

15.083: Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization

Problem Set 4 Solutions

Due 10/21/2009

Problem (4.10)

Let Z_R, Z_{NR} be the optimal cost with and without release dates respectively. Let NR be the set of acceptable completion times in the problem with no release dates. Release dates insert the constraints $C_i \geq p_i + r_i$ which we relax to obtain a problem with no release dates. For fixed λ , by prop 3.6 we have an optimal ordering (w.l.o.g $1, \dots, n$) and thus can obtain the optimal cost in closed form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Z_R &\geq Z(\lambda) \\
 &= \min_{C \in NR} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_i C_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (r_i + p_i - C_i) \right\} \\
 &= \min_{C \in NR} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i - \lambda_i) C_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (r_i + p_i) \right\} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i - \lambda_i) \sum_{j=1}^i p_j + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (r_i + p_i) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \sum_{j=1}^i p_j + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_j \right) \\
 &\geq Z_{NR} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_j \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

we wish to maximize this lower bound over $\lambda_i \in \{0, w_i\}$. Such a maximization yields an IP which is difficult to solve (since selecting specific values for λ_i change the order of jobs. We can bound this IP from below in polynomial time in the following manner: We order the jobs such that $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_n$, define the quantity

$p_{i,k} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_j + \sum_{j=i+1}^k p_j$ which bounds from above the time it will take to process all jobs prior to i if we schedule

job i to be the k^{th} processed. Then define $a_{i,k} = w_i (r_i - p_{i,k})^+$. We may then solve the assignment problem:

$Z_{Assign} = \min \sum_{i,k} a_{i,k} x_{i,k}$
subject to
$\sum_i x_{i,k} = 1 \quad \forall k$
$\sum_k x_{i,k} = 1 \quad \forall i$
$x_{i,k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i, k$

and bound Z_R as follows:

$$Z_R \geq Z_{NR} + Z_{Assign}$$

Problem (4.11) Relaxing the constraint $x = y$ is equivalent to optimizing over the set $\{(x, y) \in \text{conv}(Ax \geq b, Dy \geq d) : x = y\} = \{(x, y) : x \in \text{conv}(Ax \geq b), y \in \text{conv}(Dy \geq d), x = y\} = \{(x, y) \in \text{conv}(Ax \geq b) \cap \text{conv}(Dx \geq d)\}$

Problem (4.12)

(a)

$$\begin{array}{l} \max \sum_{(i,j) \in E} w_{ij} x_{ij} \\ \text{subject to} \\ x_{st} = 1 \\ x_{ij} + x_{jk} + x_{ik} \leq 2 \quad \forall i, j, k \\ x_{ij} - x_{jk} - x_{ik} \leq 0 \quad \forall i, j, k \\ x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i, j, k \end{array}$$

- (b) These inequalities state that for any 3 node, at least 2 lie in the same partition and if i and j are in different partitions then for some other node k it must be that k is in a different partition from either i or j .
- (c) We could relax the constraints $x_{ij} + x_{jk} + x_{ik} \leq 2$ and $x_{ij} - x_{jk} - x_{ik} \leq 0$ to end up with a subproblem that is efficaciously solvable. We could apply the subgradient algorithm (4.2) to optimize over our multipliers using subgradients of $2 - x_{ij} - x_{jk} - x_{ik}$ and $-x_{ij} + x_{jk} + x_{ik}$ and an appropriately chosen stepsize. We need to be wary of the fact that our multipliers need to be kept non-negative, so at each step, we should round any negative multipliers up to 0. The simplex algorithm will have to cope with $O(n^2)$ variables and $O(n^3)$ constraints, but the constraint matrix is very sparse, whereas each of the Lagrangian subproblems have a simple closed form solution computable in $O(n^2)$ time. So it is difficult to judge which method will converge faster. Since the polyhedron we are optimizing over in the Lagrangian relaxation is integral, it will not produce a tighter bound.

Problem (5.8)

- (a) Given a solution x^* we first check that $0 \leq x_e^* \leq 1$. Then we assign weights x_e^* to each edge $e \in V$. For each edge (i, j) we solve the min $i - j$ cut problem to obtain a set $S_{(i,j)}$ and check that $\sum_{e \in \delta(S_{(i,j)})} x_e^* \geq r_{(i,j)}$. If all of these constraints are satisfied then x^* is feasible, else we generate a separating hyperplane.
- (b) We can use the same approach as part (a) by letting $r_{(i,j)} = \mathbf{1}\{i, j \in T\}$

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

15.083J / 6.859J Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization
Fall 2009

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.