

Marks

1. Consider the following linear programming problem (P).

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{maximize} && 5x_1 + x_2 - x_3 \\
 &\text{subject to} && x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \leq -3 \\
 &&& x_1 \leq 2 \\
 &&& 3x_1 + x_2 - x_3 = -2 \\
 &&& x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

[16] (a) Solve it using the Simplex Method, finding optimal solutions for both (P) and its dual (D).

We need a Phase I. Since the right side of the equality constraint is negative, we multiply it by  $-1$ . The slack variable  $a_3$  for that constraint is artificial, and in addition we have the artificial variable  $a_0$  to take care of the right side of the first constraint being negative. The temporary objective is  $w = -a_3 - a_0$ . The initial tableau is

$w$	$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	$a_0$	rhs
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0 = $w$
0	1	-5	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0 = $z$
0	0	1	-1	-2	1	0	0	-1	-3 = $s_1$
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 = $s_2$
0	0	-3	-1	1	0	0	1	0	2 = $a_3$

We need to adjust the  $w$  row since  $a_3$  is supposed to be basic: subtract the  $a_3$  row from it, obtaining

$w$	$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	$a_0$	rhs
1	0	3	1	-1	0	0	0	1	-2 = $w$

The initial pivot to make the basic solution feasible for the relaxed problem has  $a_0$  entering and  $s_1$  leaving.

$w$	$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	$a_0$	rhs
1	0	4	0	-3	1	0	0	0	-5 = $w$
0	1	-5	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0 = $z$
0	0	-1	1	2	-1	0	0	1	3 = $a_0$
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 = $s_2$
0	0	-3	-1	1	0	0	1	0	2 = $a_3$

With the most negative entry in the  $w$  row,  $x_3$  enters. The minimum ratio is for  $a_0$ , which leaves.

$w$	$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	$a_0$	rhs
1	0	5/2	3/2	0	-1/2	0	0	3/2	-1/2 = $w$
0	1	-9/2	-3/2	0	1/2	0	0	-1/2	-3/2 = $z$
0	0	-1/2	1/2	1	-1/2	0	0	1/2	3/2 = $x_3$
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 = $s_2$
0	0	-5/2	-3/2	0	1/2	0	1	-1/2	1/2 = $a_3$

Now  $s_1$  enters, and  $a_3$  leaves.

$w$	$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	$a_0$	rhs	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	= $w$
0	1	-2	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-2	= $z$
0	0	-3	-1	1	0	0	1	0	2	= $x_3$
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	= $s_2$
0	0	-5	-3	0	1	0	2	-1	1	= $s_1$

We have successfully concluded Phase I, so we can delete the  $w$  row and column, as well as the  $a_0$  column, and continue Phase II with  $z$  as objective.  $x_1$  enters and  $s_2$  leaves.

$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$a_3$	rhs	
1	0	0	0	0	2	-1	2	= $z$
0	0	-1	1	0	3	1	8	= $x_3$
0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	= $x_1$
0	0	-3	0	1	5	2	11	= $s_1$

This is optimal (since  $a_3$  is artificial, its negative entry in the  $z$  row does not matter). The optimal solution of (P) is  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 0, x_3 = 8, s_1 = 11, s_2 = a_3 = 0$ . The optimal solution of (D) is  $y_1 = 0, y_2 = 2, y_3 = -1, \eta_1 = \eta_2 = \eta_3 = 0$ .

[4] (b) *Is there more than one optimal solution of (P)? Give reasons.*

Yes: since the entry in the  $z$  row for the nonbasic variable  $x_2$  is 0,  $x_2$  can be increased without affecting the objective.

