

CS 325: Project 3

Colin Bradford

Charles Jenkins

Albert Le

May 25, 2015

1 PROBLEM 1

Part A:

i. Linear Problem Formulation

Let each route be represented as variables of the form "SourceDestination." For example a route from Plant 1 to Warehouse 1 would be "p1w1."

Objective function:

Minimize:

$$10 \text{ p1w1} + 15 \text{ p1w2} + 11 \text{ p2w1} + 8 \text{ p2w2} + 13 \text{ p3w1} + 8 \text{ p3w2} + 9 \text{ p3w3} + 14 \text{ p4w2} + 8 \text{ p4w3} + 5 \text{ w1r1} + 6 \text{ w1r2} + 7 \text{ w1r3} + 10 \text{ w1r4} + 12 \text{ w2r3} + 8 \text{ w2r4} + 10 \text{ w2r5} + 14 \text{ w2r6} + 14 \text{ w3r4} + 12 \text{ w3r5} + 12 \text{ w3r6} + 6 \text{ w3r7}$$

Subject To:

Supply Constraints:

$$\text{p1w1} + \text{p1w2} = 150$$

$$\text{p2w1} + \text{p2w2} = 450$$

$$\text{p3w1} + \text{p3w2} + \text{p3w3} = 250$$

$$\text{p4w2} + \text{p4w3} = 150$$

Demand Constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}w1r1 &= 100 \\w1r2 &= 150 \\w1r3 + w2r3 &= 100 \\w1r4 + w2r4 + w3r4 &= 200 \\w2r5 + w3r5 &= 200 \\w2r6 + w3r6 &= 150 \\w3r7 &= 100\end{aligned}$$

Balancing Constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}p1w1 + p2w1 + p3w1 - w1r1 - w1r2 - w1r3 - w1r4 &\leq 0 \\p1w2 + p2w2 + p3w2 + p4w2 - w2r3 - w2r4 - w2r5 - w2r6 &\leq 0 \\p3w3 + p4w3 - w3r4 - w3r5 - w3r6 - w3r7 &\leq 0\end{aligned}$$

Non-negativity Constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}p1w1, p1w2, p2w1, p2w2, p3w1, p3w2, p3w3, p4w2, p4w3, w1r1, w1r2, w1r3, w1r4, \\w2r3, w2r4, w2r5, w2r6, w3r4, w3r5, w3r6, w3r7 &\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

ii. LINDO Code and Output

```
MIN 10 p1w1 + 15 p1w2 + 11 p2w1 + 8 p2w2 + 13 p3w1 + 8 p3w2 + 9 p3w3
    + 14 p4w2 + 8 p4w3 + 5 w1r1 + 6 w1r2 + 7 w1r3 + 10 w1r4 + 12 w2r3
    + 8 w2r4 + 10 w2r5 + 14 w2r6 + 14 w3r4 + 12 w3r5 + 12 w3r6 + 6 w3r7
ST
    p1w1 + p1w2 = 150
    p2w1 + p2w2 = 450
    p3w1 + p3w2 + p3w3 = 250
    p4w2 + p4w3 = 150
    w1r1 = 100
    w1r2 = 150
    w1r3 + w2r3 = 100
    w1r4 + w2r4 + w3r4 = 200
    w2r5 + w3r5 = 200
    w2r6 + w3r6 = 150
    w3r7 = 100
    p1w1 + p2w1 + p3w1 - w1r1 - w1r2 - w1r3 - w1r4 <= 0
    p1w2 + p2w2 + p3w2 + p4w2 - w2r3 - w2r4 - w2r5 - w2r6 <= 0
    p3w3 + p4w3 - w3r4 - w3r5 - w3r6 - w3r7 <= 0
    p1w1 > 0
    p1w2 > 0
    p2w1 > 0
    p2w2 > 0
    p3w1 > 0
    p3w2 > 0
```

```

p3w3 > 0
p4w2 > 0
p4w3 > 0
w1r1 > 0
w1r2 > 0
w1r3 > 0
w1r4 > 0
w2r3 > 0
w2r4 > 0
w2r5 > 0
w2r6 > 0
w3r4 > 0
w3r5 > 0
w3r6 > 0
w3r7 > 0
END

