

Branch & Bound

Alberto Parravicini

Université libre de Bruxelles

June 1, 2017

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$$

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$$

Often too hard to solve directly.

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$$

Often too hard to solve directly.

Branch & Bound finds the optimal solutions thanks to:

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$$

Often too hard to solve directly.

Branch & Bound finds the optimal solutions thanks to:

- **Branch**: find the optimal solution by exploring smaller sub-problems.

A brief introduction...

Consider a generic optimization problem:

$$\mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}\}$$

Often too hard to solve directly.

Branch & Bound finds the optimal solutions thanks to:

- **Branch**: find the optimal solution by exploring smaller sub-problems.
- **Bound**: use bounds on the objective function to implicitly enumerate all possible solutions.

Observation: if we partition the feasible region X into $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$ and let $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{max}\{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in X_i\}$, then:

Observation: if we partition the feasible region X into $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$ and let $z_i = \max\{c(x) : x \in X_i\}$, then:

$$\rightarrow z = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} z_i$$

Observation: if we partition the feasible region X into $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$ and let $z_i = \max\{c(x) : x \in X_i\}$, then:

$$\rightarrow z = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} z_i$$

Each subset X_i can be split even further, giving an enumeration tree.

Observation: if we partition the feasible region X into $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$ and let $z_i = \max\{c(x) : x \in X_i\}$, then:

$$\rightarrow z = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} z_i$$

Each subset X_i can be split even further, giving an enumeration tree.

We can't explore all possible branches though, they are too many!

Bounding

We can use *upper* and *lower* bounds to cut portions of the feasible region \mathbf{X} .

We can use *upper* and *lower* bounds to cut portions of the feasible region \mathbf{X} .

Observation: given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{X}_k$, if \bar{z}_k is an *upper* bound for X_k then $\max_k\{\bar{z}_k\}$ is an *upper* bound for X . Also, if \underline{z}_k is a *lower* bound for X_k then $\max_k\{\underline{z}_k\}$ is a *lower* bound for X .

We can use *upper* and *lower* bounds to cut portions of the feasible region \mathbf{X} .

Observation: given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{X}_k$, if \bar{z}_k is an *upper* bound for X_k then $\max_k\{\bar{z}_k\}$ is an *upper* bound for X . Also, if \underline{z}_k is a *lower* bound for X_k then $\max_k\{\underline{z}_k\}$ is a *lower* bound for X .

Lower bounds are feasible solutions, while *upper* bounds can be found by solving a relaxation.

In **ILP**, the linear relaxation will provide an upper bound \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* .

Pruning criteria

When can we prune a node of the tree?

Pruning criteria

When can we prune a node of the tree?

→ **Optimality:** if $\bar{z}_i = \underline{z}_i$ then we have an optimal solution of X_i .

Pruning criteria

When can we prune a node of the tree?

- **Optimality:** if $\bar{z}_i = \underline{z}_i$ then we have an optimal solution of X_i .
- **Infeasibility:** if $X_i = \emptyset$.

Pruning criteria

When can we prune a node of the tree?

- **Optimality:** if $\bar{z}_i = \underline{z}_i$ then we have an optimal solution of X_i .
- **Infeasibility:** if $X_i = \emptyset$.
- **Bounding:** if the **upper** bound \bar{z}_i is \leq than some other **lower** bound \underline{z}_j , or of the best feasible solution found so far.



In practice...

→ **How are branches defined?**

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable x_h in x_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.
- **Strong Branching**: try all of them, keep the one with highest upper bound.

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.
- **Strong Branching**: try all of them, keep the one with highest upper bound.
- Other (smallest sub-tour, etc...)

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.
- **Strong Branching**: try all of them, keep the one with highest upper bound.
- Other (smallest sub-tour, etc...)

→ Which branch is chosen?

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.
- **Strong Branching**: try all of them, keep the one with highest upper bound.
- Other (smallest sub-tour, etc...)

→ Which branch is chosen?

- **Depth First**, quickly find a feasible solution; easy to re-optimize.

In practice...

→ How are branches defined?

In **ILP**, pick a fractional variable \mathbf{x}_h in \mathbf{x}_{LP}^* , and define 2 sub-problems:

$$z_{ILP}^1 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \leq \lfloor \mathbf{x}_h^* \rfloor\}$$

$$z_{ILP}^2 = \max\{cx : x \in X, \mathbf{x}_h \geq \lceil \mathbf{x}_h^* \rceil\}$$

→ Which variable is chosen?

- The most fractional.
- **Strong Branching**: try all of them, keep the one with highest upper bound.
- Other (smallest sub-tour, etc...)

→ Which branch is chosen?

- **Depth First**, quickly find a feasible solution; easy to re-optimize.
- **Best Bound**, find the upper bounds of the children and choose the best (slow!).

Further optimizations

→ **Generalized upper bounds**

Further optimizations

→ **Generalized upper bounds**

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

→ Branch & Cut

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

→ Branch & Cut

- Combine **Gomory cuts** with **Branch & Bound**.

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

→ Branch & Cut

- Combine **Gomory cuts** with **Branch & Bound**.
- At each node, add **cuts** to the relaxation of the sub-problem.

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

→ Branch & Cut

- Combine **Gomory cuts** with **Branch & Bound**.
- At each node, add **cuts** to the relaxation of the sub-problem.
- Branch only when adding more cuts stops being effective.

Further optimizations

→ Generalized upper bounds

Used in constraints like $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1$; fixing one $x_i = 1$ creates unbalanced tree; instead, use:

$$\mathbf{r} = \min\{\mathbf{t} : \sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{x}_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$X_1 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, \mathbf{r}$$

$$X_2 = \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_i = 0, i = \mathbf{r} + 1, \dots, \mathbf{n}$$

→ Constraints preprocessing

→ Branch & Cut

- Combine **Gomory cuts** with **Branch & Bound**.
- At each node, add **cuts** to the relaxation of the sub-problem.
- Branch only when adding more cuts stops being effective.
- Computational tradeoff, as cuts are valid only for a node and its children. Very effective in practice, however.

THANK YOU!