► Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

Build initial tableau.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

Find an initial BFS.

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- Find an initial BFS.
- ▶ Is the BFS optimal?

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- Find an initial BFS.
- ▶ Is the BFS optimal?
  - 1. Yes- We're done.

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- Find an initial BFS.
- Is the BFS optimal?
  - 1. Yes- We're done.
  - 2. No- Find a (better) adjacent BFS.

Standard form (max):

$$z - c^{T}x = 0$$

$$Ax = b$$

$$x \ge 0, b \ge 0$$

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- Find an initial BFS.
- Is the BFS optimal?
  - 1. Yes- We're done.
  - 2. No- Find a (better) adjacent BFS.
- Repeat.

LP in standard form:

$$z$$
  $-6x_1 - 5x_2 - 0s_1 - 0s_2 = 0$   
 $x_1 + x_2 + s_1 = 5$   
 $3x_1 + 2x_2 + s_2 = 12$ 

LP in standard form:

$$z$$
  $-6x_1 5x_2 0s_1 0s_2=0$   
 $x_1+$   $x_2+$   $s_1=5$   
 $3x_1+$   $2x_2+$   $s_2=12$ 

Convert to the tableau (left-most column is optional)

LP in standard form:

$$z$$
  $-6x_1 5x_2 0s_1 0s_2=0$   
 $x_1+$   $x_2+$   $s_1=5$   
 $3x_1+$   $2x_2+$   $s_2=12$ 

Convert to the tableau (left-most column is optional)

Step 1: Initial BFS-

LP in standard form:

$$z$$
  $-6x_1 - 5x_2 - 0s_1 - 0s_2 = 0$   
 $x_1 + x_2 + s_1 = 5$   
 $3x_1 + 2x_2 + s_2 = 12$ 

Convert to the tableau (left-most column is optional)

Step 1: Initial BFS- If we have all of the columns of the identity matrix, those variables are set to BV, all others to NBV.

LP in standard form:

$$z$$
  $-6x_1 5x_2 0s_1 0s_2=0$   
 $x_1+$   $x_2+$   $s_1=5$   
 $3x_1+$   $2x_2+$   $s_2=12$ 

Convert to the tableau (left-most column is optional)

Step 1: Initial BFS- If we have all of the columns of the identity matrix, those variables are set to BV, all others to NBV. Initial BFS

$$x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0, s_1 = 5, s_2 = 12$$
  $z = 0$ 



Which variable should come in to give a better z?

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ .

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ . Should we replace  $s_1$  or  $s_2$  (we want to make  $x_1$  as large as possible for the max)

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ . Should we replace  $s_1$  or  $s_2$  (we want to make  $x_1$  as large as possible for the max)

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ . Should we replace  $s_1$  or  $s_2$  (we want to make  $x_1$  as large as possible for the max)

We can make  $x_1$  as large as 4 (larger makes  $s_1$  negative).

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ . Should we replace  $s_1$  or  $s_2$  (we want to make  $x_1$  as large as possible for the max)

We can make  $x_1$  as large as 4 (larger makes  $s_1$  negative). That means  $s_2$  is set to zero (and becomes the NBV).

Which variable should come in to give a better z? From Row 0, most negative var:  $x_1$ . Should we replace  $s_1$  or  $s_2$  (we want to make  $x_1$  as large as possible for the max)

We can make  $x_1$  as large as 4 (larger makes  $s_1$  negative). That means  $s_2$  is set to zero (and becomes the NBV). Pivot in the first column, second row

Current BFS:  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$ ,  $s_2 = 0$ . Optimal?

Current BFS:  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$ ,  $s_2 = 0$ . Optimal? No.

Current BFS:  $x_1=4$ ,  $x_2=0$ ,  $s_1=1$ ,  $s_2=0$ . Optimal? No. Bring  $x_2$  in.

Current BFS:  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$ ,  $s_2 = 0$ . Optimal? No. Bring  $x_2$  in. From our list of BVs:

Current BFS:  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$ ,  $s_2 = 0$ . Optimal? No. Bring  $x_2$  in. From our list of BVs:

$$x_1 = 4 - \frac{2}{3}x_2$$
  $\Rightarrow$   $x_2 \le \frac{4}{2/3} = 6$   
 $s_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{3}x_2$   $\Rightarrow$   $x_2 \le \frac{1}{1/3} = 3$ 

Note where these values come from: "RHS/Col Entry". Choose the Row with the smaller value, and that gives the pivot row.