```

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 13

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 17100.00

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
P1W1	150.000000	0.000000
P1W2	0.000000	8.000000
P2W1	200.000000	0.000000
P2W2	250.000000	0.000000
P3W1	0.000000	2.000000
P3W2	150.000000	0.000000
P3W3	100.000000	0.000000
P4W2	0.000000	7.000000
P4W3	150.000000	0.000000
W1R1	100.000000	0.000000
W1R2	150.000000	0.000000
W1R3	100.000000	0.000000
W1R4	0.000000	5.000000
W2R3	0.000000	2.000000
W2R4	200.000000	0.000000
W2R5	200.000000	0.000000
W2R6	0.000000	1.000000
W3R4	0.000000	7.000000
W3R5	0.000000	3.000000

W3R6	150.000000	0.000000
W3R7	100.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-10.000000
3)	0.000000	-11.000000
4)	0.000000	-11.000000
5)	0.000000	-10.000000
6)	0.000000	-5.000000
7)	0.000000	-6.000000
8)	0.000000	-7.000000
9)	0.000000	-5.000000
10)	0.000000	-7.000000
11)	0.000000	-10.000000
12)	0.000000	-4.000000
13)	0.000000	0.000000
14)	0.000000	3.000000
15)	0.000000	2.000000
16)	150.000000	0.000000
17)	0.000000	0.000000
18)	200.000000	0.000000
19)	250.000000	0.000000
20)	0.000000	0.000000
21)	150.000000	0.000000
22)	100.000000	0.000000
23)	0.000000	0.000000
24)	150.000000	0.000000
25)	100.000000	0.000000
26)	150.000000	0.000000
27)	100.000000	0.000000
28)	0.000000	0.000000
29)	0.000000	0.000000
30)	200.000000	0.000000
31)	200.000000	0.000000
32)	0.000000	0.000000
33)	0.000000	0.000000
34)	0.000000	0.000000
35)	150.000000	0.000000
36)	100.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 13

iii. Optimal Shipping Routes and Minimum Cost

The optimal shipping routes and quantity of refrigerators per route are:

Route	Refrigerators
P1W1	150
P2W1	200
P2W2	250
P3W2	150
P3W3	100
P4W3	150
W1R1	100
W1R2	150
W1R3	100
W2R4	200
W2R5	200
W3R6	150
W3R7	100

The optimal minimum cost is \$17,100.

Part B:


To remove Warehouse 2 and all its associated routes, we remove all variables in our equation that contain "w2" in it. The resulting LINDO code is as follows:

```
MIN 10 p1w1 + 11 p2w1 + 13 p3w1 + 9 p3w3 + 8 p4w3 + 5 w1r1 + 6 w1r2
    + 7 w1r3 + 10 w1r4 + 14 w3r4 + 12 w3r5 + 12 w3r6 + 6 w3r7
ST
    p1w1 = 150
    p2w1 = 450
    p3w1 + p3w3 = 250
    p4w3 = 150
    w1r1 = 100
    w1r2 = 150
    w1r3 = 100
    w1r4 + w3r4 = 200
    w3r5 = 200
    w3r6 = 150
    w3r7 = 100
    p1w1 + p2w1 + p3w1 - w1r1 - w1r2 - w1r3 - w1r4 <= 0
    p3w3 + p4w3 - w3r4 - w3r5 - w3r6 - w3r7 <= 0
    p1w1 > 0
    p2w1 > 0
    p3w1 > 0
```

```
p3w3 > 0
p4w3 > 0
w1r1 > 0
w1r2 > 0
w1r3 > 0
w1r4 > 0
w3r4 > 0
w3r5 > 0
w3r6 > 0
w3r7 > 0
```

END

Upon execution of the code, we are met with these solution infeasibility notices:



LINDO Solver Status

×

Optimizer Status

Status:Infeasible

Iterations:4

Infeasibility:50

Objective:18800

Best IP:N/A

IP Bound:N/A

Branches:N/A

Elapsed Time:00:00:18

Update Interval:

1

Interrupt Solver

Close

There is no feasible solution here because Warehouse 3's total possible supply (400) is not capable of supporting the combined demand of R4, R5, R6, and R7 (650). On the other hand, Warehouse 1 is in fact capable of supporting R1, R2, R3, and R4 with its 850 supply to 550 demand ratio, but that still does not solve the larger supply chain deficit and feasibility issue. Overall, we need Warehouse 2 to supplement the supply to

R3, R4, R5, and R6 and sufficiently "spread the load" on the warehouses.

