## LINEAR OPTIMIZATION

## LECTURE 11

25/05/2024 Lecture 11: Bland's rule In the last lecture, we have shown that when the simplex method terminatus, it does so with a correct answer. But: does Simplex terminate always? - No. We have seen an example previously where the pivoting did not change the birs. This happens when several bases correspond to a single bfs. This degenerate pivoling step may potentially lead to cycling. We will now see a pivoking rule that prevents cycling. Bland's rule: Assume variables are  $\Xi_{1}, \pi_{2}, \dots, \pi_{n}$  3 basic  $x_{k_1}$   $p_1 + q_{k_1} x_{k_1} + \dots + T_{cbl eau} B$   $Van \cdot x_{k_m}$   $p_m$  non - basis  $z = z_0 + x_1 x_{k_1} + \dots + T_{cbl eau} B$ , non-basic vars. N Choice of entring / If there are several possibilities choose the variable with the leaving variable smallest index

Example: Maximize 21 - 272 + 72 Subject to:  $\chi_1 + 2\eta_2 + \chi_3 \leq 12$  $2n_1 + n_2 - n_3 \leq 6$  $-\eta_1 + 3\eta_2 \leq 9$ x<sub>1</sub>, n<sub>2</sub>, n<sub>3</sub> ≥ 0 - Add slack variable ng, x5, n.  $\chi_4 = 12 - \chi_1 - 2\chi_2 - \chi_3$  $\eta_{5} = 6 - 2\eta_{1} - \eta_{2} + \eta_{3}$  $\pi_{1} = 9 + \pi_{1} - 3\pi_{2}$  $\chi = \chi_1 - 2\eta_2 + \eta_3$ x, 1 x, 1 x, 1  $\lambda_{4} = 9 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{5} - \frac{3}{2}\lambda_{2} - \frac{3}{2}\lambda_{3}$  $\begin{array}{rcl} n_{1} & = & 3 & -\frac{1}{2} n_{7} & -\frac{1}{2} n_{2} & +\frac{1}{2} n_{3} \\ n_{1_{0}} & = & \frac{12}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} n_{5} & -\frac{7}{2} n_{2} \end{array}$  $Z = 3 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3} - \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{3}$ ↓ 23 ↑ 24 ↓ -----



$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$$





Any other equation would look like this: In B,  $\chi = p_{\ell} + \dots + \beta \chi_{\nu_{1}} + \dots$ In br:  $\chi_{e} = p_{e} + \cdots + p(0 + \cdots - j\chi_{u_{1}} + \cdots - ) + \cdots$ When all variables in Nr are made 0, the quantity: 0 + ···· - jxu, + ···· remains 0, - ne has some value in Bz as well.

$$\frac{Claim 4:}{h_{k}} \text{ The this bits which is the some in all he tableaus of the cycle,} \\ Variable in F have value 0. \\ \mathcal{R}_{F} = 0 \\ F = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{1}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{2}}... \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{k}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{2}}... \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{k}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{2}}... \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{V}_{k}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{2}}... \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{k}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}, \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{k}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}} J = \frac{5}{2} \mathcal{R$$







Consider the foll auxiliary LP: maximize c<sup>T</sup>x subject to: Ar = b  $\chi_{N\setminus F} = 0$ xu ≤ o x<sub>F\v</sub>≥0 Claim: The aux. LP is bounded by Zo. Because: Cost = Zo + (- - - ) + (pos. coc)).) nu some fin. in terme of F13v3 where + ( befficients are -ive come fin. involving 2 2 2 5 In way feasible soln.  $\chi_{NJF}=0$ No <0 The cannot be increased above 0. 2 E 12 70 Increasing three variables only reduces the cost. Zo is obtained by setting NFINE=0, NV=0, NNF=0 - Optimum of aux 2P < Zo.

maximize CTX Now consider the subject to: Ar = b tableau B' from Where  $\lambda_{N\setminus F} = 0$ the variable no leave xv ≤ o the banis. <sup>A</sup>F\\* ≥0  $\varkappa_{\vee}$ າງ B' Claim: B' prover that the aux. LP is unbounded. i) <sup>a</sup> u c F \ {n 2. Increasing <sup>n</sup>u will increase Variables in F that are also in B, Ix upt for the. this is because the chose it to have the basis. Hence Bland's rule will imply that all variables of F have a mon-negative coefficient in the ny column of B'.



Contradiction: i) Pableau B proves that aux. LP. is bounded. ii) Tabican B' prover that aux. Lp. is unbounded. So ow arown prion that simplex dow not terminate is talse.