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- linear programming is a powerful tool in optimisation
- inspired more sophisticated techniques such as quadratic optimisation, convex optimisation, integer programming and semi-definite programming
- we will later use the connection between linear and integer programming to tackle several problems (Vertex-Cover, Set-Cover, TSP, satisfiability)
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## Linear Programming (informal definition)

- maximize or minimize an objective, given limited resources and competing constraint
- constraints are specified as (in)equalities
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## Example: Political Advertising (from CLRS3)

- Imagine you are a politician trying to win an election
- Your district has three different types of areas: Urban, suburban and rural, each with, respectively, 100,000, 200,000 and 50,000 registered voters
- Aim: at least half of the registered voters in each of the three regions should vote for you
- Possible Actions: Advertise on one of the primary issues which are (i) building more roads, (ii) gun control, (iii) farm subsidies and (iv) a gasoline tax dedicated to improve public transit.


## Political Advertising Continued

| policy | urban | suburban | rural |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| build roads | -2 | 5 | 3 |
| gun control | 8 | 2 | -5 |
| farm subsidies | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| gasoline tax | 10 | 0 | -2 |

The effects of policies on voters. Each entry describes the number of thousands of voters who could be won (lost) over by spending \$1,000 on advertising support of a policy on a particular issue.

## Political Advertising Continued

| policy | urban | suburban | rural |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| build roads | -2 | 5 | 3 |
| gun control | 8 | 2 | -5 |
| farm subsidies | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| gasoline tax | 10 | 0 | -2 |

The effects of policies on voters. Each entry describes the number of thousands of voters who could be won (lost) over by spending \$1,000 on advertising support of a policy on a particular issue.

## 2

- Possible Solution:
- $\$ 20,000$ on advertising to building roads
- \$0 on advertising to gun control
- \$4,000 on advertising to farm subsidies
- \$9,000 on advertising to a gasoline tax


## Political Advertising Continued

| policy | urban | suburban | rural |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| build roads | -2 | 5 | 3 |
| gun control | 8 | 2 | -5 |
| farm subsidies | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| gasoline tax | 10 | 0 | -2 |

The effects of policies on voters. Each entry describes the number of thousands of voters who could be won (lost) over by spending \$1,000 on advertising support of a policy on a particular issue.

## 2

- Possible Solution:
- \$20,000 on advertising to building roads
- \$0 on advertising to gun control
- \$4,000 on advertising to farm subsidies
- \$9,000 on advertising to a gasoline tax
- Total cost: \$33,000


## Political Advertising Continued

| policy | urban | suburban | rural |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| build roads | -2 | 5 | 3 |
| gun control | 8 | 2 | -5 |
| farm subsidies | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| gasoline tax | 10 | 0 | -2 |

The effects of policies on voters. Each entry describes the number of thousands of voters who could be won (lost) over by spending \$1,000 on advertising support of a policy on a particular issue.

## 2

- Possible Solution:
- \$20,000 on advertising to building roads
- \$0 on advertising to gun control
- \$4,000 on advertising to farm subsidies
- \$9,000 on advertising to a gasoline tax
- Total cost: \$33,000

What is the best possible strategy?

## Towards a Linear Program
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## Towards a Linear Program

| policy | urban | suburban | rural |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| build roads | -2 | 5 | 3 |
| gun control | 8 | 2 | -5 |
| farm subsidies | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| gasoline tax | 10 | 0 | -2 |

The effects of policies on voters. Each entry describes the number of thousands of voters who could be won (lost) over by spending \$1,000 on advertising support of a policy on a particular issue.

- $x_{1}=$ number of thousands of dollars spent on advertising on building roads
- $x_{2}=$ number of thousands of dollars spent on advertising on gun control
- $x_{3}=$ number of thousands of dollars spent on advertising on farm subsidies
- $x_{4}=$ number of thousands of dollars spent on advertising on gasoline tax Constraints:
- $-2 x_{1}+8 x_{2}+0 x_{3}+10 x_{4} \geq 50$
- $5 x_{1}+2 x_{2}+0 x_{3}+0 x_{4} \geq 100$
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Objective: Minimize $x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}+x_{4}$

## The Linear Program

| minimize <br> subject to | $x_{1}$ | + | $\chi_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ | $+$ | $\chi_{4}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $-2 x_{1}$ | $+$ | $8 x_{2}$ | $+$ | $0 x_{3}$ | $+$ | $10 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 50 |
|  | $5 x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | + | $0 x_{3}$ | $+$ | $0 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 100 |
|  | $3 x_{1}$ | - | $5 x_{2}$ | $+$ | $10 x_{3}$ | - | $2 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 25 |
|  |  | $x_{1}, x_{2}$ | $x_{3}, x_{4}$ |  |  |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |
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| minimize | $x_{1}$ | + | $\chi_{2}$ | + | $\chi_{3}$ | + | $\chi_{4}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $-2 x_{1}$ | $+$ | $8 x_{2}$ | $+$ | $0 x_{3}$ | $+$ | $10 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 50 |
|  | $5 x_{1}$ | $+$ | $2 x_{2}$ | $+$ | $0 x_{3}$ | $+$ | $0 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 100 |
|  | $3 x_{1}$ | - | $5 x_{2}$ | + | $10 x_{3}$ | - | $2 x_{4}$ | $\geq$ | 25 |
| $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |

## The Linear Program
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## Formal Definition of Linear Program

- Given $a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{n}$ and a set of variables $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$, a linear function $f$ is defined by

$$
f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=a_{1} x_{1}+a_{2} x_{2}+\cdots+a_{n} x_{n}
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- Linear Equality: $f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=b$
- Linear Inequality: $f\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \geqq b$

Linear Constraints

- Linear-Progamming Problem: either minimize or maximize a linear function subject to a set of linear constraints


## A Small(er) Example

| $\operatorname{maximize}$ | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |
|  | $4 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | $\leq$ |
|  | $2 x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | $\leq$ |
|  | $5 x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | $\geq$ |
|  | $x_{1}, x_{2}$ |  | $\geq$ | -2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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While the same approach also works for higher-dimensions, we need to take a more systematic and algebraic procedure.
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## Maximum Flow Problem

- Given: directed graph $G=(V, E)$ with edge capacities $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$ (recall $c(u, v)=0$ if $(u, v) \notin E)$, pair of vertices $s, t \in V$
- Goal: Find a maximum flow $f: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from $s$ to $t$ which satisfies the capacity constraints and flow conservation


Maximum Flow as LP
maximize

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{v \in V} f_{s v}-\sum_{v \in V} f_{v s} \\
& f_{u v} \leq c(u, v) \\
& \sum_{v \in V} f_{v u} \text { for each } u, v \in V, \\
& f_{u v} \geq \sum_{v \in V} f_{u v} \\
& \text { for each } u \in V \backslash\{s, t\}, \\
& 0 \text { for each } u, v \in V .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Minimum-Cost Flow
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## Minimum-Cost-Flow Problem

- Given: directed graph $G=(V, E)$ with capacities $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$, pair of vertices $s, t \in V$, cost function $a: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$, flow demand of $d$ units
- Goal: Find a flow $f: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from $s$ to $t$ with $|f|=d$ while minimising the total cost $\sum_{(u, v) \in E} a(u, v) f_{u v}$ incurrred by the flow.

(a)

(b)

Figure 29.3 (a) An example of a minimum-cost-flow problem. We denote the capacities by $c$ and the costs by $a$. Vertex $s$ is the source and vertex $t$ is the sink, and we wish to send 4 units of flow from $s$ to $t$. (b) A solution to the minimum-cost flow problem in which 4 units of flow are sent from $s$ to $t$. For each edge, the flow and capacity are written as flow/capacity.
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## Extension of the Maximum Flow Problem

## Minimum-Cost-Flow Problem

- Given: directed graph $G=(V, E)$ with capacities $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$, pair of vertices $s, t \in V$, cost function $a: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$, flow demand of $d$ units
- Goal: Find a flow $f: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from $s$ to $t$ with $|f|=d$ while minimising the total cost $\sum_{(u, v) \in E} a(u, v) f_{u v}$ incurrred by the flow.


## Optimal Solution with total cost:

$$
\sum_{(u, v) \in E} a(u, v) f_{u v}=(2 \cdot 2)+(5 \cdot 2)+(3 \cdot 1)+(7 \cdot 1)+(1 \cdot 3)=27
$$


(a)

(b)

Figure 29.3 (a) An example of a minimum-cost-flow problem. We denote the capacities by $c$ and the costs by $a$. Vertex $s$ is the source and vertex $t$ is the sink, and we wish to send 4 units of flow from $s$ to $t$. (b) A solution to the minimum-cost flow problem in which 4 units of flow are sent from $s$ to $t$. For each edge, the flow and capacity are written as flow/capacity.