#### Pivot

Z	$x_1$	<i>x</i> <sub>2</sub>	$s_1$	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	rhs
1	0	0	3	1	27
0	0	1	3	-1	3
0	1	0	-2	1	2

This is the optimal tableau. The optimal solution is  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 3$  with z = 27.

1. Build initial tableau.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

2. Initial BFS from cols of identity

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - $3.1\,$  Choose the **column** most negative coef.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 3.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 3.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff".

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 3.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 3.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". *Exceptions:* Ignore zeros and neg coeffs.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 3.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 3.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". *Exceptions:* Ignore zeros and neg coeffs. Choose the **row** with the **smallest** ratio.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 3.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 3.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". Exceptions: Ignore zeros and neg coeffs. Choose the **row** with the **smallest** ratio.
  - 3.3 Pivot using the column/row we found.

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
1 & -c^T & 0 \\
\hline
0 & A & b
\end{array}$$

- 2. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 3. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 3.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 3.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". Exceptions: Ignore zeros and neg coeffs. Choose the row with the smallest ratio.
  - 3.3 Pivot using the column/row we found.
- 4. If there are no more negative coefficients in Row 0, we're done. (Other stopping criteria later)

### Example 2

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{min} & 2x_1+x_2-4x_3\\ \text{st} & 3x_1-x_2+2x_3 & \leq 25\\ & -x_1-x_2+2x_3 & \leq 20\\ & -x_1-x_2+x_3 & \leq 5 \end{array}$$

with all variables non-negative.

Change the min to a max:

#### Example 2

min 
$$2x_1 + x_2 - 4x_3$$
  
st  $3x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 \le 25$   
 $-x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 \le 20$   
 $-x_1 - x_2 + x_3 \le 5$ 

with all variables non-negative.

- ► Change the min to a max:  $\max z = -2x_1 x_2 + 4x_3$
- Now construct the tableau and proceed as usual. Be sure to change back to a min at the end.

Initial tableau is using  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  as BV. From Row 0, next is  $x_3$ . Perform the ratio test to find the pivot row:

Initial tableau is using  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  as BV. From Row 0, next is  $x_3$ . Perform the ratio test to find the pivot row:

$$25/2$$
,  $20/2$ ,  $5/1 \Rightarrow \text{Row } 3$ 

					4	
5	1	0	1	0	-2	15
1	1	0	0	1	-2 -2 1	10
-1	-1	1	0	0	1	5

Now bring in  $x_2$ ,

Why do we ignore the third row?

Why do we ignore the third row? It says  $x_3 = 5 + x_2$ ,

Why do we ignore the third row? It says  $x_3 = 5 + x_2$ , No restriction on how large  $x_2$  can be.

Why do we ignore the third row? It says  $x_3 = 5 + x_2$ , No restriction on how large  $x_2$  can be.

Summary: New pivot is (2,2) position.

				3		
4	0	0	1	-1	0	5
1	1	0	0	1	-2	10
0	0	1	0	$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$	-1	15

Bring in  $s_3$ .

					3		
٠	4	0	0	1	-1	0	5
	1	1	0	0	1	-2	10
	0	0	1	0	-1 1 1	-1	15

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$ 

				3		
4	0	0	1	-1	0	5
1	1	0	0	1	-2	10
0	0	1	0	-1 1 1	-1	15

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$ 

				3		
4	0	0	1	-1	0	5
1	1	0	0	1	-2	10
0	0	1	0	-1 1 1	-1	15

Bring in  $s_3$ . Ratio test?

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $z = 50 + 2s_3$ 

Conclusion?

				3		
4	0	0	1	-1	0	5
1	1	0	0	1	-2	10
0	0	1	0	$\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$	-1	15

Bring in  $s_3$ . Ratio test?

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $z = 50 + 2s_3$ 

Conclusion? The LP is unbounded

					3		
	1	0	0	1	-1	0	5
1	L	1	0	0	1	-2	10
(	)	0	1	0	$-1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	-1	15

Bring in  $s_3$ . Ratio test?

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $z = 50 + 2s_3$ 

Conclusion? The LP is unbounded  $s_3$  can be increased without bound, AND that causes z to be unbounded.

Bring in  $s_3$ . Ratio test?

$$s_1 = 5 + 0s_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $z = 50 + 2s_3$ 

Conclusion? The LP is unbounded  $s_3$  can be increased without bound, AND that causes z to be unbounded.

