Linear Programming

Linear Programming, LP Duality Theorem, LP-Relaxation

Linear Program (LP)

- A set of linear equations/inequalities.
- Maximize or minimize a given linear objective function.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + \cdots c_nx_n \\
\text{subject to} \quad & a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \cdots + a_{1n}x_n \leq b_1 \\
& a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \cdots + a_{2n}x_n \leq b_2 \\
& \qquad \vdots \\
& a_{m1}x_1 + a_{m2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{mn}x_n \leq b_m \\
& x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Example

- Suppose a factory can produce two kinds of products: oil and sugar.
- Profit for 1 tons of sugar: 1
- Profit for 1 tons of oil: 6
- Limited resources, can produce at most
  - 200 tons of sugar
  - 300 tons of oil
  - Overall weight is at most 400 tons
- Problem: maximize the profit

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \leq 200 \\
& x_2 \leq 300 \\
& x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 \\
& x_1, x_2 \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Feasible Region

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Maximizing the Objective

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$
subject to $x_1 \leq 200$
$x_2 \leq 300$
$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$
$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



We want to maximize c.

Maximizing the Objective

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Maximizing the Objective

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$
subject to $x_1 \leq 200$
$x_2 \leq 300$
$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$
$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Optimum is obtained at vertex A, where $(x_1, x_2) = (100, 300)$ and $c = 1900$.

Another Example with Three variables

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 400$

$x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600$

$x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$



Another Example with Three variables

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \leq 200 \\
& x_2 \leq 300 \\
& x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 400 \\
& x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600 \\
& x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$



Another Example with Three variables

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \le 200 \\ & x_2 \le 300 \\ & x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \le 400 \\ & x_2 + 3x_3 \le 600 \\ & x_1, x_2, x_3 \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$



Important Observations

1. There always exists an optimum $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ at a vertex of the polytope.
   - Linear objective $\Longrightarrow c = c_1 x_1 + \cdots + c_n x_n$ is a hyperplane.
   - Optimum is obtained only when the whole feasible region is below the hyperplane and the hyperplane "barely" intersect the region by a point.
2. The feasible region is always convex.
   - Linear Constraints $\Longrightarrow$ feasible region is bounded by hyperplanes.
3. A local maximum is also a global maximum.
   - By the convexity of the feasible region…

Simplex Method

- Choose an arbitrary starting vertex.
- Iteratively move to an adjacent vertex along an edge if such movement increase the objective.
- Terminate when we reach a local maximum.

Simplex Method

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Starting from vertex O.

Simplex Method

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Moving from O to A increases the objective.

Simplex Method

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Moving from A to B increases the objective.

Simplex Method

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$



Moving from B to C increases the objective.

Simplex Method

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \leq 200 \\
& x_2 \leq 300 \\
& x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 \\
& x_1, x_2 \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

C is a local maximum:
Moving to either D or B
decreases the objective.



Simplex Method

maximize $x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3$

subject to $x_1 \leq 200$

$x_2 \leq 300$

$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 400$

$x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600$

$x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$



Time Complexity for Simplex Method

- There are exponentially many vertices: $\binom{m}{n}$ for m constraints and n variables.
- Worst-case running time: exponential
  - Many attempts have failed.
  - e.g., choose neighbors with highest objective value, choose neighbors randomly, etc.
- [Teng & Spielman] Smoothed analysis
  - Average case polynomial time if add random Gaussian noise to the constraints.
- Runs fast in practice, and most commonly used

Polynomial Time Algorithms for LP

- Ellipsoid Method



- Interior Point Method



Standard Form LP

- Maximization as objective with "≤" constraints and non-negative variables.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 + \cdots c_nx_n \\
\text{subject to} \quad & a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \cdots + a_{1n}x_n \le b_1 \\
& a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \cdots + a_{2n}x_n \le b_2 \\
& \vdots \\
& a_{m1}x_1 + a_{m2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{mn}x_n \le b_m \\
& x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \ge 0
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \\
\text{subject to} \quad & A\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{b} \\
& \mathbf{x} \ge \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

