

# Operations Research - LINMA 2491

## Course 4 - Benders decompositions

Mehdi Madani

UCLouvain & N-SIDE

February 2023

# Table of contents

## 1. Benders decomposition

- General idea

- An application to the Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem

# Benders decomposition

Let us consider

$$\min_{x,y} c^T x + d^T y \quad (1)$$

subject to :

$$Ax + By \geq b \quad (2)$$

$$x \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

$$y \in Y \quad (4)$$

- ▶ For fixed  $y$ , the remaining part is just an LP that can in nice cases be split into independent smaller LPs.
- ▶ One may be tempted to try some values for  $y$ , solve for  $x$ , "adjust" the values for  $y$  and repeat until an optimal solution is found.
- ▶ A Benders decomposition approach works along these lines. The condition  $y \in Y$  can e.g. be  $y$  integral / binary.

# Benders decomposition

We will assume that the initial problem is feasible and has an optimal solution. Let us set

$Proj_y = \{y \in Y \mid \text{there is } x \text{ such that } Ax + By \geq b\}$ . The problem can be reformulated as :

$$\min_{y \in Proj_y} \{d^T y + \{\min_x c^T x \mid Ax \geq b - By, x \geq 0\}\} \quad (5)$$

or, using LP duality:

$$\min_{y \in Proj_y} \{d^T y + \{\max_u (b - By)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}\} \quad (6)$$

# Benders decomposition

$$\min_{y \in \text{Proj}_y} \{d^T y + \{\max_u (b - By)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}\}$$

is in turn equivalent (why?) to:

$$\min_y d^T y + x_0 \tag{7}$$

$$y \in Y \tag{8}$$

$$x_0 \geq (b - By)^T u \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0 \text{ such that } A^T u \leq c \tag{9}$$

- ▶ (9) is equivalent to a finite number of inequalities (corresponding to vertices/extreme rays of  $A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0$ , see exercise session)
  - ▶  $x_0 \geq (b - By)^T u^v$  for all  $u^v$  in the finite set of vertices of  $P$
  - ▶  $0 \geq (b - By)^T u^h$  for all  $u^h$  in the finite set of extreme rays of  $P$
- ▶ The idea of a Benders decomposition is to solve (7)-(9), by considering first (7)-(8) and iteratively add cuts to enforce (9)
- ▶ Cuts to enforce (9) are obtained from the subproblem in red (or worker problem) which is equivalent to solving the remaining part of the initial problem for fixed  $y$ , problem in blue above. See below.

# Benders decomposition

Suppose we have a candidate  $y^*, x_0^*$  obtained by solving (7)-(8) and some of the constraints in (9) (for example those obtained at previous iterations of the algorithm).

This solution trivially provides a lower bound  $LB$  for (7)-(9) since only some of the constraints in (9) are considered, and hence a lower bound for the original problem.

- How to test if (9) is satisfied ? Test if

$$x_0^* \geq \{\max_u (b - By^*)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\} \quad (10)$$

## Benders decomposition

- If not, and if the max is finite, add a cut of the form:

$$x_0 \geq (b - By)^T u_k \quad (11)$$

where  $u_k$  solves the right-hand side of (10). In that case,  $u_k$  is a vertex of  $P$  defined by  $A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0$ . [Optimality cut]

Note that this step leads to an upper bound

$UB = d^T y^* + \{\max_u (b - By^*)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}$ , since it has been shown above that the original problem is equivalent to:

$$\min_{y \in Proj_y} \{d^T y + \{\max_u (b - By)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}\}$$

- If the problem is unbounded, the solver can provide an "extreme ray"  $u_k$  of the polyhedron  $P$  in which direction the objective can be arbitrarily increased, i.e. with  $(b - By^*)^T u_k > 0$ . In that case, add the cut  $(b - By)^T u_k \leq 0$  where  $u_k$  is an extreme ray of  $P$  [Feasibility cut]
- In all cases, as a polyhedron  $P$  has finitely many vertices and extreme rays, there are finitely many cuts to generate.

# Benders decomposition

- ▶ Note as above with (5) and (7) that the dual of the Benders subproblem is just the remaining part of the initial problem when  $y$  has been fixed:  $\min_x c^T x \mid Ax + By \geq b, x \geq 0$
- ▶ For simplicity (to avoid dealing with unbounded master problems), we will assume that  $Y$  is bounded and that we know from the beginning a lower bound  $M$  for  $x_0$ .



# Benders Decomposition Algorithm I

Initialization:  $LB := -\infty$ ,  $UB := +\infty$ . While  $UB - LB > \epsilon$  =: tolerance

1. Solve the Master Problem:

$$\min_y d^T y + x_0 \quad (7)$$

$$y \in Y, x_0 \geq M \quad (8)$$

Update the lower bound  $LB$ , cf. previous slides

$M$  is an initial known lower bound on  $x_0$  (part of the objective corresponding to the  $x$  variables)

# Benders Decomposition Algorithm II

2. Solve Benders Subproblem  $\{\max_u (b - By^*)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}$

2.1 If unbounded, add the “feasibility cut”:

$$0 \geq (b - By)^T u_k$$

where  $u_k$  is an extreme ray of  $P$  defined by  $A^T u \leq c_{ij}, u \geq 0$

2.2 If bounded and  $x_0^* < \{\max_u (b - By^*)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}$ , add the “optimality cut” using  $u_k$  an optimal solution to the right-hand side problem:

$$x_0 \geq (b - By)^T u_k \quad (11)$$

Update the upper bound  $UB$ , cf. previous slides

2.3 If (10)  $x_0^* \geq \{\max_u (b - By^*)^T u \mid A^T u \leq c, u \geq 0\}$  is satisfied: stop, optimal solution found

Repeat: resolve Master Problem with all the added cuts (old and new), make the test with the subproblem, add a cut if needed, etc.