## Minimum-Cost Flow as a LP

Minimum Cost Flow as LP
minimize $\quad \sum_{(u, v) \in E} a(u, v) f_{u v}$
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{u v} & \leq c(u, v) & & \text { for each } u, v \in V, \\
\sum_{v \in V} f_{v u}-\sum_{v \in V} f_{u v} & =0 & & \text { for each } u \in V \backslash\{s, t\}, \\
\sum_{v \in V} f_{s v}-\sum_{v \in V} f_{v s} & =d, & & \\
f_{u v} & \geq 0 & & \text { for each } u, v \in V .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Minimum-Cost Flow as a LP

Minimum Cost Flow as LP
minimize $\quad \sum_{(u, v) \in E} a(u, v) f_{u v}$
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{u v} & \leq c(u, v) & & \text { for each } u, v \in V, \\
\sum_{v \in V} f_{v u}-\sum_{v \in V} f_{u v} & =0 & & \text { for each } u \in V \backslash\{s, t\}, \\
\sum_{v \in V} f_{s v}-\sum_{v \in V} f_{v s} & =d, & & \\
f_{u v} & \geq 0 & & \text { for each } u, v \in V .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Real power of Linear Programming comes from the ability to solve new problems!

## Outline

## Introduction

## Formulating Problems as Linear Programs

Standard and Slack Forms

## Simplex Algorithm

Finding an Initial Solution

## Standard and Slack Forms

Standard Form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { maximize } \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} x_{j} \\
& \text { subject to }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i} & \text { for } i=1,2, \ldots, m \\
x_{j} \geq 0 & \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, n
\end{aligned}
$$

## Standard and Slack Forms

Standard Form
maximize $\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} x_{j}<$ Objective Function
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i} & \text { for } i=1,2, \ldots, m \\
x_{j} \geq 0 & \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, n
\end{aligned}
$$

## Standard and Slack Forms

| maximize <br> subject to | $\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} x_{j} \curvearrowright \text { Objective Function }$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $n+m$ Constraints | $\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i} & \text { for } i=1,2, \ldots, m \\ x_{j} & \geq 0 \quad \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, n \end{aligned}$ |

## Standard and Slack Forms



## Standard and Slack Forms



Standard Form (Matrix-Vector-Notation)
maximize
subject to

$$
c^{T} x<\text { Inner product of two vectors }
$$

$$
A x \leq b<\text { Matrix-vector product }
$$

## Converting Linear Programs into Standard Form

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.
2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.
3. There might be equality constraints.
4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).
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## Converting Linear Programs into Standard Form

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.
2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.
3. There might be equality constraints.
4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).

Goal: Convert linear program into an equivalent program which is in standard form


Equivalence: a correspondence (not necessarily a bijection) between solutions.

## Converting into Standard Form (1/5)

Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.

## Converting into Standard Form (1/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.


## Converting into Standard Form (1/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.

| minimize | $-2 x_{1}$ | $+$ | $3 x_{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | $=$ | 7 |
|  | $x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  | $x_{1}$ |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |
|  |  | Negate objective function |  |  |  |

## Converting into Standard Form (1/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

1. The objective might be a minimization rather than maximization.

| minimize | $-2 x_{1}$ | $+$ | $3 x_{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\chi_{1}$ | + | $\chi_{2}$ | $=$ | 7 |
|  | $\chi_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  | $\chi_{1}$ |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |
|  |  | Negate objective function |  |  |  |
| maximize | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ |  |  |
| subject to |  | + |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{1}$ |  | $x_{2}$ | $=$ | 7 |
|  | $x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  | $x_{1}$ |  |  |  | 0 |

Converting into Standard Form (2/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.

## Converting into Standard Form (2/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
\operatorname{maximize} & 2 x_{1}-3 x_{2} & \\
\text { subject to } & & \\
& x_{1}+2 x_{2}=7 \\
& x_{1}-2 x_{2} \leq 4 \\
& x_{1} & \geq 0 \\
& & \geq 0
\end{array}
$$

## Converting into Standard Form (2/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { maximize } 2 x_{1}-3 x_{2} \\
& \text { subject to } \\
& \text { Replace } x_{2} \text { by two non-negative } \\
& \text { variables } x_{2}^{\prime} \text { and } x_{2}^{\prime \prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Converting into Standard Form (2/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

2. There might be variables without nonnegativity constraints.

maximize $2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}^{\prime}+3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$
subject to


## Converting into Standard Form (3/5)

Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:
3. There might be equality constraints.

## Converting into Standard Form (3/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

3. There might be equality constraints.

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
\begin{array}{l}
\operatorname{maximize} \\
\text { subject to }
\end{array} & 2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}^{\prime}+3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime} \\
& x_{1}+x_{2}^{\prime}-2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}=7 \\
& x_{1}-2 x_{2}^{\prime}+2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime} \leq 4 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime \prime} & \geq 0
\end{array}
$$

## Converting into Standard Form (3/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

3. There might be equality constraints.

| maximize subject to | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}^{\prime}$ | $+$ | $3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $x_{1}$ |  | $x_{2}^{\prime}$ | - | $\chi_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |  | 7 |
|  |  |  | $2 x_{2}^{\prime}$ | $+$ | $2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  |  | $x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ <br> Replace each equality by two inequalities. |  |  |  |  |  |

## Converting into Standard Form (3/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

3 . There might be equality constraints.
maximize $2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}^{\prime}+3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$
subject to

| $x_{1}+x_{2}^{\prime}-x_{2}^{\prime \prime}=7$ |
| :--- |
| $x_{1}-2 x_{2}^{\prime}+2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime} \leq 4$ |
| $x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime} x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Reppace each equality |
| by two inequalities. |

$\downarrow$ by two
maximize $2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}^{\prime}+3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$
subject to

| $x_{1}$ <br> $x_{1}$ | + |  | - |  |  |  | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | + | $x_{2}^{\prime}$ | - | $x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  | 7 |
|  |  | ${ }_{2}^{\prime}$ | + | $2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Converting into Standard Form (4/5)

Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:
4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).

## Converting into Standard Form (4/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).


## Converting into Standard Form (4/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).

> maximize $\quad 2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}^{\prime}+3 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ subject to

| $x_{1}+r x_{2}^{\prime}$ |
| :---: |
| $x_{1}+2 x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |$\leq$|  |
| :--- |
| $x_{1}-2$ |
| $x_{1}-2 x_{2}^{\prime}$ |
| $x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime \prime}$ |

Negate respective inequalities.

## Converting into Standard Form (4/5)

## Reasons for a LP not being in standard form:

4. There might be inequality constraints (with $\geq$ instead of $\leq$ ).


Converting into Standard Form (5/5)

| maximize | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | 7 |
|  | $-x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | -7 |
|  | $x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  | $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$ |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |  |  |

Converting into Standard Form (5/5)


## Converting into Standard Form (5/5)



It is always possible to convert a linear program into standard form.

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (1/3)

Goal: Convert standard form into slack form, where all constraints except for the non-negativity constraints are equalities.
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## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (1/3)

Goal: Convert standard form into slack form, where all constraints except for the non-negativity constraints are equalities.

For the simplex algorithm, it is more convenient to work with equality constraints.

Introducing Slack Variables

- Let $\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i}$ be an inequality constraint
- Introduce a slack variable $s$ by

$$
s=b_{i}-\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j}
$$

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (1/3)

Goal: Convert standard form into slack form, where all constraints except for the non-negativity constraints are equalities.

For the simplex algorithm, it is more convenient to work with equality constraints.

Introducing Slack Variables

- Let $\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i}$ be an inequality constraint
- Introduce a slack variable $s$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s=b_{i}-\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \\
& s \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (1/3)

Goal: Convert standard form into slack form, where all constraints except for the non-negativity constraints are equalities.

For the simplex algorithm, it is more convenient to work with equality constraints.

Introducing Slack Variables

- Let $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{a}_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i}$ be an inequality constraint
- Introduce a slack variable $s$ by
$s$ measures the slack between the two sides of the inequality.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s=b_{i}-\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \\
& s \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (1/3)

Goal: Convert standard form into slack form, where all constraints except for the non-negativity constraints are equalities.

For the simplex algorithm, it is more convenient to work with equality constraints.

Introducing Slack Variables

- Let $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{a}_{i j} x_{j} \leq b_{i}$ be an inequality constraint
- Introduce a slack variable $s$ by
$s$ measures the slack between the two sides of the inequality.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s=b_{i}-\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} \\
& s \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

- Denote slack variable of the $i$ th inequality by $x_{n+i}$

Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)

| maximize | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | 7 |
|  | $-x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | -7 |
|  | $x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |
|  | $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$ |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |  |  |

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)



## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { maximize } 2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}+3 x_{3} \\
& \text { subject to }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { subject to } \\
& x_{4}=7-x_{1}-x_{2}+x_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)

| maximize subject to | $2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}+3 x_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $x_{1}$ | $+$ | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ |  | 7 |  |
|  | $-x_{1}$ | - | $\chi_{2}$ | $+$ | $x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | -7 |  |
|  | $x_{1}$ |  | $2 x_{2}$ | $+$ | $2 x_{3}$ | $\leq$ | 4 |  |
|  |  | $x_{1}, x_{2}$ |  |  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |  |
|  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | Introd | duce s | lack | ariab |  |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + |
|  | $x_{5}$ |  | -7 | + |  | + |  |  |

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)



## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)


subject to

\[

\]

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (2/3)

maximize $2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}+3 x_{3}$
subject to
maximize
subject to

\[

\]

Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (3/3)
maximize
subject to
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\]

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (3/3)

maximize<br>subject to

\[

\]

Use variable $z$ to denote objective function and omit the nonnegativity constraints.

