Disclaimer: These notes have not been subjected to the usual scrutiny reserved for formal publications.

28.1 Speeding-up Technique 2: Column Generation

Suppose we have an IP of the following form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\max & \quad c^1 x^1 + c^2 x^2 + \cdots + c^k x^k \\
A^1 x^1 + A^2 x^2 + \cdots + A^k x^k & = b \\
D^1 x^1 & \leq d_1 \\
D^2 x^2 & \leq d_2 \\
\vdots & \\
D^k x^k & \leq d_k \\
x^1 \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+ \ldots, x^k \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+ 
\end{align*}
\]

We notice that constraints (1), ..., (k) are over disjoint sets of variables. Let

\[
S_j := \{ x^j \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_j}_+: D^j x^j \leq d_j \}.
\]

Then \( S^i \) and \( S^j \) are independent for distinct \( i, j \in [k] \). Only the joint constraint \( \sum_{j=1}^k A^j x^j = b \) links the disjoint set of variables. Recall that we have already seen two approaches to benefit from such structures.

1. Cut generation: Generate valid inequalities for each subset \( S^j \) and use disjunctive cuts.

2. Lagrangian Relaxation: Dualize the joint constraint.

Let us see another way to exploit such structures. Our IP can be restated in the following convenient form:

\[
z = \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k c^i x^i : \sum_{i=1}^k A^i x^i = b, x^i \in S^i \forall i \in [k] \right\}
\]

For simplicity, suppose that \( S^i \) is bounded for every \( i \in [k] \). So, \( S^i = \{ x^{i,1}, \ldots, x^{i,T_i} \} \). It implies that

\[
S^i = \left\{ x^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} : x^i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \lambda_{i,t} x^{i,t}, \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \lambda_{i,t} = 1, \lambda_{i,t} \in \{0,1\} \forall t \in [T_i] \right\}
\]
Substituting (28.2) back into IP (28.1), we get the IP master problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{z}_{\text{IP-Master}} &= \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} (c^i \cdot x^{i,t}) \lambda_{i,t} : \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} (A^i \cdot x^{i,t}) \lambda_{i,t} = b, \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \lambda_{i,t} = 1 \forall i \in [k], \lambda_{i,t} \in \{0,1\} \forall t \in [T_i], \forall i \in [k] \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Problem (28.3) is a reformulation of IP (28.1) with \( \lambda_{i,t} \) as variables. We observe the following about the reformulation:

- **Cons:** The number of variables could be very large.
- **Pro:** LP-relaxation may be solvable faster which may lead to faster bounds for the IP.

LPs of the form obtained by relaxation the IP master problem are best solved by the primal simplex method. Primal simplex only needs the basis to be stored. So, we can run the primal simplex by *generating columns* only if needed. We now discuss the strength of the LP-relaxation of the IP master problem.

**Theorem 1.** [Strength of Master LP] Let \( z_{LPM} \) be the optimum value of LP-relaxation of the IP master problem. Then,

\[
\begin{align*}
z_{LPM} &= \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} c^i x^i : \sum_{i=1}^{k} A^i x^i = b, x^i \in \text{convex-hull}(S^i) \forall i \in [k] \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** Master LP is obtained by substituting

\[
x^i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \lambda_{i,t} x^{i,t}, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \lambda_{i,t} = 1, \quad \lambda_{i,t} \geq 0 \forall t \in [T_i]
\]

which is equivalent to substituting \( x^i \in \text{convex-hull}(S^i) \).

Note that the form of the RHS in Theorem 1 resembles the form of the result that we showed for the strength of the Lagrangian Dual. We make this connection explicit now. The Lagrangian Dual obtained by dualizing the linking constraints is

\[
w_{LD} = \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} z(u)
\]

where

\[
z(u) = \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} c^i x^i + u^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} A^i x^i - b \right) : x^i \in S^i \forall i \in [k] \right\} = u^T b + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \max \left\{ (c^i - A^i u) x^i : x^i \in S^i \right\}.
\]

Note that calculating \( z(u) \) breaks into \( k \) subproblems. From the result on Lagrangian Dual, we know, \( w_{LD} \) is the RHS of Theorem 1. So, we have the following corollary:

