

5.3 Strong Duality

$$P = \max\{c^T x \mid Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\}$$


n_A : number of variables, m_A : number of constraints

We can put the non-negativity constraints into A (which gives us unrestricted variables): $\bar{P} = \max\{c^T x \mid \bar{A}x \leq \bar{b}\}$

$$n_{\bar{A}} = n_A, m_{\bar{A}} = m_A + n_A$$

Dual $D = \min\{\bar{b}^T y \mid \bar{A}^T y = c, y \geq 0\}$.

5.3 Strong Duality



If we have a conic combination y of c then $b^T y$ is an upper bound of the profit we can obtain (**weak duality**):

$$c^T x = (\bar{A}^T y)^T x = y^T \bar{A} x \leq y^T \bar{b}$$

If x and y are optimal then the **duality gap** is 0 (**strong duality**). This means

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= c^T x - y^T \bar{b} \\ &= (\bar{A}^T y)^T x - y^T \bar{b} \\ &= y^T (\bar{A} x - \bar{b}) \end{aligned}$$

The last term can only be 0 if y_i is 0 whenever the i -th constraint is not tight. This means we have a conic combination of c by normals (columns of \bar{A}^T) of *tight* constraints.

Conversely, if we have x such that the normals of tight constraint (at x) give rise to a conic combination of c , we know that x is optimal.

The profit vector c lies in the cone generated by the normals for the hops and the corn constraint (the tight constraints).

Strong Duality

Theorem 33 (Strong Duality)

Let P and D be a primal dual pair of linear programs, and let z^* and w^* denote the optimal solution to P and D , respectively.

Then

$$z^* = w^*$$


Lemma 34 (Weierstrass)

Let X be a compact set and let $f(x)$ be a continuous function on X . Then $\min\{f(x) : x \in X\}$ exists.

(without proof)


Lemma 35 (Projection Lemma)

Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a non-empty convex set, and let $y \notin X$. Then there exist $x^* \in X$ with minimum distance from y . Moreover for all $x \in X$ we have $(y - x^*)^T (x - x^*) \leq 0$.




Proof of the Projection Lemma

- ▶ Define $f(x) = \|y - x\|$.
- ▶ We want to apply Weierstrass but X may not be bounded.
- ▶ $X \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $x' \in X$.
- ▶ Define $X' = \{x \in X \mid \|y - x\| \leq \|y - x'\|\}$. This set is closed and bounded.
- ▶ Applying Weierstrass gives the existence.




Proof of the Projection Lemma

- ▶ Define $f(x) = \|y - x\|$.
- ▶ We want to apply Weierstrass but X may not be bounded.
- ▶ $X \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $x' \in X$.
- ▶ Define $X' = \{x \in X \mid \|y - x\| \leq \|y - x'\|\}$. This set is closed and bounded.
- ▶ Applying Weierstrass gives the existence.




Proof of the Projection Lemma

- ▶ Define $f(x) = \|y - x\|$.
- ▶ We want to apply Weierstrass but X may not be bounded.
- ▶ $X \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $x' \in X$.
- ▶ Define $X' = \{x \in X \mid \|y - x\| \leq \|y - x'\|\}$. This set is closed and bounded.
- ▶ Applying Weierstrass gives the existence.




Proof of the Projection Lemma

- ▶ Define $f(x) = \|y - x\|$.
- ▶ We want to apply Weierstrass but X may not be bounded.
- ▶ $X \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $x' \in X$.
- ▶ Define $X' = \{x \in X \mid \|y - x\| \leq \|y - x'\|\}$. This set is closed and bounded.
- ▶ Applying Weierstrass gives the existence.



Proof of the Projection Lemma

- ▶ Define $f(x) = \|y - x\|$.
- ▶ We want to apply Weierstrass but X may not be bounded.
- ▶ $X \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $x' \in X$.
- ▶ Define $X' = \{x \in X \mid \|y - x\| \leq \|y - x'\|\}$. This set is closed and bounded.
- ▶ Applying Weierstrass gives the existence.



Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

$$\|y - x^*\|^2$$

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

$$\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x^* - \epsilon(x - x^*)\|^2$$

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\|y - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|y - x^* - \epsilon(x - x^*)\|^2 \\ &= \|y - x^*\|^2 + \epsilon^2 \|x - x^*\|^2 - 2\epsilon(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*)\end{aligned}$$

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\|y - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|y - x^* - \epsilon(x - x^*)\|^2 \\ &= \|y - x^*\|^2 + \epsilon^2 \|x - x^*\|^2 - 2\epsilon(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*)\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \|x - x^*\|^2$.

Proof of the Projection Lemma (continued)

x^* is minimum. Hence $\|y - x^*\|^2 \leq \|y - x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.

By **convexity**: $x \in X$ then $x^* + \epsilon(x - x^*) \in X$ for all $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\|y - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|y - x^* - \epsilon(x - x^*)\|^2 \\ &= \|y - x^*\|^2 + \epsilon^2 \|x - x^*\|^2 - 2\epsilon(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*)\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon \|x - x^*\|^2$.


Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives the result.

Theorem 36 (Separating Hyperplane)

Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a non-empty closed convex set, and let $y \notin X$. Then there exists a *separating hyperplane* $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : a^T x = \alpha\}$ where $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ that *separates* y from X . ($a^T y < \alpha$; $a^T x \geq \alpha$ for all $x \in X$)


Proof of the Hyperplane Lemma

- ▶ Let $x^* \in X$ be closest point to y in X .
- ▶ By previous lemma $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
- ▶ Choose $a = (x^* - y)$ and $\alpha = a^T x^*$.
- ▶ For $x \in X$: $a^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$, and, hence, $a^T x \geq \alpha$.
- ▶ Also, $a^T y = a^T(x^* - a) = \alpha - \|a\|^2 < \alpha$




Proof of the Hyperplane Lemma

- ▶ Let $x^* \in X$ be closest point to y in X .
- ▶ By previous lemma $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
- ▶ Choose $a = (x^* - y)$ and $\alpha = a^T x^*$.
- ▶ For $x \in X$: $a^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$, and, hence, $a^T x \geq \alpha$.
- ▶ Also, $a^T y = a^T(x^* - a) = \alpha - \|a\|^2 < \alpha$




Proof of the Hyperplane Lemma

- ▶ Let $x^* \in X$ be closest point to y in X .
- ▶ By previous lemma $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
- ▶ Choose $a = (x^* - y)$ and $\alpha = a^T x^*$.
- ▶ For $x \in X$: $a^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$, and, hence, $a^T x \geq \alpha$.
- ▶ Also, $a^T y = a^T(x^* - a) = \alpha - \|a\|^2 < \alpha$




Proof of the Hyperplane Lemma

- ▶ Let $x^* \in X$ be closest point to y in X .
- ▶ By previous lemma $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
- ▶ Choose $a = (x^* - y)$ and $\alpha = a^T x^*$.
- ▶ For $x \in X$: $a^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$, and, hence, $a^T x \geq \alpha$.
- ▶ Also, $a^T y = a^T(x^* - a) = \alpha - \|a\|^2 < \alpha$



Proof of the Hyperplane Lemma

- ▶ Let $x^* \in X$ be closest point to y in X .
- ▶ By previous lemma $(y - x^*)^T(x - x^*) \leq 0$ for all $x \in X$.
- ▶ Choose $a = (x^* - y)$ and $\alpha = a^T x^*$.
- ▶ For $x \in X$: $a^T(x - x^*) \geq 0$, and, hence, $a^T x \geq \alpha$.
- ▶ Also, $a^T y = a^T(x^* - a) = \alpha - \|a\|^2 < \alpha$



Lemma 37 (Farkas Lemma)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then *exactly one* of the following statements holds.

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$

Assume \hat{x} satisfies 1. and \hat{y} satisfies 2. Then

$$0 > \hat{y}^T b = \hat{y}^T A \hat{x} \geq 0$$

Hence, at most one of the statements can hold.

Lemma 37 (Farkas Lemma)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then *exactly one* of the following statements holds.

