

TARAS SHEVCHENKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF KYIV



INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
**PROBABILITY, RELIABILITY AND
STOCHASTIC OPTIMIZATION**

APRIL 7–10, 2015, KYIV, UKRAINE

CONFERENCE MATERIALS

ORGANIZED BY

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Institute of Mathematics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
V. M. Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
National Technical University of Ukraine "Kiev Polytechnical Institute"
Dragomanov National Pedagogical University
Ukrainian Charitable Foundation for Furthering Development of Mathematical Science

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

V. Koroliuk (Honorary Co-Chair), I. Kovalenko (Honorary Co-Chair),
P. Knopov (Co-Chair), Yu. Kozachenko (Co-Chair),
O. Ivanov, O. Klesov, Yu. Kondratiev, K. Kubilius, O. Kukush, N. Leonenko,
R. Maiboroda, E. Orsingher, M. Pratsiovytyj, M. Savchuk, G. Torbin

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

O. Zakusylo (Co-Chair), A. Samoilenko (Co-Chair),
I. Sergienko (Co-Chair), Yu. Mishura (Vice-Chair),
O. Borisenko, V. Golomozi, V. Knopova, A. Kulik, R. Nikiforov,
V. Radchenko, K. Ral'chenko, O. Ragulina, L. Sakhno, I. Samoilenko,
G. Shevchenko, O. Vasylyk, R. Yamnenko, T. Yanevych, V. Zubchenko

On A
mathem
V. S.
graduate
Taras SH
by the in
Since
of USSR
Departm
analysis
the Insti
Academi
V. S.
semi-Ma
these stu
They we
applicati
1978, in
In 198
results o
Ukrainia
with A. V
Since
random p
N. Limni
of the he
of World
The n
reprinted
to "Encyc
The o
1954 he le
Kyiv Uni
statistics"
a part of
of Cybern
(1995). In
V. S. Kor
M. V. Ost
Under
At his
pursuits a
and in sci
in organiz
Mathemat
"Theory o

AUTHOR INDEX

- Abdushukurov A. A., 37
 Ageeva H., 37
 Alekseychuk A. N., 27
 Anulova S., 68
 Aryasova O. V., 51
 Azmoodeh E., 68, 86

 Babilua P., 68
 Banna O. L., 17
 Barbolina T. M., 64
 Bazylevych I. B., 69
 Bezditnyi V. T., 28
 Bila G. D., 69
 Bilynskyi A., 11
 Blazhievskia I. P., 38
 Bock W., 60
 Bodnarchuk S. V., 51
 Bogdan K., 70
 Bondarenko I. S., 35
 Brysina I. V., 33
 Budz I. S., 65
 Buraczewski D., 70

 Cai C., 19
 Chabanyuk Ya. M., 52, 57, 63, 65, 72
 Cherchuk N. V., 17
 Chigansky P., 19
 Chuikov A. S., 18

 Damek E., 52
 Deriyeva O. M., 64
 Didmanidze I., 11
 Dochviri B., 68
 Doobko V. A., 60
 Doronin O. V., 38
 Dozzi M., 18

 Fal O. M., 27
 Fesenko A. V., 28
 Finkelshtein D., 61
 Fomina T. A., 47

 Ganychenko Iu. V., 52
 Garko I., 18
 Glazunov N. M., 31
 Glonti O. A., 12, 53
 Golomoziy V. V., 12
 Gonchar N. S., 13
 Gorbachuk V. M., 64
 Greičius E., 34
 Grothaus M., 61
 Gryshakov S. V., 27

 Ianevych T. O., 71
 Idrisova U. C., 78
 Iksanov A., 71
 Ilichenko O. V., 53
 Imkeller P., 54
 Infusino M., 76
 Isaieva T. M., 22
 Ivanenko D. O., 38
 Ivanov A. V., 39