[9] **2.** *Someone claims that  $x_1 = 10, x_2 = 0, x_3 = 1$  is an optimal solution to the problem*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{maximize} && 2x_1 + 3x_2 + 4x_3 \\
 &\text{subject to} && 3x_1 + x_2 + 3x_3 \leq 45 \\
 &&& x_1 + x_2 \leq 10 \\
 &&& x_1 + 2x_2 + 5x_3 \leq 15 \\
 &&& x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

*Use complementary slackness to check whether the claim is correct.*

With those values of  $x_1, x_2$  and  $x_3$  we have  $s_1 = 45 - 30 - 3 > 0, s_2 = 10 - 10 = 0, s_3 = 15 - 10 - 5 = 0$ . So the given solution is feasible for the primal problem, and complementary slackness says  $y_1 = \eta_1 = \eta_3 = 0$  for the dual problem. The equations of the dual, with  $y_1 = \eta_1 = \eta_3 = 0$ , are

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_2 + y_3 &= 2 \\
 y_2 + 2y_3 - \eta_2 &= 3 \\
 5y_3 &= 4
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $y_3 = 4/5, y_2 = 2 - 4/5 = 6/5$ , and  $\eta_2 = 6/5 + 8/5 - 3 = -1/5$ . This is not feasible for the dual problem, so the claim is incorrect.

**3.** *Consider the following linear programming problem, and its optimal tableau : (to fit our notation, I changed the “dictionary” of the original exam to a tableau)*

$$\text{maximize} \quad 4x_1 + x_2 + 5x_3 + 3x_4$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to } & x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + 3x_4 \leq 1 \\ & 5x_1 + x_2 + 3x_3 + 8x_4 \leq 55 \\ & -x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 - 5x_4 \leq 3 \\ & \text{all } x_i \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$z$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$s_1$	$s_2$	$s_3$	rhs
1	1	0	2	0	11	0	6	29 = $z$
0	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	5 = $x_4$
0	2	1	4	0	5	0	3	14 = $x_2$
0	-5	0	-9	0	-21	1	-11	1 = $s_2$

- [9] (a) *If the right side of the third constraint is changed from 3 to  $p$ , for what values of the parameter  $p$  will the current basis be optimal? What is the optimal solution when  $p$  is the maximum value in this interval? For  $p$  slightly larger, what variables would enter and leave the basis?*

Note that  $B^{-1}$  is found in the tableau. The new  $\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 5 & 0 & 3 \\ -21 & 1 & -11 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 55 \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{matrix} x_4 \\ x_2 \\ s_2 \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2+p \\ 5+3p \\ 34-11p \end{pmatrix}$ .

The current basis is optimal as long as all these  $\geq 0$ , i.e.  $-5/3 \leq p \leq 34/11$ . For  $p = 34/11$ , the optimal solution is  $x_4 = 56/11$ ,  $x_2 = 157/11$ ,  $x_1 = x_3 = s_1 = s_2 = s_3 = 0$ .

- [6] (b) *If the first constraint is removed, what variables would enter and leave the basis on the first pivot?*

Removing the first constraint means making  $s_1$  into a URS variable. Then  $s_1$  will enter the basis decreasing. When a variable enters decreasing, we calculate ratios using the negative entries in its column. There is only one of these, for  $s_2$ , so  $s_2$  would leave the basis.

- [3] (c) *By how much would the coefficient of  $x_3$  in the objective have to be increased to make the optimal solution have  $x_3 > 0$ ?*

In the optimal tableau,  $x_3$  is nonbasic with reduced cost  $\eta_3 = 2$ . Thus  $c_3$  would have to be increased by at least 2 to make an optimal solution have  $x_3 > 0$ .

- [6] 4. *What does it mean for a linear programming problem to be unbounded? How would this fact be detected in the course of attempting to solve it using the Simplex Method?*

A linear programming problem is unbounded if there are feasible solutions with arbitrarily large positive objective values (for a maximize problem) or arbitrarily large negative objective values (for a minimize problem). This is detected in Phase II of the (primal) Simplex Method when there is an entering variable but no ratios to calculate and thus no leaving variable.