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (3/3)

maximize
subject to

$$
2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}+3 x_{3}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rrrrrrrr}
x_{4} & = & 7 & - & x_{1} & - & x_{2} & + \\
x_{5} & = & -7 & + & x_{1} & + & x_{2} & - \\
x_{3} \\
x_{6} & = & 4 & - & x_{1} & + & 2 x_{2} & - \\
c & 2 x_{3} \\
x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, x_{6} & & \geq & 0 &
\end{array}
$$

Use variable $z$ to denote objective function and omit the nonnegativity constraints.

| $z$ | $=$ |  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | -7 | + | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - |
| $x_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 4 | - | $x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | - |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Converting Standard Form into Slack Form (3/3)

maximize
subject to

$$
2 x_{1}-3 x_{2}+3 x_{3}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rrrrrrrr}
x_{4} & = & 7 & - & x_{1} & - & x_{2} & + \\
x_{5} & = & -7 & + & x_{1} & + & x_{2} & - \\
x_{3} \\
x_{6} & = & 4 & - & x_{1} & + & 2 x_{2} & - \\
c & 2 x_{3} \\
x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, x_{6} & & \geq & 0 & &
\end{array}
$$

Use variable $z$ to denote objective function and omit the nonnegativity constraints.

| $z$ | $=$ |  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | -7 | + | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 4 | - | $x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $2 x_{3}$ |

This is called slack form.

## Basic and Non-Basic Variables

| $z$ | $=$ |  |  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | -7 | + | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 4 | - | $x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $2 x_{3}$ |

## Basic and Non-Basic Variables
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## Basic and Non-Basic Variables

| $z$ | $=$ |  |  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | -7 | + | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 4 | - | $x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $2 x_{3}$ |

Basic Variables: $B=\{4,5,6\}$
Non-Basic Variables: $N=\{1,2,3\}$

Slack Form (Formal Definition)
Slack form is given by a tuple ( $N, B, A, b, c, v$ ) so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=v+\sum_{j \in N} c_{j} x_{j} \\
& x_{i}=b_{i}-\sum_{j \in N} a_{i j} x_{j} \quad \text { for } i \in B
\end{aligned}
$$

and all variables are non-negative.

## Basic and Non-Basic Variables

| $z$ | $=$ |  |  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $3 x_{2}$ | + | $3 x_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 7 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | + | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | -7 | + | $x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | - | $x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 4 | - | $x_{1}$ | + | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $2 x_{3}$ |

Basic Variables: $B=\{4,5,6\}$
Non-Basic Variables: $N=\{1,2,3\}$

Slack Form (Formal Definition)
Slack form is given by a tuple ( $N, B, A, b, c, v$ ) so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=v+\sum_{j \in N} c_{j} x_{j} \\
& x_{i}=b_{i}-\sum_{j \in N} a_{i j} x_{j} \quad \text { for } i \in B
\end{aligned}
$$

and all variables are non-negative.
Variables/Coefficients on the right hand side are indexed by $B$ and $N$.

## Slack Form (Example)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Slack Form (Example)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-1 \frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Slack Form Notation

## Slack Form (Example)
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\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-1 \frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
&
\end{aligned}
$$

## Slack Form Notation

- $B=\{1,2,4\}, N=\{3,5,6\}$
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## Slack Form Notation

- $B=\{1,2,4\}, N=\{3,5,6\}$

$$
A=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
a_{13} & a_{15} & a_{16} \\
a_{23} & a_{25} & a_{26} \\
a_{43} & a_{45} & a_{46}
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8 / 3 & 2 / 3 & -1 / 3 \\
1 / 2 & -1 / 2 & 0
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$$
b=\left(\begin{array}{l}
b_{1} \\
b_{2} \\
b_{4}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
8 \\
4 \\
18
\end{array}\right), \quad c=\left(\begin{array}{l}
c_{3} \\
c_{5} \\
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-1 / 6 \\
-2 / 3
\end{array}\right)
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Slack Form (Example)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18 \\
& x_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Slack Form Notation

- $B=\{1,2,4\}, N=\{3,5,6\}$

$$
A=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
a_{13} & a_{15} & a_{16} \\
a_{23} & a_{25} & a_{26} \\
a_{43} & a_{45} & a_{46}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-1 / 6 & -1 / 6 & 1 / 3 \\
8 / 3 & 2 / 3 & -1 / 3 \\
1 / 2 & -1 / 2 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
b=\left(\begin{array}{l}
b_{1} \\
b_{2} \\
b_{4}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
8 \\
4 \\
18
\end{array}\right), \quad c=\left(\begin{array}{l}
c_{3} \\
c_{5} \\
c_{6}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{l}
-1 / 6 \\
-1 / 6 \\
-2 / 3
\end{array}\right)
$$

- $v=28$
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- Consider $x+\lambda d$ as a function of $\lambda \geq 0$
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## The Structure of Optimal Solutions

## Definition

A point $x$ is a vertex if it cannot be represented as a strict convex combination of two other points in the feasible set.

The set of feasible solutions is a convex set.

## Theorem

If the slack form has an optimal solution, one of them occurs at a vertex.

## Proof Sketch (informal and non-examinable):

- Rewrite LP s.t. $A x=b$. Let $x$ be optimal but not a vertex

- Case 2: For all $j, d_{j} \geq 0$
- $x+\lambda d$ is feasible for all $\lambda \geq 0: A(x+\lambda d)=b$ and $x+\lambda d \geq x \geq 0$
- If $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, then $c^{T}(x+\lambda d) \rightarrow \infty$
$\Rightarrow$ This contradicts the assumption that there exists an optimal solution.
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## Simplex Algorithm: Introduction

Simplex Algorithm

- classical method for solving linear programs (Dantzig, 1947)
- usually fast in practice although worst-case runtime not polynomial
- iterative procedure somewhat similar to Gaussian elimination


## Basic Idea:

- Each iteration corresponds to a "basic solution" of the slack form
- All non-basic variables are 0 , and the basic variables are determined from the equality constraints
- Each iteration converts one slack form into an equivalent one while the objective value will not decrease In that sense, it is a greedy algorithm.
- Conversion ("pivoting") is achieved by switching the roles of one basic and one non-basic variable


## Extended Example: Conversion into Slack Form

maximize $3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3}$
subject to

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
x_{1}+x_{2}+3 x_{3} & \leq 30 \\
2 x_{1}+2 x_{2}+5 x_{3} & \leq \\
4 x_{1}+ & x_{2}+24 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3} & \leq & \\
& &
\end{array}
$$
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## Extended Example: Iteration 1

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=30-x_{1}-2 x_{2}-3 x_{3} \\
& x_{5}=24-2 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-5 x_{3} \\
& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-x_{2}-2 x_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Extended Example: Iteration 1

Increasing the value of $x_{1}$ would increase the objective value.
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& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-2 x_{3}
\end{aligned}
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The third constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{1}$.

Switch roles of $x_{1}$ and $x_{6}$ :
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## Extended Example: Iteration 2

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=27+\frac{x_{2}}{4}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{3 x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{1}=9-\frac{x_{2}}{4}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{4}=21-\frac{3 x_{2}}{4}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{5}=6-\frac{3 x_{2}}{2}-4 x_{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{2}
\end{aligned}
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## Extended Example: Iteration 2

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=27+\frac{x_{2}}{4}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{3 x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{1}=9-\frac{x_{2}}{4}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{4}=21-\frac{3 x_{2}}{4}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{6}}{4} \\
& x_{5}=6-\frac{3 x_{2}}{2}-4 x_{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{2} \\
& \text { Basic solution: }\left(\overline{x_{1}}, \overline{x_{2}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{6}}\right)=(9,0,0,21,6,0) \text { with objective value } 27
\end{aligned}
$$
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The third constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{3}$.

## Switch roles of $x_{3}$ and $x_{5}$ :

## Extended Example: Iteration 2

Increasing the value of $x_{3}$ would increase the objective value.
$z=27+\frac{x_{2}}{4}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{3 x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{1}=9-\frac{x_{2}}{4}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{4}=21-\frac{3 x_{2}}{4}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{5}=6-\frac{3 x_{2}}{2}-4 x_{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{2}$

The third constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{3}$.

Switch roles of $x_{3}$ and $x_{5}$ :

- Solving for $x_{3}$ yields:

$$
x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}-\frac{x_{6}}{8}
$$

## Extended Example: Iteration 2

Increasing the value of $x_{3}$ would increase the objective value.
$z=27+\frac{x_{2}}{4}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{3 x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{1}=9-\frac{x_{2}}{4}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{4}=21-\frac{3 x_{2}}{4}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{6}}{4}$
$x_{5}=6-\frac{3 x_{2}}{2}-4 x_{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{2}$

The third constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{3}$.