 Jaoshvili V., 68
 Jarynowski A., 61

 Kaimanovich V. A., 71
 Kakhiani G., 11
 Kakoichenko A. I., 13
 Kakubava R., 31
 Kartashov N. V., 12
 Khabachova A., 13
 Kharin Yu. S., 29, 37, 40
 Kharkhota A. A., 43
 Khechinashvili Z. J., 12
 Khimka U. T., 63, 72
 Khomyak O. M., 32
 Khusanbaev Ya. M., 72
 Khvorostina Yu. V., 22
 Kinash A. V., 72
 Kinash O. M., 11, 80
 Kiria J. K., 49
 Kiria T. V., 49
 Kirichenko L., 13
 Kirilyuk V. S., 65
 Kleptsyna M., 19
 Klesov O. I., 73
 Knopov P. S., 73
 Knopova V., 74

 Kokobinadze T., 11
 Konushok S. N., 27
 Kopytko B. I., 54
 Korkhin A., 40
 Koroliouk D., 41, 62
 Koroliuk V. S., 74
 Kosenkova T., 74
 Kovalchuk L. V., 28
 Kovalenko I. N., 31
 Kozachenko Yu. V., 75
 Kubilius K., 41
 Kuchinka K. J., 75
 Kuchinska N. V., 28
 Kukurba V. R., 65
 Kukush A., 42, 48
 Kulik A. M., 54
 Kulnich G. L., 55
 Kuna T., 76
 Kushnirenko S. V., 65
 Kuznetsov I., 32
 Kuznetsov N. Yu., 32

 Lebedev E. A., 33
 Lebowitz J., 76
 Leonenko N. N., 19
 Livinska H. V., 76
 Lupain M. L., 20
 Luz M. M., 66

 Maiboroda R. E., 42
 Makarichev A. V., 33
 Makogin V. I., 20
 Malyk I. V., 76
 Marina I. V., 55
 Marynych A., 77
 Matsak I. K., 39
 Megrelishvili Z., 11
 Melikov A., 34
 Melnik S. A., 43
 Minkevičius S., 34
 Mishura Yu. S., 14, 15, 21, 55
 Mlavets Yu. Yu., 77
 Moklyachuk M. P., 43, 66
 Molyboga G. M., 78
 Moskvychova K. K., 43
 Mumladze M. O., 49
 Munchak Y., 14
 Muradov R. S., 37

 Nadaraya E. A., 44
 Nakonechniy A. G., 44
 Nasirova T. H., 78
 Nikiforov R., 21
 Norkin V. I., 66

 Oliveira M. J., 62
 Orlovskiy I. V., 39
 Orsinger E., 79
 Ostapenko V. I., 43

 Palukha U. Yu., 29
 Pashko A. A., 79
 Pilipenko A. Yu., 51, 56, 79
 Platsydem M. I., 80
 Pogoriliak O. O., 45
 Polosmak O. V., 80
 Polotskiy S. V., 39
 Ponomarenko L., 34
 Ponomarov V. D., 35
 Postan M. Ya., 62
 Prangishvili A., 31
 Pratsiovytyi M. V., 21-23
 Prihodko V. V., 45
 Prykhodko Yu. E., 56
 Purtukhia O. G., 53

 Radchenko V. M., 56
 Ragulina O. Yu., 15
 Ralchenko K., 46
 Roelly S., 57
 Rogala T., 15
 Rozora I. V., 80
 Rudnytskyi S. O., 23
 Runovska M. K., 81

 Sagidullayev K. S., 37
 Sakhno L., 46
 Samoilenko I. V., 74, 81
 Samosyonok O., 66

POLYHEDRAL COHERENT RISK MEASURES IN DECISION-MAKING UNDER RISK AND UNCERTAINTY

V. S. Kirilyuk

The mathematical apparatus of polyhedral coherent risk measures (PCRM) introduced for discrete random variables [1] is proposed for the risk assessment. The PCRM class has a number of advantages. It is a subset of the class of coherent risk measures having theoretically attractive properties. Besides, its use allows us to reduce portfolio optimization problems to linear programming problems (LPP) [1].

The PCRM class contains a number of known risk measures. One of the most famous such measures is Conditional Value-at-Risk, which in recent years is seen as a successful replacement for Value-at-Risk. The last one has been widely used in finance and insurance for a long time, but currently it is seriously criticized for a number of shortcomings.

