sad	23.69	8.64	23.69	8.64	52.97	50.34	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case60_c__sad	145.62	52.82	146.34	52.82	242.20	242.20	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00
case73_ieee_rts__sad	41.88	22.34	41.88	22.34	53.54	53.09	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.01
case118_ieee__sad	93.65	38.90	94.10	38.91	132.14	131.29	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.01
case300_ieee__sad	8.23	5.81	8.26	5.80	33.95	32.65	0.20	0.22	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.02
case793_goc__sad	68.65	55.70	68.91	55.70	102.23	99.67	1.17	1.32	0.15	0.23	0.02	0.05
case2312_goc__sad	64.61	61.57	64.78	61.50	97.14	97.07	9.90	14.17	0.67	1.02	0.07	0.18
case3022_goc__sad	82.81	75.84*	83.77	73.89	164.13	163.67	14.17	10.73	0.92	1.22	0.08	0.15
Test Case	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC
case14_ieee__api	46.48	4.64	46.65	4.64	51.47	37.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
case24_ieee_rts__api	43.36	8.09	44.86	8.09	73.48	67.70	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case30_ieee__api	43.10	2.80	44.09	2.80	68.94	47.72	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case39_epri__api	14.91	3.31	14.91	3.31	33.99	33.99	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case57_ieee__api	70.81	21.48	70.83	21.48	123.27	121.60	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case60_c__api	33.16	18.84	33.16	18.84	76.68	76.68	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00
case73_ieee_rts__api	42.21	13.47	43.46	13.47	73.75	68.10	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00
case118_ieee__api	88.62	39.93	89.14	39.95	106.40	105.52	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.01
case300_ieee__api	26.74	18.19	26.99	18.17	40.65	38.75	0.17	0.28	0.11	0.13	0.01	0.02
case793_goc__api	72.13	63.43	72.28	63.43	84.99	84.90	0.45	0.65	0.18	0.39	0.01	0.03
case2312_goc__api	60.50	59.71	60.51	59.71	73.72	73.72	0.72	0.97	0.54	0.79	0.05	0.09
case3022_goc__api	95.59	89.45*	96.19	88.19	112.47	112.05	3.79	4.80	0.80	1.01	0.08	0.15

*Solver displayed numerical warnings / Suboptimal termination.

Table 2: Optimality gaps and runtime results for the generation cost minimization problem. Test cases preprocessed with OBBT.

	% Optimality Gap						Runtime (s)					
Test Case	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC
case14_ieee__sad	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	21.35	14.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
case24_ieee_rts__sad	2.09	2.09	2.09	2.09	13.63	11.52	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case30_ieee__sad	1.90	1.89	1.90	1.89	13.93	12.76	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case39_epri__sad	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	2.60	2.43	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case57_ieee__sad	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.17	2.51	2.37	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case60_c__sad	1.50	1.34	1.50	1.34	3.92	3.49	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00
case73_ieee_rts__sad	3.32	3.32	3.32	3.32	16.18	14.44	0.11	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.01
case118_ieee__sad	5.31	4.65	5.31	4.65	11.53	11.53	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.01
case300_ieee__sad	1.06	1.05†	1.06	0.95	8.02	7.84	0.46	0.68	0.09	0.54	0.01	0.04
case793_goc__sad	8.78†	8.54†	6.94	6.93	10.07	9.33	1.80	3.57	0.21	0.34	0.03	0.07
case2312_goc__sad	4.25†	4.19†	3.93	3.91	5.87	5.87	7.53	10.85	7.03	10.52	0.14	0.26
case3022_goc__sad	2.76†	2.76†	2.77	2.77	2.95	2.95	9.94	3.41	1.27	1.57	0.14	0.22
Test Case	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC	SOC	SOC+LNC	CDF	CDF+LNC	NF	NF+LNC
case14_ieee__api	5.13	5.13	5.13	5.13	22.25	22.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
case24_ieee_rts__api	3.39	3.39	3.39	3.39	10.55	10.25	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case30_ieee__api	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	15.52	13.82	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case39_epri__api	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	2.19	2.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
case57_ieee__api	6.48	6.40	6.48	6.40	18.08	16.84	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00
case60_c__api	0.88	0.77	0.88	0.77	5.69	5.08	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00
case73_ieee_rts__api	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.90	6.63	6.34	0.06	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.00	0.01
case118_ieee__api	7.56	7.52	7.56	7.52	16.21	15.45	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.01
case300_ieee__api	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.60	4.26	4.10	0.23	0.22	0.07	0.11	0.01	0.04
case793_goc__api	23.54†	21.80†	13.96	13.93	17.21	17.05	1.60	2.53	0.18	0.23	0.02	0.05
case2312_goc__api	25.00†	23.56†	17.56	17.52	19.72	19.72	11.43	8.21	0.67	2.13	0.09	0.13
case3022_goc__api	13.50†	13.49†	13.46	13.46	14.42	14.42	2.93	4.96	0.95	6.34	0.14	0.22