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 10 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 15 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + s_3 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

				3					$= 5 + 0s_3$
4	0	0	1	-1	0	5	-	<i>x</i> <sub>2</sub>	$= 10 + 2s_3$
1	1	0	0	1	-2	10	$\rightarrow$	<i>X</i> 3	$= 10 + 2s_3$ = $15 + s_3$
0	0	1	0	1	-1	15			

$$x_1 = 0$$

$$x_1 = 0$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$ 

$$x_1 = 0$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$ 

$$x_1 = 0$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $s_1 = 5$ 

$$x_1 = 0$$
  
 $x_2 = 10 + 2s_3$   
 $x_3 = 15 + s_3$   
 $s_1 = 5$   
 $s_2 = 0$ 

so 
$$d = (0, 2, 1, 0, 0, 1)^T$$

#### Direction of unboundedness?

so d =  $(0, 2, 1, 0, 0, 1)^T$  (the other vector is a BFS)

In one column (for one variable), we need:

► The entry in Row 0 is negative

In one column (for one variable), we need:

- ► The entry in Row 0 is negative Why? That means making the variable > 0 will increase z.
- ➤ The other entries are all zero or negative, with at least one value not zero.

In one column (for one variable), we need:

- ► The entry in Row 0 is negative Why? That means making the variable > 0 will increase z.
- The other entries are all zero or negative, with at least one value not zero.
  - Why? The ratio test fails,

In one column (for one variable), we need:

- ► The entry in Row 0 is negative Why? That means making the variable > 0 will increase z.
- The other entries are all zero or negative, with at least one value not zero.
  - Why? The ratio test fails, and this implies that this variable can be increased without bound (and the remaining solution remains feasible).

In one column (for one variable), we need:

- ► The entry in Row 0 is negative Why? That means making the variable > 0 will increase z.
- The other entries are all zero or negative, with at least one value not zero.

Why? The ratio test fails, and this implies that this variable can be increased without bound (and the remaining solution remains feasible).

Let's look at other issues that might come up.

# The Simplex Method

### What other things can happen in the algorithm?

- 1. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 2. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 2.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 2.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". Exceptions: Ignore zeros and neg coeffs. Choose the row with the smallest ratio.
  - 2.3 Pivot using the column/row we found.
- 3. If there are no more negative coefficients in Row 0, we're done.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & 3x_1 - x_2 - 4x_3 \\ \text{st} & 3x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \geq 25 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \leq 20 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + x_3 & \geq 5 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{max} & 3x_1-x_2-4x_3\\ \text{st} & 3x_1-x_2+2x_3 & \geq 25\\ & -x_1-x_2+2x_3 & \leq 20\\ & -x_1-x_2+x_3 & \geq 5 \end{array}$$

#### Construct the tableau:

z	$x_1$	<i>x</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>X</i> <sub>3</sub>	$e_1$	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	$e_3$	rhs
1	<i>x</i> <sub>1</sub> 3	-1	<b>-4</b>	0	0	0	0
0	$ \begin{array}{c c} 3 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{array} $	-1	2	-1	0	0	25
0	-1	-1	2	0	1	0	20
0	-1	-1	1	0	0	-1	5

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{max} & 3x_1 - x_2 - 4x_3 \\ \text{st} & 3x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \geq 25 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \leq 20 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + x_3 & \geq 5 \end{array}$$

#### Construct the tableau:

z	$x_1$	<i>x</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>X</i> 3	$e_1$	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>e</i> <sub>3</sub>	rhs
1	3	$x_2 \\ -1$	<b>-4</b>	0	0	0	0
0	3	-1 $-1$ $-1$	2	-1	0	0	25
0	-1	-1	2	0	1	0	20
0	-1	-1	1	0	0	-1	5

No initial BFS!

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & 3x_1 - x_2 - 4x_3 \\ \text{st} & 3x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \geq 25 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + 2x_3 & \leq 20 \\ & -x_1 - x_2 + x_3 & \geq 5 \end{array}$$

#### Construct the tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>X</i> 3	$e_1$	<i>s</i> <sub>2</sub>	$e_3$	rhs
1	3	$x_2 \\ -1$	<b>-4</b>	0	0	0	0
0	3	$-1 \\ -1 \\ -1$	2	-1	0	0	25
0	-1	-1	2	0	1	0	20
0	-1	-1	1	0	0	-1	5

#### No initial BFS!

"The Big-M Method" is later and will fix this.