The mathematical tool of PCRM allows constructing such risk measures not only in the conditions of known distributions of random variables, but under incomplete information on the distributions [2]. For example, for case of imprecise scenario probabilities of future events.

The examples of constructing PCRM are considered. Their use allows us to unite problems of stochastic programming and robust optimization within the overall approach. It is shown how linear optimization problems under uncertainty using such measures can be reduced to appropriate LPP.

The application of this apparatus for portfolio optimization problems on risk-reward ratio [3] and maximizing expected utility [4] is discussed. We show how these problems are reduced to LPP not only in the conditions of known distributions of random variables, but under imprecise scenario probabilities. In the latter case it is made for the corresponding robust optimization problems. Reducing the initial decision-making problems to LPP allows us efficiently to solve them even under large dimensions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kirilyuk, V. S., *The class of polyhedral coherent risk measures*. *Cybern. Syst. Analysis* **40** (4), 2004, 599–609.
- [2] Kirilyuk, V. S., *Polyhedral coherent risk measures and investment portfolio optimization*. *Cybern. Syst. Analysis* **44** (2), 2008, 250–260.
- [3] Kirilyuk, V. S., *Polyhedral coherent risk measures and optimal portfolios on the reward-risk ratio*. *Cybern. Syst. Analysis* **50** (5), 2014, 724–740.
- [4] Kirilyuk, V. S., *Expected utility theory, the optimal portfolios and polyhedral coherent risk measures*. *Cybern. Syst. Analysis* **50** (6), 2014, 874–883.

V. M. GLUSHKOV INSTITUTE OF CYBERNETICS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, PROSP. AKADEMIIKA GLUSHKOVA 40, KYIV 03680, UKRAINE
E-mail address: vlad00@ukr.net

CONVERGES OF OPTIMIZATION PROCEDURE WITH IMPULSIVE PERTURBATIONS

V. R. Kukurba¹, Ya. M. Chabanyuk², I. S. Budz³

Continuous stochastic optimization procedure (SOP) with semi-Markov's switchings and impulsive perturbations is defined by the evolution equation [1]:

$$du^\varepsilon(t) = a(t)[\nabla_{b(t)} C(u^\varepsilon(t); x(t/\varepsilon^4))dt + \varepsilon d\eta^\varepsilon(t)], \quad (1)$$

where $\nabla_{b(t)} C(u; x) = \frac{C(u+b(t);x)-C(u-b(t);x)}{2b(t)}$, $u \in R$. The regression function $C(u; x)$ depends on uniformly ergodic semi-Markov process $x(t) > 0, t \geq 0$, in the dimensional space phase of states (X, X) , $u^\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$ is a random evolution, ε is a scheme parameter. Impulsive perturbation process $\eta^\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$ and its generator are defined in [1].

Consider conditions of existing Lyapunov function $V(u) \in C^4(R)$, that satisfies exponential stability of average system

$$du(t)/dt = C'(u(t)), C(u) := \int_X \pi(dx)C(u; x). \quad (2)$$

Also we defined additional conditions for regression function and use Kramer condition for distribution function to determine conditions of weak converges of SOP (1) for extremum point of average system (2)

$$P\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u^\varepsilon(t) = 0\} = 1.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Kukurba, V., *Stochastic optimization with semi-Markov switching and impulsive perturbation*. *Mathematic and Computing Modeling Kamenetz-Podolsk National University* **8**, 2013, 112–121.
- [2] Semenyuk, S., Chabanyuk, Ya., *Stochastic evolution systems with impulsive perturbation*. *Physics and Mathematics, National University Lviv Polytechnic* **660**, Lviv, 2009, 56–60.

¹ LVIV POLYTECHNIC NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, S. BANDERA STR. 12, LVIV 79013, UKRAINE
E-mail address: vkuku@i.ua

² LVIV STATE UNIVERSITY OF LIVE SAFETY, KLEPARIVSKA STR. 35, LVIV 79000, UKRAINE
E-mail address: yaroslav.chab@gmail.com

³ LVIV POLYTECHNIC NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, S. BANDERA STR. 12, LVIV 79013, UKRAINE
E-mail address: ihorbud@meta.ua