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$

Assume \hat{x} satisfies 1. and \hat{y} satisfies 2. Then

$$0 > \hat{y}^T b = \hat{y}^T A \hat{x} \geq 0$$

Hence, at most one of the statements can hold.

Lemma 37 (Farkas Lemma)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then *exactly one* of the following statements holds.


1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$

Assume \hat{x} satisfies 1. and \hat{y} satisfies 2. Then

$$0 > \hat{y}^T b = \hat{y}^T A \hat{x} \geq 0$$

Hence, at most one of the statements can hold.

Farkas Lemma



If b is not in the cone generated by the columns of A , there exists a hyperplane y that separates b from the cone.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Proof of Farkas Lemma

Now, assume that 1. does not hold.

Consider $S = \{Ax : x \geq 0\}$ so that S closed, convex, $b \notin S$.

We want to show that there is y with $A^T y \geq 0$, $b^T y < 0$.

Let y be a hyperplane that separates b from S . Hence, $y^T b < \alpha$ and $y^T s \geq \alpha$ for all $s \in S$.

$$0 \in S \Rightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \Rightarrow y^T b < 0$$

$y^T Ax \geq \alpha$ for all $x \geq 0$. Hence, $y^T A \geq 0$ as we can choose x arbitrarily large.

Lemma 38 (Farkas Lemma; different version)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then exactly one of the following statements holds.

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax \leq b, x \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $A^T y \geq 0, b^T y < 0, y \geq 0$

Rewrite the conditions:

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\begin{bmatrix} A & I \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x \\ s \end{bmatrix} = b, x \geq 0, s \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\begin{bmatrix} A^T \\ I \end{bmatrix} y \geq 0, b^T y < 0$

Lemma 38 (Farkas Lemma; different version)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then exactly one of the following statements holds.

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax \leq b, x \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $A^T y \geq 0, b^T y < 0, y \geq 0$

Rewrite the conditions:

1. $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\begin{bmatrix} A & I \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x \\ s \end{bmatrix} = b, x \geq 0, s \geq 0$
2. $\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\begin{bmatrix} A^T \\ I \end{bmatrix} y \geq 0, b^T y < 0$

Proof of Strong Duality

$$P: z = \max\{c^T x \mid Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\}$$

$$D: w = \min\{b^T y \mid A^T y \geq c, y \geq 0\}$$

Theorem 39 (Strong Duality)

Let P and D be a primal dual pair of linear programs, and let z and w denote the optimal solution to P and D , respectively (i.e., P and D are non-empty). Then

$$z = w .$$

Proof of Strong Duality

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

$z \geq w$:

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

$z \geq w$:

We show $z < \alpha$ implies $w < \alpha$.

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

$z \geq w$:

We show $z < \alpha$ implies $w < \alpha$.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n & \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax \leq b \\ & -c^T x \leq -\alpha \\ & x \geq 0 \end{array}$$

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

$z \geq w$:

We show $z < \alpha$ implies $w < \alpha$.

$$\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t.} \quad Ax &\leq b \\ -c^T x &\leq -\alpha \\ x &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m; v \in \mathbb{R}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t.} \quad A^T y - cv &\geq 0 \\ b^T y - \alpha v &< 0 \\ y, v &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Strong Duality

$z \leq w$: follows from weak duality

$z \geq w$:

We show $z < \alpha$ implies $w < \alpha$.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n & \\ \text{s.t.} & Ax \leq b \\ & -c^T x \leq -\alpha \\ & x \geq 0 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m; v \in \mathbb{R} & \\ \text{s.t.} & A^T y - cv \geq 0 \\ & b^T y - \alpha v < 0 \\ & y, v \geq 0 \end{array}$$

From the definition of α we know that the first system is infeasible; hence the second must be feasible.