Part C:

To simulate the limitation of 100 shipments (inbound and outbound) on Warehouse 2, we add two new constraints to our code for Part A. The constraints limit the inbound and outbound shipments to being less than or equal to 100.

LINDO Code and Output:

```
MIN 10 p1w1 + 15 p1w2 + 11 p2w1 + 8 p2w2 + 13 p3w1 + 8 p3w2 + 9 p3w3
    + 14 p4w2 + 8 p4w3 + 5 w1r1 + 6 w1r2 + 7 w1r3 + 10 w1r4 + 12 w2r3
    + 8 w2r4 + 10 w2r5 + 14 w2r6 + 14 w3r4 + 12 w3r5 + 12 w3r6 + 6 w3r7
ST
    p1w1 + p1w2 = 150
    p2w1 + p2w2 = 450
    p3w1 + p3w2 + p3w3 = 250
    p4w2 + p4w3 = 150
    w1r1 = 100
    w1r2 = 150
    w1r3 + w2r3 = 100
    w1r4 + w2r4 + w3r4 = 200
    w2r5 + w3r5 = 200
    w2r6 + w3r6 = 150
    w3r7 = 100
    p1w1 + p2w1 + p3w1 - w1r1 - w1r2 - w1r3 - w1r4 <= 0
    p1w2 + p2w2 + p3w2 + p4w2 - w2r3 - w2r4 - w2r5 - w2r6 <= 0
    p3w3 + p4w3 - w3r4 - w3r5 - w3r6 - w3r7 <= 0
    p1w1 > 0
    p1w2 > 0
    p2w1 > 0
    p2w2 > 0
    p3w1 > 0
    p3w2 > 0
    p3w3 > 0
    p4w2 > 0
    p4w3 > 0
    w1r1 > 0
    w1r2 > 0
    w1r3 > 0
    w1r4 > 0
    w2r3 > 0
    w2r4 > 0
    w2r5 > 0
```



```

w2r6 > 0
w3r4 > 0
w3r5 > 0
w3r6 > 0
w3r7 > 0
p1w2 + p2w2 + p3w2 + p4w2 <= 100
w2r3 + w2r4 + w2r5 + w2r6 <= 100
END

```

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 7

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 18300.00

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
P1W1	150.000000	0.000000
P1W2	0.000000	8.000000
P2W1	350.000000	0.000000
P2W2	100.000000	0.000000
P3W1	0.000000	4.000000
P3W2	0.000000	2.000000
P3W3	250.000000	0.000000
P4W2	0.000000	9.000000
P4W3	150.000000	0.000000
W1R1	100.000000	0.000000
W1R2	150.000000	0.000000
W1R3	100.000000	0.000000
W1R4	150.000000	0.000000
W2R3	0.000000	7.000000
W2R4	50.000000	0.000000
W2R5	50.000000	0.000000
W2R6	0.000000	4.000000
W3R4	0.000000	4.000000
W3R5	150.000000	0.000000
W3R6	150.000000	0.000000
W3R7	100.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-20.000000
3)	0.000000	-21.000000
4)	0.000000	-19.000000

5)	0.000000	-18.000000
6)	0.000000	5.000000
7)	0.000000	4.000000
8)	0.000000	3.000000
9)	0.000000	0.000000
10)	0.000000	-2.000000
11)	0.000000	-2.000000
12)	0.000000	4.000000
13)	0.000000	10.000000
14)	0.000000	13.000000
15)	0.000000	10.000000
16)	150.000000	0.000000
17)	0.000000	0.000000
18)	350.000000	0.000000
19)	100.000000	0.000000
20)	0.000000	0.000000
21)	0.000000	0.000000
22)	250.000000	0.000000
23)	0.000000	0.000000
24)	150.000000	0.000000
25)	100.000000	0.000000
26)	150.000000	0.000000
27)	100.000000	0.000000
28)	150.000000	0.000000
29)	0.000000	0.000000
30)	50.000000	0.000000
31)	50.000000	0.000000
32)	0.000000	0.000000
33)	0.000000	0.000000
34)	150.000000	0.000000
35)	150.000000	0.000000
36)	100.000000	0.000000
37)	0.000000	0.000000
38)	0.000000	5.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 7

We see that this is a feasible solution, though it raises our optimal cost from \$17,100 to \$18,300.

