## Math 340: Answers to Assignment 5

6.3.3. The Dakota problem has $B^{-1}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}1 & 2 & -8 \\ 0 & 2 & -4 \\ 0 & -0.5 & 1.5\end{array}\right)$ so with the new $\mathbf{b}=\left(\begin{array}{c}b_{1} \\ 20 \\ 8\end{array}\right)$ we have $\boldsymbol{\beta}=B^{-1} \mathbf{b}=\left(\begin{array}{c}b_{1}-24 \\ 8 \\ 2\end{array}\right)$. This is optimal as long as it is feasible, i.e. for $b_{1} \geq 24$. For $b_{1}=30$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}=\left(\begin{array}{l}6 \\ 8 \\ 2\end{array}\right)$, i.e. $s_{1}=6, x_{3}=8, x_{1}=2$.
6.3.6(a). In the optimal solution of the original problem, $x_{1}$ is nonbasic, with reduced cost 3 . This means that each Type I candy bar made reduces $z$ by 3 cents. The current basis remains optimal if the profit $c_{1}$ for Type I candy bars increases by no more than 3 cents, i.e. if $c_{1} \leq 6$. If the profit were 7 cents, the tableau would be

| $z$ | $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $x_{3}$ | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ | rhs |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 300 | $=$ | $z$ |
| 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | $3 / 2$ | $-1 / 2$ | 25 | $=$ | $x_{3}$ |
| 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | $-1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 25 | $=$ | $x_{2}$ |

$x_{1}$ enters; there is a tie for leaving variable, so I'll choose $x_{3}$ (the higher row in the tableau) to leave. The next tableau is

|  | $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $x_{3}$ | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ | rhs |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 350 | $=$ | $z$ |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | -1 | 50 | $=$ | $x_{1}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | -2 | 1 | 0 | $=$ | $x_{2}$ |