Switch roles of $x_{3}$ and $x_{5}$ :

- Solving for $x_{3}$ yields:

$$
x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}-\frac{x_{6}}{8} .
$$

- Substitute this into $x_{3}$ in the other three equations


## Extended Example: Iteration 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{111}{4}+\frac{x_{2}}{16}-\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{11 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{1}=\frac{33}{4}-\frac{x_{2}}{16}+\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{5 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}+\frac{x_{6}}{8} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{69}{4}+\frac{3 x_{2}}{16}+\frac{5 x_{5}}{8}-\frac{x_{6}}{16}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Iteration 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{111}{4}+\frac{x_{2}}{16}-\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{11 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{1}=\frac{33}{4}-\frac{x_{2}}{16}+\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{5 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}+\frac{x_{6}}{8} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{69}{4}+\frac{3 x_{2}}{16}+\frac{5 x_{5}}{8}-\frac{x_{6}}{16} \\
& \text { Basic solution: }\left(\overline{x_{1}}, \overline{x_{2}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{6}}\right)=\left(\frac{33}{4}, 0, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{69}{4}, 0,0\right) \text { with objective value } \frac{111}{4}=27.75
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Iteration 3

Increasing the value of $x_{2}$ would increase the objective value.
$z=\frac{111}{4}+\frac{x_{2}}{16}-\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{11 x_{6}}{16}$
$x_{1}=\frac{33}{4}-\frac{x_{2}}{16}+\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{5 x_{6}}{16}$
$x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}+\frac{x_{6}}{8}$
$x_{4}=\frac{69}{4}+\frac{3 x_{2}}{16}+\frac{5 x_{5}}{8}-\frac{x_{6}}{16}$

Basic solution: $\left(\overline{x_{1}}, \overline{x_{2}}, \ldots, \overline{\bar{x}_{6}}\right)=\left(\frac{33}{4}, 0, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{69}{4}, 0,0\right)$ with objective value $\frac{111}{4}=27.75$
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The second constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{2}$.
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The second constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{2}$.

Switch roles of $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$ :

- Solving for $x_{2}$ yields:

$$
x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3}
$$

## Extended Example: Iteration 3



The second constraint is the tightest and limits how much we can increase $x_{2}$.
Switch roles of $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$ :

- Solving for $x_{2}$ yields:

$$
x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} .
$$

- Substitute this into $x_{2}$ in the other three equations


## Extended Example: Iteration 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Iteration 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic solution: $\left(\overline{x_{1}}, \overline{x_{2}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{6}}\right)=(8,4,0,18,0,0)$ with objective value 28

## Extended Example: Iteration 4

All coefficients are negative, and hence this basic solution is optimal!

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic solution: $\left(\overline{x_{1}}, \overline{x_{2}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{6}}\right)=(8,4,0,18,0,0)$ with objective value 28
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Exercise: How many basic solutions (including non-feasible ones) are there?

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (1/2)

| $z$ | $=$ |  | $3 x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 30 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | 34 | - | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | - |
|  | $5 x_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 36 | - | $4 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (1/2)

| $z$ | $=$ |  |  | $3 x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 30 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - | $3 x_{3}$ |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | 24 | - | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $5 x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 36 | - | $4 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - | $2 x_{3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (1/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=30-x_{1}-x_{2}-3 x_{3} \\
& x_{5}=24-2 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-5 x_{3} \\
& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-x_{2}-2 x_{3} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{2} \text { and } x_{5} \\
& z=12+2 x_{1}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{2}=12-x_{1}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{4}=18-x_{2}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{6}=24-3 x_{1}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (1/2)

$$
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
z & = & & & 3 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + & 2 x_{3} \\
x_{4} & = & 30 & - & x_{1} & - & x_{2} & - & 3 x_{3} \\
x_{5} & = & 24 & - & 2 x_{1} & - & 2 x_{2} & - & 5 x_{3} \\
x_{6} & = & 36 & - & 4 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & - & 2 x_{3} \\
& & & & \text { Switch roles of } x_{2} & \text { and } x_{5} \\
z & = & 12 & + & 2 x_{1} & - & \frac{x_{3}}{2} & - & \frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
x_{2} & = & 12 & - & x_{1} & - & \frac{5 x_{3}}{2} & - & \frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
x_{2} \\
x_{4} & = & 18 & - & x_{2} & - & \frac{x_{3}}{2} & + & \frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
x_{6} & = & 24 & - & 3 x_{1} & + & \frac{x_{3}}{2} & + & \frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& & & & \text { Switch roles of } x_{1} & \text { and } x_{6}
\end{array}
$$

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (1/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=30-x_{1}-x_{2}-3 x_{3} \\
& x_{5}=24-2 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-5 x_{3} \\
& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-x_{2}-2 x_{3} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{2} \text { and } x_{5} \\
& z=12+2 x_{1}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{2}=12-x_{1}-\frac{5 x_{3}}{2}-\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{4}=18-x_{2}-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& x_{6}=24-3 x_{1}+\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{1} \text { and } x_{6} \\
& z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

| $z$ | $=$ |  | $3 x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $x_{4}$ | $=$ | 30 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - |
| $x_{5}$ | $=$ | 34 | - | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | - |
| $x_{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 36 | - | $4 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - |
| $2 x_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

| $z$ | $=$ |  |  | $3 x_{1}$ | + | $x_{2}$ | + | $2 x_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\chi_{4}$ | $=$ | 30 | - | $x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | - | $3 x_{3}$ |
| $\chi_{5}$ | $=$ | 24 | - | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $2 x_{2}$ | - | $5 x_{3}$ |
| $x_{6}$ | $=$ | 36 | - | $\begin{aligned} & 4 x_{1} \\ & 1 \\ & \downarrow \\ & \downarrow \end{aligned}$ | ch |  | and |  |

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=30-x_{1}-x_{2}-3 x_{3} \\
& x_{5}=24-2 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-5 x_{3} \\
& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-x_{2}-2 x_{3} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{3} \text { and } x_{5} \\
& z=\frac{48}{5}+\frac{11 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{78}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{3 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{24}{5}-\frac{2 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{2}}{5}-\frac{x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{6}=\frac{132}{5}-\frac{16 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{2 x_{3}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{48}{5}+\frac{11 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{78}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{3 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{24}{5}-\frac{2 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{2}}{5}-\frac{x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{6}=\frac{132}{5}-\frac{16 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{2 x_{3}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

Switch roles of $x_{1}$ and $x^{2}$

Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{48}{5}+\frac{11 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{78}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{3 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{24}{5}-\frac{2 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{2}}{5}-\frac{x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{6}=\frac{132}{5}-\frac{16 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{2 x_{3}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

Switch roles of $x_{1}$ and $x^{\prime}$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
z & = \\
\frac{111}{4} & + \\
x_{1} & = \\
\frac{33}{16} & - \\
\frac{x_{2}}{16} & + \\
\frac{x_{5}}{8} & -\frac{x_{5}}{8} \\
x_{3} & = \\
\frac{3}{2} & -\frac{11 x_{6}}{16} \\
x_{4} & \frac{5 x_{6}}{16} \\
x_{4} & = \\
\frac{69}{4} & +\frac{x_{5}}{4} \\
\hline & +\frac{x_{6}}{16} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{48}{5}+\frac{11 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{78}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{3 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{24}{5}-\frac{2 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{2}}{5}-\frac{x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{6}=\frac{132}{5}-\frac{16 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{2 x_{3}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

Switch roles of $x_{1}$ and $x_{6} \ldots$ Switch roles of $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{111}{4}+\frac{x_{2}}{16}-\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{11 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{1}=\frac{33}{4}-\frac{x_{2}}{16}+\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{5 x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}+\frac{x_{6}}{8} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{69}{4}+\frac{3 x_{2}}{16}+\frac{5 x_{5}}{8}-\frac{x_{6}}{16}
\end{aligned}
$$

