

Parametric programming: Week 8 Lecture Notes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && (\mathbf{c} + \theta \mathbf{d})' \mathbf{x} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{Ax} = \mathbf{b} \\ & && \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

Solve for every value of θ

Example:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && (-3 + 2\theta)x_1 + (3 - \theta)x_2 + x_3 \\ & \text{subject to} && x_1 + 2x_2 - 3x_3 + x_4 = 5 \\ & && 2x_1 + x_2 - 4x_3 + x_5 = 7 \\ & && x \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Optimal cost:

$$g(\theta) = \min_{i=1, \dots, N} (\mathbf{c} + \theta \mathbf{d})' \mathbf{x}^i,$$

$\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^N$ are the extreme points of the feasible set

(Parametric) simplex tableau

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccc} 0 & -3 + 2\theta & 3 - \theta & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 5 & 1 & 2 & -3 & 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 2 & 1 & -4 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

- If $-3 + 2\theta \geq 0$ and $3 - \theta \geq 0$, all reduced costs are non-negative and we have an optimal basic feasible solution.

$$g(\theta) = 0, \quad \frac{3}{2} \leq \theta \leq 3.$$

- For $\theta > 3$, have x_2 enter the basis

- New tableau:

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccc} -7.5 + 2.5\theta & -4.5 + 2.5\theta & 0 & 5.5 - 1.5\theta & -1.5 + 0.5\theta & 0 \\ \hline 2.5 & 0.5 & 1 & -1.5 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 4.5 & 1.5 & 0 & -2.5 & -0.5 & 1 \end{array}$$

- All reduced costs nonnegative if $3 \leq \theta \leq 5.5/1.5$

- Optimal cost

$$g(\theta) = 7.5 - 2.5\theta, \quad 3 \leq \theta \leq \frac{5.5}{1.5}$$

- For $\theta > 5.5/1.5$, reduced cost of x_3 is negative.

- No positive pivot element

- For $\theta > 5.5/1.5$, $g(\theta) = -\infty$

- Proceed similarly for $\theta < 3/2$

Parametric programming more generally

- Reduced costs depend linearly on θ
- Bfs and basis matrix \mathbf{B} , optimal for $\theta_1 \leq \theta \leq \theta_2$
- Reduced cost of x_j negative for $\theta > \theta_2$.
 - Reduced cost is zero for $\theta = \theta_2$
- If $\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_j \leq \mathbf{0}$, $g(\theta) = -\infty$ for $\theta > \theta_2$.
- Otherwise, bring x_j into basis
- Still have optimal solution at $\theta = \theta_2$.
- Range of θ under which new basis is optimal $[\theta_2, \theta_3]$
- If $\theta_i < \theta_{i+1}$, no basis repeated twice
- Change of basis: breakpoints of $g(\theta)$
- If $\theta_i = \theta_{i+1}$, method may cycle

Dual parametric programming

- Keep \mathbf{c} fixed
- Right-hand side $\mathbf{b} + \theta\mathbf{d}$
- If increasing θ makes a basic variable negative, do a dual simplex iteration

Delayed column generation

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \mathbf{c}'\mathbf{x} \\ \text{subject to} & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{array}$$

- \mathbf{A} has a huge number of columns
Can't form \mathbf{A} explicitly
- All that simplex needs is to discover i with $\bar{c}_i < 0$ when one exists
- Assume we can solve the problem:

$$\text{minimize } c_i - \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{A}_i \quad (= \bar{c}_i)$$

where $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{c}'_B \mathbf{B}^{-1}$

- Find j such that $\bar{c}_j \leq \bar{c}_i$ for all i
- Run revised simplex
 - If $\bar{c}_j \geq 0$, have optimal solution
 - If $\bar{c}_j < 0$, \mathbf{A}_j enters the basis
- Method terminates in the absence of degeneracy

Cutting stock problem

- Fabric rolls of width r
- Sizes of interest w_1, \dots, w_m
 - Example: $r = 10$ and $w_1 = 5, w_2 = 4, w_3 = 3$.
- Demand b_i for each size w_i
- Minimize the number of rolls needed to satisfy demand

Cutting stock (ctd)

- Each roll is cut according to a certain pattern
- Example: $r = 10$ and $w_1 = 5$, $w_2 = 4$, $w_3 = 3$.
- Allowed patterns:

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

- A vector

$$\mathbf{A}_j = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_m \end{bmatrix}$$

is an allowed pattern if:

$$\sum_{i=1}^m a_i w_i \leq r$$

a_i integer, $a_i \geq 0$

- Let x_j = number of rolls cut according to pattern A_j

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_j x_j \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_j A_j x_j = b \\ & && \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

Cutting stock (ctd)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_j x_j \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_j \mathbf{A}_j x_j = \mathbf{b} \\ & && \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

1. Optimal solution need not be integer
2. Number of possible patterns is huge

1. Solve LP and round each x_j upwards
2. Use delayed column generation

- At each iteration, minimize $\bar{c}_j = 1 - \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{A}_j$
– maximize $\mathbf{p}'\mathbf{A}_j$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{i=1}^m p_i a_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^m w_i a_i \leq r \\ & && a_i \geq 0, \quad a_i \text{ integer} \end{aligned}$$

- “Knapsack” problem (p_i =value, w_i =weight)
- Despite integrality constraints, can be solved fairly efficiently

Variant with retained columns

- Keep some columns \mathbf{A}_i , $i \in I$, in memory
(The basic columns plus, possibly, more)

- Look for j with $\bar{c}_j < 0$
 - Look only inside the set I
 - Same as solving restricted problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & \mathbf{c}'\mathbf{x} \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{A}_i x_i = \mathbf{b} \\ & \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{array}$$

- When at optimal of restricted problem, look outside the set I for j with $\bar{c}_j < 0$
- Form new set I (that includes j) and restart

- Extreme variants:
 - I = set of basic indices
 - I = indices of all columns generated in the past
- All variants terminate under nondegeneracy

Cutting plane methods

- Dual of standard form problem:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{b} \\ \text{subject to} & \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{A}_i \leq c_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{array}$$

- Large number n of constraints
- Let $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$
- Solve **relaxed** dual problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{b} \\ \text{subject to} & \mathbf{p}'\mathbf{A}_i \leq c_i, \quad i \in I, \end{array}$$

- If optimal solution of relaxed problem satisfies **all** constraints of original problem, then it is optimal for the latter

Cutting planes (continued)

- If optimal solution of relaxed problem is infeasible, bring a violated constraint into I
- Method needs:
 - A way of checking feasibility
 - A way of identifying violated constraints

- One possibility

$$\text{minimize } c_i - (\mathbf{p}^*)' \mathbf{A}_i$$

- Cutting planes for dual = Column generation for primal
- Options:
 - Retain old constraints
 - Discard (some) inactive constraints