This is optimal. The new optimal solution has $x_{1}=50, x_{2}=x_{3}=s_{1}=s_{2}=0, z=350$.
(b). With $\mathbf{c}_{B V}^{T}=\left[5, c_{2}\right]$ have $\mathbf{y}^{T}=\mathbf{c}_{B V}^{T} B^{-1}=\left[15 / 2-c_{2} / 2,-5 / 2+c_{2} / 2\right]$ and $\eta_{1}=\mathbf{y}^{T} A_{1}-3=$ $-1 / 2+c_{2} / 2$. The current solution is optimal if all these are nonnegative, i.e. $5 \leq c_{2} \leq 15$. At a profit of 13 cents, the current solution would still be optimal, with the same values $x_{2}=x_{3}=25$, and $z=13 \times 25+5 \times 25=450$ cents.
(c). With $b_{1}$ changed from 50 to $t, \beta=B^{-1}\binom{t}{100}=\binom{3 t / 2-50}{50-t / 2}$. Thus the current basis remains feasible (and therefore optimal) if $100 / 3 \leq t \leq 100$.
(d). Within the above interval, the shadow price of the sugar constraint is 4 cent per oz. The additional 10 oz of sugar raises the profit by 40 cents, to 340 cents. We have $\beta=\binom{40}{20}$, i.e. they should produce 20 type 1 and 40 type 2 candy bars. If only 30 oz of sugar were available, this would be outside the interval where the current basis is feasible, and the questions can't be answered (except by solving the new problem from scratch or using the Dual Simplex Method, which we didn't have yet).
(e). The reduced cost of the new type 1 bar would be $.5 \times 4+.5 \times 1-3=-.5<0$, so it would become profitable to produce these.
(f). The reduced cost of the type 4 bar would be $3 \times 4+4 \times 1-17=-1<0$, so it would be profitable to produce these.
6.3.8(a). In my version of the problem with $\mathbf{c}_{B V}^{T}=\left[c_{1},-100\right]$ we have $\mathbf{y}^{T}=[-5 / 2-$ $\left.3 / 20 c_{1}, 35 / 4+1 / 40 c_{1}\right]$. The current basis is optimal if $-350 \leq c_{1} \leq-50 / 3$, i.e. if the cost of a comedy ad is between $\$ 16,666.67$ and $\$ 350,000$.
(b). With $b_{1}$ changed from -28 to $-t$, we have $\boldsymbol{\beta}=B^{-1} \mathbf{b}=\binom{(3 t-12) / 20}{(84-t) / 40}$. The current basis is optimal as long as $4 \leq t \leq 84$, i.e. the required HIW exposures are from 4 million to 84 million. A requirement of 40 million (i.e. $t=40$ ) is in this interval, so the optimal solution would be $x_{1}=5.4, x_{2}=1.1$.
(c). Pricing it out: $\mathbf{y}^{T} A_{\text {news }}-c_{\text {news }}=[5,7.5]\binom{-12}{-7}-(-110)=-2.5<0$. Therefore Dorian should advertise on the news program.
6.3.9. The new $\mathbf{b}$ is the old $\mathbf{b}+\Delta \mathbf{e}$ where $\mathbf{e}$ is the vector with $e_{i}=1$ and all other entries 0 . So the new $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the old $\boldsymbol{\beta}+\Delta B^{-1} \mathbf{e}$, and $B^{-1} \mathbf{e}$ is column number $i$ of $B^{-1}$.
6.4.7. In the Dakota problem the desks and chairs are basic, so we use the $100 \%$ rule. The "OBJ COEFFICIENT RANGES" in the LINDO output on p. 282 shows that a price of $\$ 65$ for desks, a $\$ 5$ increase, is $25 \%$ of the allowable increase; $\$ 25$ for tables, a $\$ 5$ decrease, is $0 \%$ of the allowable decrease; $\$ 18$ for chairs, a $\$ 2$ decrease, is $40 \%$ of the allowable decrease. The total is $65 \%<100 \%$. Therefore the current basis would remain optimal. The new $z$ value would be $65 \times 2+18 \times 8=\$ 274$.
6.4.13. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{1}\left[U_{1}, b_{2}\right] & +r_{2}\left[b_{1}, L_{2}\right]+\left(1-r_{1}-r_{2}\right)\left[b_{1}, b_{2}\right]=\left[r_{1}\left(U_{1}-b_{1}\right)+b_{1}, r_{2}\left(L_{2}-b_{2}\right)+b_{2}\right] \\
& =\left[b_{1}+\Delta b_{1}, b_{2}+\Delta b_{2}\right]=\left[b_{1}^{\prime}, b_{2}^{\prime}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Now $B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}^{\prime}}{b_{2}^{\prime}}=r_{1} B^{-1}\binom{U_{1}}{b_{2}}+r_{2} B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}}{L_{2}}+\left(1-r_{1}-r_{2}\right) B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}}{b_{2}}$.
Note that $B^{-1}\binom{U_{1}}{b_{2}} \geq 0$ because the current basis is still optimal if $b_{1}$ is changed to $U_{1}$ with $b_{2}$ unchanged. Similarly, $B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}}{L_{2}} \geq 0$, while $B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}}{b_{2}} \geq 0$ because the current basis is optimal with $b_{1}$ and $b_{2}$ unchanged. Thus if $r_{1}+r_{2} \leq 1, B^{-1}\binom{b_{1}^{\prime}}{b_{2}^{\prime}}$ is a linear combination of nonnegative vectors with nonnegative coefficients, and therefore is nonnegative.
E.1(a). We have $\mathbf{b}=\left(\begin{array}{c}15 \\ 18 \\ 4\end{array}\right)$ so $\beta=B^{-1} \mathbf{b}=\left(\begin{array}{l}2 \\ 1 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$, i.e. the optimal solution is $x_{1}=2, x_{2}=1$, $x_{3}=x_{4}=0$. We have $\mathbf{c}_{B V}^{T}=[-1,0,4]$ so the vector of dual prices is $\mathbf{y}^{T}=\mathbf{c}_{B V}^{T} B^{-1}=[0,-1 / 3,2]$ (the fact that $y_{2}<0$ is no problem because the second constraint is an equality). The vector of reduced costs is $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{T}=\mathbf{y}^{T} A-\mathbf{c}^{T}=[0,0,2,7]$.
(b). The reduced cost of $x_{5}$ would be $\eta_{5}=\mathbf{y}^{T}\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 3 \\ p\end{array}\right)-3=2 p-4$, so the solution is optimal if $p \geq 2$. With $p=2$, the current solution is still optimal but is not the only optimal solution: $x_{5}$ could enter the basis. The $x_{5}$ column of the tableau would be $B^{-1}\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 3 \\ 2\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}-1 \\ 0 \\ 1 / 2\end{array}\right)$. Thus $x_{1}=2+x_{5}, s_{1}=1$ and $x_{2}=1-x_{5} / 2$. The other optimal basic solution (when $x_{5}=2$ ) is $x_{1}=4$, $x_{2}=x_{3}=x_{4}=0, x_{5}=2$.