Extended Example: Alternative Runs (2/2)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=3 x_{1}+x_{2}+2 x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=30-x_{1}-x_{2}-3 x_{3} \\
& x_{5}=24-2 x_{1}-2 x_{2}-5 x_{3} \\
& x_{6}=36-4 x_{1}-x_{2}-2 x_{3} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{3} \text { and } x_{5} \\
& z=\frac{48}{5}+\frac{11 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{78}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{3 x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{24}{5}-\frac{2 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{2 x_{2}}{5}-\frac{x_{5}}{5} \\
& x_{6}=\frac{132}{5}-\frac{16 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{2}}{5}+\frac{2 x_{3}}{5} \\
& \text { Switch roles of } x_{1} \text { and } x_{6} \ldots \ldots \text { Switch roles of } x_{2} \text { and } x_{3} \\
& z=\frac{111}{4}+\frac{x_{2}}{16}-\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{11 x_{6}}{16} \quad z=28-\frac{x_{3}}{6}-\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{2 x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{1}=\frac{33}{4}-\frac{x_{2}}{16}+\frac{x_{5}}{8}-\frac{5 x_{6}}{16} \quad x_{1}=8+\frac{x_{3}}{6}+\frac{x_{5}}{6}-\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3 x_{2}}{8}-\frac{x_{5}}{4}+\frac{x_{6}}{8} \\
& x_{4}=\frac{69}{4}+\frac{3 x_{2}}{16}+\frac{5 x_{5}}{8}-\frac{x_{6}}{16} \\
& x_{2}=4-\frac{8 x_{3}}{3}-\frac{2 x_{5}}{3}+\frac{x_{6}}{3} \\
& x_{4}=18-\frac{x_{3}}{2}+\frac{x_{5}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

## The Pivot Step Formally

$\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)$
1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable $x_{e}$.
2 let $\hat{A}$ be a new $m \times n$ matrix
$\hat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$
for each $j \in N-\{e\}$
$\hat{a}_{e j}=a_{l j} / a_{l e}$
$\hat{a}_{e l}=1 / a_{l e}$
// Compute the coefficients of the remaining constraints.
for each $i \in B-\{l\}$
$\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$
for each $j \in N-\{e\}$
$\hat{a}_{i j}=a_{i j}-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e j}$
$\widehat{a}_{i l}=-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e l}$
// Compute the objective function.
$\hat{v}=v+c_{e} \hat{b}_{e}$
for each $j \in N-\{e\}$
$\widehat{c}_{j}=c_{j}-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e j}$
$\widehat{c}_{l}=-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e l}$
// Compute new sets of basic and nonbasic variables.
$\widehat{N}=N-\{e\} \cup\{l\}$
$\hat{B}=B-\{l\} \cup\{e\}$
return $(\hat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{v})$

## The Pivot Step Formally

```
Pivot( \(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable \(x_{e}\).
    2 let \(\hat{A}\) be a new \(m \times n\) matrix
    \(\hat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}\)
    for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
    \(\hat{a}_{e j}=a_{l j} / a_{l e}\)
    \(\hat{a}_{e l}=1 / a_{l e}\)
    // Compute the coefficients of the remaining constraints.
    for each \(i \in B-\{l\}\)
        \(\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \hat{b}_{e}\)
        for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
        \(\widehat{a}_{i j}=a_{i j}-a_{i e} \widehat{a}_{e j}\)
        \(\hat{a}_{i l}=-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
    // Compute the objective function.
\(\hat{v}=v+c_{e} \hat{b}_{e}\)
for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
    \(\widehat{c}_{j}=c_{j}-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e j}\)
\(\hat{c}_{l}=-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
// Compute new sets of basic and nonbasic variables.
\(\widehat{N}=N-\{e\} \cup\{l\}\)
\(\widehat{B}=B-\{l\} \cup\{e\}\)
return \((\hat{N}, \widehat{B}, \hat{A}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{v})\)
```


## The Pivot Step Formally

```
Pivot( \(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable \(x_{e}\).
    2 let \(\hat{A}\) be a new \(m \times n\) matrix
    \(\hat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}\)
for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
\(\quad \hat{a}_{e j}=a_{l j} / a_{l e}\)
\(\hat{a}_{e l}=1 / a_{l e}\)
// Compute the coefficients of the remaining constraints.
    for each \(i \in B-\{l\}\)
        \(\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \hat{b}_{e}\)
        for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
        \(\widehat{a}_{i j}=a_{i j}-a_{i e} \widehat{a}_{e j}\)
        \(\hat{a}_{i l}=-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
    Rewrite "tight" equation
for enterring variable \(x_{e}\).
```

Substituting $x_{e}$ into other equations.

## The Pivot Step Formally

```
Pivot( \(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable \(x_{e}\).
    2 let \(\hat{A}\) be a new \(m \times n\) matrix
```



## The Pivot Step Formally

    1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable \(x_{e}\).
    2 let \(\hat{A}\) be a new \(m \times n\) matrix
    ```
    \(\widehat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}\)
    for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
        \(\hat{a}_{e j}=a_{l j} / a_{l e}\)
    \(\hat{a}_{e l}=1 / a_{l e}\)
// Compute the coefficients of the remaining constraints.
for each \(i \in B-\{l\}\)
    \(\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \hat{b}_{e}\)
    for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
        \(\widehat{a}_{i j}=a_{i j}-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e j}\)
    \(\hat{a}_{i l}=-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
    // Compute the objective function.
\(\hat{v}=v+c_{e} \hat{b}_{e}\)
for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\)
    \(\widehat{c}_{j}=c_{j}-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e j}\)
\(\hat{c}_{l}=-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
// Compute new sets of basic and nonbasic variables.
\(\widehat{N}=N-\{e\} \cup\{l\}\)
\(\widehat{B}=B-\{l\} \cup\{e\}\)
return \((\hat{N}, \widehat{B}, \hat{A}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{v})\)
\(\hat{c}_{l}=-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e l}\)
return \((\hat{N}, \widehat{B}, \hat{A}, \hat{b}, \widehat{c}, \hat{v})\)
```

Rewrite "tight" equation for enterring variable $x_{e}$.

Substituting $x_{e}$ into other equations.

```
Pivot(N, B,A,b,c,v,l,e)
```

```
Pivot(N, B,A,b,c,v,l,e)
```

Substituting $x_{e}$ into objective function.

## The Pivot Step Formally

    1 // Compute the coefficients of the equation for new basic variable \(x_{e}\).
    2 let \(\hat{A}\) be a new \(m \times n\) matrix
    \(3 \hat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}\)
    for each \(j \in N-\{e\}\) Need that \(a_{l e} \neq 0\) !
    \(\hat{a}_{e j}=a_{l j} / a_{l e}\)
    $\hat{a}_{e l}=1 / a_{l e}$
Rewrite "tight" equation
for enterring variable $x_{e}$.
// Compute the coefficients of the remaining constraints.
for each $i \in B-\{l\}$
$\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$
for each $j \in N-\{e\}$
$\widehat{a}_{i j}=a_{i j}-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e j}$
$\hat{a}_{i l}=-a_{i e} \hat{a}_{e l}$

Substituting $x_{e}$ into other equations.

```
Pivot(N,B,A,b,c,v,l,e)
```

```
Pivot(N,B,A,b,c,v,l,e)
```

    // Compute the objective function.
    $\hat{v}=v+c_{e} \hat{b}_{e}$
for each $j \in N-\{e\}$
$\widehat{c}_{j}=c_{j}-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e j}$
$\hat{c}_{l}=-c_{e} \hat{a}_{e l}$
// Compute new sets of basic and nonbasic variables.
$\hat{N}=N-\{e\} \cup\{l\}$
$\widehat{B}=B-\{l\} \cup\{e\}$
return $(\hat{N}, \widehat{B}, \hat{A}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{v})$

## Effect of the Pivot Step (extra material, non-examinable)

## Lemma 29.1

Consider a call to $\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, I, e)$ in which $a_{l e} \neq 0$. Let the values returned from the call be $(\widehat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \widehat{c}, \widehat{v})$, and let $\bar{x}$ denote the basic solution after the call. Then

## Effect of the Pivot Step (extra material, non-examinable)

## Lemma 29.1

Consider a call to $\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)$ in which $a_{l e} \neq 0$. Let the values returned from the call be ( $\widehat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \widehat{c}, \widehat{v}$ ), and let $\bar{x}$ denote the basic solution after the call. Then

1. $\bar{x}_{j}=0$ for each $j \in \widehat{N}$.
2. $\bar{x}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. $\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B} \backslash\{e\}$.

## Effect of the Pivot Step (extra material, non-examinable)

## Lemma 29.1

Consider a call to $\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)$ in which $a_{l e} \neq 0$. Let the values returned from the call be ( $\widehat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \widehat{c}, \widehat{v}$ ), and let $\bar{x}$ denote the basic solution after the call. Then

1. $\bar{x}_{j}=0$ for each $j \in \widehat{N}$.
2. $\bar{x}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. $\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B} \backslash\{e\}$.

Proof:

## Effect of the Pivot Step (extra material, non-examinable)

## Lemma 29.1

Consider a call to $\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)$ in which $a_{l e} \neq 0$. Let the values returned from the call be ( $\widehat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \widehat{c}, \widehat{v}$ ), and let $\bar{x}$ denote the basic solution after the call. Then

1. $\bar{x}_{j}=0$ for each $j \in \widehat{N}$.
2. $\bar{x}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. $\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B} \backslash\{e\}$.

## Proof:

1. holds since the basic solution always sets all non-basic variables to zero.
2. When we set each non-basic variable to 0 in a constraint

$$
x_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}-\sum_{j \in \widehat{N}} \widehat{a}_{i j} x_{j}
$$

we have $\bar{x}_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B}$. Hence $\bar{x}_{e}=\widehat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. After substituting into the other constraints, we have

$$
\bar{x}_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}
$$

## Effect of the Pivot Step (extra material, non-examinable)

## Lemma 29.1

Consider a call to $\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)$ in which $a_{l e} \neq 0$. Let the values returned from the call be ( $\widehat{N}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{A}, \widehat{b}, \widehat{c}, \widehat{v}$ ), and let $\bar{x}$ denote the basic solution after the call. Then

1. $\bar{x}_{j}=0$ for each $j \in \widehat{N}$.
2. $\bar{x}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. $\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B} \backslash\{e\}$.

## Proof:

1. holds since the basic solution always sets all non-basic variables to zero.
2. When we set each non-basic variable to 0 in a constraint

$$
x_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}-\sum_{j \in \widehat{N}} \widehat{a}_{i j} x_{j}
$$

we have $\bar{x}_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}$ for each $i \in \widehat{B}$. Hence $\bar{x}_{e}=\widehat{b}_{e}=b_{l} / a_{l e}$.
3. After substituting into the other constraints, we have

$$
\bar{x}_{i}=\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}-a_{i e} \widehat{b}_{e}
$$

## Formalizing the Simplex Algorithm: Questions

## Questions:

- How do we determine whether a linear program is feasible?
- What do we do if the linear program is feasible, but the initial basic solution is not feasible?
- How do we determine whether a linear program is unbounded?
- How do we choose the entering and leaving variables?


## Formalizing the Simplex Algorithm: Questions

## Questions:

- How do we determine whether a linear program is feasible?
- What do we do if the linear program is feasible, but the initial basic solution is not feasible?
- How do we determine whether a linear program is unbounded?
- How do we choose the entering and leaving variables?

> Example before was a particularly nice one!

## The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{InitiaLIZE-Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\)
    while some index \(j \in N\) has \(c_{j}>0\)
    choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
    for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    for \(i=1\) to \(n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
```

