МОСКОВСКИЙ АВИАЦИОННЫЙ ИНСТИТУТ
(НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ)

Институт №8 «Информационные технологии и прикладная математика»
Кафедра 804 «Теория вероятностей и компьютерное моделирование»

# Лабораторная работа №1
# по курсу «Математическая экономика»

Выполнил: М.А.Трофимов

Группа: М8О-408Б-18

Преподаватель: С.В.Иванов

Москва, 2021

Текст программы:

```
library(Matrix)
library(gurobi)
library(ramify) # для argmax
# =========
#   p two
# =========

l <- 8
k <- 21
n <- 10 + k%/%4
#n <- 2
m <- 30 - k%/%4
#m <- 3

cat("l =", l, '\n')
cat("k =", k, '\n')
cat("n =", n, '\n')
cat("m =", m, '\n')

tmp <- 0

b <- c()

for ( i in 1:m){
  tmp = 70 + l + k + i
  b = append(b, tmp)
}
cat("b :", b, "\n")

c <- c()

for ( i in 1:n){
  tmp = 50 + l + k - i
  c = append(c, tmp)
}
cat("c :", c, "\n")

A <- c()
for (i in 1:m)
  for ( j in 1:n){
          tmp = 1 + ( (j+k)*i + j*j + i*i*i + 3*(i+l) ) %% (30 + k%/%5)
          #tmp = (i-1)*n + j
          A = append(A, tmp)
  }
A = matrix(A, ncol=n, byrow=T)
cat("A :\n")
```

```
print(A)

# =========
#  p three
# =========

model=list()
model$A = A
model$obj = c
model$modelsense = 'max'
model$rhs = b
model$vtype = 'C'

result = gurobi(model)
print('objective value')
print(result$objval) # выведем оптимальное значение целевой функции
print('x=')
print(result$x) # выведем решение задачи
print('y=')
print(result$pi) # выведем решение двойственной задачи

value1 = result$objval

# =========
#  p four
# =========

idx = argmax(matrix(result$pi), rows=F)
result$pi[idx]=0
idx2 = argmax(matrix(result$pi), rows=F)

cat("\n\nBest resource to increase is", idx, "th resource\n\n")

b[idx] = b[idx] + 1
model$rhs = b
b[idx] = b[idx] - 1


result = gurobi(model)
print('objective value')
print(result$objval) # выведем оптимальное значение целевой функции
print('x=')
print(result$x) # выведем решение задачи
print('y=')
print(result$pi) # выведем решение двойственной задачи

value2 = result$objval
# =========
```

```
#  p five
# =========

b[idx2] = b[idx2] + 1
model$rhs = b
b[idx2] = b[idx2] - 1

cat("\n\nchange resource", idx2, "\n\n")

result = gurobi(model)
print('objective value')
print(result$objval) # выведем оптимальное значение целевой функции
print('x=')
print(result$x) # выведем решение задачи
print('y=')
print(result$pi) # выведем решение двойственной задачи

value3 = result$objval

cat("\n\nprevious value", value2, "better then", value3, "\n\n")

# =========
#  p six
# =========

model$rhs = b
model$vtype = 'I'

result = gurobi(model)
print('objective value')
print(result$objval) # выведем оптимальное значение целевой функции
print('x=')
print(result$x) # выведем решение задачи
cat("\n\n")

value4 = result$objval

# =========
#  p seven
# =========

vtypes = c()

for ( i in 1:(n%/%2) ){
  vtypes = append(vtypes,'I')
}

for ( i in (n%/%2 + 1):n ){
```

```
  vtypes = append(vtypes,'C')
}


model$vtype = vtypes

result = gurobi(model)
print('objective value')
print(result$objval) # выведем оптимальное значение целевой функции
print('x=')
print(result$x) # выведем решение задачи

value5 = result$objval

# =========
#  p eight
# =========

cat("\n\nvalue \\w all integers", value4, "worse then", value5, "\n\n")

rm(list=ls())
```