**Corollary 1.1.** \( z_{LPM} = w_{LD} \).
28.2 Speeding up Technique 3: Better Cuts

Criteria for cuts in the cutting plane algorithm:

1. Cut deep: Cut as much of the polyhedron as possible.
2. Cut fast: Cut generation should be efficient.

**Definition 2** (Comparing cuts). Let $c^T x \leq \delta, w^T x \leq d$ be two valid inequalities for $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n_+$. $c^T x \leq \delta$ dominates $w^T x \leq d$ if there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $c \geq \lambda w, \delta \leq \lambda d$ and $(c, \delta) \neq (\lambda w, \lambda d)$.

**Observation.** If $c^T x \leq \delta$ dominates $w^T x \leq d$ then

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+: c^T x \leq \delta\} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+: w^T x \leq d\}.$$ 

28.2.1 Application: 0-1 knapsack

We will see how to generate better cuts for the knapsack IP. The knapsack IP is a quintessential BIP. So, solving and speeding-up techniques for the knapsack IP have been well-studied. The knapsack IP is of the following form: $\text{max} \{c^T x : \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \leq b, x \in \{0,1\}^N\}$. Let

$$P(N,a,b) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \leq b, 0 \leq x_j \leq 1 \forall j \in N \right\}$$

and

$$P_I(N,a,b) := \text{convex-hull} \left\{ x \in \{0,1\}^N : \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \leq b \right\}.$$

We will call the constraint $\sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \leq b$ as the **knapsack constraint**. Note that knapsack constraint occurs as a constraint in larger IPs. For this reason, it is important to know how to generate valid inequalities for $P_I(N,a,b)$.

We will assume that $0 \leq a_j \leq b$ for all $j \in b$. This assumption is without loss of generality for the following reasons.

- If $a_j > b$, then set $x_j = 0$ and remove such variables.
- If $a_j < 0$, there replace $x_j$ by $1 - x_j$ and satisfy the assumption.

With this assumption, our ideal goal is to obtain facet-defining inequalities for $P_I(N,a,b)$. We will consider the following running example:

$$P := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 11x_1 + 6x_2 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19, 0 \leq x_i \leq 1 \forall x \in [7] \}$$

**Observation.** The inequality $x_1 + x_2 + x_6 \leq 2$ is valid for $P_I$ (because $11 + 6 + 4 = 21 > 19$ and hence we cannot pick all three of $\{1,2,6\}$).

This observation is generalized by the notion of covers.
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Definition 3. A set $C \subseteq N$ is a cover if $\sum_{j \in C} a_j > b$.

Example: The sets $C_1, C_2, C_3$ below are covers. The covers immediately lead to valid inequalities for $P_I$ as shown below.

\[
C_1 = \{1, 2, 6\} \quad \text{implies} \quad x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3 \text{ is valid for } P_I.
\]
\[
C_2 = \{3, 4, 5, 6\} \quad \text{implies} \quad x_1 + x_2 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3 \text{ is valid for } P_I.
\]
\[
C_3 = \{1, 2, 5, 6\} \quad \text{implies} \quad x_1 + x_2 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3 \text{ is valid for } P_I.
\] (28.5)

Theorem 4. Let $C \subseteq N$ be a cover. Then $\sum_{j \in C} x_j \leq |C| - 1$ is valid for $P_I(N, a, b)$ and is known as a cover inequality.

Next, we see a simple way to strengthen the cover inequality:

Example: We have seen that $C = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ is a cover, therefore, $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$ is valid for $P_I$. However, observe that

\[
x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3
\] (28.6)

is also valid for $P_I$. This is because the coefficients of $x_1$ and $x_2$ are at least as large as the coefficient of $x_3$ in the knapsack constraint. This leads to the following definition of an extended cover:

Definition 5. Let $C$ be a cover. The extended cover of $C$ is

\[
E(C) := C \cup \{j \in N : a_j \geq a_i \forall i \in C\}.
\]

Theorem 6. The extended cover inequality $\sum_{j \in E(C)} x_j \leq |C| - 1$ is valid for $P_I(N, a, b)$.