The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Initialize-Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\)
while some index \(j \in N\) has \(c_{j}>0\)
    choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
    for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
for \(i=1\) to \(n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
```

Returns a slack form with a feasible basic solution (if it exists)

The formal procedure Simplex


The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Initialize}-\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
2 let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\)
3 , while some index \(\bar{j} \in \bar{N}\) has \(\bar{c}_{j}>\overline{0}\)
4 1 choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
    for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\) ।
    for \(\bar{i} \overline{=} \overline{1} \overline{\mathbf{t}}{ }^{-} n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
```


## The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Initialize}-\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
    let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\)
    while some index \(j \in N\) has \(c_{j}>0\)
    choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
    for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    \(\overline{\mathbf{f o r}} \bar{i}=\overline{1} \overline{\mathbf{t}} \bar{n} n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
```


## Main Loop:

- terminates if all coefficients in objective function are negative
- Line 4 picks enterring variable $x_{e}$ with negative coefficient
- Lines 6-9 pick the tightest constraint, associated with $x_{1}$
- Line 11 returns "unbounded" if there are no constraints
- Line 12 calls Pivot, switching roles of $x_{l}$ and $x_{e}$


## The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
\(\left.1 \quad(N, B, A, b, c, \nu)=\operatorname{Initialize-Simplex}(A, b, c) \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Returns a slack form with a } \\ 2 \\ \text { let } \Delta \text { be a new vector of length } m\end{array}\right) . \begin{gathered}\text { feasible basic solution (if it exists) }\end{gathered}\)
2 let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\) -
3 , while some index \(j \in N\) has \(c_{j}>0\)
4 choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
5 for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\)
    for \(i=\overline{1} \overline{\mathbf{t}}{ }^{-} n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
Return corresponding solution.
```


## The formal procedure Simplex

```
\(\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
\((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Initialize}-\operatorname{Simplex}(A, b, c)\)
let \(\Delta\) be a new vector of length \(m\)
, while some index \(j \in N\) has \(c_{j}>0\)
    choose an index \(e \in N\) for which \(c_{e}>0\)
    for each index \(i \in B\)
        if \(a_{i e}>0\)
            \(\Delta_{i}=b_{i} / a_{i e}\)
        else \(\Delta_{i}=\infty\)
    choose an index \(l \in B\) that minimizes \(\Delta_{i}\)
    if \(\Delta_{l}==\infty\)
        return "unbounded"
    else \((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, e)\) ।
for \(\bar{i}=\overline{1} \overline{\mathbf{t}}{ }^{-} n\)
    if \(i \in B\)
        \(\bar{x}_{i}=b_{i}\)
    else \(\bar{x}_{i}=0\)
    return \(\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)\)
```


## Lemma 29.2

Suppose the call to Initialize-Simplex in line 1 returns a slack form for which the basic solution is feasible. Then if SImplex returns a solution, it is a feasible solution. If SIMPLEX returns "unbounded", the linear program is unbounded.

## The formal procedure Simplex



Proof is based on the following three-part loop invariant:

Lemma 29.2
Suppose the call to Initialize-Simplex in line 1 returns a slack form for which the basic solution is feasible. Then if SImplex returns a solution, it is a feasible solution. If SIMPLEX returns "unbounded", the linear program is unbounded.

## The formal procedure Simplex



Proof is based on the following three-part loop invariant:

1. the slack form is always equivalent to the one returned by Initialize-Simplex,
2. for each $i \in B$, we have $b_{i} \geq 0$,
3. the basic solution associated with the (current) slack form is feasible.

Lemma 29.2
Suppose the call to Initialize-Simplex in line 1 returns a slack form for which the basic solution is feasible. Then if Simplex returns a solution, it is a feasible solution. If SIMPLEX returns "unbounded", the linear program is unbounded.

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.

$$
\begin{array}{lllllll}
z & = & x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + & x_{3} \\
x_{4} & = & 8 & - & x_{1} & - & x_{2} \\
& & \\
x_{5} & = & & & & x_{2} & - \\
x_{3}
\end{array}
$$

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
z & = & & x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + & x_{3} \\
x_{4} & = & 8 & - & x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \\
x_{5} & = & & & & x_{2} & -x_{3} \\
& & & & \text { Pivot with } x_{1} \text { entering and } x_{4} \text { leaving }
\end{array}
$$

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=8-x_{1}-x_{2} \\
& x_{5}=\quad x_{2}-x_{3} \\
& \text { Pivot with } x_{1} \text { entering and } x_{4} \text { leaving } \\
& z=8+x_{3}-x_{4} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
x_{1} \\
x_{2}
\end{array}-x_{2}-x_{4} \\
& x_{5}=\quad x_{2}-x_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.


## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3} \\
& x_{4}=8-x_{1}-x_{2} \\
& x_{5}=\quad x_{2}-x_{3} \\
& \text { Pivot with } x_{1} \text { entering and } x_{4} \text { leaving } \\
& z=8+x_{3}-x_{4} \\
& x_{1}=8-x_{2} \quad-x_{4} \\
& x_{5}=x_{2}-x_{3} \\
& \text { Pivot with } x_{3} \text { entering and } x_{5} \text { leaving } \\
& z=8+x_{2}-x_{4}-x_{5} \\
& x_{1}=8-x_{2}-x_{4} \\
& \begin{array}{clll}
x_{3} & = & x_{2} & -x_{5}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Termination

Degeneracy: One iteration of SIMPLEX leaves the objective value unchanged.


$$
\begin{array}{lllllll}
z & =8 & + & x_{2} & - & x_{4} & - \\
x_{5} \\
x_{1} & =8 & - & x_{2} & - & x_{4} & \\
x_{3} & = & & x_{2} & & & - \\
x_{5}
\end{array}
$$



Exercise: Execute one more step of the Simplex Algorithm on the tableau from the previous slide.

## Termination and Running Time

Cycling: Simplex may fail to terminate.

## Termination and Running Time

It is theoretically possible, but very rare in practice.
Cycling: SIMPLEX may fail to terminate.
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Anti-Cycling Strategies

1. Bland's rule: Choose entering variable with smallest index
2. Random rule: Choose entering variable uniformly at random
3. Perturbation: Perturb the input slightly so that it is impossible to have two solutions with the same objective value

## Termination and Running Time

It is theoretically possible, but very rare in practice.
Cycling: SIMPLEX may fail to terminate.

Anti-Cycling Strategies

1. Bland's rule: Choose entering variable with smallest index
2. Random rule: Choose entering variable uniformly at random
3. Perturbation: Perturb the input slightly so that it is impossible to have two solutions with the same objective value

Replace each $b_{i}$ by $\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}+\epsilon_{i}$, where $\epsilon_{i} \gg \epsilon_{i+1}$ are all small.

## Termination and Running Time

It is theoretically possible, but very rare in practice.
Cycling: SIMPLEX may fail to terminate.

## Anti-Cycling Strategies

1. Bland's rule: Choose entering variable with smallest index
2. Random rule: Choose entering variable uniformly at random
3. Perturbation: Perturb the input slightly so that it is impossible to have two solutions with the same objective value

Replace each $b_{i}$ by $\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}+\epsilon_{i}$, where $\epsilon_{i} \gg \epsilon_{i+1}$ are all small.

