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## Method of working

```
Lectures
\(\square\) Self study material
\(\square\) Slides and your own notes
- Book
Some lecture notes (under construction)
\(\square\) Additional reading material
Exercises (if you hand in a solution I can check, good solutions can be made available on the course website)
\(\square\) Slides and reading material published on website http://www.staff.science.uu.nl/~akker103/ALP/
\(\square\) Written exam at the end. ONE retake
```


## Topics of part 2

Large-scale LP (Ch 6)
$\square$ Column generation and Dantzig-Wolfe decomposition

- Benders decomposition

Integer Linear Programming (ILP) (Ch $10+11$ ):
$\square$ Modelling
$\square$ Solving by branch-and-bound
$\square$ Cutting planes, branch-and-cut

Lagrangean relaxation (Ch 11)

Since column generation and Benders have their main applications in ILP, we will do ILP first.

## This lecture

$\square$ ILP models
$\square$ Remarks on complexity LP and ILP
$\square$ Solving ILP by branch-and-bound
$\square$ Model choice matters: strength of LP-relaxation

## Knapsack problem

## Knapsack with volume 15

What should you take with you to maximize utility?

| Item | 1:paper | 2:book | 3:bread | 4:smart <br> -phone | 5:water |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Utility | 8 | 12 | 7 | 15 | 12 |
| Volume | 4 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 6 |

## Knapsack problem (2)

## $x_{1}=1$ if item 1 is selected, 0 otherwise, $x_{2}, \ldots \ldots$

$\max z=8 x_{1}+12 x_{2}+7 x_{3}+15 x_{4}+12 x_{5}$
subject to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4 x_{1}+8 x_{2}+5 x_{3}+2 x_{4}+6 x_{5} \leq 15 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5} \in\{0,1\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## (Mixed) Integer linear programming

Min $c^{\top} x+d^{\top} y$
s.t. $A x+B y \leq b$
$x, y \geq 0$
$x$ integral (or binary)

Extension of LP:
$\square$ Good news: more possibilities for modelling
Bad news: larger solution times

## Combinatorial optimization

- Find feasible solution with minimal cost, maximal revenue
- Number of possible solutions is finite but very, very large
- Many combinatorial optimization problem can be modeled as ILP
I ILP is NP-hard


## NP-hardness

## - NP-hard !!!!

$\square$ P: problem can be solved in polynomial time

- NP: check solution for feasibility is polynomial, optimization is not provably faster than enumeration of all solutions. (non-deterministic polynomial)
- Pvs NP
\$ 1 million Millenium Prize problem
http://www.claymath.org/millennium/P vs NP

A long time ago Sissa ben Dahir, the Grand Vizer to the INDIAN KING, SHIRHAM, PRESENTED HIS LATEST CREATION TO HIS RIULER.


THE KING NAME HIS OWN M

SISSA REPLIED, 'MAJESTY, GIVE $>3$

OR GIVE ME SOME RICE IN THE FOLLOWINu

1 GRAIN TO PLACE ON THE FIRST SQUARE OF THE CHESSBOA
2 GRAINS TO PLACE ON THE SECOND SQUARE,
4 GRAINS FOR THE THIRD SQUARE, AND 8 GRAINS FOR THE 4TH SQUARE; AND

TO CONTINUE IN LIKE MANNER

# Cover Netherlands and Belgium with a layer of 1 m 

## (Mixed) Integer linear program

$\operatorname{Min} c^{\top} x+D^{\top} y$
s.t. $A x+B y \leq b$
$x, y \geq 0$
$x$ integral
(or binary)

## LP-relaxation

Min $c^{\top} x+D^{\top} y$
s.t. $A x+B y \leq b$
$x, y \geq 0$

Lower bound (or upper bound in case of maximization)

## Solution method for linear programming

$\square$ Simplex method

- Slower than polynomial
- Practical
- Ellipsoid method (previous lecture)
$\square$ Polynomial (Khachian, 1979)
- Not practical
- Interior points methods
$\square$ Polynomial (Karmakar, 1984)
■ Outperforms Simplex for very large instances


## $L P \in P$

## Knapsack problem revisited

 since we use it to demonstrate branch-and-bound for ILPKnapsack volume $b$
Item $i$ has profit $c_{i}$ and weight $a_{i}$ $x_{i}=1$ if item i is selected, 0 otherwise...... $\max \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} x_{i}$
s.t.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} x_{i} \leq b \\
& x_{i} \in\{0,1\} \quad(i=1,2, \ldots, n)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Knapsack problem: elements needed in branch-and-bound

## LP-relaxation:

Greedy algorithm
Step 0. Order variables such that $\frac{c_{1}}{a_{1}} \geq \frac{c_{2}}{a_{2}} \geq \ldots \geq \frac{c_{n}}{a_{n}}$
Step 1. $x_{i} \leftarrow 0 \forall_{i}$; restcapacity $\bar{b}=b ; i=1$
Step 2.If $a_{i} \leq \bar{b}$, then $x_{j} \leftarrow 1$, else $x_{j} \leftarrow \frac{\bar{b}}{a_{i}}$. Set $\bar{b} \leftarrow \bar{b}-a_{i} x_{i} ; j \leftarrow j+1$
Step 3. If $\bar{b}>0$, go to Step 2.