†Solver displayed numerical warnings / Suboptimal termination.

(3) The LNC have a more significant effect on the optimality gaps for the maximization objective given their equivalence to an upper bound on branch line losses.

(4) Tables 3 and 4 emphasize the runtime performance difference between the three strengthened relaxations. Even though the SOC and CDF relaxations are mathematically equivalent, thus providing the same relaxation quality [12], the strengthened CDF has better performance than the strengthened SOC, displaying significantly less numerical warnings during each solve.

(5) Coffrin et al. [8] demonstrated that the NF relaxation is scalable for large datasets due to its linearity. Here, the NF relaxation still shows good scalability, even with the inclusion of the LNC, making it suitable for finding tighter optimality gaps when the use of stronger relaxations is computationally prohibitive. It shows appropriate scalability up to 78,484 buses, making it a good choice for obtaining fast lower bounds in global solution algorithms for large networks.

Table 3: Performance comparison - Power generation maximization.

	SOC+LNC		CDF+LNC		NF+LNC	
Test Case	Runtime (s)	Iterations	Runtime (s)	Iterations	Runtime (s)	Iterations
case4837_goc__sad	2.70	50	3.06	59	0.59	22
case5658_epigrids__sad	30.93	306	2.43	31	1.11	22
case9591_goc__sad	7.49	54	9.81	87	1.88	35
case24464_goc__sad	17.46	53	10.87	50	3.80	17
case30000_goc__sad	22.65	94	11.34	51	2.06	20
case78484_epigrids__sad	870.59‡	342	41.77	44	9.24	19
case4837_goc__api	4.94	80	1.18	28	0.28	9
case5658_epigrids__api	25.19	294	1.30	27	0.30	11
case9591_goc__api	8.73	73	3.94	37	0.70	14
case24464_goc__api	152.70‡	237	10.05	38	2.34	16
case30000_goc__api	17.98	80	9.92	51	0.86	17
case78484_epigrids__api	388.13‡	241	41.00	45	7.10	20

‡Solver displayed numerical warnings / Suboptimal termination.

Table 4: Performance comparison - Generation cost minimization.

	SOC+LNC		CDF+LNC		NF+LNC	
Test Case	Runtime (s)	Iterations	Runtime (s)	Iterations	Runtime (s)	Iterations
case4837_goc__sad	13.77	171	2.92	37	0.46	39
case5658_epigrids__sad	6.48	62	3.15	41	1.74	66
case9591_goc__sad	36.08	178	10.33	59	1.37	58
case24464_goc__sad	118.78§	173	28.03§	72	3.25	52
case30000_goc__sad	72.01§	115	47.57§	96	1.92	56
case78484_epigrids__sad	170.44§	68	74.41	72	16.54	84
case4837_goc__api	25.10	285	1.99	40	0.33	35
case5658_epigrids__api.m	8.42	113	1.94	39	0.35	0
case9591_goc__api	20.00	119	6.48	52	1.02	50
case24464_goc__api	122.18§	183	28.97§	75	2.60	47
case30000_goc__api	§	§	41.21§	118	1.14	39
case78484_epigrids__api	123.35	74	53.00	57	14.52	70

§Solver displayed numerical warnings / Suboptimal termination.

4 Conclusion

This letter demonstrates that the projection of lifted nonlinear cuts into the variable space of the SOC, CDF and NF relaxations has the potential to produce tighter optimality gaps with minimal additional runtime overheads. We showed the trade-off between relaxation quality and solve time, concluding that even though the strengthened SOC and CDF formulations are equivalent, the strengthened CDF is the better alternative for solving large datasets. While the NF relaxation provides a weaker optimality gap than CDF, it allows for computation of fast lower bounds during branch and bound algorithms for datasets with more than 78,484 buses.

