

## Home task discussion

The SPLP is NP-hard in the strong sense.

A problem is said to be strongly NP-complete (NP-complete in strong sense), if it remains NP-complete even when all of its numerical parameters are bounded by a polynomial in the length of the input.

Node Cover Problem;

Knapsack Problem;

Maximal Clique Problem.

# The traveling salesman problem

$$\min \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{i \in I} c_{ij} x_{ij}$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{ij} = 1, \quad j \in J;$$

$$\sum_{j \in J} x_{ij} = 1, \quad i \in I;$$

$$u_i - u_j + nx_{ij} \leq n - 1, \quad i, j = 2, \dots, n;$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0,1\}, \quad u_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

## Lecture 2.

# Basic facility location models

- The simple plant location problem
- The  $p$ -median problem
- The  $p$ -center problem
- The set covering problem

# Combinatorial formulations

**Proposition 1.** The SPLP has the single assignment property ( $x_{ij} = 1 \vee 0$ ).

**Proof.** For each customer  $j \in J$  we select a cheapest deliverer  $i: x_i = 1$ .

SPLP: combinatorial formulation

$$\min_{P \subseteq I} \left\{ \sum_{j \in J} \min_{i \in P} c_{ij} + \sum_{i \in P} f_i \right\}$$

# The $p$ -median problem

$$\min_{P \subset I, |P|=p} \left\{ \sum_{j \in J} \min_{i \in P} c_{ij} \right\}$$

Mixed integer programming model:

$$\min \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{i \in I} c_{ij} x_{ij}$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{ij} = 1, \quad j \in J;$$
$$y_i \geq x_{ij}, \quad i \in I, j \in J;$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} y_i = p;$$

$$y_i \in \{0,1\}, \quad x_{ij} \geq 0, \quad i \in I, j \in J.$$

*Has the  $p$ -median problem the Single Assignment Property?*

# The $p$ -center problem

$$\min_{P \subset I, |P|=p} \left\{ \max_{j \in J} \min_{i \in P} c_{ij} \right\}$$

Mixed integer linear programming model:

$$\min D$$

subject to:

$$D \geq c_{ij}x_{ij}, \quad i \in I, j \in J;$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{ij} = 1, \quad j \in J;$$

$$y_i \geq x_{ij}, \quad i \in I, j \in J;$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} y_i = p;$$

$$y_i \in \{0,1\}, \quad x_{ij} \geq 0, \quad i \in I, j \in J.$$

How about relaxation  $x_{ij} \in \{0,1\} \Rightarrow 0 \leq x_{ij} \leq 1$ ?

*Why we discuss the relaxations?*

Suppose that we have an algorithm for the  $p$ -median problem.

- Can we solve the  $p$ -center problem by using this algorithm?
- What is computational complexity of your approach?
- Can we say that the  $p$ -center problem is NP-hard?

# The set covering problem

Let  $A = \{a_{ij}\}$  be an 0–1 matrix:

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if facility } i \text{ can service customer } j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A subset  $P \subseteq I$  of facilities defines a cover of  $J$  if  $\sum_{i \in P} a_{ij} \geq 1$  for all  $j \in J$ .

The set covering problem is to find a cover of minimal cost:

$$\min \sum_{i \in I} f_i y_i$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i \in I} y_i a_{ij} \geq 1, \quad j \in J;$$
$$y_i \in \{0,1\}, \quad i \in I.$$

*Can we claim that this problem is NP-hard?*



# Pseudo-Boolean reformulations

For a vector  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  with ranking  $g_{i_1} \leq g_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq g_{i_m}$  we introduce a vector  $\Delta g = (\Delta g_0, \dots, \Delta g_m)$  in the following way:

$$\Delta g_0 = g_{i_1}$$

$$\Delta g_l = g_{i_{l+1}} - g_{i_l}, \quad 1 \leq l < m;$$

$$\Delta g_m = g_{i_m}.$$

**Lemma.** For each 0-1 vector  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ ,  $z \neq (1, \dots, 1)$  we have

$$\min_{i|z_i=0} g_i = \Delta g_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} \Delta g_l z_{i_1} \dots z_{i_l}.$$

**Example.**  $g = (10, 8, 5, 7, 1, 9)$ ;  $\Delta g = (1, 4=5-1, 2=7-5, 1=8-7, 1=10-9)$ ;

$$z = (1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0), z = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), z = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0).$$

# Pseudo-Boolean reformulation for SPLP

Let the ranking for column  $j$  of the matrix  $(c_{ij})$  be

$$c_{i_1^j} \leq c_{i_2^j} \leq \dots \leq c_{i_m^j}$$

Using Lemma, we can get a pseudo-boolean function for the SPLP:

$$z_i = 1 - y_i, \quad i \in I;$$

$$\min_z \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} f_i(1 - z_i) + \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \Delta c_{lj} z_{i_1^j} \dots z_{i_l^j} \right\}.$$

**Example.**  $I = J = \{1,2,3\}$ ;  $f_i = \begin{pmatrix} 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \end{pmatrix}$ ;  $c_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 3 & 10 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 \\ 10 & 20 & 7 \end{pmatrix}$ ;

We get the pseudo-boolean function:  $b(z) = 10(1 - z_1) + 10(1 - z_2) + 10(1 - z_3) + (5z_1 + 5z_1z_2) + (3z_2 + 17z_1z_2) + (7z_2 + 3z_2z_3) = 15 + 5(1 - z_1) + 0(1 - z_2) + 10(1 - z_3) + 22z_1z_2 + 3z_2z_3.$

# Correspondence “many to one”

**Theorem.** The minimization problem for the pseudo-boolean function  $b(z)$  for  $z \neq (1, \dots, 1)$  and the SPLP are equivalent. For optimal solutions  $z^*, P^*$  of these problems we have

$$F(P^*) = b(z^*) \text{ and } z_i^* = 0 \Leftrightarrow i \in P^* \text{ for all } i \in I.$$

**Example.** Optimal solutions for these instances are the same or not?

$$f = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 0 \\ 10 \end{pmatrix} c_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 22 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } f = \begin{pmatrix} 5 \\ 2 \\ 10 \end{pmatrix} c_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 23 \end{pmatrix}$$

# Reduction of the set $J$

**Theorem.** For the minimization problem of the pseudo-boolean function  $b(z)$  with positive coefficients in the nonlinear terms, the equivalent instance of the SPLP with minimal number of customers can be found in polynomial time from  $n$  and  $m$ .