Результаты исчислений:

```
schizophrenia@home:~/labs/4kurs/MathEc/1lab$ Rscript main.R
Загрузка требуемого пакета: slam

Присоединяю пакет: ‘ramify’

Следующие объекты скрыты от ‘package:Matrix’:

        tril, triu

Следующий объект скрыт от ‘package:graphics’:

        clip

l = 8
k = 21
n = 15
m = 25
b : 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119
120 121 122 123 124
c : 78 77 76 75 74 73 72 71 70 69 68 67 66 65 64
A :
        [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6] [,7] [,8] [,9] [,10] [,11] [,12] [,13]
 [1,]   18   22   28        2   12   24        4   20   4          24        12        2          28
```

```
 [2,] 16 21 28  3 14 27  8 25 10 31 20 11 4
 [3,] 26 32 6 16 28  8 24 8 28 16 6 32 26
 [4,] 20 27 2 13 26  7 24 9 30 19 10 3 32
 [5,]  4 12 22 34 14 30 14 34 22 12 4 32 28
 [6,] 18 27 4 17 32 15 34 21 10 1 28 23 20
 [7,] 34 10 22  2 18 2 22 10 34 26 20 16 14
 [8,] 24  1 14 29 12 31 18  7 32 25 20 17 16
 [9,] 28  6 20 2 20 6 28 18 10  4 34 32 32
[10,] 18 31 12 29 14  1 24 15  8 3 34 33 34
[11,] 34 14 30 14 34 22 12 4 32 28 26 26 28
[12,] 14 29 12 31 18  7 32 25 20 17 16 17 20
[13,] 32 14 32 18 6 30 22 16 12 10 10 12 16
[14,] 26  9 28 15  4 29 22 17 14 13 14 17 22
[15,]  2 20 6 28 18 10 4 34 32  32 34 4 10
[16,] 34 19 6 29 20 13 8  5  4 5 8 13 20
[17,] 26 12 34 24 16 10  6  4 4 6 10 16 24
[18,] 18  5 28 19 12 7  4  3 4 7 12 19 28
[19,] 16  4 28 20 14 10 8  8 10 14 20 28 4
[20,] 26 15 6 33 28 25 24 25 28 33 6 15 26
[21,] 20 10 2 30 26 24 24 26 30 2 10 20 32
[22,]  4 29 22 17 14 13 14 17 22 29 4 15 28
[23,] 18 10 4 34 32 32 34  4 10 18 28 6 20
[24,] 34 27 22 19 18 19 22 27 34 9 20 33 14
[25,] 24 18 14 12 12 14 18 24 32 8 20 34 16
      [,14] [,15]
 [1,]   22    18
 [2,]   33    30
 [3,]   22    20
 [4,]   29    28
 [5,]   26    26
 [6,]   19    20
 [7,]   14    16
 [8,]   17    20
 [9,]   34     4
[10,]    3     8
[11,]   32     4
[12,]   25    32
[13,]   22    30
[14,]   29     4
[15,]   18    28
[16,]   29     6
[17,]   34    12
[18,]    5    18
[19,]   16    30
[20,]    5    20
[21,]   12    28
[22,]    9    26
[23,]    2    20
```

```
[24,]    31       16
[25,]    34       20
Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.1 build v9.5.1rc2 (linux64)
Thread count: 4 physical cores, 4 logical processors, using up to 4 threads
Optimize a model with 25 rows, 15 columns and 375 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0xf0d710f4
Coefficient statistics:
  Matrix range [1e+00, 3e+01]
  Objective range  [6e+01, 8e+01]
  Bounds range           [0e+00, 0e+00]
  RHS range    [1e+02, 1e+02]
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 25 rows, 15 columns, 375 nonzeros

Iteration         Objective        Primal Inf.       Dual Inf.         Time
          0        1.5987500e+32   1.290625e+32   1.598750e+02       0s
         18        4.0298182e+02   0.000000e+00   0.000000e+00       0s

Solved in 18 iterations and 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)
Optimal objective  4.029818182e+02
[1] "objective value"
[1] 402.9818
[1] "x="
 [1] 0.581818182 1.490909091 0.218181818 1.009090909 0.009090909 1.218181818
 [7] 0.154545455 0.000000000 0.045454545 0.263636364 0.418181818 0.000000000
[13] 0.000000000 0.000000000 0.000000000
[1] "y="
 [1] 0.00000000 0.67727273 0.14204545 0.00000000 0.41931818 0.23863636
 [7] 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.40000000 0.65795455 0.49659091
[13] 0.40000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000
[19] 0.00000000 0.23863636 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.05795455
[25] 0.00000000


Best resource to increase is 2 th resource

Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.1 build v9.5.1rc2 (linux64)
Thread count: 4 physical cores, 4 logical processors, using up to 4 threads
Optimize a model with 25 rows, 15 columns and 375 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0x16fb0b73