## Lemma 29.7

Assuming INITIALIZE-SIMPLEX returns a slack form for which the basic solution is feasible, SIMPLEX either reports that the program is unbounded or returns a feasible solution in at most $\binom{n+m}{m}$ iterations.

## Termination and Running Time

It is theoretically possible, but very rare in practice.
Cycling: SIMPLEX may fail to terminate.

## Anti-Cycling Strategies

1. Bland's rule: Choose entering variable with smallest index
2. Random rule: Choose entering variable uniformly at random
3. Perturbation: Perturb the input slightly so that it is impossible to have two solutions with the same objective value

Replace each $b_{i}$ by $\widehat{b}_{i}=b_{i}+\epsilon_{i}$, where $\epsilon_{i} \gg \epsilon_{i+1}$ are all small.

## Lemma 29.7

Assuming INITIALIZE-SIMPLEX returns a slack form for which the basic solution is feasible, SIMPLEX either reports that the program is unbounded or returns a feasible solution in at most $\binom{n+m}{m}$ iterations.

Every set $B$ of basic variables uniquely determines a slack form, and there are at most $\binom{n+m}{m}$ unique slack forms.

## Outline

## Introduction

## Formulating Problems as Linear Programs

## Standard and Slack Forms

## Simplex Algorithm

Finding an Initial Solution

Finding an Initial Solution

| $\operatorname{maximize}$ | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subject to |  |  |  |  |
|  | $2 x_{1}$ | - | $x_{2}$ | $\leq$ |
|  | $x_{1}$ | - | $5 x_{2}$ | $\leq$ |
|  | $x_{1}, x_{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\geq$ | 0 |  |

Finding an Initial Solution


Finding an Initial Solution


Geometric Illustration

## maximize $2 x_{1}-x_{2}$

subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rllr}
2 x_{1}- & x_{2} & \leq & 2 \\
x_{1}- & 5 x_{2} & \leq & -4 \\
x_{1}, x_{2} & & \geq & 0
\end{array}
$$



Geometric Illustration

## maximize $2 x_{1}-x_{2}$

subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rllr}
2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \leq \\
x_{1} & - & 5 x_{2} & \leq \\
x_{1}, x_{2} & & \geq \\
x_{1} & 0
\end{array}
$$



Geometric Illustration


## Formulating an Auxiliary Linear Program

maximize $\quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j} x_{j}$
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{i j} x_{j} & \leq b_{i} \quad \text { for } i=1,2, \ldots, m \\
x_{j} & \geq 0 \quad \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, n
\end{aligned}
$$
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Lemma 29.11
Let $L_{\text {aux }}$ be the auxiliary LP of a linear program $L$ in standard form. Then $L$ is feasible if and only if the optimal objective value of $L_{a u x}$ is 0 .
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## Initialize-Simplex

## Initialize-Simplex $(A, b, c)$

```
let \(k\) be the index of the minimum \(b_{i}\)
if \(b_{k} \geq 0 \quad / /\) is the initial basic solution feasible?
    return \((\{1,2, \ldots, n\},\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)\)
form \(L_{\text {aux }}\) by adding - \(x_{0}\) to the left-hand side of each constraint
    and setting the objective function to \(-x_{0}\)
let ( \(N, B, A, b, c, \nu\) ) be the resulting slack form for \(L_{\text {aux }}\)
\(l=n+k\)
// \(L_{\text {aux }}\) has \(n+1\) nonbasic variables and \(m\) basic variables.
\((N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, 0)\)
// The basic solution is now feasible for \(L_{\text {aux }}\).
iterate the while loop of lines 3-12 of Simplex until an optimal solution
    to \(L_{\text {aux }}\) is found
if the optimal solution to \(L_{\text {aux }}\) sets \(\bar{x}_{0}\) to 0
    if \(\bar{x}_{0}\) is basic
        perform one (degenerate) pivot to make it nonbasic
    from the final slack form of \(L_{\text {aux }}\), remove \(x_{0}\) from the constraints and
        restore the original objective function of \(L\), but replace each basic
        variable in this objective function by the right-hand side of its
        associated constraint
    return the modified final slack form
else return "infeasible"
```
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let $k$ be the index of the minimum $b_{i}$
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { Test solution with } N=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, B=\{n+1, n+ \\
& 2, \ldots, n+m\}, \bar{x}_{i}=b_{i} \text { for } i \in B, \bar{x}_{i}=0 \text { otherwise. }
\end{aligned}
$$

```
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    return \((\{1,2, \ldots, n\},\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)\)
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if $\bar{x}_{0}$ is basic
perform one (degenerate) pivot to make it nonbasic
from the final slack form of $L_{\text {aux }}$, remove $x_{0}$ from the constraints and
restore the original objective function of $L$, but replace each basic
variable in this objective function by the right-hand side of its
associated constraint
return the modified final slack form
else return "infeasible"
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## Initialize-Simplex $(A, b, c)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Test solution with } N=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, B=\{n+1, n+ \\
& 2, \ldots, n+m\}, \bar{x}_{i}=b_{i} \text { for } i \in B, \bar{x}_{i}=0 \text { otherwise. }
\end{aligned}
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let $k$ be the index of the minimum $b_{i}$

```
if \(b_{k} \geq 0 \quad / /\) is the initial basic solution feasible?
    return \((\{1,2, \ldots, n\},\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)\)
```

form $L_{\text {aux }}$ by adding - $x_{0}$ to the left-hand side of each constraint
and setting the objective function to $-x_{0}$
let ( $N, B, A, b, c, v$ ) be the resulting slack form for $L_{\text {aux }}$
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iterate the while loop of lines 3-12 of Simplex until an optimal solution
to $L_{\text {aux }}$ is found
if the optimal solution to $L_{\text {aux }}$ sets $\bar{x}_{0}$ to 0
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { Test solution with } N=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, B=\{n+1, n+ \\
& 2, \ldots, n+m\}, \bar{x}_{i}=b_{i} \text { for } i \in B, \bar{x}_{i}=0 \text { otherwise. }
\end{aligned}
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let $k$ be the index of the minimum $b_{i}$

```
if \(b_{k} \geq 0 \quad / /\) is the initial basic solution feasible?
```

    return \((\{1,2, \ldots, n\},\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)\)
    form $L_{\text {aux }}$ by adding $-x_{0}$ to the left-hand side of each constraint
and setting the objective function to $-x_{0}$
let $(N, B, A, b, c, v)$ be the resulting slack form for $L_{\text {aux }}$
$l=n+k$$\quad\left\{\begin{array}{r}\ell \text { will be the leaving variable so } \\ \text { that } x_{\ell} \text { has the most negative value. }\end{array}\right.$
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$(N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, 0) \quad$ Pivot step with $x_{\ell}$ leaving and $x_{0}$ entering.
// The basic solution is now feasible for $L_{\text {aux }}$.
iterate the while loop of lines 3-12 of Simplex until an optimal solution
to $L_{\text {aux }}$ is found
if the optimal solution to $L_{\text {aux }}$ sets $\bar{x}_{0}$ to 0
if $\bar{x}_{0}$ is basic
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from the final slack form of $L_{\text {aux }}$, remove $x_{0}$ from the constraints and
restore the original objective function of $L$, but replace each basic
variable in this objective function by the right-hand side of its
associated constraint
return the modified final slack form
else return "infeasible"
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## Initialize-Simplex $(A, b, c)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Test solution with } N=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, B=\{n+1, n+ \\
& 2, \ldots, n+m\}, \bar{x}_{i}=b_{i} \text { for } i \in B, \bar{x}_{i}=0 \text { otherwise. }
\end{aligned}
$$

let $k$ be the index of the minimum $b_{i}$

