

Wednesday, November 17

Program of the day:

- Repetition: Definition of facets, dimension
- Cover inequalities
- Separation of valid inequalities
- Lifting of inequalities
- Applications: The Traveling Salesman Problem, separation of subtour constraints
- “Projekt opgave P2”

Dominance

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} \quad \dots \\ & \text{subject to} \quad 1x_1 + 3x_2 \leq 4 \\ & \quad \quad \quad 2x_1 + 4x_2 \leq 9 \\ & \quad \quad \quad x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the second inequality with $u = \frac{1}{2}$


$$1x_1 + 2x_2 \leq \frac{9}{2}$$

First inequality dominates the second.

Dominance:

$$\pi x \leq \pi_0 \quad \mu x \leq \mu_0$$

$\pi x \leq \pi_0$ dominates $\mu x \leq \mu_0$ if there exists $u > 0$ such that $\pi \geq u\mu$ and $\pi_0 \leq u\mu_0$.




Redundance

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{maximize} \quad \dots \\
 & \text{subject to} \quad 6x_1 - x_2 \leq 9 \\
 & \quad \quad \quad 9x_1 - 5x_2 \leq 6 \\
 & \quad \quad \quad 5x_1 - 2x_2 \leq 6 \\
 & \quad \quad \quad x_1, x_2 \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first two constraints with $u = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$

$$5x_1 - 2x_2 \leq 5$$

Last inequality is redundant



Redundance:

$$\pi^i x \leq \pi_0^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

$$\mu x \leq \mu_0$$

Inequality $\mu x \leq \mu_0$ is *redundant* if there exists a vector $(u_1, \dots, u_k) \geq 0$ such that


$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k u_i \pi^i \right) x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \pi_0^i$$

dominates $\mu x \leq \mu_0$

Polyhedra, Facets

Polyhedra $P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to } x_1 &\leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_2 &\leq 4 \\ x_1 + 2x_2 &\leq 10 \\ x_1 + 2x_2 &\leq 6 \\ x_1 + x_2 &\geq 2 \\ x_1, x_2 &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$



- $P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and “both directions are present”
- P is full-dimensional.
- The points $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ are affinely independent points.
- The dimension of P is one less than the number of affinely independent points.

Polyhedra, Facets

Affinely independent

The points $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are affinely independent if directions $(x^2 - x^1), \dots, (x^k - x^1)$ are linearly independent

Dimension

The dimension of P , denoted $\dim(P)$ is one less than the maximum number of affinely independent points in P .

Full-dimensional

$P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is full-dimensional iff $\dim(P) = n$.

If not full-dimensional, eliminate some variables:

$$\begin{cases} x_1 + x_2 \leq 3 \\ x_1 - x_2 \leq 0 \\ -x_1 + x_2 \leq 0 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow 2x_1 \leq 3$$

Face

If $\pi x \leq \pi_0$ is a valid inequality of P then F is a face of P

$$F = \{x \in P : \pi x = \pi_0\}$$

Facet

F is a facet of P iff

- F is a face of P
- $\dim(F) = \dim(P) - 1$

Cover inequalities

$$11x_1 + 6x_2 - 6x'_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 13$$
$$x \in \{0, 1\}$$

To get positive coefficients we substitute $x_3 = 1 - x'_3$

$$11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19$$

Observe

- At most two of x_1 , x_2 and x_3 can be 1.
- At most two of x_1 , x_2 and x_6 can be 1.
- At most two of x_1 , x_5 and x_6 can be 1.
- At most three of x_3 , x_4 , x_5 and x_6 can be 1.

Cover inequalities

Consider the set

$$X = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{B}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j \leq b \right\}$$

We assume that $a_j \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$.

Cover

A set $C \subseteq N$ is a cover if

$$\sum_{j \in C} a_j > b$$

A set $C \subseteq N$ is a minimal cover if $C \setminus \{j\}$ is not a cover for any $j \in C$

Cover Inequality

If C is a cover the cover inequality

$$\sum_{j \in C} x_j \leq |C| - 1$$

is valid for X .

Cover inequalities

$$11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19$$

Family \mathcal{F} of minimal cover inequalities

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_4 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_5 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_6 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_4 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_5 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_6 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_4 + x_5 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_4 + x_6 \leq 2 \\ x_1 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 2 \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 \leq 3 \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_6 \leq 3 \\ x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3 \\ \vdots \end{array} \right.$$

Separation problem

The separation problem decides whether a LP-solution vector satisfies all constraints of a given family \mathcal{F} . If it does not, it must return a violated constraint in \mathcal{F}

Separation of cover inequalities

Consider a constraint in a IP model

$$\sum_{i \in I} a_i x_i \leq b$$

LP-solution $x = x'$ is fractional. Solve problem

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma = \text{minimize} \quad & \sum_{i \in I} (1 - x'_i) \delta_i \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i \in I} a_i \delta_i \geq b + 1 \\ & \delta_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i \in I. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