Coefficient statistics:
  Matrix range [1e+00, 3e+01]
  Objective range  [6e+01, 8e+01]
  Bounds range           [0e+00, 0e+00]
  RHS range    [1e+02, 1e+02]
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 25 rows, 15 columns, 375 nonzeros
```

```
Iteration    Objective       Primal Inf.    Dual Inf.      Time
       0   1.5987500e+32   1.290625e+32   1.598750e+02      0s
      19   4.0365226e+02   0.000000e+00   0.000000e+00      0s

Solved in 19 iterations and 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)
Optimal objective  4.036522593e+02
[1] "objective value"
[1] 403.6523
[1] "x="
 [1] 0.57147810 1.51363689 0.21252745 0.99653299 0.00000000 1.23500520
 [7] 0.14642321 0.00000000 0.03669248 0.28209869 0.42505489 0.00000000
[13] 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000
[1] "y="
 [1] 0.0000000 0.6601179 0.1866405 0.0000000 0.4400786 0.2534381 0.0000000
 [8] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.4066798 0.6935167 0.4734774 0.4066798 0.0000000
[15] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.2200393 0.0000000
[22] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000



change resource 11

Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.1 build v9.5.1rc2 (linux64)
Thread count: 4 physical cores, 4 logical processors, using up to 4 threads
Optimize a model with 25 rows, 15 columns and 375 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0xf85e5677
Coefficient statistics:
  Matrix range [1e+00, 3e+01]
  Objective range  [6e+01, 8e+01]
  Bounds range           [0e+00, 0e+00]
  RHS range    [1e+02, 1e+02]
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 25 rows, 15 columns, 375 nonzeros

Iteration    Objective       Primal Inf.    Dual Inf.      Time
       0   1.5987500e+32   1.290625e+32   1.598750e+02      0s
      16   4.0363977e+02   0.000000e+00   0.000000e+00      0s

Solved in 16 iterations and 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)
Optimal objective  4.036397727e+02
[1] "objective value"
[1] 403.6398
[1] "x="
 [1] 0.58241979 1.46510695 0.24919786 1.01099599 0.04040775 1.19037433
 [7] 0.15384358 0.00000000 0.04395053 0.26373663 0.41758021 0.00000000
[13] 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000
[1] "y="
 [1] 0.00000000 0.67727273 0.18068182 0.00000000 0.41931818 0.20000000
 [7] 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.40000000 0.65795455 0.49659091
```

```
[13] 0.40000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.00000000
[19] 0.00000000 0.20000000 0.00000000 0.00000000 0.03863636 0.05795455
[25] 0.00000000


previous value 403.6523 better then 403.6398

Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.1 build v9.5.1rc2 (linux64)
Thread count: 4 physical cores, 4 logical processors, using up to 4 threads
Optimize a model with 25 rows, 15 columns and 375 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0x1896e981
Variable types: 0 continuous, 15 integer (0 binary)
Coefficient statistics:
  Matrix range [1e+00, 3e+01]
  Objective range  [6e+01, 8e+01]
  Bounds range           [0e+00, 0e+00]
  RHS range    [1e+02, 1e+02]
Found heuristic solution: objective 234.0000000
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 25 rows, 15 columns, 375 nonzeros
Variable types: 0 continuous, 15 integer (0 binary)

Root relaxation: objective 4.029818e+02, 22 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)

         Nodes |         Current Node |         Objective Bounds      |         Work
 Expl Unexpl |  Obj  Depth IntInf | Incumbent         BestBd   Gap | It/Node Time

         0       0  402.98182   0   10  234.00000  402.98182  72.2%         -        0s
H        0       0                     306.0000000  402.98182  31.7%       -        0s
H        0       0                     369.0000000  402.98182  9.21%       -        0s
         0       0  386.10640   0        9  369.00000  386.10640  4.64%     -        0s
