

DM545/DM871 – Linear and integer programming

Sheet 3, Spring 2023

Solution:

Included.

Exercises with the symbol $+$ are to be done at home before the class. Exercises with the symbol $*$ will be tackled in class and should be at least read at home. The remaining exercises are left for self training after the exercise class.

Exercise 1 $^+$

Show that the dual of $\max\{c^T x \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$ is $\min\{y^T b \mid y^T A \geq c\}$. Use one of the methods presented in class or even all of them.

Solution:

Let's show it here by the bounding method.

Given $\max\{c^T x \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$ we search for multipliers $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y^T Ax = y^T b$ (since we have equalities, the multipliers can be both positive or negative as we do not need to ensure the maintainance of the direction of the inequality). To ensure that we find an upper bound and hence have $c^T x \leq y^T Ax$, we impose $y^T A \geq c^T$ (since $x \geq 0$). Hence, the best upper bound will be given by solving $\min\{y^T b \mid y^T A \geq c^T\}$ (recalling from linear algebra that $(AB)^T = B^T A^T$, we can rewrite: $\min\{y^T b \mid A^T y \geq c\}$, which is the form we would obtain using the recipe method.)

Exercise 2

Consider the following LP problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & 2x_1 + 3x_2 \\ & 2x_1 + 3x_2 \leq 30 \\ & x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 10 \\ & x_1 - x_2 \leq 1 \\ & x_2 - x_1 \leq 1 \\ & x_1 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Write the dual problem
- Using the optimality conditions derived from the theory of duality, and without using the simplex method, find the optimal solution of the dual knowing that the optimal solution of the primal is $(27/5, 32/5)$.

Solution:

The dual is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & 30y_1 + 10y_2 + y_3 + y_4 \\ & 2y_1 + y_2 + y_3 - y_4 \geq 2 \\ & 3y_1 + 2y_2 - y_3 + y_4 = 3 \\ & y_1, y_3, y_4 \geq 0 \\ & y_2 \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

We use the complementary slackness theorem.

$$\begin{cases} 2y_1 + y_2 + y_3 - y_4 = 2 \\ 3y_1 + 2y_2 - y_3 + y_4 = 3 \\ y_2 = 0 \\ y_3 = 0 \end{cases}$$

The first because the corresponding variable of the primal is > 0 , the second for the same reason or however because it is already tight by definition, the third and fourth equation are a consequence of the fact that substituting the value of the primal variables variables in the primal problem, the second and third constraints are binding. What we obtain is a linear system of four equations in four variables that we can solve to find the value of the variables of the dual problem.

Exercise 3*

Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \\ &\text{subject to} && 2x_1 + 3x_2 + x_3 \leq 5 \\ & && 4x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 11 \\ & && 3x_1 + 4x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 8 \\ & && x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Without applying the simplex method, how can you tell whether the solution $(2, 0, 1)$ is an optimal solution? Is it? [Hint: consider consequences of Complementary slackness theorem.]

Exercise 4

Consider the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min && 3x_1 + 2x_2 - 4x_3 \\ & && 2x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \geq 3 \\ & && x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 5 \\ & && x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Find the optimal solution knowing that the solution of the dual problem is $(u_1, u_2) = (10/3, 11/3)$.

Exercise 5+ LP modeling — Investment plan

An investor has 10,000 Dkk to invest in four projects. The following table gives the cash flow for the four investments.

| Project | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | -1.00 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 1.80 | 1.20 |
| 2 | -1.00 | 0.60 | 0.20 | 1.50 | 1.30 |
| 3 | 0.00 | -1.00 | 0.80 | 1.90 | 0.80 |
| 4 | -1.00 | 0.40 | 0.60 | 1.80 | 0.95 |

The information in the table can be interpreted as follows: For project 1, 1.00 Dkk invested at the start of year 1 will yield 0.50 Dkk at the start of year 2, 0.30 Dkk at the start of year 3, 1.80 Dkk at the start of year 4, and 1.20 Dkk at the start of year 5. The remaining entries can be interpreted similarly. The entry 0.00 indicates that no transaction is taking place. The investor has the additional option of investing in a bank account that earns 6.5% annually. All funds accumulated at the end of 1 year can be reinvested in the following year. Formulate the problem as a linear program to determine the optimal allocation of funds to investment opportunities.

