Notes for Lecture 17

1 Linear Programming

It turns out that a great many problems can be formulated as linear programs, i.e. maximizing (or minimizing) a linear function of some variables, subject to constraints on the variables; these constraints are either linear equations or linear inequalities, i.e. linear functions of the variables either set equal to a constant, or ≤ a constant, or ≥ a constant. Most of this lecture will concentrate on recognizing how to reformulate (or reduce) a given problem to a linear program, even though it is not originally given this way. The advantage of this is that there are several good algorithms for solving linear programs that are available. We will only say a few words about these algorithms, and instead concentrate on formulating problems as linear programs.

2 Introductory example in 2D

Suppose that a company produces two products, and wishes to decide the level of production of each product so as to maximize profits. Let $x_1$ be the amount of Product 1 produced in a month, and $x_2$ that of Product 2. Each unit of Product 1 brings to the company a profit of 120, and each unit of Product 2 a profit of 500. At this point it seems that the company should only produce Product 2, but there are some constraints on $x_1$ and $x_2$ that the company must satisfy (besides the obvious one, $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$). First, $x_1$ cannot be more than 200, and $x_2$ more than 300—because of raw material limitations, say. Also, the sum of $x_1$ and $x_2$ must be at most 400, because of labor constraints. What are the best levels of production to maximize profits?

We represent the situation by a linear program, as follows (where we have numbered the constraints for later reference):

$$\text{max } 120x_1 + 500x_2$$

subject to:

1. $x_1 \leq 200$
2. $x_2 \leq 300$
3. $x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$
4. $x_1 \geq 0$
5. $x_2 \geq 0$

The set of all feasible solutions of this linear program (that is, all vectors $(x_1, x_2)$ in 2D space that satisfy all constraints) is precisely the (black) polygon shown in Figure 1 below, with vertices numbered 1 through 5.

The vertices are given in the following table, and labelled in Figure 1 (we explain the meaning of “active constraint” below):
The reason all these constraints yield the polygon shown is as follows. Recall that a linear equation like \( ax_1 + bx_2 = p \) defines a line in the plane. The inequality \( ax_1 + bx_2 \leq p \) defines all points on one side of that line, i.e. a half-plane, which you can think of as an (infinite) polygon with just one side. If we have two such constraints, the points have to lie in the intersection of two half-planes, i.e. a polygon with 2 sides. Each constraint adds (at most) one more side to the polygon. For example, the 5 constraints above yield 5 sides in the polyhedron: constraint (1), \( x_2 \leq 200 \), yields the side with vertices #2 and #5, constraint (2), \( x_3 \leq 300 \), yields the side with vertices #3 and #4, constraint (3), \( x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 \), yields the side with vertices #4 and #5, constraint (4), \( x_1 \geq 0 \), yields the side with vertices #1 and #3, and constraint (5), \( x_2 \geq 0 \), yields the side with vertices #1 and #2. We also say that constraint (1) is \textit{active} at vertices #2 and #5 since it is just barely satisfied at those vertices (at other vertices \( x_2 \) is strictly less than 200).

We wish to maximize the linear function \( \text{profit} = 120x_1 + 500x_2 \) over all points of this polygon. We think of this geometrically as follows. The set of all points satisfying \( p = 120x_1 + 500x_2 \) for a fixed \( p \) is a line. As we vary \( p \), we get different lines, all parallel to one another, and all perpendicular to the vector \((120, 500)\). (We review this basic geometrical fact below).
Geometrically, we want to increase \( p \) so that the line is just barely touching the polygon at one point, and increasing \( p \) would make the plane miss the polygon entirely. It should be clear geometrically that this point will usually be a vertex of the polygon. This point is the optimal solution of the linear program. This is shown in the figure above, where the green line (going from the origin to the top of the graph) is parallel to the vector \((120, 500)\), the red line (going all the way from left to right across the graph) is perpendicular to the green line and connects to the solution vertex #4 \((100, 300)\), which occurs for \( p = 120 \cdot 100 + 500 \cdot 300 = 162000 \) in profit. (The blue “L” connecting the green and red lines indicates that they are perpendicular.)