5 Acknowledgements

We acknowledge funding from the Los Alamos National Laboratory LDRD program through the Center for Nonlinear Studies (CNLS). LA-UR-24-23960.

References

[1] K. Lehmann, A. Grastien, and P. Van Hentenryck, "AC-Feasibility on tree networks is NP-Hard," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 31, pp. 798–801, Jan. 2016.

[2] C. Coffrin, H. L. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, "Strengthening the SDP relaxation of AC power flows with convex envelopes, bound tightening, and valid inequalities," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 32, pp. 3549–3558, Sept. 2017.

[3] C. Chen, A. Atamturk, and S. S. Oren, "Bound tightening for the alternating current optimal power flow problem," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 31, p. 3729–3736, Sept. 2016.

[4] J. Liu, C. D. Laird, J. K. Scott, J.-P. Watson, and A. Castillo, "Global solution strategies for the network-constrained unit commitment problem with AC transmission constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 34, p. 1139–1150, Mar. 2019.

[5] H. Nagarajan, M. Lu, S. Wang, R. Bent, and K. Sundar, "An adaptive, multivariate partitioning algorithm for global optimization of nonconvex programs," *J. Glob. Optim.*, vol. 74, pp. 639–675, Aug. 2019.

[6] R. Jabr, "Radial distribution load flow using conic programming," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 21, p. 1458–1459, Aug. 2006.

[7] M. Farivar, C. R. Clarke, S. H. Low, and K. M. Chandy, "Inverter var control for distribution systems with renewables," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Smart Grid Communications (SmartGridComm)*, IEEE, Oct. 2011.

[8] C. Coffrin, H. L. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, "Network flow and copper plate relaxations for AC transmission systems," in *2016 Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, IEEE, June 2016.

[9] S. Babaeinejadsarookolaee, A. Birchfield, R. D. Christie, C. Coffrin, C. DeMarco, R. Diao, M. Ferris, S. Fliscounakis, S. Greene, R. Huang, C. Josz, R. Korab, B. Lesieutre, J. Maeght, T. W. K. Mak, D. K. Molzahn, T. J. Overbye, P. Panciatici, B. Park, J. Snodgrass, A. Tbaileh, P. V. Hentenryck, and R. Zimmerman, "The power grid library for benchmarking AC optimal power flow algorithms," 2021.

[10] C. Coffrin, H. L. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, *Strengthening Convex Relaxations with Bound Tightening for Power Network Optimization*, p. 39–57. Springer International Publishing, 2015.

[11] C. Coffrin, H. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, "The QC relaxation: A theoretical and computational study on optimal power flow," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 31, p. 3008–3018, July 2016.

[12] C. Coffrin, H. L. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, "Distflow extensions for AC transmission systems," 2018.

[13] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, "On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 106, pp. 25–57, Apr. 2005.

[14] M. Lubin, O. Dowson, J. Dias Garcia, J. Huchette, B. Legat, and J. P. Vielma, "JuMP 1.0: Recent improvements to a modeling language for mathematical optimization," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 15, p. 581–589, 2023.

[15] C. Coffrin, R. Bent, K. Sundar, Y. Ng, and M. Lubin, "Powermodels.jl: An open-source framework for exploring power flow formulations," in *2018 Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, pp. 1–8, Jun. 2018.

[16] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, "Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual," 2023.

[17] D. K. Molzahn and L. A. Roald, "Towards an AC optimal power flow algorithm with robust feasibility guarantees," in *2018 Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, IEEE, June 2018.

[18] Molzahn, Lesieutre, and DeMarco, "A sufficient condition for power flow insolvability with applications to voltage stability margins," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 28, p. 2592–2601, Aug. 2013.