[Taken from Operations Research: An Introduction, Taha]

Solution:

Let

x_i = Krone invested in project $i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$

y_j = Krone invested in bank in year $j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$

| Expected Investment Cash Flows and Net Present Value | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| | Opp. 1 | Opp. 2 | Opp. 3 | Opp. 4 | Opp. 5 | Opp. 6 | Budget |
| Year 1 | -\$5.00 | -\$9.00 | -\$12.00 | -\$7.00 | -\$20.00 | -\$18.00 | \$45.00 |
| Year 2 | -\$6.00 | -\$6.00 | -\$10.00 | -\$5.00 | \$6.00 | -\$15.00 | \$30.00 |
| Year 3 | -\$16.00 | \$6.10 | -\$5.00 | -\$20.00 | \$6.00 | -\$10.00 | \$20.00 |
| Year 4 | \$12.00 | \$4.00 | -\$5.00 | -\$10.00 | \$6.00 | -\$10.00 | \$0.00 |
| Year 5 | \$14.00 | \$5.00 | \$25.00 | -\$15.00 | \$6.00 | \$35.00 | \$0.00 |
| Year 6 | \$15.00 | \$5.00 | \$15.00 | \$75.00 | \$6.00 | \$35.00 | \$0.00 |
| NPV | \$8.01 | \$2.20 | \$1.85 | \$7.51 | \$5.69 | \$5.93 | |

Figure 1:

$$\max z = y_5$$

$$x_1 + x_2 + x_4 + y_1 \leq 10000$$

$$.5x_1 + .6x_2 - x_3 + .4x_4 + 1.065y_1 - y_2 = 0$$

$$.3x_1 + .2x_2 + .8x_3 + .6x_4 + 1.065y_2 - y_3 = 0$$

$$1.8x_1 + 1.5x_2 + 1.9x_3 + 1.8x_4 + 1.065y_3 - y_4 = 0$$

$$1.2x_1 + 1.3x_2 + .8x_3 + .95x_4 + 1.065y_4 - y_5 = 0$$

$$x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5 \geq 0$$

Optimum solution:

$$x_1 = 0, x_2 = 10,000, x_3 = 6000, x_4 = 0$$

$$y_1 = 0, y_2 = 0, y_3 = 6800, y_4 = 33,642$$

$$z = 53,628.73 \text{ at the start of year 5}$$

Exercise 6* LP modeling — Budget Allocation

A company has six different opportunities to invest money. Each opportunity requires a certain investment over a period of 6 years or less. See Figure 1.

The company wants to invest in those opportunities that maximize the combined *Net Present Value* (NPV). It also has an investment budget that needs to be met for each year. (The Net Present Value is calculated with an interest rate of 5%).

How should the company invest?

We assume that it is possible to invest partially in an opportunity. For instance, if the company decides to invest 50% of the required amount in an opportunity, the return will also be 50%.

Net present value:

A debtor wants to delay the payment back of a loan for t years. Let P be the value of the original payment presently due. Let r be the market rate of return on a similar investment asset. The future value of P is

$$F = P(1 + r)^t$$

Viceversa, consider the task of finding the present value P of \$100 that will be received in five years, or equivalently, which amount of money today will grow to \$100 in five years when subject to a constant discount rate. Assuming a 5% per year interest rate, it follows that

$$P = \frac{F}{(1 + r)^t} = \frac{\$100}{(1 + 0.05)^5} = \$78.35.$$

Solution:

Net Present Value calculation:

for each opportunity we calculate the NPV at time zero (the time of decision) as:

$$P_0 = \sum_{t=1}^5 \frac{F_t}{(1 + 0.05)^t}$$

Let B_t be the budget available for investments during the years $t = 1..5$. Let a_{tj} be the cash flow for opportunity j and c_j its NPV. We want to choose a set of opportunities such that the budget is never exceeded and the expected return is maximized. We consider divisible opportunities.

