

HOMEWORK 2

Due: Thursday, September 29

Ground rules: *same as for Homework 1.*

1. Unemployment. Consider the *assignment problem* studied in class; i.e., Maximum-Weight Perfect Matching in a bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$.

- Suppose now that there are more people than jobs; i.e., $|U| > |V|$. We still want every job done, but some people will not be assigned any job. Formulate the appropriate integer program and LP relaxation.
- Show that the integrality theorem from class still holds: if the LP relaxation is feasible, then every extreme point is integral.

2. George & Leslie's Theorem. Recall the LP relaxation for Minimum Vertex-Cover:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{v \in V} c_v x_v \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & 0 \leq x_v \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } v \in V, \\ & x_u + x_v \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } (u, v) \in E. \end{aligned}$$

- Let \tilde{x} be any feasible solution for the LP. Define another solution x^+ by

$$x_v^+ = \begin{cases} \tilde{x}_v + \epsilon & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \tilde{x}_v < 1, \\ \tilde{x}_v - \epsilon & \text{if } 0 < \tilde{x}_v < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \tilde{x}_v & \text{if } \tilde{x}_v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Similarly define the solution x^- , replacing ϵ with $-\epsilon$. Prove that one can find $\epsilon > 0$ such that both x^+ and x^- are feasible for the LP. (Hint: there are at least four cases.)

- Show that every extreme point x^* of the LP is *half-integral*, i.e. $x_v^* \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ for all $v \in V$.

3. Reductio ad solutionem de feasibility. Consider the computational problem of solving a general LP $\min\{c^T x \mid Ax \geq b\}$; we'll call it SOLVE-LP. It takes as input the $m \times n$ matrix A , the vectors $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The desired output is:

- **Infeasible** if the LP is infeasible,
- **Unbounded** if the optimal value is $-\infty$,
- or a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which is an optimal feasible solution to the LP.

Give a reduction from SOLVE-LP to the decision version of polyhedron feasibility defined in Hwk1(#1). As always, your reduction should run in time polynomial in the input length. (Hint: recall Hwk1(#4) and the discussion about binary search in class.)

4. A Farkas Lemma.

- (a) Show the execution of our LP-feasibility-testing algorithm (“Simplex with the b -rule”) on the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} -x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3 &\leq 3 \\ 3x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3 &\leq -17 \\ -x_1 - 6x_2 - 23x_3 &\leq 16 \\ x &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This system is infeasible, so execution should end with an “offending equation” (i.e., a basic variable equated to a negative constant plus a nonpositive linear combination of nonbasic variables).

- (b) Rearrange the offending equation so that the slack variables are on the LHS (with nonnegative coefficients), a negative constant is on the RHS, and the original variables are on the RHS (with nonpositive coefficients). Write out all six coefficients explicitly (even if some are 0 or 1).
- (c) This offending equation is a unique linear combination of the equations in the initial tableau. Which linear combination? Why must it be unique?
- (d) Take the same linear combination of the original *inequalities*. Why is the resulting inequality obviously incompatible with the constraint $x \geq 0$?
- (e) Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Show that exactly one of the following is true:

- $\exists x \geq 0$ s.t. $Ax \leq b$
- $\exists y \geq 0$ s.t. $y^\top A \geq 0$, $y^\top b < 0$.

5. Max-Sat. A *Sat instance* over Boolean variables u_1, \dots, u_n consists of a list of m *clauses*, each of which is a *disjunction* (OR) of *literals* (a variable u_i or its negation \bar{u}_i). Let Opt denote the maximal number of clauses that can be satisfied by a Boolean assignment to the variables. The *Sat problem* is to determine whether or not $\text{Opt} = m$. The *Max-Sat problem* is to find an assignment satisfying Opt clauses. We remark that both tasks are NP-hard.

- (a) Formulate an integer program (IP) capturing Max-Sat. There should be a 0-1 IP-variable for each Sat-variable, as well as a 0-1 IP-variable representing the “truth value” of each clause.
- (b) Suppose you relax your IP to an LP. Find an instance of Max-Sat with 4 clauses for which $\text{Opt} = 3$ but $\text{LPOpt} = 4$.
- (c) A *Horn-Sat instance* is a special kind of Sat instance in which each clause has at most one positive (i.e., unnegated) literal. The Sat problem restricted to Horn-Sat instances is in P (you might like to convince yourself of that), though the Max-Sat problem remains NP-hard. Show that your LP relaxation solves the Sat problem for Horn-Sat instances, in the sense that $\text{LPOpt} = m$ if and only if $\text{Opt} = m$.