Appendix A: Network Flow (NF) relaxation

The extended AC line flow equation, solved for the voltage product term, yields,

$$W_{ij} = \left(\boldsymbol{Z^*_{ij}} \boldsymbol{T_{ij}} \left((\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{Y^c_{ij}}) \frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - S_{ij} \right) \right) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{7}$$

Expressions for w^R_{ij} and w^I_{ij} are derived as follows,

$$w^R_{ij} = \Re\left(\boldsymbol{Z^*_{ij}} \boldsymbol{T_{ij}} \left((\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{Y^c_{ij}}) \frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - S_{ij} \right) \right) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{8}$$

$$w^I_{ij} = \Im\left(\boldsymbol{Z^*_{ij}} \boldsymbol{T_{ij}} \left((\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{Y^c_{ij}}) \frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - S_{ij} \right) \right) \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{9}$$

The implementation in JuMP is based on the real number formulation for Eqs. (8)-(9),

$$w^R_{ij} = \left(\boldsymbol{tz^R_{ij}}(\boldsymbol{g} + \boldsymbol{g^c_{ij}}) + \boldsymbol{tz^I_{ij}}(\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{b^c_{ij}}) \right) \frac{w_i}{(\boldsymbol{t^R_{ij}})^2 + (\boldsymbol{t^I_{ij}})^2} - \boldsymbol{tz^R_{ij}} p_{ij} + \boldsymbol{tz^I_{ij}} q_{ij} \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{10}$$

$$w^I_{ij} = \left(\boldsymbol{tz^I_{ij}}(\boldsymbol{g} + \boldsymbol{g^c_{ij}}) - \boldsymbol{tz^R_{ij}}(\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{b^c_{ij}}) \right) \frac{w_i}{(\boldsymbol{t^R_{ij}})^2 + (\boldsymbol{t^I_{ij}})^2} - \boldsymbol{tz^I_{ij}} p_{ij} - \boldsymbol{tz^R_{ij}} q_{ij} \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{11}$$

Where the terms tz^R_{ij} and tz^I_{ij} are defined as,

$$\boldsymbol{tz^R_{ij}} = \boldsymbol{rt^R_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{xt^I_{ij}} \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{12}$$

$$\boldsymbol{tz^I_{ij}} = \boldsymbol{rt^I_{ij}} - \boldsymbol{xt^R_{ij}} \quad \forall (i,j) \in E \tag{13}$$

Appendix B: Convex DistFlow (CDF) relaxation

An expression for w_{ij}^R, needed for the lifted nonlinear cut (LNC) implementation, is derived as follows. We first obtain an equation for the absolute square of Ohm's law, which is valid for the extended AC-OPF feasibility problem and is needed to lift the nonconvex problem into the space of line currents (L-space).

$$I_{ij}I_{ij}^* = \left((\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c})\frac{V_i}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}} - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}}V_j\right)\left((\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}} + \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c})^*\frac{V_i^*}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}^*}} - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}V_j^*\right) \quad \forall(i,j) \in E \tag{14}$$

Expanding Eq. (14) and considering $I_{ij}I_{ij}^* = |I_{ij}|^2$, we obtain,

$$|I_{ij}|^2 = |\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}}|^2\left(\frac{|V_i|^2}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - \frac{V_iV_j^*}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}} - \frac{V_i^*V_j}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}^*}} + |V_j|^2\right) + (\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}S_{ij} + \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^{c*}}S_{ij}^*) - |\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}|^2\frac{|V_i|^2}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} \quad \forall(i,j) \in E \tag{15}$$

Assigning the CDF variables $\{w_i,\, L_{ij},\, S_{ij}\}$,

$$L_{ij} = |\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}}|^2\left(\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - \frac{W_{ij}}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}} - \frac{W_{ij}^*}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}^*}} + w_j\right) + (\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}S_{ij} + \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^{c*}}S_{ij}^*) - |\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}|^2\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} \tag{16}$$

Applying the complex number property: $X + X^* = 2\Re(X)$, the expression for w_{ij}^R is obtained from Eq. (16), observing the equivalence,

$$\left(\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - \frac{W_{ij}}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}} - \frac{W_{ij}^*}{\boldsymbol{T_{ij}^*}} + w_j\right) \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} - \frac{2\Re(W_{ij})}{\Re(\boldsymbol{T_{ij}})} + w_j\right) \tag{17}$$

Thus, the projection of w_{ij}^R in the variable space of the CDF relaxation is given by Eq. (18).

$$w_{ij}^R = \frac{\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^R}}{2}\left(\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2} + w_j - \left(L_{ij} - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}S_{ij} - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^{c*}}S_{ij}^* + |\boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^c}|^2\frac{w_i}{|\boldsymbol{T_{ij}}|^2}\right)|\boldsymbol{Z_{ij}}|^2\right) \quad \forall(i,j) \in E \tag{18}$$