Variables $x_j = 1$ if opportunity j is selected and $x_j = 0$ otherwise, $j = 1..6$

Objective

$$\max \sum_{j=1}^6 c_j x_j$$

Constraints

$$\sum_{j=1}^6 a_{tj} x_j + B_t \geq 0 \quad \forall t = 1..5$$

Exercise 7

Consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && z = x_1 - x_2 \\ &\text{subject to} && x_1 + x_2 \leq 2 \\ & && 2x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 2 \\ & && x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

In the ordinary simplex method this problem does not have an initial feasible basis. Hence, the method has to be enhanced by a preliminary phase to attain a feasible basis. Traditionally we talk about a *phase I–phase II* simplex method. In phase I an initial feasible solution is sought and in phase II the ordinary simplex is started from the initial feasible solution found.

There are two ways to carry out phase I.

- Solving an auxiliary LP problem defined by introducing auxiliary variables and minimizing them in the objective. The solution of the auxiliary LP problem gives an initial feasible basis or a proof of infeasibility.
- Applying the dual simplex on a possibly modified problem to find a feasible solution. If the initial infeasible tableau of the original problem is not optimal then the objective function can be temporarily modified for this phase in order to make the initial tableau optimal although not feasible. Opposite to the primal simplex method, the dual simplex method iterates through infeasible basic solutions, while maintaining them optimal, and stops when a feasible solution is reached.

Dual Simplex: The strong duality theorem states that we can solve the primal problem by solving its dual. You can verify that applying the *primal simplex method* to the dual problem corresponds to the following method, called *dual simplex method* that works on the primal problem:

1. (Feasibility condition) select the leaving variable by picking the basic variable whose right-hand side term is negative, i.e., select i^* with $b_{i^*} < 0$.
2. (Optimality condition) pick the entering variable by scanning across the selected row and comparing ratios of the coefficients in this row to the corresponding coefficients in the objective row, looking for the largest negated. Formally, select j^* such that $j^* = \min\{|c_j/a_{i^*j}| : a_{i^*j} < 0\}$
3. Update the tableau around the pivot in the same way as with the primal simplex.
4. Stop if no right-hand side term is negative.

Duality can help us with the issue of initial feasible basic solutions. In the problem above, the initial tableau is infeasible and not optimal, hence we cannot apply the primal simplex nor the dual simplex. However, if the objective function was $w = -x_1 - x_2$, then we would have the conditions of infeasibility and optimality needed by the dual simplex. You can understand this also looking at the dual problem. With the new objective function the initial basic solution of the dual problem would be feasible and we could solve the problem solving the dual problem with the primal simplex. In contrast, with original objective function z the primal simplex has infeasible initial basis in both problems. So we can change temporarily the objective function z with w and apply the dual simplex method to the primal problem.

When it stops we reached a feasible solution that is optimal with respect to w . We can then reintroduce the original objective function and continue iterating with the primal simplex. The phase I–phase II simplex method that uses the dual simplex is also called the *dual-primal simplex method*.

Apply the two versions of the phase I–phase II simplex method (that is, phase I is carried out with the auxiliary problem or with the dual simplex) to the problem above and verify that they lead to the same solutions.

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & x_1 - x_2 = z \\ & x_1 + x_2 \leq 2 \\ & 2x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 2 \\ & x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

We put in equational standard form by introducing a slack variable $s_1 \geq 0$ and a surplus variable $s_2 \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & x_1 - x_2 = z \\ & x_1 + x_2 + s_1 = 2 \\ & 2x_1 + 2x_2 - s_2 = 2 \\ & x_1, x_2, s_1, s_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This form is not canonical and therefore the first tableau does not have a feasible starting solution.