The optimal shipping routes and quantity of refrigerators per route are:

Route	Refrigerators
P1W1	150
P2W1	350
P2W2	100

P3W3	250
P4W3	150
W1R1	100
W1R2	150
W1R3	100
W1R4	150
W2R4	50
W2R5	50
W3R5	150
W3R6	150
W3R7	100

Part D:

For some cost c_{ab} and some route x_{ab} where their subscripts represent the route from a to b, the objective function is:

$$\text{Min}(\sum_p \sum_w c_{pw} x_{pw} + \sum_w \sum_r c_{wr} x_{wr})$$

s.t.

(Supply Constraint) For each source node p, where s is supply: $\sum_w x_{pw} = s_p$

(Demand Constraint) For each destination node r, where d is demand: $\sum_w x_{wr} = d_r$

(Balancing Constraint) For each intermediate node w: $\sum_p x_{pw} - \sum_r x_{wr} \leq 0$

(Non-negativity Constraint) For all nodes p and r: $x_{pw}, x_{wr} \geq 0$

2 PROBLEM 2

Part A:

i. Linear Problem Formulation

Let each ingredient be represented as variables using the first two letters of the ingredient's name. For example spinach is "sp."

Objective function:

Minimize:

$$21 \text{ to} + 16 \text{ le} + 40 \text{ sp} + 41 \text{ ca} + 41 \text{ su} + 120 \text{ sm} + 164 \text{ ch} + 884 \text{ oi}$$

Subject To:

Nutrition Constraints:

$$0.85 \text{ to} + 1.62 \text{ le} + 2.86 \text{ sp} + 0.93 \text{ ca} + 23.4 \text{ su} + 16 \text{ sm} + 9 \text{ ch} \geq 15$$

$$0.33 \text{ to} + 0.20 \text{ le} + 0.39 \text{ sp} + 0.24 \text{ ca} + 48.7 \text{ su} + 5 \text{ sm} + 2.6 \text{ ch} + 100 \text{ oi} \geq 2$$

$0.33 \text{ to} + 0.20 \text{ le} + 0.39 \text{ sp} + 0.24 \text{ ca} + 48.7 \text{ su} + 5 \text{ sm} + 2.6 \text{ ch} + 100 \text{ oi} \leq 8$
 $4.64 \text{ to} + 2.37 \text{ le} + 3.63 \text{ sp} + 9.58 \text{ ca} + 15 \text{ su} + 3 \text{ sm} + 27 \text{ ch} \geq 4$
 $9 \text{ to} + 28 \text{ le} + 65 \text{ sp} + 69 \text{ ca} + 3.8 \text{ su} + 120 \text{ sm} + 78 \text{ ch} \leq 200$
 $\text{le} + \text{sp} - .4\text{le} - .4\text{sp} - .4\text{to} - .4\text{ca} - .4\text{su} - .4\text{sm} - .4\text{ch} - .4\text{oi} \geq 0$

Non-negativity Constraints:

$\text{le}, \text{sp}, \text{to}, \text{ca}, \text{su}, \text{sm}, \text{ch}, \text{oi} \geq 0$

ii. LINDO Code and Output

MIN 21 to + 16 le + 40 sp + 41 ca + 41 su + 120 sm + 164 ch + 884 oi
ST

$0.85 \text{ to} + 1.62 \text{ le} + 2.86 \text{ sp} + 0.93 \text{ ca} + 23.4 \text{ su} + 16 \text{ sm} + 9 \text{ ch} \geq 15$
 $0.33 \text{ to} + 0.20 \text{ le} + 0.39 \text{ sp} + 0.24 \text{ ca} + 48.7 \text{ su} + 5 \text{ sm} + 2.6 \text{ ch} + 100 \text{ oi} \geq 8$
 $0.33 \text{ to} + 0.20 \text{ le} + 0.39 \text{ sp} + 0.24 \text{ ca} + 48.7 \text{ su} + 5 \text{ sm} + 2.6 \text{ ch} + 100 \text{ oi} \leq 8$
 $4.64 \text{ to} + 2.37 \text{ le} + 3.63 \text{ sp} + 9.58 \text{ ca} + 15 \text{ su} + 3 \text{ sm} + 27 \text{ ch} \geq 4$
 $9 \text{ to} + 28 \text{ le} + 65 \text{ sp} + 69 \text{ ca} + 3.8 \text{ su} + 120 \text{ sm} + 78 \text{ ch} \leq 200$
 $\text{le} + \text{sp} - .4\text{le} - .4\text{sp} - .4\text{to} - .4\text{ca} - .4\text{su} - .4\text{sm} - .4\text{ch} - .4\text{oi} \geq 0$
 $\text{le} > 0$
 $\text{sp} > 0$
 $\text{to} > 0$
 $\text{ca} > 0$
 $\text{su} > 0$
 $\text{sm} > 0$
 $\text{ch} > 0$
 $\text{oi} > 0$