5. *Farmer Jones grows rutabagas and zucchini on a 45 hectare farm. He can sell up to 140 tonnes of rutabagas, at a profit of \$30 per tonne (excluding labour costs), and up to 120 tonnes of zucchini, at a profit of \$50 per tonne (excluding labour costs). Each hectare yields 5 tonnes of rutabagas or 4 tonnes of zucchini. Jones must hire 6 hours of labour to harvest each hectare of rutabagas, and 10 hours of labour to harvest each hectare of zucchini. Labour costs \$10 per hour, and at most 350 hours of labour is available. Being a very high-tech farmer, Jones uses a LINDO program, shown below together with its output, to decide how many hectares*

to plant with each crop ( $x_1$  for rutabagas,  $x_2$  for zucchini) and how much labour to hire ( $x_3$  hours).

```
max 150 x1 + 200 x2 - 10 x3
subject to
land) x1 + x2 <= 45
labour) 6 x1 + 10 x2 - x3 <= 0
maxlabour) x3 <= 350
maxruta) 5 x1 <= 140
maxzucc) 4 x2 <= 120
end
```

```
LP OPTIMUM FOUND AT STEP      4
OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE
1)      4250.000
```

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
X1	25.000000	0.000000
X2	20.000000	0.000000
X3	350.000000	0.000000

ROW	SLACK OR SURPLUS	DUAL PRICES
LAND)	0.000000	75.000000
LABOUR)	0.000000	12.500000
MAXLABOU)	0.000000	2.500000
MAXRUTA)	15.000000	0.000000
MAXZUCC)	40.000000	0.000000

RANGES IN WHICH THE BASIS IS UNCHANGED:

OBJ COEFFICIENT RANGES			
VARIABLE	CURRENT COEF	ALLOWABLE INCREASE	ALLOWABLE DECREASE
X1	150.000000	10.000000	30.000000
X2	200.000000	50.000000	10.000000
X3	-10.000000	INFINITY	2.500000

RIGHTHAND SIDE RANGES			
ROW	CURRENT RHS	ALLOWABLE INCREASE	ALLOWABLE DECREASE
LAND	45.000000	1.200000	6.666667
LABOUR	0.000000	40.000000	12.000000
MAXLABOU	350.000000	40.000000	12.000000
MAXRUTA	140.000000	INFINITY	15.000000
MAXZUCC	120.000000	INFINITY	40.000000

- [6] (a) What is the most that Jones should be willing to pay for an additional hour of labour? How much should he be willing to hire at that price?

The “dual price” of the MAXLABOUR constraint is 2.5, so he should be willing to pay up to \$2.50 extra per hour to hire additional labour. Since he is now paying \$10 per hour for labour, that means he should be willing to pay up to \$12.50 per hour. You could also get this from the dual price of the LABOUR constraint. At that price, the basis remains optimal if the right side of the

LABOUR or MAXLABOUR constraint is increased by up to 40, so he should be willing to hire at least 40 additional hours of labour at that price.

- [4] (b) *If 5 hectares of land were removed from the farm to build a road, what would be the effect on the farm's profit?*

The dual price of the LAND constraint is 75. Since 5 is less than the allowable decrease for the right side of the LAND constraint, the basis remains optimal, and the profit would decrease by  $5 \times 75 = \$375$ .

- [4] (c) *Explain the practical significance of the "Allowable decrease" for X2 in the "Obj coefficient ranges".*

The coefficient of X2 in the objective represents the contribution to the profit of one hectare planted in zucchini (at \$50 per tonne times 4 tonnes per hectare). If this were to decrease by up to the allowable decrease of \$10 per hectare, e.g. by a decrease in the selling price of zucchini or in the yield, the current solution would remain optimal.

- [6] (d) *Jones is considering planting pumpkins. Demand for pumpkins is unlimited. Each hectare planted with pumpkins yields 4 tonnes of pumpkins, at a profit of \$30 per tonne (excluding labour costs), and requires 3 hours of labour. Should Jones plant any pumpkins?*

We must price out a new variable. The contribution of one hectare of pumpkins to the profit is  $30 \times 4 = \$120$ . The resources consumed are one hectare of land at \$75 and 3 hours of labour at \$12.50, for a total shadow price of \$112.50. Thus a hectare of pumpkins would more than pay for the resources it consumes. He should plant some pumpkins.