Auxiliary Problem Approach

We proceed by

- Phase I solving an auxiliary/augmented problem
- Phase II continuing with ordinary simplex

Phase I We introduce an auxiliary variable $a_1 \geq 0$ in the constraint that makes the infeasibility to yield a canonical form:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & x_1 - x_2 = z \\ & x_1 + x_2 + s_1 = 2 \\ & 2x_1 + 2x_2 - s_2 + a_1 = 2 \\ & x_1, x_2, s_1, s_2, a_1 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now we have a canonical form

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--|
| x1 | x2 | s1 | s2 | a1 | -z | b | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

This problem will have the same solution as the original one only when $a_1 = 0$. We can then solve

- an *augmented problem* by introducing the following objective function $\max w = x_1 - x_2 - Ma_1$, where M is a large enough constant or
- an *auxiliary problem* $\min w = a_1 = -\max(-a_1)$.

Let's take the auxiliary problem, if $w^* > 0$ then we will conclude that the feasibility region of the original problem is empty. Otherwise, if $w^* = 0$, then this implies that $a_1 = 0$ and we found a feasible solution. Let's proceed by setting up the tableau of the auxiliary problem

| x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | a_1 | $-z$ | $-w$ | b |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-----|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

This is not in canonical form but it is easy to bring it to canonical form: just add the second row to the last one.

| x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | a_1 | $-z$ | $-w$ | b |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-----|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

The variables s_1, a_1 give us a feasible basis now. It is not optimal. We proceed with the pivot operations. In this case it is worth noting that in the ratio rule, we do not consider the third row since that row corresponds to the original objective function and not to a constraint.

We make x_1 enter the basis and consequently a_1 goes out. The pivot is 2 and the new tableau:

| | x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | a_1 | $-z$ | $-w$ | b |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-----|
| R1' = R1 - R2' | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | -1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| R2' = R2/2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | -1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| R3' = R3 - R2' | 0 | -2 | 0 | 1/2 | -1/2 | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| R4' = R4 - R2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

The tableau is optimal. One non basic variable has reduced cost null, which indicates that there are infinite solutions, but this is not relevant now. The relevant thing is that $w^* = 0$ hence the minimum of the auxiliary problem is 0 and hence there is a feasible solution for $a_1 = 0$. This concludes the Phase I of the algorithm since a feasible solution for the auxiliary problem is feasible also for the original problem.

Phase II We throw away the last row and the second last column from the tableau since we do not need them anymore.

| x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | a_1 | $-z$ | b |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | -1/2 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | -1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | -2 | 0 | 1/2 | -1/2 | 1 | -1 |

The tableau is not optimal. The basic solution corresponding to this tableau is feasible but not optimal. We bring s_2 in the basis and make s_1 leave. The new tableau is:

| | x1 | x2 | s1 | s2 | a1 | -z | b |
|-----------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|
| R1'=2*R1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 2 |
| R2'=R2+R1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 2 |
| R3'=R3-R1 | 0 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -2 |

The tableau is now optimal. The optimal solution is $x = (2, 0)$ and $z^* = 2$.

Dual-Primal Simplex Method

Phase I Let's write the dual of the problem above:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \max & x_1 - x_2 = z \\
 & x_1 + x_2 \leq 2 \\
 & 2x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 2 \\
 & x_1, x_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ll}
 \min & 2y'_1 + 2y'_2 = w \\
 & y'_1 + 2y'_2 \geq 1 \\
 & y'_1 + 2y'_2 \geq -1 \\
 & y'_1 \geq 0 \\
 & y'_2 \leq 0
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{l}
 y'_1 = y_1 \\
 y'_2 = -y_2 \rightarrow
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \min & 2y_1 - 2y_2 = w \\
 & y_1 - 2y_2 \geq 1 \\
 & y_1 - 2y_2 \geq -1 \\
 & y_1, y_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}$$