END

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 8

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 103.3371

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
TO	0.000000	16.520000
LE	0.561163	0.000000
SP	0.000000	13.916369
CA	0.000000	35.535095
SU	0.084189	0.000000
SM	0.757556	0.000000
CH	0.000000	96.583527
OI	0.000000	1212.744385

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-8.632957
3)	6.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	3.269654
5)	0.865455	0.000000
6)	93.060745	0.000000
7)	0.000000	-4.447570
8)	0.561163	0.000000
9)	0.000000	0.000000
10)	0.000000	0.000000
11)	0.000000	0.000000
12)	0.084189	0.000000
13)	0.757556	0.000000
14)	0.000000	0.000000
15)	0.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 8

The minimum amount of calories a salad can contain while meeting the nutrition constraints is 103.3371 calories.

The optimal ingredient mix is:

Ingredient	Amount
LE	0.561163
SU	0.084189
SM	0.757556

iii.

The cost of this salad is: $(0.561163 \cdot .75) + (0.084189 \cdot .45) + (0.757556 \cdot 2.15) = \$2.0875 \approx \$2.09$.

Part B:

i. Linear Problem Formulation

Let each ingredient be represented as variables using the first two letters of the ingredient's name. For example spinach is "sp."

Objective function:

Minimize:

1 to + .75 le + .5 sp + .5 ca + .45 su + 2.15 sm + .95 ch + 2 oi

Subject To:

Nutrition Constraints:

0.85 to + 1.62 le + 2.86 sp + 0.93 ca + 23.4 su + 16 sm + 9 ch >= 15
 0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi >= 2
 0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi <= 8
 4.64 to + 2.37 le + 3.63 sp + 9.58 ca + 15 su + 3 sm + 27 ch >= 4
 9 to + 28 le + 65 sp + 69 ca + 3.8 su + 120 sm + 78 ch <= 200
 le + sp - .4le - .4sp - .4to - .4ca - .4su - .4sm - .4ch - .4oi >= 0

Non-negativity Constraints:

le, sp, to, ca, su, sm, ch, oi >= 0

ii. LINDO Code and Output

```
MIN 1 to + .75 le + .5 sp + .5 ca + .45 su + 2.15 sm + .95 ch + 2 oi
ST
    0.85 to + 1.62 le + 2.86 sp + 0.93 ca + 23.4 su + 16 sm + 9 ch >= 15
    0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi >= 2
    0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi <= 8
    4.64 to + 2.37 le + 3.63 sp + 9.58 ca + 15 su + 3 sm + 27 ch >= 4
    9 to + 28 le + 65 sp + 69 ca + 3.8 su + 120 sm + 78 ch <= 200
    le + sp - .4le - .4sp - .4to - .4ca - .4su - .4sm - .4ch - .4oi >= 0
    le > 0
    sp > 0
    to > 0
    ca > 0
    su > 0
    sm > 0
    ch > 0
    oi > 0
END
```

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 2

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 1.554133

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
TO	0.000000	1.002081
LE	0.000000	0.402912

SP	0.832298	0.000000
CA	0.000000	0.486914
SU	0.096083	0.000000
SM	0.000000	0.405609
CH	1.152364	0.000000
OI	0.000000	7.281258

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-0.131261
3)	6.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	0.051847
5)	31.576324	0.000000
6)	55.651089	0.000000
7)	0.000000	-0.241358
8)	0.000000	0.000000
9)	0.832298	0.000000
10)	0.000000	0.000000
11)	0.000000	0.000000
12)	0.096083	0.000000
13)	0.000000	0.000000
14)	1.152364	0.000000
15)	0.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 2

The minimum cost of a salad while meeting the nutrition constraints is \$1.554133 \approx \$1.55.

The optimal ingredient mix is:

Ingredient	Amount
SP	0.832298
SU	0.096083
CH	1.152364

iii.

The caloric content of this salad is: $(0.832298 \times 40) + (0.096083 \times 585) + (1.152364 \times 164) = 278.488$ calories.