```
if \(b_{k} \geq 0 \quad / /\) is the initial basic solution feasible?
```

    return \((\{1,2, \ldots, n\},\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, n+m\}, A, b, c, 0)\)
    form $L_{\text {aux }}$ by adding - $x_{0}$ to the left-hand side of each constraint
and setting the objective function to $-x_{0}$
let $(N, B, A, b, c, v)$ be the resulting slack form for $L_{\text {aux }}$
$l=n+k$
// $L_{\text {aux }}$ has $n+1$ nonbasic variables and $m$ basic variables.
$(N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, 0)$
// The basic solution is now feasible for $L$ $\begin{array}{r}\ell \text { will be the leaving variable so } \\ \text { that } x_{\ell} \text { has the most negative value. }\end{array}$
let $(N, B, A, b, c, v)$ be the resulting slack form for $L_{\text {aux }}$
$l=n+k$
$/ / L_{\text {aux }}$ has $n+1$ nonbasic variables and $m$ basic variables.
$(N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, 0)$
Pivot step with $x_{\ell}$ leaving and $x_{0}$ entering.
let $(N, B, A, b, c, v)$ be the resulting slack form for $L_{\text {aux }}$
$l=n+k$
$/ / L_{\text {aux }}$ has $n+1$ nonbasic variables and $m$ basic variables.
$(N, B, A, b, c, v)=\operatorname{Pivot}(N, B, A, b, c, v, l, 0)$
Pivot step with $x_{\ell}$ leaving and $x_{0}$ entering.
// The basic solution is now feasible for $L_{\text {aux }}$.
iterate the while loop of lines 3-12 of Simplex until an optimal solution
to $L_{\text {aux }}$ is found
if the optimal solution to $L_{\text {aux }}$ sets $\bar{x}_{0}$ to 0
if $\bar{x}_{0}$ is basic
perform one (degenerate) pivot to make it nonbasic
This pivot step does not change
the value of any variable.
from the final slack form of $L_{\text {aux }}$, remove $x_{0}$ from the constraints and
restore the original objective function of $L$, but replace each basic
variable in this objective function by the right-hand side of its
associated constraint
return the modified final slack form
else return "infeasible"

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (1/3)

$$
\begin{array}{lcccc}
\operatorname{maximize} & 2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \\
\text { subject to } & & & & \\
& 2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \leq \\
& x_{1} & - & 5 x_{2} & \leq \\
& x_{1}, x_{2} & & \geq \\
& & \geq
\end{array}
$$
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## Example of Initialize-Simplex (1/3)

maximize $2 x_{1}-x_{2}$
subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rllr}
2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \leq \\
x_{1}- & 5 x_{2} & \leq & -4 \\
x_{1}, x_{2} & & \geq
\end{array}
$$

Formulating the auxiliary linear program
maximize
$-\quad x_{0}$
subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rlrlll}
2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & - & x_{0} & \leq \\
x_{1} & - & 5 x_{2} & - & x_{0} & \leq \\
x_{1}, & x_{2}, x_{0} & & & 4 \\
& & \geq & 0 \\
& \text { Converting into slack form } \\
& & & &
\end{array}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (1/3)

maximize $2 x_{1}-x_{2}$
subject to

$$
\begin{array}{rlrr}
2 x_{1} & - & x_{2} & \leq \\
x_{1} & - & 2 \\
x_{1}, x_{2} & & \geq & -4 \\
& & \geq
\end{array}
$$

Formulating the auxiliary linear program
maximize $-x_{0}$
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
2 x_{1}-x_{2}-x_{0} \\
x_{1}-5 x_{2}-x_{0} \\
x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{0}
\end{array} \\
& \text { Converting into slack form } \\
& \begin{array}{llllllll}
z & = & & & & & & \\
x_{0} \\
x_{3} & = & 2 & - & 2 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + \\
x_{4} & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & + \\
x_{0}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$
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$$
\begin{array}{rlrlllll}
z & = & & & & & & x_{0} \\
x_{3} & = & 2 & - & 2 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + \\
x_{4} & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & + \\
x_{0}
\end{array}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (2/3)

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
z & = & & & & - & x_{0} \\
x_{3} & = & 2 & - & 2 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + \\
x_{0} \\
x_{4} & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & + \\
& & & x_{0}
\end{array}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (2/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
z=2-2 x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{0} \\
x_{3}=2
\end{array} \\
& x_{4}=-4-x_{1}+5 x_{2}+x_{0} \\
& \text { Pivot with } x_{0} \text { entering and } x_{4} \text { leaving } \\
& \begin{array}{llrllllll}
z & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & - & x_{4} \\
x_{0} & = & 4 & + & x_{1} & - & 5 x_{2} & + & x_{4} \\
x_{3} & = & 6 & - & x_{1} & - & 4 x_{2} & + & x_{4}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (2/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{llllllll}
z & = & & & & & & x_{0} \\
x_{3} & = & 2 & - & 2 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + \\
x_{4} & = & -4 & x_{0} \\
& & & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & + & x_{0} \\
& & & & & \\
& & & &
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{rlrllll}
z & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & +5 x_{2} & - \\
x_{0} \\
x_{0} & = & 4 & + & x_{1} & -5 x_{2} & + \\
x_{3} & = & x_{4} \\
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic solution $(4,0,0,6,0)$ is feasible!
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## Example of Initialize-Simplex (2/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{llllllll}
z & = & & & & & & x_{0} \\
x_{3} & = & 2 & - & 2 x_{1} & + & x_{2} & + \\
x_{4} & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & + & 5 x_{2} & + \\
& & & x_{0} \\
& & & & & \\
& & & &
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{rlrlllll}
z & = & -4 & - & x_{1} & +5 x_{2} & - & x_{4} \\
x_{0} & = & 4 & + & x_{1} & -5 x_{2} & + & x_{4} \\
x_{3} & = & 6 & - & x_{1} & - & 4 x_{2} & + \\
x_{4}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic solution $(4,0,0,6,0)$ is feasible!
Pivot with $x_{2}$ entering and $x_{0}$ leaving

$$
\begin{aligned}
z & = \\
x_{2} & =\frac{4}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{3} & =\frac{14}{5}+\frac{4 x_{0}}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$
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Basic solution $(4,0,0,6,0)$ is feasible! Pivot with $x_{2}$ entering and $x_{0}$ leaving

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=\frac{4}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
& x_{2}=\frac{4 x_{0}}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{14}{5}+\frac{4}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Optimal solution has $x_{0}=0$, hence the initial problem was feasible!

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (3/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
z & = \\
x_{2} & =\frac{4}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{3} & =\frac{14}{5}+\frac{4 x_{0}}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (3/3)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
z= & -x_{0} \\
x_{2}= & \frac{4}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{3}=\frac{14}{5}+\frac{4 x_{0}}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
& & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Set } x_{0}=0 \text { and express objective function } \\
\\
\end{array} \\
& \text { by non-basic variables }
\end{array}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (3/3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
z=4-\frac{x_{0}}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{2}=\frac{94}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{3}=\frac{14}{5}+\frac{4 x_{0}}{5}
\end{array} \\
& \underbrace{2 x_{1}-x_{2}=2 x_{1}-\left(\frac{4}{5}-\frac{x_{0}}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5}\right)} \\
& \text { by non-basic variables } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
z=-\frac{4}{5}+\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{2}=\frac{4}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
x_{3}=\frac{14}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example of Initialize-Simplex (3/3)



## Example of Initialize-Simplex (3/3)

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
z & = & - & x_{0} \\
x_{2} & = & \frac{4}{5} & -\frac{x_{0}}{5} \\
x_{3} & =\frac{14}{5} & +\frac{4 x_{0}}{5} & -\frac{x_{1}}{5} \\
\frac{9 x_{1}}{5} & +\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
\frac{x_{4}}{5}
\end{array}
$$

Set $x_{0}=0$ and express objective function by non-basic variables

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z=-\frac{4}{5}+\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}-\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
& x_{2}=\frac{4}{5}+\frac{x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5} \\
& x_{3}=\frac{14}{5}-\frac{9 x_{1}}{5}+\frac{x_{4}}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic solution $\left(0, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{14}{5}, 0\right)$, which is feasible!

## Lemma 29.12

If a linear program $L$ has no feasible solution, then Initialize-Simplex returns "infeasible". Otherwise, it returns a valid slack form for which the basic solution is feasible.

## Fundamental Theorem of Linear Programming

## Theorem 29.13 (Fundamental Theorem of Linear Programming)

Any linear program $L$, given in standard form, either

1. has an optimal solution with a finite objective value,
2. is infeasible, or
3. is unbounded.

If $L$ is infeasible, Simplex returns "infeasible". If $L$ is unbounded, Simplex returns "unbounded". Otherwise, SIMPLEX returns an optimal solution with a finite objective value.

## Fundamental Theorem of Linear Programming

Theorem 29.13 (Fundamental Theorem of Linear Programming)
Any linear program $L$, given in standard form, either

1. has an optimal solution with a finite objective value,
2. is infeasible, or

3 . is unbounded.

If $L$ is infeasible, Simplex returns "infeasible". If $L$ is unbounded, Simplex returns "unbounded". Otherwise, SIMPLEX returns an optimal solution with a finite objective value.

Proof requires the concept of duality, which is not covered in this course (for details see CLRS3, Chapter 29.4)

## Workflow for Solving Linear Programs
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## Linear Programming and Simplex: Summary and Outlook

## Linear Programming

- extremely versatile tool for modelling problems of all kinds
- basis of Integer Programming, to be discussed in later lectures


## Simplex Algorithm

- In practice: usually terminates in polynomial time, i.e., $O(m+n)$
- In theory: even with anti-cycling may need exponential time

Research Problem: Is there a pivoting rule which makes SIMPLEX a polynomial-time algorithm?

_ Polynomial-Time Algorithms
erses the interior of the feasible set of solutions (not just vertices!)


## Test your Understanding



Which of the following statements are true?

1. In each iteration of the Simplex algorithm, the objective function increases.
2. There exist linear programs that have exactly two optimal solutions.
3. There exist linear programs that have infinitely many optimal solutions.
4. The Simplex algorithm always runs in worst-case polynomial time.