For implementation purposes in JuMP, we express Eq. (18) in terms of real numbers,

$$w_{ij}^R = \frac{\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^R}}{2}\left[\frac{w_i}{(\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^R})^2 + (\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^I})^2} + w_j - \left(L_{ij} - 2\boldsymbol{g_{ij}^c}p_{ij} + 2\boldsymbol{b_{ij}^c}q_{ij} + \frac{w_i\left((\boldsymbol{g_{ij}^c})^2 + (\boldsymbol{b_{ij}^c})^2\right)}{(\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^R})^2 + (\boldsymbol{t_{ij}^I})^2}\right)(\boldsymbol{r^2} + \boldsymbol{x^2})\right] \quad \forall(i,j) \in E \tag{19}$$

Finally, the expression for w_{ij}^I is shown in Eq. (11).

Appendix C

Proposition. *The LNC are equivalent to an upper bound on branch line losses.*

Proof. The LNC are given by Eqs. (20)-(21), where $\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} = (\boldsymbol{\theta_{ij}^u} + \boldsymbol{\theta_{ij}^l})/2$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}} = (\boldsymbol{\theta_{ij}^u} - \boldsymbol{\theta_{ij}^l})/2$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}(w_{ij}^R \cos\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w_{ij}^I \sin\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) - \boldsymbol{v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i - \boldsymbol{v_i^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma}\frac{(w_{ij}^R)^2+(w_{ij}^I)^2}{w_i}\\ &\geq \boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l} - \boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}(w_{ij}^R \cos\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w_{ij}^I \sin\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) - \boldsymbol{v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i - \boldsymbol{v_i^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma}\frac{(w_{ij}^R)^2+(w_{ij}^I)^2}{w_i}\\ &\geq \boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u} - \boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Lifting the LNC to the $\mathbb{R}^4$ space $\{w_i,\, w_j,\, w_{ij}^R,\, w_{ij}^I\}$ using $|W_{ij}|^2 = w_i w_j$, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}(w_{ij}^R \cos\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w_{ij}^I \sin\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) - \boldsymbol{v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i - \boldsymbol{v_i^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma} w_j\\ &\geq \boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l} - \boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}(w_{ij}^R \cos\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} + w_{ij}^I \sin\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}}) - \boldsymbol{v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i - \boldsymbol{v_i^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma} w_j\\ &\geq \boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u} - \boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Assuming symmetrical bounds on the phase angle differences (i.e. $\theta_{ij}^u = -\theta_{ij}^l$), $\boldsymbol{\phi_{ij}} = 0$. Reorganizing the LNC and solving for w_{ij}^R, we obtain a lower bound on this variable, as shown:

$$w_{ij}^R \geq \frac{\boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l} - \boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u}) + \boldsymbol{v_j^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i + \boldsymbol{v_i^u}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma} w_j}{\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}} \quad \forall (i,j)\in E \tag{24}$$

$$w_{ij}^R \geq \frac{\boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\times(\boldsymbol{v_i^u v_j^u} - \boldsymbol{v_i^l v_j^l}) + \boldsymbol{v_j^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_j^\sigma} w_i + \boldsymbol{v_i^l}\cos(\boldsymbol{\delta_{ij}})\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma} w_j}{\boldsymbol{v_i^\sigma v_j^\sigma}} \quad \forall (i,j)\in E \tag{25}$$

The simple AC Power Flow equation for a branch is,

$$S_{ij} = \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}|V_i|^2 - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}V_i V_j^* \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\cup E^R \tag{26}$$

Projecting this equation to the W-space,

$$S_{ij} = \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}w_i - \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}W_{ij} \quad \forall (i,j)\in E\cup E^R \tag{27}$$

An expression for the power loss through a branch is obtained by summing the flow going from bus i to bus j (S_{ij}) and from bus j to bus i (S_{ji}),

$$S_{ij} + S_{ji} = \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}(w_i + w_j - W_{ij} - W_{ij}^*) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E \tag{28}$$

Applying the complex number property: $X + X^* = 2\Re(X)$,

$$S_{ij} + S_{ji} = \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}(w_i + w_j - 2w_{ij}^R) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E \tag{29}$$

Replacing Eq. (24) or Eq. (25) in Eq. (29), the result follows,

$$S_{ij} + S_{ji} \leq \boldsymbol{Y_{ij}^*}(w_i + w_j - 2w_{ij}^R) \quad \forall (i,j)\in E \tag{30}$$