# The Simplex Method

### What other things can happen in the algorithm?

- 1. Initial BFS from cols of identity
- 2. Look at Row 0 for neg coeffs:
  - 2.1 Choose the **column** most negative coef.
  - 2.2 Perform a "ratio test" by taking "RHS/Lead Coeff". Exceptions: Ignore zeros and neg coeffs. Choose the row with the smallest ratio.
  - 2.3 Pivot using the column/row we found.
- 3. If there are no more negative coefficients in Row 0, we're done.

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \max_{x} & 6x_1 + & 4x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 + & x_2 \leq 5 \\ & 3x_1 + & 2x_2 \leq 12 \\ & x_1, & x_2 \geq 0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \max_{x} & 6x_{1} + & 4x_{2} \\ \text{s.t.} & x_{1} + & x_{2} \leq 5 \\ & 3x_{1} + & 2x_{2} \leq 12 \\ & x_{1}, & x_{2} \geq 0 \end{array}$$

Initial Tableau:

Final(?) tableau: Solution is  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$  and  $s_2 = 0$ 

$$\begin{array}{lll} \max_{x} & 6x_{1} + & 4x_{2} \\ \text{s.t.} & x_{1} + & x_{2} \leq 5 \\ & 3x_{1} + & 2x_{2} \leq 12 \\ & x_{1}, & x_{2} \geq 0 \end{array}$$

Initial Tableau:

Final(?) tableau: Solution is  $x_1 = 4$ ,  $x_2 = 0$ ,  $s_1 = 1$  and  $s_2 = 0$ 

Can we bring in  $x_2$  as a basic variable?

New solution:  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 3$  with  $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ 

New solution:  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 3$  with  $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ Any other solutions?

New solution:  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 3$  with  $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ Any other solutions? (2D) Line between (4,0) and (2,3)

## Alternative Optimal Solutions

▶ If a NBV in Row 0 is 0, and we can pivot in this column (and maintain the same value of z), then we may have alternative optimal solutions.

# Alternative Optimal Solutions

- ▶ If a NBV in Row 0 is 0, and we can pivot in this column (and maintain the same value of z), then we may have alternative optimal solutions.
- ► If two BFS are optimal, the line segment joining them is also optimal (by convexity).

Consider the following "final" tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>X</i> 3	<i>X</i> 4	rhs
1	0	0	0		2
0	1	0	-1	1	2
0	0	1	-2	3	3

Interpretation?

Consider the following "final" tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>X</i> 3	<i>X</i> 4	rhs
1	0	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	-1	1	2
0	0	1	-2	3	3

Interpretation?

Row 0 may have a 0 for  $x_3$  (z doesn't change)

Consider the following "final" tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> 2	<i>X</i> 3	<i>X</i> 4	rhs
1	0	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	-1	1	2
0	0	1	-2	3	3

Interpretation?

Row 0 may have a 0 for  $x_3$  (z doesn't change) Entries in the column are all negative or zero,

Consider the following "final" tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> 2	<i>X</i> 3	<i>X</i> 4	rhs
1	0	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	-1	1	2
0	0	1	-2	3	3

Interpretation?

Row 0 may have a 0 for  $x_3$  (z doesn't change)

Entries in the column are all negative or zero, Ratio test fails.

Consider the following "final" tableau:

Z	$x_1$	<i>X</i> 2	<i>X</i> 3	<i>X</i> 4	rhs
1	0	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	-1	1	2
0	0	1	-2	3	3

Interpretation?

Row 0 may have a 0 for  $x_3$  (z doesn't change)

Entries in the column are all negative or zero, Ratio test fails.

How many solutions do we have?

$$x_1 = 2 + x_3$$
  
 $x_2 = 3 + 2x_3$   
 $x_3 = x_3$   
 $x_4 = 0$ 

min 
$$z = -x_1 + 2x_2$$
  
st  $x_1 - x_2 \le 1$   
 $x_1 - 2x_2 \le 2$   
 $x_1, x_2 \ge 0$ 

Proceed as usual:

Interpretation?

There is an optimal solution:

(1,0)

The feasible set is unbounded.

## Two Types of Unboundedness

- ▶ The objective function is unbounded (as is the feasible region).
- ► The feasible region is unbounded, but the objective function is not.

"The LP is unbounded if there is a negative coefficient in Row 0, and all the remaining elements in the column are negative or zero"