**Sketch of proof.** Consider a pseudo-boolean function  $b(z)$  define by

$$b(z) = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i (1 - z_i) + \sum_{l \in L} \beta_l \prod_{i \in I_l} z_i,$$

where  $\beta_l > 0$  and  $I_l \subset I$  for all  $l \in L$ .

The family of subset  $\{I_l\}_{l \in L}$  of the set  $I$  with order relation  $I_{l'} < I_{l''} \Leftrightarrow I_{l'} \subset I_{l''}$  forms a partially ordered set (poset). An arbitrary sequence of subsets  $I_{l_1} < \dots < I_{l_k}$  is called a chain. An arbitrary partition of the family  $\{I_l\}_{l \in L}$  into nonoverlapping chains induces a matrix  $(c_{ij})$  for the UFLP. Each element of the partition corresponds a user. The requirement to find an instance of UFLP with a minimal number of users is equivalent to finding a partition of the poset into the minimal number of nonoverlapping chains. This is a well-known problem which can be solved in polynomial time. ■

## Example:

Function  $b(z) = z_1z_2 + z_1z_3 + z_1z_4 + z_1z_5 + z_3z_4 + z_3z_5 + z_4z_5 + z_1z_2z_3 + z_1z_3z_4 + z_1z_4z_5 + z_1z_2z_3z_4 + z_2z_3z_4z_5 + z_1z_3z_4z_5 - 10z_1 - 10z_2 - 5z_3 - 5z_4 - 6z_5$ .

Generate an equivalent SPLP instance:  $I = \{1, \dots, 5\}$ ,  $J = \{1, \dots, ?\}$ .

*What can we say about the integrality gap for the minimization problem for the pseudo-boolean function?*

# Paradox

Integrality gap for the SPLP can be arbitrary close to 1 (see lecture 1) but for the minimization problem  $b(z)$  **the gap equals 0**.

**Theorem.** The set of optimal solutions of the minimization problem for arbitrary pseudo-boolean function with continuous variables contains a pure integer solution.

**Proof.** For boolean variable  $z$ , we have  $z = z^2$  ( $0 = 0^2, 1 = 1^2$ ). So, we may assume that pseudo-boolean function has not  $z^2, z^3, \dots$ . All nonlinear terms are product of different variables.

Let  $z^*$  be the optimal solution for  $b(z)$  and assume that  $z_1^* \neq 0 \vee 1$ . We can rewrite  $b(z)$ :

$$b(z) = b_1(z_2, \dots, z_m) + z_1 b_2(z_2, \dots, z_m).$$

If  $b_2(z_2^*, \dots, z_m^*)$  is positive, then we can improve our optimal solution by decreasing  $z_1^*$  to 0. If it is negative, we put  $z_1^* = 1$ . Hence,  $b_2(z_2^*, \dots, z_m^*) = 0$

and we can put  $z_1^* = 1 \vee 0$ . ■ *Can it helps us to solve the problem?*

# Boolean linear and nonlinear optimization

Boolean linear problem:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{(BL):} \\ \min cx \\ Ax \geq b; \\ x \in B^n. \end{array}$$

It is NP-hard problem (SPLP).

Note that  $y \in \{0,1\} \Leftrightarrow y(1 - y) = 0$ .

Hence, the BL is equivalent to

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{(NLP):} \\ \min cx \\ Ax \geq b; \\ x_i(1 - x_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \\ x \in R^n. \end{array}$$



## Hometask 1

In the SPLP we have  $I = J = \{\text{Altus, Ardmore, Bartlesville, Duncan, Edmond, Enid}\}$ ,

$$n = m = 6$$

$$c_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 169 & 291 & 88 & 153 & 208 \\ 169 & 0 & 248 & 75 & 112 & 199 \\ 291 & 248 & 0 & 231 & 146 & 132 \\ 88 & 75 & 231 & 0 & 93 & 137 \\ 153 & 112 & 146 & 93 & 0 & 88 \\ 208 & 199 & 132 & 137 & 88 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad f_i = \begin{pmatrix} 150 \\ 150 \\ 150 \\ 100 \\ 100 \\ 100 \end{pmatrix}$$

Find the equivalent minimization problem for a pseudo-boolean function.

## Hometask 2

For the following instance of the set covering problem:  $I = \{1, \dots, 5\}$ ,  $J = \{1, \dots, 4\}$ ,  $f_i = 1$  for  $i \in I$ , and

$$a_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

find the equivalent minimization problem for a pseudo-boolean function.

# Questions

1. Suppose that we have an algorithm for the set covering problem. Can we solve the  $p$ -center problem using this algorithm?
2. The set covering problem is NP-hard in the strong sense. If the previous reduction is correct, can we claim that the  $p$ -center problem is NP-hard in the strong sense?
3. The minimization problem for arbitrary pseudo-boolean function is NP-hard in the strong sense or not?