Part C:

i. Finding Possible Alternatives

First we have a manual way:

She can look at the two optimal solutions provided above and first see which of the two is closest to her overall goal of a low calorie, low cost salad. She should notice that the low calorie salad is well under her calorie goal of 250, and it is only \$0.09 away from the margin she wants. The low cost salad provides a comparative benefit of \$0.54 (about 25% less than the low calorie option) for a caloric increase of 175.1509 (about 70% more than the low calorie option).

Overall, she is probably going to notice that lowering cost quickly raises the calories of the salad. She should start with the low calorie option, and slowly replace low calorie, expensive ingredients with higher calorie variants until she finds a satisfactory ratio of cost to nutrition. To prioritize the effort, in this case, of the three ingredients in her salad, the smoked tofu is by far the most expensive. She should take away bits of smoked tofu and replace it with chickpeas. The chickpeas are similar enough across the board nutritionally and dramatically cheaper.

Now a more automated way:

She could run two modified LINDO programs that incorporate the objective of one program as a constraint on the other and vice versa. Of course the nutrition-focused program will optimize more for nutrition and less for cost and the opposite is true for the cost-focused algorithm. Then it comes down to a business decision as to whether she wants to sell more units (lower calorie) or make more money per unit (cheaper).

ii. Suggested Alternative

We would suggest the following ingredient list based on wanting to prioritize the caloric content of the meal and just make enough margin on price:

Ingredient	Amount
LE	0.359265
SP	0.192344
SU	0.085036
SM	0.742378

The cost of this lettuce, spinach, sunflower seed, and smoked tofu salad is exactly \$2.00 $[(0.359265 * 0.75) + (0.192344 * 0.5) + (0.085036 * 0.45) + (0.742378 * 2.15)]$ and it is 106.0138 calories. This greatly exceeds our caloric goal of 250 calories and meets our profit goal of \$3.00 when sold at \$5.00.

iii. Derivation of Solution

We derived the solution by running the two LINDO programs mentioned above (cost- and calorie-focused) and the calorie-focused approach met our goals very well, while the cost approach couldn't adequately keep the calorie count below 250.

CALORIE-FOCUSED:


```

MIN 21 to + 16 le + 40 sp + 41 ca + 41 su + 120 sm + 164 ch + 884 oi
ST
0.85 to + 1.62 le + 2.86 sp + 0.93 ca + 23.4 su + 16 sm + 9 ch >= 15
0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi >=
0.33 to + 0.20 le + 0.39 sp + 0.24 ca + 48.7 su + 5 sm + 2.6 ch + 100 oi <=
4.64 to + 2.37 le + 3.63 sp + 9.58 ca + 15 su + 3 sm + 27 ch >= 4
9 to + 28 le + 65 sp + 69 ca + 3.8 su + 120 sm + 78 ch <= 200
le + sp - .4le - .4sp - .4to - .4ca - .4su - .4sm - .4ch - .4oi >= 0
le > 0
sp > 0
to > 0
ca > 0
su > 0
sm > 0
ch > 0
oi > 0
1 to + .75 le + .5 sp + .5 ca + .45 su + 2.15 sm + .95 ch + 2 oi <= 2
END

```

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 1

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 106.0138

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
TO	0.000000	52.999741
LE	0.359265	0.000000
SP	0.192344	0.000000
CA	0.000000	56.100624
SU	0.085036	0.000000
SM	0.742378	0.000000
CH	0.000000	92.476135
OI	0.000000	1493.750610

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-14.010375
3)	6.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	5.370244
5)	1.052338	0.000000
6)	88.029716	0.000000
7)	0.000000	-28.866138

8)	0.359265	0.000000
9)	0.192344	0.000000
10)	0.000000	0.000000
11)	0.000000	0.000000
12)	0.085036	0.000000
13)	0.742378	0.000000
14)	0.000000	0.000000
15)	0.000000	0.000000
16)	0.000000	30.589922

NO. ITERATIONS= 1

3 PROBLEM 3

Part A:

i. General Problem Statement

Objective:

$Min \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$, for some b_i representing $|y_i - (a_1x_i + a_0)|$ for each $i = 1...n$

s.t.