## Feasible solution:

rounding down solution of LP-relaxation

## Solving ILP by branch-and-bound

Let $\mathrm{x}^{*}$ be the best known feasible solution

1. Select an active sub problem $F_{i}$ (unevaluated node)
2. If $F_{i}$ is infeasible: delete node
3. Compute upper bound $Z_{L P}\left(F_{i}\right)$ by solving LP-relaxation and feasible solution $x_{f}$ (by rounding)
If $Z_{L P}\left(F_{i}\right) \leq$ value $x^{*}$ delete node (bounding)
If $x_{f}$ is better than $x^{*}$ : update $x^{*}$
If solution $x_{L P}$ to LP-relaxation is integral,
then If $x_{L P}$ is better than $x^{*}$ : update $x^{*}$ and node finished,
otherwise split node into two new subproblems (branching)
4. Go to step 1

## Optional

This if for maximization problem, the book uses a minimization problem.

## Modeling

## Objective function Constraints <br> $\square$ Decision variables

## Facility location

## Possible locations: n



Customers: $m$

## Capacitated facility location

$\square$ Data:
$\square m$ customers, $n$ possible locations of depot
$\square c_{i j}$ unit cost of serving customer $i$ by depot $j$
$\square$ Customer demand: $D_{\mathrm{i}}$
$\square$ Capacity depot: $C_{j}$
$\square$ Fixed cost for opening depot DC: $F_{j}$
$\square$ Which depots are opened and which customer is served by which depot?

## Capacitated facility location:

Our example shows modelling possibilities with binary variables
$\square$ Our model uses binary variables for fixed cost constraints
$\square$ Our model uses binary variables forcing constraints:
$\square$ depot can only be used when it is open.

## Uncapacitated facility location

Data:
$m$ customers, $n$ possible locations of depot
$\square$ Each customer is assigned to one depot
$\square d_{i j}$ cost of serving customer $i$ by depot $j$Fixed cost for opening depot DC: $F_{j}$
Which depots are opened and which customer is served by which depot?

## Uncapacitated facility location

- Two formulations: (FL) and (AFL)
$\square P_{F}$ is defined as the feasible set corresponding to the LP-relaxation of $F\left(P_{F}\right.$ is a polyhedron)
$\square$ We show that

$$
P_{F L} \subset P_{A F L}
$$

$\square$ This means that (FL) gives a stronger lower bound

$$
Z_{L P}(A F L) \leq Z_{L P}(F L) \leq Z_{I P}
$$

However, (FL) has more constraints

## Strength (quality) of an ILP formulation

$\square T$ set of feasible integral solutions
$\square$ For formulation $F, P_{F}$ is defined as the feasible set of solutions of the LP-relaxation of $F$
$\square P_{F}$ is a polyhedron
$\square$ Ideal situation: $P_{F}$ is the convex hull of $T$
$\square$ Formulation $A$ is stronger than formulation $B$ if

$$
P_{A} \subset P_{B}
$$

$\square$ Hence, the bound is better
$\square$ This is likely to reduce the number of nodes in the branch-and-bound tree
This shows that model choices matter!


## Minimum spanning tree

- $G=(N, E)$
$\square \mathrm{N}$ set of $n$ nodes
$\square E$ set of $m$ edges
$\square C_{e}$ cost of edge e
- Tree is a subgraph without cycles
- Spanning tree is a tree containing all nodes
$\square$ Find a spanning tree with minimum cost
$\square$ We compare formulations (Subtour) and (Cut) and show that (Subtour) is stronger.


## Procurement problem

Computer-manufacturer wants to buy 600 hard-disks
Offers:

|  | Fixed <br> cost | Minimum <br> amount <br> to order | Price <br> per <br> item | Discount <br> Threshold | Discount <br> price | Available <br> number of items |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | 100 | 50 | 24 | 250 | 18 | 500 |
| B | 75 | 50 | 28 | 150 | 20 | 700 |

$\square$ What is the optimal procurement plan?

## Procurement problem

Contains important ILP modelling features:

Already seen in facility location:
$\square$ Fixed cost
$\square$ Forcing contraints

Other features:
$\square$ Linearize piece-wise linear cost
$\square$ Choice constraints

## Treasure island

$\square$ Diamonds are buried on an island
$\square$ Numbers give number of diamonds in neighboring positions (include diagonal)
$\square$ At most one diamond per position

- No diamond at position with number

|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 2 | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 2 |
|  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
|  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 0 |
|  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 |
|  |  | 3 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 3 |
|  | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 3 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |
|  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  |  |

## Treasure island with pitfall

$\square$ Like treasure island but exactly one given number is incorrect.

## Wrap-up

$\square$ Integer linear programming (ILP) has many modelling possibilities
$\square$ ILP can be solved by branch-and-bound
$\square$ Soemtimes there are different ILP formulation for the same problem. Formulation makes a difference, e.g. because of the strength of the LP-relaxation.