Other Forms Reduce to Standard Form

- Minimization to Maximization
  - $\min c_1x_1 + \cdots + c_nx_n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \max -c_1x_1 - \cdots - c_nx_n$
- $\geq$-inequalities
  - $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \geq b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad -a_1x_1 - \cdots - a_nx_n \leq -b$
- Inequality $\Leftrightarrow$ Equality
  - $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \leq b \\ a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \geq b \end{cases}$
  - $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \leq b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n + s = b$
- Variable with unrestricted signs
  - Introduce two variables x^+ and x^- with standard constraints $x^+, x^- \geq 0$
  - Replace x with $x^+ - x^-$

Take-Home Message

- A linear program can be solved in a polynomial time.
- Whenever a problem can be formulated by a linear program, it is polynomial-time solvable.

Formulation as Linear Program

- The maximum flow problem can be formulated by a linear program.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \sum_{u:(s,u)\in E} f_{su} & \\ \text{subject to} \quad & 0 \le f_{uv} \le c_{uv} & \forall (u,v) \in E \\ & \sum_{v:(v,u)\in E} f_{vu} = \sum_{w:(v,w)\in E} f_{uw} & \forall u \in V \setminus \{s,t\} \end{aligned}$$

- Ford-Fulkerson Method implements the simplex method.

Part II:
LP Duality

Motivation

- We have seen that the optimal solution for the LP below is $(x_1,\ x_2) = (100, 300)$, with value 1900.
  - Geometric argument, argument based on simplex method
- Let's try to prove it by some simple observations from the LP itself!

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \le 200 \\ & x_2 \le 300 \\ & x_1 + x_2 \le 400 \\ & x_1, x_2 \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

Motivation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \le 200 && \text{(i)} \\
& x_2 \le 300 && \text{(ii)} \\
& x_1 + x_2 \le 400 && \text{(iii)} \\
& x_1, x_2 \ge 0
\end{aligned}
$$

- Let's try adding (i) to 6 times (ii): $x_1 + 6x_2 \le 200 + 6 \times 300 = 2000$
- We know that any solution (x_1, x_2) cannot yield objective value greater than 2000.
- Can we combine the inequality in a better way to show that the objective value is at most 1900?

Motivation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize } & x_1 + 6x_2 \\
\text{subject to } & x_1 \leq 200 && \text{(i)} \\
& x_2 \leq 300 && \text{(ii)} \\
& x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 && \text{(iii)} \\
& x_1, x_2 \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

- Can we combine the inequality in a better way to show that the objective value is at most 1900?
- Yes, we can:
  - Multiple (ii) by 5 and add to (iii): $x_1 + 6x_2 \leq 300 \times 5 + 400 = 1900.$
- This proves that $(x_1, x_2) = (100, 300)$ with objective value 1900 is optimal!

Let's try this one…

- Suppose we multiple (i) by y_1, (ii) by y_2, (iii) by y_3, and (iv) by y_4.
- We have $(y_1 + y_3)x_1 + (y_2 + y_3 + y_4)x_2 + (y_3 + 3y_4)x_3 \leq 200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3 + 600y_4$.
- We need $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \geq 0$ to keep the inequality.
- To find an upper bound to the objective $x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3$, we need to make sure $x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 \leq (y_1 + y_3)x_1 + (y_2 + y_3 + y_4)x_2 + (y_3 + 3y_4)x_3$ holds for every (x_1, x_2, x_3).
- Since $x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$, we must have:
  - $y_1 + y_3 \geq 1$
  - $y_2 + y_3 + y_4 \geq 6$
  - $y_3 + 3y_4 \geq 13$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 & \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \leq 200 & \text{(i)} \\
& x_2 \leq 300 & \text{(ii)} \\
& x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 400 & \text{(iii)} \\
& x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600 & \text{(iv)} \\
& x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 &
\end{aligned}
$$

Let's try this one…

- $(y_1 + y_3)x_1 + (y_2 + y_3 + y_4)x_2 + (y_3 + 3y_4)x_3 \leq 200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3 + 600y_4$.
- Since $x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$, we must have:
  - $y_1 + y_3 \geq 1$
  - $y_2 + y_3 + y_4 \geq 6$
  - $y_3 + 3y_4 \geq 13$
- Now, we want to find the tightest possible upper-bound to $x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3$.
- This means we want to minimize $200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3 + 600y_4$.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{maximize} & x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 & \\
\text{subject to} & x_1 \leq 200 & \text{(i)} \\
& x_2 \leq 300 & \text{(ii)} \\
& x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 400 & \text{(iii)} \\
& x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600 & \text{(iv)} \\
& x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 &
\end{array}
$$