If $\gamma < 1$, let

$$C = \{i \in I : \delta_i = 1\}$$

New inequality

$$\sum_{i \in C} x_i \leq |C| - 1 \tag{2}$$

Example

Consider the IP problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && 4x_1 + 5x_2 + 6x_3 + 7x_4 + 8x_5 + 3x_6 + 4x_7 \\ &\text{subject to} && 11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19 \\ &&& x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7 \in \mathbb{B} \end{aligned}$$

LP-solution: $x_2 = \frac{1}{3}, x_3 = 1, x_4 = 1, x_5 = 1, x_7 = 1$

Separation problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && 1\delta_1 + \frac{2}{3}\delta_2 + 0\delta_3 + 0\delta_4 + 0\delta_5 + 1\delta_6 + 0\delta_7 \\ &\text{subject to} && 11\delta_1 + 6\delta_2 + 6\delta_3 + 5\delta_4 + 5\delta_5 + 4\delta_6 + 1\delta_7 \geq 20 \\ &&& \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4, \delta_5, \delta_6, \delta_7 \in \mathbb{B} \end{aligned}$$

Solution: $\delta_2 = 1, \delta_3 = 1, \delta_4 = 1, \delta_5 = 1$. with $\gamma = \frac{2}{3} < 1$

Cover

$$C = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$$

Most violated cover inequality

$$x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 \leq 3$$

C is a violated cover

- It is a *cover* since

$$\sum_{i \in C} a_i = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \delta_i \geq b + 1 > b$$

- Assume that we remove items j with $1 - x'_j = 0$ from C as long as $\sum_{i \in C} a_i > b$. Then C is a *minimal* cover, since if we were able to remove an item j from C and still have a cover, then we would have a solution to (1) with smaller objective function.
- It is a *violated* inequality since assume that (2) actually was satisfied for the current solution x' . Then we can choose $\delta_k = 1$ for $k \in C$ as a solution to (1). This is a valid solution (due to the definition of C), and it has objective value

$$\sum_{i \in I} (1 - x'_i) \delta_i = \sum_{i \in C} (1 - x'_i) = |C| - \sum_{i \in C} x'_i \geq |C| - |C| + 1 = 1$$

But this violates the assumption saying that $\gamma < 1$.

Cover inequalities

$$11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19$$

Minimal cover inequality

$$x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$$

Extended cover inequalities for $C = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$

$$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$$

which dominates the first-mentioned

Extended cover inequalities

If C is a cover for X , the extended cover inequality

$$\sum_{j \in E(C)} x_j \leq |C| - 1$$

is valid, where

$$E(C) = C \cup \{j \in N : a_j \geq a_i \text{ for all } i \in C\}$$

Lifting Cover Inequalities

$$11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19 \quad (3)$$

Have found cover inequality

$$x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$$

What is the value of α_1 such that

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3 \quad (4)$$

is valid for all $x \in X$?

Constraint (4) must be valid whenever (3) is valid.

Most difficult to satisfy (4) when $x_2 = x_7 = 0$.

- $x_1 = 0$ then (4) is valid.
- $x_1 = 1$ then we demand that

$$\alpha_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$$

whenever

$$11 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 \leq 19$$

Maximize $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6$ subject to the second inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma = \text{maximize } & x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \\ \text{subject to } & 11 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 \leq 19 \\ & x_i \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

a Knapsack Problem with solution $\gamma = 1$.

Thus $\alpha_1 = 3 - \gamma = 2$.

Strength of cover inequalities (Balas)

- Order the variables so that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$
- Let $C = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n\}$ be a cover where $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_n$
- Let $p = \min\{j : j \in N \setminus E(C)\}$
- The cover inequality

$$\sum_{j \in E(C)} x_j \leq |C| - 1$$

is a facet of $\text{conv}(X)$ if one of the following holds


- $C = N$
- $E(C) = N$ and $\sum_{j \in C \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}} a_j + a_1 \leq b$
- $C = E(C)$ and $\sum_{j \in C \setminus \{j_1\}} a_j + a_p \leq b$
- $C \subset E(C) \subset N$ and $\sum_{j \in C \setminus \{j_1, j_2\}} a_j + a_1 \leq b$ and $\sum_{j \in C \setminus \{j_1\}} a_j + a_p \leq b$

Symmetric Traveling Salesman Problem

One of most famous and most applicable optimization problems

Given a finite number of "cities" along with the cost of travel between each pair of them, find the cheapest way of visiting all the cities and returning to your starting point.

Recently Applegate, Bixby, Chvatal, Cook solved USA13509 and Germany15112



Traveling Salesman Problem

- Set of V cities
- To each edge $e \in E$ is associated a cost c_e
- Visit each city exactly once
- Minimize travel cost
- $x_e = 1$ if edge e is used

Model 1

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{e \in \delta(j)} x_e = 2 \quad , j \in V \\ & \sum_{e \in E(S)} x_e \leq |S| - 1 \quad , S \subset V, S \neq V \\ & x_e \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

Model 2

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{e \in \delta(j)} x_e = 2 \quad , j \in V \\ & \sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq 2 \quad , S \subset V, S \neq V \\ & x_e \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

degree constraint, subtour elimination constraint

Traveling Salesman Problem

Subtour LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{e \in \delta(j)} x_e = 2, \quad j \in V \\ & \sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq 2, \quad S \subset V, S \neq V \\ & 0 \leq x_e \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

exponentially many constraints

Cutting plane algorithm:

- 1 solve problem without subtour elimination constraints getting x_e^*
- 2 if x_e^* is a hamilton cycle, stop
- 3 solve separation problem obtaining a valid inequality

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq 2$$

such that

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e^* < 2$$

- 4 add the valid inequality to the problem and repeat

Traveling Salesman Problem

Separation problem:

- capacitated network (V, E, d)
- $d_e = x_e^*$
- find min cut in graph
- optimal solution has value less than 2 iff violated constraint exists
- min-cut can be found in $O(nm \log n)$ time where $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$.
- try each pair of nodes, i.e. run min-cut $n(n-1)/2$ times

$$c_e = \begin{pmatrix} - & 4 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 2 & 5 \\ - & - & 5 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ - & - & - & 4 & 6 & 0 & 4 \\ - & - & - & - & 4 & 4 & 6 \\ - & - & - & - & - & 5 & 8 \\ - & - & - & - & - & - & 3 \\ - & - & - & - & - & - & - \end{pmatrix}$$

Traveling Salesman Problem

```

minimize
+ 4 x12 + 3 x13 + 3 x14 + 5 x15 + 2 x16 + 5 x17
      + 5 x23 + 3 x24 + 3 x25 + 4 x26 + 7 x27
            + 4 x34 + 6 x35 + 0 x36 + 4 x37
                  + 4 x45 + 4 x46 + 6 x47
                          + 5 x56 + 8 x57
                                  + 3 x67
  
```


```

subject to
      x12 + x13 + x14 + x15 + x16 + x17 = 2
x12 +      x23 + x24 + x25 + x26 + x27 = 2
x13 + x23 +      x34 + x35 + x36 + x37 = 2
x14 + x24 + x34 +      x45 + x46 + x47 = 2
x15 + x25 + x35 + x45 +      x56 + x57 = 2
x16 + x26 + x36 + x46 + x56 +      x67 = 2
x17 + x27 + x37 + x47 + x57 + x67 = 2
  
```

```

binary
      x12 x13 x14 x15 x16 x17
        x23 x24 x25 x26 x27
          x34 x35 x36 x37
            x45 x46 x47
              x56 x57
                x67
  
```

end



Traveling Salesman Problem

```

minimize
+ 4 x12 + 3 x13 + 3 x14 + 5 x15 + 2 x16 + 5 x17
      + 5 x23 + 3 x24 + 3 x25 + 4 x26 + 7 x27
            + 4 x34 + 6 x35 + 0 x36 + 4 x37
                  + 4 x45 + 4 x46 + 6 x47
                          + 5 x56 + 8 x57
                                + 3 x67

```

```

subject to
      x12 + x13 + x14 + x15 + x16 + x17 = 2
x12 +      x23 + x24 + x25 + x26 + x27 = 2
x13 + x23 +      x34 + x35 + x36 + x37 = 2
x14 + x24 + x34 +      x45 + x46 + x47 = 2
x15 + x25 + x35 + x45 +      x56 + x57 = 2
x16 + x26 + x36 + x46 + x56 +      x67 = 2
x17 + x27 + x37 + x47 + x57 + x67      = 2

```

```

x13 + x23 + x34 + x35 +
x16 + x26 + x46 + x56 +
x17 + x27 + x47 + x57 >= 2


```

```

binary
      x12 x13 x14 x15 x16 x17
        x23 x24 x25 x26 x27
          x34 x35 x36 x37
            x45 x46 x47
              x56 x57
                x67

```

end



Traveling Salesman Problem

```

minimize
+ 4 x12 + 3 x13 + 3 x14 + 5 x15 + 2 x16 + 5 x17
      + 5 x23 + 3 x24 + 3 x25 + 4 x26 + 7 x27
            + 4 x34 + 6 x35 + 0 x36 + 4 x37
                  + 4 x45 + 4 x46 + 6 x47
                          + 5 x56 + 8 x57
                                + 3 x67

```

```

subject to
      x12 + x13 + x14 + x15 + x16 + x17 = 2
x12 +      x23 + x24 + x25 + x26 + x27 = 2
x13 + x23 +      x34 + x35 + x36 + x37 = 2
x14 + x24 + x34 +      x45 + x46 + x47 = 2
x15 + x25 + x35 + x45 +      x56 + x57 = 2
x16 + x26 + x36 + x46 + x56 +      x67 = 2
x17 + x27 + x37 + x47 + x57 + x67      = 2

```

```

x13 + x23 + x34 + x35 +
x16 + x26 + x46 + x56 +
x17 + x27 + x47 + x57 >= 2

```

```

x12 + x23 + x26 + x27 +
x14 + x34 + x46 + x67 +
x15 + x35 + x56 + x57 >= 2

```

```

binary
      x12 x13 x14 x15 x16 x17
        x23 x24 x25 x26 x27
          x34 x35 x36 x37
            x45 x46 x47
              x56 x57
                x67

```

end