For each $i = 1...n$, $b_i - (y_i - (a_1x_i + a_0)) \geq 0$

For each $i = 1...n$, $b_i + (y_i - (a_1x_i + a_0)) \geq 0$

ii. LINDO Code and Output

MIN b1 + b2 + b3 + b4 + b5 + b6 + b7

ST

```

b1 + 1 a1 + a0 >= 5
b1 - 1 a1 - a0 >= -5
b2 + 1 a1 + a0 >= 3
b2 - 1 a1 - a0 >= -3
b3 + 2 a1 + a0 >= 13
b3 - 2 a1 - a0 >= -13
b4 + 3 a1 + a0 >= 8
b4 - 3 a1 - a0 >= -8
b5 + 4 a1 + a0 >= 10
b5 - 4 a1 - a0 >= -10
b6 + 5 a1 + a0 >= 14
b6 - 5 a1 - a0 >= -14
b7 + 6 a1 + a0 >= 18
b7 - 6 a1 - a0 >= -18
b1 > 0

```

```

b2 > 0
b3 > 0
b4 > 0
b5 > 0
b6 > 0
b7 > 0
END

```

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 7

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 12.25000

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
B1	2.000000	0.000000
B2	0.000000	0.250000
B3	7.250000	0.000000
B4	0.500000	0.000000
B5	1.250000	0.000000
B6	0.000000	0.750000
B7	1.250000	0.000000
A1	2.750000	0.000000
A0	0.250000	0.000000


ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	-1.000000
3)	4.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	0.000000
5)	0.000000	-0.750000
6)	0.000000	-1.000000
7)	14.500000	0.000000
8)	1.000000	0.000000
9)	0.000000	-1.000000
10)	2.500000	0.000000
11)	0.000000	-1.000000
12)	0.000000	0.000000
13)	0.000000	-0.250000
14)	0.000000	-1.000000
15)	2.500000	0.000000
16)	2.000000	0.000000
17)	0.000000	0.000000
18)	7.250000	0.000000

19)	0.500000	0.000000
20)	1.250000	0.000000
21)	0.000000	0.000000
22)	1.250000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 7

The sum of the absolute deviations was 12.25.

iii. Graph



The LAD approach creates a line that has a steeper slope and lesser y-intercept than the least squares line. The line more tightly follows the path of the majority of the data points and seems to be less affected by the outlier at $x = 2$.

Part B:

i. General Problem Statement

Objective:

$\text{Min } b$, for some b representing $\text{Max}|y_i - (a_1x_i + a_0)|$

s.t.

For each $i = 1 \dots n$, $b + a_1x_i + a_0 \geq y_i$

For each $i = 1 \dots n$, $b - a_1x_i - a_0 \geq -y_i$

ii. LINDO Code and Output

MIN b

ST

b + 1 a1 + a0 >= 5
b - 1 a1 - a0 >= -5
b + 1 a1 + a0 >= 3
b - 1 a1 - a0 >= -3
b + 2 a1 + a0 >= 13
b - 2 a1 - a0 >= -13
b + 3 a1 + a0 >= 8
b - 3 a1 - a0 >= -8
b + 4 a1 + a0 >= 10
b - 4 a1 - a0 >= -10
b + 5 a1 + a0 >= 14
b - 5 a1 - a0 >= -14
b + 6 a1 + a0 >= 18
b - 6 a1 - a0 >= -18
b > 0

END

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 3

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 3.833333

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
B	3.833333	0.000000
A1	2.333333	0.000000
A0	4.500000	0.000000


ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	5.666667	0.000000
3)	2.000000	0.000000
4)	7.666667	0.000000
5)	0.000000	-0.333333
6)	0.000000	-0.500000
7)	7.666667	0.000000
8)	7.333333	0.000000
9)	0.333333	0.000000
10)	7.666667	0.000000
11)	0.000000	-0.166667
12)	6.000000	0.000000
13)	1.666667	0.000000
14)	4.333333	0.000000

15)	3.333333	0.000000
16)	3.833333	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 3

The min of the max absolute deviations was 3.833333.


iii. Graph



The MMAD approach gives a line that appears to be more affected by the outlier at $x = 2$ with a much higher y-intercept than the LAD and least squares approaches. It's slope however, is only slightly steeper than the least squares line.

iv. Same Line Data Set

Yes, the data set $(x,y) = [(1,2), (2,4), (3,6)]$ computes the same line for all three methods.