If we put this LP problem in standard form:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \max & -2y_1 + 2y_2 = w \\
 & -y_1 + 2y_2 \leq -1 \\
 & -y_1 + 2y_2 \leq 1 \\
 & y_1, y_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}$$

and look at the tableau:

| y1 | y2 | s1 | s2 | -z | b |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| -1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| -1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| -2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

we see that the initial tableau like for the primal problem is infeasible.

However, the dual problem has an advantage, if we change temporarily the objective function of the primal problem to $\eta = -x_1 - x_2$, the dual problem becomes:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 \max -x_1 - x_2 = \eta & \min 2y_1 - 2y_2 = \gamma & \max -2y_1 + 2y_2 = \gamma \\
 x_1 + x_2 \leq 2 & y_1 - 2y_2 \geq -1 & -y_1 + 2y_2 \leq 1 \\
 2x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 2 & y_1 - 2y_2 \geq -1 & -y_1 + 2y_2 \leq 1 \\
 x_1, x_2 \geq 0 & y_1, y_2 \geq 0 & y_1, y_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}$$

and the corresponding tableau has an easy feasible basic solution:

| y1 | y2 | s1 | s2 | -z | b |
|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| -1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| -1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|
| | -2 | | 2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | |

We can then solve to optimality with the primal simplex: the variable y_2 enters the basis and the variable s_2 exits. The new tableau becomes:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|
| | | | y1 | | y2 | | s1 | | s2 | | -z | | b | |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | |
| | R1 | | -1 | | 2 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | R2'=R2/2 | | -1/2 | | 1 | | 0 | | 1/2 | | 0 | | 1/2 | |
| | R3'=R3-R2 | | -1 | | 0 | | 0 | | -1 | | 1 | | -1/2 | |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | |

and it is optimal. At this stage we can go back to the primal problem where we now have a feasible solution, change the objective function back to the original one and continue with the primal simplex.

We can do the same iteration on the primal but with the dual simplex. Let's write the tableau of the primal with the objective function temporarily changed and keeping the old objective as well:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|------|--|
| | x1 | | x2 | | s1 | | s2 | | -z | | -e | | b | |
| | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | |
| | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| | -2 | | -2 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | | -2 | |
| | 1 | | -1 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | -1 | | -1 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | | ---- | |

As we see we have the conditions of the dual simplex satisfied, the tableau is optimal but not feasible. Let's make an iteration of the dual simplex. We choose the row with negative b term and the column with negative pivot that minimizes the ratio test: $|c/a|$. We choose the second row and the second column (again watch out that we do not consider the row of the old objective to decide the column). In other terms, we try to make the solution feasible while minimizing the loss in quality. The operations to update the tableau remain the same as for the primal simplex. We obtain:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|-------|--|
| | | | x1 | | x2 | | s1 | | s2 | | -z | | -e | | b | |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | |
| | R1'=R1-R2' | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1/2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | R2'=-1/2R2 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | | -1/2 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | R3'=R3+R2' | | 2 | | 0 | | 0 | | -1/2 | | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | R4'=R4+R2' | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | -1/2 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | | ----- | |

This tableau is optimal for the dual simplex, this means that a feasible solution for the primal problem has been found: $(0, 1, 1, 0)$. We can now proceed with the primal simplex.

Note that the considerations on the dual problem made above were just for explanation purposes, when solving our LP problem we do not need to write the dual form of it or its tableaux. Instead, we just need to switch from dual simplex to primal simplex always working on the original (the primal) formulation of the problem. The dual simplex method is simply a new way of picking the entering and leaving variables in a sequence of primal tableaux.

