

Simplex

Proposition. *Simplex*

1. If Simplex returns a result, it is a feasible solution
2. Simplex will terminate in at most $\binom{n+m}{m}$ steps (prevent cycling by choosing entering/leaving variable of least possible index)
3. Simplex algorithm yields an optimal solution (proves that on termination, the maximization and minimization problem is tight on a single solution set)

Definition. Given a **primal** version of LPP,

$$\begin{array}{ll}\textbf{Maximize} & c^T x \\ \textbf{Subject to} & Ax \leq b \\ & x \geq 0\end{array}$$

The corresponding **dual** version is given by

$$\begin{array}{ll}\textbf{Minimize} & b^T y \\ \textbf{Subject to} & A^T y \geq c \\ & y \geq 0\end{array}$$

Lemma. Let \bar{x} be any feasible solution to the primal and \bar{y} be any feasible solution to the dual LPP. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_j \bar{x}_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \bar{y}_i \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad c^T \bar{x} \leq b^T \bar{y}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^n c_j \bar{x}_j &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} \bar{y}_i \right) \bar{x}_j \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \bar{x}_j \bar{y}_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \bar{y}_i\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary. Let \bar{x} be a feasible solution to the primal and \bar{y} be feasible solution to the dual such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_j \bar{x}_j = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \bar{y}_i$$

Then \bar{x} is an optimal solution to the primal LPP and \bar{y} is an optimal solution to dual LPP

Theorem. LPP Duality Assume simplex returns values $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ for the LPP (A, b, c) . Let N be the nonbasic and B be basic variables for the final slack form (N, B, A', b', c', v') . Define $\bar{y} = (\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_m)$ as follows,

$$\bar{y}_i = \begin{cases} c_{n+i} & \text{if } n+i \in N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then \bar{x} is an optimal solution to the primal and \bar{y} is an optimal solution to the dual, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_j \bar{x}_j = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \bar{y}_i \iff c^T x = b^T y$$

<pre> 1 Function Initialize-Simplex(A, b, c) 2 $k \leftarrow$ index of minimum b_i 3 if $b_k \geq 0$ then 4 return $(\{1, \dots, n\}, \{n+1, \dots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)$ 5 $L_{aux} \leftarrow$ be L by adding x_0 to LHS of each constant, 6 and setting the objective function to $-x_0$ 7 $(N, B, A, b, c, v) \leftarrow$ the resulting slack from L_{aux} 8 $l \leftarrow n+k$ 9 $(N, B, A, b, c, v) = \text{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, l, 0)$ //basic solution feasible 10 $x \leftarrow \text{Simplex}(N, B, A, b, c, v)$ 11 if $\bar{x}_0 \neq 0$ then 12 return Infeasible 13 else 14 if \bar{x}_0 is basic variable then 15 do another pivot to make it nonbasic 16 else 17 remove \bar{x}_0 from constraints 18 restore original objective function of L, but replace each basic variable 19 in each objective function by RHS of its associated constraints 20 return Modified slack form </pre>
--

Definition. During initialization,

1. if LPP is infeasible, stops right away

2. if LPP is feasible, but the basic solution is not feasible, transform LPP to another problem such that the basic solution is feasible, do simplex

(a) Define L_{aux}

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \textbf{Maximize} & -x_0 \\
 \textbf{Subject to} & x_1 - x_2 - x_0 \leq -5 \\
 & x_1 + x_2 - x_0 \leq 11 \\
 & x_1, x_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}$$

L is feasible if and only if the optimal objective value of L_{aux} is 0

3. Otherwise, do simplex

NP-Completeness

Definition. Polynomial-time Reducibility Let X and Y be two problems. We say Y is polynomial-time reducible to X if arbitrary instances of problem Y can be solved using a polynomial number of standard computational steps, plus a polynomial number of calls to a blackbox that solves problem X . We specify this as

$$Y \leq_p X$$

X is at least as hard as Y

1. Suppose $Y \leq_p X$, If X can be solved in polynomial time, then so can be Y
2. Suppose $Y \leq_p X$, If Y cannot be solved in polynomial time, then X cannot be solved in polynomial time either
3. If X , Y and Z are 3 problems, and $Z \leq_p Y$ and $Y \leq_p X$, then $Z \leq_p X$

If want to show $X \in NP$, we reduce $Y \leq_p X$ such that $Y \in NP$

Example. Independent set of vertex cover

1. **Independence Set** Given a set $S \subseteq V$ of nodes in graph $G = (V, E)$ is called independent if no two vertices in S is connected in G
2. **Independent Set problem** Find the independent set of maximum size
3. **An equivalent decision problem** Given a graph G and a number k , ask if there exists an independent set of size k .
4. **Vertex cover** A set $S \subseteq V$ in $G = (V, E)$ is called a vertex cover if every $e \in E$ has at least one end in S

5. **Vertex cover problem** Given a graph G , find a vertex cover of minimum size.

6. **An equivalent decision problem** Given a graph G and $k \in \mathbb{R}$, ask if there exists a vertex cover of size at most k

Lemma. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, then $S \subseteq V$ is an independent set if and only if $V \setminus S$ is a vertex cover

Proof. 1. \Rightarrow If S is independent, want to show $V \setminus S$ is a vertex cover. Let $e = (u, v) \in E$. Assume $u, v \notin V \setminus S$, then $u, v \in S$, then S not independent □

Corollary. Independent set problem \leq_p vertex cover problem. Similarly for vertex cover problem \leq_p independent set problem (equally hard)

Proof. If we have a black box to solve vertex cover, then we can decide whether G has an independent set of size at least k by asking the blackbox if G has a vertex cover of size at most $n - k$ □

Example. Set cover Given a set U of n elements, a collection $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m \subseteq U$, and a number k , does there exist a collection of at most k of these sets whose union is U Relation between vertex cover and set cover. For $i \in V$, define

$$S_i = \{\text{edges going out of } i\}$$

so $\cup S_i = E$ so $U = E$.

Lemma. Vertex cover \leq_p Set cover

Example. Set packing Given a set U of n elements, a collection S_1, \dots, S_m of subsets of U and a number k , does there exist a collection of at least k of these sets with the property that no two of them intersect?

Lemma. Independent set \leq_p set packing

Definition. Problem

1. Solving a problem, i.e. finding a solution
2. Verification, i.e. checking if something is a solution

Formulation

1. **Input** A binary string $s \in \{0, 1\}^*$, where

$$I = \{0, 1\}^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{0, 1\}^n$$

2. **Decision problem**

$$X = \{s \in I \mid X(s) = \text{yes}\}$$

3. **Algo for decision problem** An algorithm A for a decision problem is a function that takes a binary string input and outputs yes or no.

4. **Solution** We say A solves problem X if for all strings $s \in I$, we have

$$A(s) = \text{yes} \quad \text{if and only} \quad \text{if } s \in X$$

5. **Polynomial-time solution** We say A is a polynomial-time algorithm if there is a polynomial function P such that for every input $s \in I$, the algorithm terminates in at most $O(P(|s|))$ steps.

$$\mathbb{P} = \{X \mid \text{if there exists a polynomial-time algorithm } A \text{ that solves } x\}$$