LAD Method:

MIN $b_1 + b_2 + b_3$

ST

$b_1 + 1 \cdot a_1 + a_0 \geq 2$
 $b_1 - 1 \cdot a_1 - a_0 \geq -2$
 $b_2 + 2 \cdot a_1 + a_0 \geq 4$
 $b_2 - 2 \cdot a_1 - a_0 \geq -4$
 $b_3 + 3 \cdot a_1 + a_0 \geq 6$
 $b_3 - 3 \cdot a_1 - a_0 \geq -6$
 $b_1 > 0$
 $b_2 > 0$
 $b_3 > 0$

END

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 1

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 0.000000E+00

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
B1	0.000000	1.000000
B2	0.000000	1.000000
B3	0.000000	1.000000

A1	2.000000	0.000000
A0	0.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	0.000000
3)	0.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	0.000000
5)	0.000000	0.000000
6)	0.000000	0.000000
7)	0.000000	0.000000
8)	0.000000	0.000000
9)	0.000000	0.000000
10)	0.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 1

MMAD Method:

MIN b

ST

b + 1 a1 + a0 >= 2
 b - 1 a1 - a0 >= -2
 b + 2 a1 + a0 >= 4
 b - 2 a1 - a0 >= -4
 b + 3 a1 + a0 >= 6
 b - 3 a1 - a0 >= -6
 b > 0

END

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 1

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 0.0000000E+00

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
B	0.000000	1.000000
A1	2.000000	0.000000
A0	0.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	0.000000	0.000000

3)	0.000000	0.000000
4)	0.000000	0.000000
5)	0.000000	0.000000
6)	0.000000	0.000000
7)	0.000000	0.000000
8)	0.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 1

Least Squares Line was produced in Excel (see graph above) rather than LINDO.

Part C: Objective:

$\text{Min } \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$, for some b_i representing $|y_i - (a_2x_{2i} + a_1x_{1i} + a_0)|$ for each $i = 1 \dots n$

s.t.

For each $i = 1 \dots n$, $b_i - (y_i - (a_2x_{2i} + a_1x_{1i} + a_0)) \geq 0$

For each $i = 1 \dots n$, $b_i + (y_i - (a_2x_{2i} + a_1x_{1i} + a_0)) \geq 0$

MIN b1 + b2 + b3 + b4 + b5 + b6

ST

$b1 + 1 \ a2 + 1 \ a1 + a0 \geq 5$
 $b1 - 1 \ a2 - 1 \ a1 - a0 \geq -5$
 $b2 + 2 \ a2 + 1 \ a1 + a0 \geq 9$
 $b2 - 2 \ a2 - 1 \ a1 - a0 \geq -9$
 $b3 + 2 \ a2 + 2 \ a1 + a0 \geq 12$
 $b3 - 2 \ a2 - 2 \ a1 - a0 \geq -12$
 $b4 + 1 \ a2 + 0 \ a1 + a0 \geq 3$
 $b4 - 1 \ a2 - 0 \ a1 - a0 \geq -3$
 $b5 + 0 \ a2 + 0 \ a1 + a0 \geq 0$
 $b5 - 0 \ a2 - 0 \ a1 - a0 \geq 0$
 $b6 + 3 \ a2 + 1 \ a1 + a0 \geq 11$
 $b6 - 3 \ a2 - 1 \ a1 - a0 \geq -11$
 $b1 > 0$
 $b2 > 0$
 $b3 > 0$
 $b4 > 0$
 $b5 > 0$
 $b6 > 0$

END

LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP 8

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 2.000000

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
B1	1.000000	0.000000
B2	0.000000	0.000000
B3	0.000000	0.500000
B4	0.000000	0.000000
B5	0.000000	0.500000
B6	1.000000	0.000000
A2	3.000000	0.000000
A1	3.000000	0.000000
A0	0.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
2)	2.000000	0.000000
3)	0.000000	-1.000000
4)	0.000000	-1.000000
5)	0.000000	0.000000
6)	0.000000	-0.500000
7)	0.000000	0.000000
8)	0.000000	-1.000000
9)	0.000000	0.000000
10)	0.000000	0.000000
11)	0.000000	-0.500000
12)	2.000000	0.000000
13)	0.000000	-1.000000
14)	1.000000	0.000000
15)	0.000000	0.000000
16)	0.000000	0.000000
17)	0.000000	0.000000
18)	0.000000	0.000000
19)	1.000000	0.000000

NO. ITERATIONS= 8

The sum of the absolute deviations was 2.
The regression model is: $y = 3x_2 + 3x_1 + 0$