**6.** Consider the following linear programming problem (P).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & x_1 + 7x_2 - 3x_3 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x_1 + 2x_2 \leq 4 \\ & x_2 - x_3 \leq -2 \\ & -2x_1 - 4x_2 + x_3 \leq -3 \\ & x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

In the process of solving this by the Revised Simplex Method, suppose we reach the basis  $x_1, s_3, x_3$  with

$$B^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

- [3] (a) Check that this  $B^{-1}$  is correct.

$$B^{-1}B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

- [8] (b) Perform the next pivot, obtaining the new basis,  $B^{-1}$  and  $\beta$ .

With  $\mathbf{c}_{BV} = \begin{matrix} x_1 & s_3 & x_3 \\ (1 & 0 & -3) \end{matrix}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}^T = \mathbf{c}_{BV}B^{-1}(-1) = [1, 3, 0]$  and  $\eta_2 = [1, 3, 0] \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} - 3 = -7$ .

Thus  $x_2$  enters. The  $x_2$  column is

$B^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ -4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$  while  $\beta = B^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 4 \\ -2 \\ -3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ s_3 \\ x_3 \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ , so ratios are  $\begin{matrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ - - - \end{matrix}$ . With the least ratio,  $x_1$  leaves. The update step is

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{array} \right] \implies \left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 3/2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1/2 & -1 & 0 & 4 \end{array} \right]$$

The new basis is  $x_2, s_3, x_3$ ,  $B^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3/2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/2 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$ .

- [4] (c) *By changing the value of  $c_2$ , the coefficient of  $x_2$  in the objective, we could obtain a problem for which the basis  $(x_1, s_3, x_3)$  is optimal. For what range of values of  $c_2$  would this be true?*

We still have the same  $\mathbf{y}$ , and only  $\eta_2$  will change:  $\eta_2 = [1, 3, 0] \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix} - c_2 = -4 - c_2$ . For this basis to be optimal we would need  $c_2 \leq -4$ .

Note: the final question is on a topic we did not cover this term.

7. Suppose a two-person zero-sum game has the following payoff matrix for the row player, where  $t$  is a parameter:

$$\begin{matrix} & (1) & (2) & (3) \\ (1) & \begin{pmatrix} 3 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \\ (2) & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \\ (3) & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

- [6] (a) Write down a linear programming problem whose optimal solution gives an optimal strategy for the row player. DO NOT SOLVE.

- [6] (b) Suppose that the column player's optimal strategy is  $(1/2, 1/2, 0)$ , and the row player has an optimal strategy that involves sometimes playing (1) (with probability greater than 0

but less than 1). What can you say about the value of  $t$ ? *Hint:* the row player still uses the same mixed strategy even if she knows the column player's mixed strategy.

Be sure that this examination has 9 pages including this cover

The University of British Columbia

Sessional Examinations - April 2002

Mathematics 340 Section 201

Linear Programming

Dr. Israel

Closed book examination

Time: 2  $\frac{1}{2}$  hours

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Student Number \_\_\_\_\_ Section \_\_\_\_\_

**Special Instructions:**

Allowed aids: One sheet (two-sided) of notes; non-graphing, non-programmable calculator.

Write your name at the top of each page. Write your answers in the space provided.

Show your work.

**Rules governing examinations**

1. Each candidate must be prepared to produce, upon request, a Library/AMS card for identification.
2. Candidates are not permitted to ask questions of the invigilators, except in cases of supposed errors or ambiguities in examination questions.
3. No candidate shall be permitted to enter the examination room after the expiration of one-half hour from the scheduled starting time, or to leave during the first half hour of the examination.
4. Candidates suspected of any of the following, or similar, dishonest practices shall be immediately dismissed from the examination and shall be liable to disciplinary action.

Having at the place of writing any books, papers or memoranda, calculators, computers, audio or video cassette players or other memory aid devices, other than those authorized by the examiners.

Speaking or communicating with other candidates.

Purposely exposing written papers to the view of other candidates. The plea of accident or forgetfulness shall not be received.

5. Candidates must not destroy or mutilate any examination material; must hand in all examination papers; and must not take any examination material from the examination room without permission of the invigilator.

1		20
2		9
3		18
4		6
5		20
6		15
7		12
Total		100