Proof of Strong Duality

$$\begin{aligned} \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m; v \in \mathbb{R} \\ \text{s.t. } \quad A^T y - cv &\geq 0 \\ \quad \quad b^T y - \alpha v &< 0 \\ \quad \quad \quad y, v &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Strong Duality

$$\begin{array}{ll} \exists \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m; \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R} & \\ \text{s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} - c\mathbf{v} \geq 0 & \\ \quad b^T \mathbf{y} - \alpha \mathbf{v} < 0 & \\ \quad \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} \geq 0 & \end{array}$$

If the solution \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} has $\mathbf{v} = 0$ we have that

$$\begin{array}{ll} \exists \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m & \\ \text{s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} \geq 0 & \\ \quad b^T \mathbf{y} < 0 & \\ \quad \mathbf{y} \geq 0 & \end{array}$$

is feasible.

Proof of Strong Duality

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m; \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R} \\ \text{s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} - c\mathbf{v} &\geq 0 \\ b^T \mathbf{y} - \alpha\mathbf{v} &< 0 \\ \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

If the solution \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v} has $\mathbf{v} = 0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m \\ \text{s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} &\geq 0 \\ b^T \mathbf{y} &< 0 \\ \mathbf{y} &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

is feasible. By Farkas lemma this gives that LP P is infeasible. Contradiction to the assumption of the lemma.

Proof of Strong Duality

Hence, there exists a solution y, v with $v > 0$.

We can rescale this solution (scaling both y and v) s.t. $v = 1$.

Then y is feasible for the dual but $b^T y < \alpha$. This means that $w < \alpha$.

Proof of Strong Duality

Hence, there exists a solution y, v with $v > 0$.

We can rescale this solution (scaling both y and v) s.t. $v = 1$.

Then y is feasible for the dual but $b^T y < \alpha$. This means that $w < \alpha$.

Proof of Strong Duality

Hence, there exists a solution y, v with $v > 0$.

We can rescale this solution (scaling both y and v) s.t. $v = 1$.

Then y is feasible for the dual but $b^T y < \alpha$. This means that $w < \alpha$.

Proof of Strong Duality

Hence, there exists a solution y, v with $v > 0$.

We can rescale this solution (scaling both y and v) s.t. $v = 1$.

Then y is feasible for the dual but $b^T y < \alpha$. This means that $w < \alpha$.

Fundamental Questions

Definition 40 (Linear Programming Problem (LP))

Let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Does there exist $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ s.t. $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$, $c^T x \geq \alpha$?

Questions:

- ▶ Is LP in NP?
- ▶ Is LP in co-NP? yes!
- ▶ Is LP in P?

Proof:

Fundamental Questions

Definition 40 (Linear Programming Problem (LP))

Let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Does there exist $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ s.t. $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$, $c^T x \geq \alpha$?

Questions:

- ▶ Is LP in NP?
- ▶ Is LP in co-NP? yes!
- ▶ Is LP in P?

Proof:

- ▶ Given a primal maximization problem P and a parameter α . Suppose that $\alpha > \text{opt}(P)$.
- ▶ We can prove this by providing an optimal basis for the dual.
- ▶ A verifier can check that the associated dual solution fulfills all dual constraints and that it has dual cost $< \alpha$.

Fundamental Questions

Definition 40 (Linear Programming Problem (LP))

Let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Does there exist $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ s.t. $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$, $c^T x \geq \alpha$?

Questions:

- ▶ Is LP in NP?
- ▶ Is LP in co-NP? yes!
- ▶ Is LP in P?

Proof:

- ▶ Given a primal maximization problem P and a parameter α . Suppose that $\alpha > \text{opt}(P)$.
- ▶ We can prove this by providing an optimal basis for the dual.
- ▶ A verifier can check that the associated dual solution fulfills all dual constraints and that it has dual cost $< \alpha$.

Fundamental Questions

Definition 40 (Linear Programming Problem (LP))

Let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. Does there exist $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ s.t. $Ax = b$, $x \geq 0$, $c^T x \geq \alpha$?

Questions:

- ▶ Is LP in NP?
- ▶ Is LP in co-NP? yes!
- ▶ Is LP in P?

Proof:

- ▶ Given a primal maximization problem P and a parameter α . Suppose that $\alpha > \text{opt}(P)$.
- ▶ We can prove this by providing an optimal basis for the dual.
- ▶ A verifier can check that the associated dual solution fulfills all dual constraints and that it has dual cost $< \alpha$.