Dual Program

- The problem of finding the tightest upper-bound can be formulated by another linear program!
- This linear program is called the dual program, and the original one is called the primal program.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 + 13x_3 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \le 200 \\
& x_2 \le 300 \\
& x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \le 400 \\
& x_2 + 3x_3 \le 600 \\
& x_1, x_2, x_3 \ge 0
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{minimize} \quad & 200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3 + 600y_4 \\
\text{subject to} \quad & y_1 + y_3 \ge 1 \\
& y_2 + y_3 + y_4 \ge 6 \\
& y_3 + 3y_4 \ge 13 \\
& y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \ge 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Dual Program

- Factory Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 6x_2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x_1 \leq 200 \\ & x_2 \leq 300 \\ & x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 \\ & x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & 200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & y_1 + y_3 \geq 1 \\ & y_2 + y_3 \geq 6 \\ & y_1, y_2, y_3 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

- Dual program for standard form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A^\top \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{c} \\ & \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Weak Duality Theorem

- By our motivation of dual program, we obtain the following theorem.
- Theorem [Weak Duality Theorem]. If $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is a feasible solution to (a) and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is a feasible solution to (b), then $\mathbf{c}^\top \hat{\mathbf{x}} \le \mathbf{b}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{b} \\ & \mathbf{x} \ge \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(a)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A^\top \mathbf{y} \ge \mathbf{c} \\ & \mathbf{y} \ge \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \qquad \text{(b)}$$



Strong Duality Theorem: This gap is always closed!

Strong Duality Theorem

- Theorem [Strong Duality Theorem]. Let $\mathbf{x}^*$ be the optimal solution to (a) and $\mathbf{y}^*$ be the optimal solution to (b), then $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{b} \qquad \text{(a)} \\ & \mathbf{x} \ge \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & A^\top \mathbf{y} \ge \mathbf{c} \qquad \text{(b)} \\ & \mathbf{y} \ge \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Primal feasible | Primal OPT = Dual OPT | Dual feasible

Application of Strong Duality Theorem

- Max-Flow-Min-Cut Theorem
- Minimax Theorem
- Kőnig-Egerváry Theorem
- Design approximation algorithms:
  - Dual fitting
  - Primal-Dual Schema
- Economic interpretation: “resource allocation”-”resource valuation”

Today's Lecture

- Introduction to Linear Programming
- LP Duality Theorem

Proof of Strong Duality Theorem

Not presented in the class.
You may want to read it if you are interested.

Proof of Strong Duality Theorem

- **Theorem [Farkas Lemma].** Exactly one of the followings holds for matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$:
  1. There exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.
  2. There exists $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $A^\top \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} < 0$.
- $\{A\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ is the grey area.
- 1 says that $\mathbf{b}$ is inside the grey area.
- 2 says that we can separate the grey area and $\mathbf{b}$ by a hyperplane (defined by the normal vector $\mathbf{y}$).
  - In this case $\mathbf{b}$ must be outside the grey area.

Illustration for $A = [\boldsymbol{c}_1 \quad \boldsymbol{c}_2]$



A Corollary to Farkas Lemma

- **Corollary**. Exactly one of the followings holds for matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$:
  1. There exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}$.
  2. There exists $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0}$ such that $A^\top \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}^\top \mathbf{y} < 0$.

Case 1 of the Corollary



- $\{A\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ is the dark grey area.
- $\{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}\}$ is the light grey area.
- 1 says that the two areas intersect.

Case 2 of the Corollary



- $\{A\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ is the dark grey area.
- $\{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}\}$ is the light grey area.
- 2 describes that the two areas do not intersect.
- We can find a separating plane with normal vector $\mathbf{y}$.
  - Thus, $A^\top \mathbf{y} \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} < 0$
- We must have $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0}$:
  - If this fails for one entry: $y_i > 0$
  - $\mathbf{z} = (\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon, z_i = 1, \varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon)$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ on same side
  - $\mathbf{z}$ is in the first quadrant, and it will eventually intersect the light grey area after extension.
  - The two areas are on the same side with $\mathbf{y}$.