Phase II We can now remove the temporary objective function and the corresponding column and proceed with the primal simplex.

| x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | $-z$ | b |
|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 1 | $1/2$ | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | $-1/2$ | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | $-1/2$ | 1 | 1 |

x_1 enters the basis and x_2 exits. The tableau is updated consequently:

| | x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | $-z$ | b |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-----|
| R1'=R1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $1/2$ | 0 | 1 |
| R2'=R2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $-1/2$ | 0 | 1 |
| R3'=R3-2*R2 | 0 | -2 | 0 | $1/2$ | 1 | -1 |

A reduced cost is still positive, hence we make s_2 enters in the basis and s_1 leave. This leads to

| | x_1 | x_2 | s_1 | s_2 | $-z$ | b |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|
| R1'=2*R1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| R2'=R2+R1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| R3'=R3-R1 | 0 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | -2 |

The tableau is now optimal and the corresponding basic feasible solution is $x = (2, 0)$ and has value $z^* = 2$.

We can visualize the problem using the LP Grapher tool linked from the course webpage:

Enter the linear programming problem here:

☒ Maximize $z = x - y$ subject to the constraints:

☐ Minimize

☐ Show only the region defined by the following constraints:

$x + y \leq 2$
 $2x + 2y \geq 2$


LP Examples Graphing Examples Solve

Rounding: 4 decimal places Fraction Mode ☐

Erase Everything

The solution will appear below.

| Vertex | Lines through vertex | Value of objective |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| • (0, 2) | $x + y = 2$ $x = 0$ | -2 |
| • (2, 0) | $x + y = 2$ $y = 0$ | 2 Maximum |
| • (0, 1) | $2x + 2y = 2$ $x = 0$ | -1 |
| • (1, 0) | $2x + 2y = 2$ $y = 0$ | 1 |



Exercise 8*

Write the dual of the following problem

$$\begin{aligned}
 (P) \quad & \max \sum_{j \in I} \sum_{i \in I} r_j x_{ij} \\
 & \sum_{j \in I} x_{ij} \leq b_i & \forall i \in I \\
 & \sum_{i \in I} x_{ij} \leq d_j & \forall j \in J \\
 & \sum_{i \in I} p_i x_{ij} = p_j \sum_{i \in I} x_{ij} & \forall j \in J \\
 & x_{ij} \geq 0 & \forall i \in I, j \in J
 \end{aligned}$$

Solution:

There are three different sets of constraints. We introduce the dual variables $\alpha_i \geq 0$, for $i \in I$, for the first set; the dual variables $\beta_j \geq 0$, for $j \in J$, for the second set; and the dual variables $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$, for $j \in J$ for the third set.

We then write the A matrix for the example in the picture, augmented with the b vector:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc|c}
 & x_{G1} & x_{G2} & x_{G3} & x_{G4} & x_{T1} & x_{T2} & x_{T3} & x_{T4} & \\
 \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc|c}
 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & b_1 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & b_2 \\
 1 & & & & 1 & & & & d_1 \\
 & 1 & & & & & 1 & & d_2 \\
 & & 1 & & & & & 1 & d_3 \\
 & & & 1 & & & & & d_4 \\
 p_G - p1 & & & & 1 & p_T - p1 & & & 1 & d_4 \\
 & p_G - p2 & & & & & p_T - p2 & & & \\
 & & p_G - p3 & & & & & p_T - p3 & & \\
 & & & p_G - p4 & & & & & p_T - p4 & \\
 \end{array} \right]
 \end{array}$$

and finally the dual from the columns of the A matrix in general terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (D) \quad & \min \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i b_i + \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j d_j \\
 & \alpha_i + \beta_j + (p_i - p_j) \gamma_j \geq r_j & \forall i \in I, j \in J \\
 & \alpha_i \geq 0 & \forall i \in I \\
 & \beta_j \geq 0 & \forall j \in J \\
 & \gamma_j \in \mathbb{R} & \forall j \in J
 \end{aligned}$$