N.B. Instead of solving the Master Problems each time to optimality, often better to include the Benders cuts (coming from the subproblems) in the B&B tree solving the master

# Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem

$$\min_{x,y} \sum_{i,j} c_{ij}x_{ij} + \sum_i f_i y_i \quad (12)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} \geq 1 \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m \quad (13)$$

$$x_{ij} \leq y_i \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m \quad (14)$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad (15)$$

$$y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (16)$$

The costs  $c_{ij}$ ,  $f_i$  are assumed to be non-negative.

# Benders Master Problem and Subproblems

Master Problem

$$\min_{x_0, y} x_0 + \sum_i f_i y_i \quad (17)$$

subject to:

$$y \in \{0, 1\} \quad (18)$$

$$x_0 \geq 0 \quad (19)$$

$$\textit{Benders cuts iteratively added} \quad (20)$$

( $x_0 \geq 0$  is a known lower bound on  $x_0$ , since  $c_{ij}x_{ij} \geq 0$ )

Benders subproblem "in primal form" ([blue problem above](#)) is:

$$\min_x \sum_{i,j} c_{ij}x_{ij} + \left( \sum_i f_i \bar{y}_i \right) \quad (21)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} \geq 1 \quad [v_j] \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m \quad (22)$$

$$x_{ij} \leq \bar{y}_i \quad [w_{ij}] \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m \quad (23)$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad (24)$$

# Benders subproblems

The "real" Benders subproblem (subproblem in "dual form", "red problem above", dual to the "blue problem") is:

$$\max_{v,w} \sum_j v_j - \sum_{ij} w_{ij} \bar{y}_i \quad (25)$$

subject to:

$$v_j - w_{ij} \leq c_{ij} \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m \quad (26)$$

$$v_j, w_{ij} \geq 0 \quad (27)$$

# Benders subproblems

For a candidate  $(x_0^*, y^*)$ :

- ▶ if this subproblem is unbounded (this will happen at the first iteration where  $x_0^* = 0 = y_i^*$ , why?), we need to add:

$$0 \geq \sum_j v_j^* - \sum_{ij} w_{ij}^* y_i \quad (28)$$

where  $v^*, w^*$  is an extreme ray of  $P$  defined by (26)-(27).

- ▶ if this subproblem has an optimal solution  $(v^*, w^*)$  with objective greater than  $x_0$ , we need to add the cut:

$$x_0 \geq \sum_j v_j^* - \sum_{ij} w_{ij}^* y_i \quad (29)$$

## Remarks

It can be shown (see [3], Proposition 10.7) that the following values for  $v_j, w_{ij}$  solves the Benders subproblem (25)-(27) when this problem is bounded (always the case for  $\bar{y}$  with at least one entry = 1):

- ▶  $v_j = \min_{i \mid \bar{y}_i = 1} c_{ij}$
- ▶
  - ▶  $w_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \mid \bar{y}_i = 1$
  - ▶  $w_{ij} = \max\{(v_j - c_{ij}), 0\}$  for  $i \mid \bar{y}_i = 0$

We can hence solve the subproblems by relying on a few comparisons.

## An exercise

We take the Example 10.6 from [3]:

|              |          | <i>CUSTOMER</i> |          |          |          |          | <i>FIXED COSTS</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|
|              |          | <i>1</i>        | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> |                    |
| <i>PLANT</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i>        | <i>3</i> | <i>4</i> | <i>5</i> | <i>7</i> | <i>2</i>           |
|              | <i>2</i> | <i>4</i>        | <i>3</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>6</i> | <i>3</i>           |
|              | <i>3</i> | <i>5</i>        | <i>4</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>3</i>           |

- ▶ Solving the initial problem (17)-(19) without any other cut provides the candidate  $y_1 = y_2 = y_3 = x_0 = 0$ . It can be verified that no  $x_{ij}$  exist such as to obtain a feasible solution to the original problem to solve. The Benders subproblem will be unbounded and a Benders cut will be added, equivalent to  $y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \geq 1$ .



## An exercise

- ▶ Solve the initial problem (17)-(19), with the additional condition  $y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \geq 1$  N.B. The solution can be found "by inspection" without using any solver or advanced computation.
- ▶ For the solution  $\bar{y}$  obtained, what are the optimal values for the variables  $v, w$  in the corresponding Benders subproblem ? (Use the slide "Remarks" above.)
- ▶ Does this solution solve the original problem? Make the test by comparing the value obtained for  $x_0$  to the optimal value obtained for the subproblem.
- ▶ If the test fails, i.e. the  $y$  found doesn't solve the original problem, what is the corresponding Benders cut to add ?

Side question:

- ▶ Is this first solution  $\bar{y}$  such that we can find values for  $x_{ij}$  and obtain a *feasible* solution to the original problem?
- ▶ If yes, what are the values for  $x_{ij}$  and the corresponding total costs?

# References I



M. S. Bazaraa, J. J. Jarvis, and H. D. Sherali.

*Linear Programming and Network Flows.*

Wiley, second edition, 1990.



D. Bertsimas and J. N. Tsitsiklis.

*Introduction to Linear Optimization.*

Athena Scientific and Dynamic Ideas, 1997.



R. K. Martin.

*Large Scale Linear and Integer Optimization: a unified approach.*

Springer, 1999.



Y. Pochet and L. A. Wolsey.

*Production Planning by Mixed Integer Programming.*

Springer, 2006.