Proof of the Corollary

- Define $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n+m)}$ by $A' = [A \quad -I]$.
- Apply Farkas Lemma on A' and $\mathbf{b}$.
- Let P1 and P2 be 1 and 2 in Farkas Lemma; Q1 and Q2 be 1 and 2 in the corollary.
- We aim to show P1 $\Leftrightarrow$ P2 and Q1 $\Leftrightarrow$ Q2.

Proof of the Corollary

- Define $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n+m)}$ by $A' = [A \quad -I]$.
- P1 $\Leftrightarrow \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ s.t. $\mathbf{x}' \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $A'\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{b}$.
- (by writing $\mathbf{x}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}} \end{bmatrix}$) $\Leftrightarrow$ $[A \quad -I]\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{b}$ (where $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \geq \mathbf{0}$)
- $\Leftrightarrow$ $A\mathbf{x} - \bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{b}$ $\Leftrightarrow A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}$ (since $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \geq \mathbf{0}$)
- $\Leftrightarrow$ Q1

Proof of the Corollary

- Define $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times(n+m)}$ by $A' = [A \quad -I]$.
- P2 $\Leftrightarrow \exists\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ s.t. $A'^{\top}\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y} < 0$.
- $\Leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} A^{\top} \\ -I \end{bmatrix}\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y} < 0$
- $\Leftrightarrow A^{\top}\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad -\mathbf{y} \geq 0,$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y} < 0$
- $\Leftrightarrow$ Q2

Now we are ready to prove strong duality theorem…

- Weak duality: $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^*$ holds for any $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$.
- Suppose strong duality fails: $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} < \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^*$.
- There does not exist $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ satisfying $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^*$.
- We cannot have $\begin{bmatrix} -A \\ \mathbf{c}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \geq \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^* \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$.
- Q1 in corollary fails for matrix $\begin{bmatrix} -A \\ \mathbf{c}^\top \end{bmatrix}$ and vector $\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^* \end{bmatrix}$.
- Thus, Q2 must be true.

Now we are ready to prove strong duality theorem…

- Q2 is true for matrix $\begin{bmatrix} -A \\ \mathbf{c}^\top \end{bmatrix}$ and vector $\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^* \end{bmatrix}$.
- There exist $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$[-A^\top \quad \mathbf{c}] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ w \end{bmatrix} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $[-\mathbf{b}^\top \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^*] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ w \end{bmatrix} < 0$, and $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ w \end{bmatrix} \leq \mathbf{0}$.

- After matrix multiplications,

$$\begin{cases} -A^\top \mathbf{y} + w\mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} + w\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^* < 0 \\ \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0} \\ w \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

Proof of Strong Duality Theorem

$$\begin{cases} -A^{\top}\mathbf{y} + w\boldsymbol{c} \geq \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y} + w\mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y}^{*} < 0 \\ \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0} \\ w \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

- Suppose $w < 0$. We divide w on both sides:

$$\begin{cases} -A^{\top}\left(\dfrac{\mathbf{y}}{w}\right) + \mathbf{c} \leq \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{b}^{\top}\left(\dfrac{\mathbf{y}}{w}\right) + \mathbf{b}^{\top}\mathbf{y}^{*} > 0 \\ \left(\dfrac{\mathbf{y}}{w}\right) \geq \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

- $\left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{w}\right)$ is a better solution than $\mathbf{y}^{*}$ in the dual LP, contradiction!

Proof of Strong Duality Theorem

$$\begin{cases} -A^\top \mathbf{y} + w\mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{b}^\top \mathbf{y} + w\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y}^* < 0 \\ \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0} \\ w \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

- Let's then do the case $w = 0$.
- We have $-A^\top \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $-\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{y} < 0$, and $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{0}$.
- Q2 in Corollary holds for $-A$ and $-\mathbf{b}$.
- So Q1 must be false: $\nexists \mathbf{x} \geq 0 : (-A)\mathbf{x} \geq -\mathbf{b}$.
- The feasible region for the primal LP is empty!