Note that the family of extended cover inequalities dominates the family of cover inequalities.

Can we strengthen cover inequalities further?

Example: The inequality $2x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$ is valid for $P_I$ and it dominates the extended cover inequality $\boxed{28.6}$.

Proof. We ignore $x_2$ and explain why the choice of 2 as the coefficient of $x_1$ in the above inequality gives a valid inequality for $P_I$.

The inequality $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$ is valid for $\{x \in \{0,1\}^4 : 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19\}$. We would like to determine $\alpha_1$ such that

\[
\alpha_1 x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3
\] (28.7)

is valid for $\{x \in \{0,1\}^5 : 11x_1 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19\}$.

- If $x_1 = 0$, then $\boxed{28.7}$ is valid for $\{x \in \{0,1\}^5 : 11x_1 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19\}$ for all $\alpha$.
- If $x_1 = 1$, then $\boxed{28.7}$ is valid for $\{x \in \{0,1\}^5 : 11x_1 + 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 19\}$ iff $\alpha_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 \leq 3$ is valid for

\[
\{x \in \{0,1\}^4 : 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 8\}
\]

iff $\alpha_1 \leq 3 - z$ where

\[
z = \max \{x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 : 6x_3 + 5x_4 + 5x_5 + 4x_6 + x_7 \leq 8, x \in \{0,1\}^4\}.
\]
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We note that the last problem \( z \) above is in fact a knapsack problem again. The solution \((0, 0, 0, 1)\) is a feasible solution for this new knapsack problem so \( z \geq 1 \). Also, no two items can fit in the knapsack so \( z \leq 1 \). Therefore, the optimum value is \( z = 1 \) and hence \( \alpha_1 \leq 2 \). Taking \( \alpha_1 = 2 \) gives the strongest inequality.

The above technique is called \textit{lifting}. We lifted an inequality with few variables into an inequality with larger number of variables. Such lifting is possible by understanding local structures in the IP. More generally, we can lift a cover inequality into all variables. For this, we would like to find best possible values \( \alpha_j \) for all \( j \in N \setminus C \) such that \( \sum_{j \in N \setminus C} \alpha_j x_j + \sum_{j \in C} x_j \leq |C| - 1 \) is valid for \( P_I(N, a, b) \). Generalizing the above proof technique, we obtain the following lifting algorithm:

\begin{algorithm}
\begin{algorithmic}[1]
\State find an ordering \( j_1, \ldots, j_r \) of \( j \in N \setminus C \);
\For {\( t = 1, \ldots, r \)}
\State solve \( z = \max \{ \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_j x_j + \sum_{j \in C} x_j : \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} a_j x_j + \sum_{j \in C} a_j x_j \leq b - a_j \} \);
\State set \( \alpha_{j_t} = |C| - 1 - z \);
\EndFor
\end{algorithmic}
\end{algorithm}

In Algorithm 1, at each round \( t \), we suppose \( \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_j x_j + \sum_{j \in C} x_j \leq |C| - 1 \) has been obtained so far. Then, to find \( \alpha_{j_t} \) such that \( \alpha_j x_{j_t} + \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_j x_j + \sum_{j \in C} x_j \leq |C| - 1 \) is valid for \( P_I(N, a, b) \), we solve a knapsack problem. Note that the algorithm is sensitive to the ordering of processing the variables.

The lifting technique is applicable in more general settings and at times leads to facet-defining inequalities. We describe a case under which it leads to facet-defining inequalities for \( P_I(N, a, b) \).

\textbf{Definition 7.} A cover \( C \) is \textit{minimal} if \( C \setminus \{j\} \) is not a cover for all \( j \in C \).

\textbf{Theorem 8.} Let \( C \) be a minimal cover for \( P_I(N, a, b) \). Then Algorithm 1 gives a facet-defining inequality for \( P_I \).

How fast can we generate a violated cover inequality?

- Separation problem for the family of cover inequalities requires solving a knapsack type problem on fewer variables. This is typically solved using DP or heuristics.
- Separation problem for the family of extended cover inequalities requires solving a sequence of knapsack type problems. Again, this is done using DP or heuristics.