(Now we review why the equation \( y_1 \cdot x_1 + y_2 \cdot x_2 = p \) defines a line perpendicular to the vector \( y = (y_1, y_2) \). You may skip this if this is familiar material. Write the equation as a dot product of \( y \) and \( x = (x_1, x_2) \): \( y \cdot x = p \). First consider the case \( p = 0 \), so \( y \cdot x = 0 \). Recall that the if the dot product of two vectors is 0, then the vectors are perpendicular. So when \( p = 0 \), \( y \cdot x = 0 \) defines the set of all vectors (points) \( x \) perpendicular to \( y \), which is a line through the origin. When \( p \neq 0 \), we argue as follows. Note that \( y \cdot y = y_1^2 + y_2^2 \). Then define the vector \( \vec{y} = (p/(y \cdot y)) y \), a multiple of \( y \). Then we can easily confirm that \( \vec{y} \) satisfies the equation because \( y \cdot \vec{y} = (p/(y \cdot y))(y \cdot y) = p \). Now think of every point \( x \) as the sum of two vectors \( x = \vec{x} + \vec{y} \). Substituting in the equation for \( x \) we get \( p = y \cdot x = y \cdot (\vec{x} + \vec{y}) = y \cdot \vec{x} + y \cdot \vec{y} = y \cdot \vec{x} + p \), or \( y \cdot \vec{x} = 0 \). In other words, the points \( \vec{x} \) lie in a plane through the origin perpendicular to \( y \), and the points \( x = \vec{x} + \vec{y} \) are gotten just by adding the vector \( \vec{y} \) to each vector in this plane. This just shifts the plane in the direction \( \vec{y} \), but leaves it perpendicular to \( y \).)

There are three other geometric possibilities that could occur:

- If the planes for each \( p \) are parallel to an edge or face touching the solution vertex, then all points in that edge or face will also be solutions. This just means that the solution is not unique, but we can still solve the linear program. This would occur in the above example if we changed the profits from \((120, 500)\) to \((100, 100)\); we would get equally large profits of \( p = 40000 \) either at vertex #5 \((200, 200)\), vertex #4 \((100, 300)\), or anywhere on the edge between them.

- It may be that the polygon is infinite, and that \( p \) can be made arbitrarily large. For example, removing the constraints \( x_1 + x_2 \leq 400 \) and \( x_1 \leq 200 \) means that \( x_1 \) could become arbitrarily large. Thus \((x_1, 0)\) is in the polygon for all \( x_1 > 0 \), yielding an arbitrarily large profit \( 120x_1 \). If this happens, it probably means you forgot a constraint and so formulated your linear program incorrectly.

- It may be that the polygon is empty, which is also called infeasible. This means that no points \((x_1, x_2)\) satisfy the constraints. This would be the case if we added the constraint, say, that \( x_1 + 2x_2 \geq 800 \); since the largest value of \( x_1 + 2x_2 \) occurs at vertex #4, with \( x_1 + 2x_2 = 100 + 2 \cdot 300 = 700 \), this extra constraint cannot be satisfied. When this happens it means that your problem is overconstrained, and you have to weaken or eliminate one or more constraints.
3 Introductory Example in 3D

Now we take the same company as in the last section, add Product 3 to its product line, along with some constraints, and ask how the problem changes. Each unit of Product 3 brings a profit of 200, and the sum of $x_2$ and three times $x_3$ must be at most 600, because Products 2 and 3 share the same piece of equipment ($x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600$).

This changes the linear program to

$$\text{max } 120x_1 + 500x_2 + 200x_3$$

(1) $x_1 \leq 200$

(2) $x_2 \leq 300$

(3) $x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$

(4) $x_1 \geq 0$

(5) $x_2 \geq 0$

(6) $x_3 \geq 0$

(7) $x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 600$

Each constraint correspond to being on one side of a plane in $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ space, a half-space. The 7 constraints result in a 7-sided polyhedron shown in Figure 2. The polyhedron has vertices and active constraints show here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertex</th>
<th>x1-coord</th>
<th>x2-coord</th>
<th>x3-coord</th>
<th>Active constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4,5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,5,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a vertex now has 3 active constraints, because it takes the intersection of at least 3 planes to make a corner in 3D, whereas it only took the intersection of 2 lines to make a corner in 2D.

Again the (green) line is in the direction (120,500,200) of increasing profit, the maximum of which occurs at vertex #7. There is a (red) line connecting vertex #7 to the green line, to which it is perpendicular.

In general $m$ constraints on $n$ variables can yield an $m$-sided polyhedron in $n$-dimensional space. Such a polyhedron can be seen to have as many as $\binom{m}{n}$ vertices, since $n$ constraints are active at a corner, and there are $\binom{m}{n}$ ways to choose $n$ constraints. Each of these very many vertices is a candidate solution. So when $m$ and $n$ are large, we must rely on a systematic algorithm rather than geometric intuition in order to find the solution.
Figure 2: The feasible region (polyhedron).