         0       0  383.80000   0        9  369.00000  383.80000  4.01%     -        0s
         0       0  383.80000   0   10   369.00000  383.80000  4.01%         -        0s
         0       0  377.62187   0        9  369.00000  377.62187  2.34%     -        0s
         0       0  377.62187   0        9  369.00000  377.62187  2.34%     -        0s
         0       0  377.62187   0        9  369.00000  377.62187  2.34%     -        0s
         0       0  377.24353   0        9  369.00000  377.24353  2.23%     -        0s
         0       0  373.27948   0   10   369.00000  373.27948  1.16%         -        0s
         0       0  371.82759   0   10   369.00000  371.82759  0.77%         -        0s
         0       0  371.82759   0   10   369.00000  371.82759  0.77%         -        0s
         0       0  371.82759   0   10   369.00000  371.82759  0.77%         -        0s

Cutting planes:
  Gomory: 3
  MIR: 3
  StrongCG: 1

Explored 1 nodes (48 simplex iterations) in 0.02 seconds (0.01 work units)
```

```
Thread count was 4 (of 4 available processors)

Solution count 3: 369 306 234

Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)
Best objective 3.690000000000e+02, best bound 3.690000000000e+02, gap 0.0000%
[1] "objective value"
[1] 369
[1] "x="
 [1] 0 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0


Gurobi Optimizer version 9.5.1 build v9.5.1rc2 (linux64)
Thread count: 4 physical cores, 4 logical processors, using up to 4 threads
Optimize a model with 25 rows, 15 columns and 375 nonzeros
Model fingerprint: 0xdc208417
Variable types: 8 continuous, 7 integer (0 binary)
Coefficient statistics:
  Matrix range [1e+00, 3e+01]
  Objective range  [6e+01, 8e+01]
  Bounds range     [0e+00, 0e+00]
  RHS range    [1e+02, 1e+02]
Found heuristic solution: objective 262.4000000
Presolve time: 0.00s
Presolved: 25 rows, 15 columns, 375 nonzeros
Variable types: 8 continuous, 7 integer (0 binary)

Root relaxation: objective 4.029818e+02, 21 iterations, 0.00 seconds (0.00 work units)

         Nodes  |    Current Node  |     Objective Bounds      |     Work
 Expl Unexpl |  Obj  Depth IntInf | Incumbent    BestBd   Gap | It/Node Time

         0     0  402.98182   0        7  262.40000  402.98182  53.6%     -    0s
H        0     0                       352.8090909  402.98182  14.2%     -    0s
H        0     0                       388.2413793  402.98182  3.80%     -    0s

Cutting planes:
  Gomory: 1

Explored 1 nodes (21 simplex iterations) in 0.01 seconds (0.00 work units)
Thread count was 4 (of 4 available processors)

Solution count 2: 388.241 262.4

Optimal solution found (tolerance 1.00e-04)
Best objective 3.882413793103e+02, best bound 3.882413793103e+02, gap 0.0000%
[1] "objective value"
[1] 388.2414
```

```
[1] "x="
 [1] 1.00000000 1.00000000 0.00000000 1.00000000 0.00000000 1.00000000
 [7] 0.00000000 0.27203065 0.00000000 0.19540230 0.65900383 0.00000000
[13] 0.07662835 0.00000000 0.04022989


value \w all integers 369 worse then 388.2414
```

Краткая сводка

При решении исходной задачи было получено значение целевой функции равному 402.9818.

Решение двойственной задачи имело наибольшее значение во втором элементе, что означает, что наиболее полезный ресурс, за счёт увеличения запаса которого увеличение целевой функции будет наибольшим. Увеличим на единицу сначала запас второго ресурса, а затем для сравнения 11ый ресурс, т.к. в двойственном решении 11 элемент второй по величине. Первое увеличение дало значение 403.6523, а второе - 403.6398. Как видно, разница не слишком большая между полученными значениями, но увеличение целевой функции было больше в первом увеличении, чем во втором.

Теперь будем искать целочисленные решения и решения, которые наполовину целые, а наполовину действительные. В первом случае итоговое решение - 369, во втором - 388.2414. Как видно, целочисленные решения достаточно сильно ухудшают целевую функцию.