20. Logic constraints, integer variables

- If-then constraints
- Generalized assignment problems
- Logic constraints
- Modeling a restricted set of values
- Sudoku!

If-then constraints

A single simple trick (with suitable adjustments) can help us model a great variety of if-then constraints

The trick

- We'd like to model the constraint: if z = 0 then $a^T x \le b$.
- Let M be an upper bound for $a^{T}x b$.
- Write: $a^{\mathsf{T}}x b \leq Mz$
- If z = 0, then $a^Tx b \le 0$ as required. Otherwise, we get $a^Tx - b \le M$, which is always true.

If-then constraints

Slight change: if z = 1 then $a^{\mathsf{T}} x \leq b$

- Again, let M be an upper bound for $a^{\mathsf{T}}x b$
- Write: $a^Tx b \le M(1-z)$

Reversed inequality: if z = 0 then $a^{T}x \ge b$

- Write constraint as $-a^{T}x + b < 0$
- Let m be an upper bound on $-a^{T}x + b$
- Write: $-a^{\mathsf{T}}x + b \leq mz$. Same as: $a^{\mathsf{T}}x b \geq -mz$
- Note: -m is a *lower* bound on $a^{T}x b$.

If-then constraints

The converse: if $a^Tx \leq b$ then z = 1

- Equivalent to: if z = 0 then $a^{T}x > b$ (contrapositive).
- The strict inequality is not really enforceable. Instead, write: if z = 0 then $a^T x \ge b + \varepsilon$ where ε is small.
- Let m be a lower bound for $a^Tx b$ and we obtain the equivalent constraint: $a^Tx b \ge mz + \varepsilon(1 z)$
- If z = 0, we get $a^T x \ge b + \varepsilon$, as required. Otherwise, we get: $a^T x - b \ge m$, which is always true.
- **Note:** If a, x, b are integer-valued, we may set $\varepsilon = 1$.

If-then constraints (summary)

Logic statement	Constraint		
if $z = 0$ then $a^T x \leq b$	$a^{T}x - b \leq Mz$		
if $z = 0$ then $a^T x \ge b$	$a^{T}x - b \ge mz$		
if $z = 1$ then $a^T x \leq b$	$a^{T}x - b \leq M(1-z)$		
if $z = 1$ then $a^{T} x \geq b$	$a^{T}x - b \geq m(1-z)$		
if $a^{T}x \leq b$ then $z = 1$	$a^{T}x - b \geq mz + \varepsilon(1-z)$		
if $a^{T}x \geq b$ then $z = 1$	$a^{T}x - b \leq Mz - \varepsilon(1-z)$		
if $a^T x \leq b$ then $z = 0$	$a^{T}x - b \geq m(1-z) + \varepsilon z$		
if $a^{T}x \geq b$ then $z = 0$	$a^{T}x - b \leq M(1-z) - \varepsilon z$		

Where M and m are upper and lower bounds on $a^{T}x - b$.

Return to fixed costs and lower bounds

- Modeling a fixed cost: if x > 0 then z = 1.
 - Use the contrapositive: if z = 0 then $x \le 0$.
 - Apply the 1st rule on Slide 20-5.

- Modeling a lower bound: either x = 0 or $x \ge m$.
 - Equivalent to: if x > 0 then $x \ge m$.
 - Equivalent to the following two logical constraints: if x > 0 then z = 1, and if z = 1 then $x \ge m$.
 - ▶ The first one is a fixed cost (see above)
 - ▶ The second one is the 4th rule on Slide 20-5.

Generalized assignment problems (GAP)

- Set of machines: $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ that can perform jobs. (think of these as the facilities in the facility problem)
- Machine i has a fixed cost of h_i if we use it at all.
- Machine *i* has a capacity of *b_i* units of work (this is new!)
- Set of jobs: $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ that must be performed. (think of these as the customers in the facility problem)
- Job j requires a_{ij} units of work to be completed if it is completed on machine i.
- Job j will cost c_{ij} if it is completed on machine i.
- Each job must be assigned to exactly one machine.

GAP model

- $z_i = 1$ if machine *i* is used, and
- $x_{ij} = 1$ if job j is performed by machine i.
- **Note:** many choices possible for M_i and aggregations.

New constraints

Let's make GAP more interesting...

- **1.** If you use k or more machines, you must pay a penalty of λ .
- **2.** If you operate either machine 1 or machine 2, you may not operate both machines 3 and 4 at the same time.
- **3.** If you operate both machines 1 and 2, then machine 3 must be operated at 40% of its capacity.
- **4.** Each job $j \in \mathcal{N}$ has a duration d_j . Minimize the time we have to wait before all jobs are completed. (this is called the makespan).

GAP 1

If you use k or more machines, you must pay a penalty of λ .

Using k or more machines is equivalent to saying that

$$z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_m \geq k$$

- Let $\delta_1=1$ if we incur the penalty. We now have the if-then constraint: if $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{M}}z_i\geq k$ then $\delta_1=1$.
- Use the 6th rule on Slide 20-5 and obtain:

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{M}} z_i \leq m\delta_1 + (k-1)(1-\delta_1)$$

• add $\lambda \delta_1$ to the cost function.

GAP 2

If you operate either machine 1 or machine 2, you may not operate both machines 3 and 4 at the same time.

- Operating machine 1 or machine 2: $z_1 + z_2 \ge 1$.
- Not operating machines 3 and 4: $z_3 + z_4 \le 1$
- We must model $z_1 + z_2 \ge 1 \implies z_3 + z_4 \le 1$
 - Same trick as before: model this in two steps: $z_1 + z_2 \ge 1 \implies \delta_2 = 1$ and $\delta_2 = 1 \implies z_3 + z_4 \le 1$
 - First follows from 6th rule on Slide 20-5
 - Second follows from 3rd rule on Slide 20-5
- Result: $z_1 + z_2 \le 2\delta_2$ and $z_3 + z_4 + \delta_2 \le 2$.

GAP 2 (cont'd)

If you operate either machine 1 or machine 2, you may not operate both machines 3 and 4 at the same time.

We didn't do anything to ensure that when $z_i = 1$, the machines are actually operating! (we didn't explicitly disallow paying the fixed cost without using the machine).

- To force the converse as well, include the constraint: if $z_i=1$ then $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{N}} x_{ij}\geq 1$
- Use the 4th rule on Slide 20-5.
- Result: $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{ij} \ge z_i$ (for i = 1, 2, 3, 4)

GAP 3

If you operate both machines 1 and 2, then machine 3 must be operated at 40% of its capacity.

- Operate both machines 1 and 2: $z_1 + z_2 \ge 2$
- Capacity of machine 3 drops: b_3 becomes $0.4b_3$.
- Two parts to the implementation:
 - $z_1 + z_2 \ge 2 \implies \delta_3 = 1$. (6th rule on Slide 20-5)
 - $\delta_3=1\implies \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}}a_{3j}x_{3j}\leq 0.4b_3.$ (3rd rule on Slide 20-5)
- Equivalently, just replace b_3 by: $b_3(1-\delta_3)+0.4b_3\delta_3$.

GAP 4

Each job $j \in \mathcal{N}$ has a duration d_j . Minimize the time we have to wait before all jobs are completed. (the makespan)

- Machine i completes all its jobs in time: $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{ij} d_j$
- Minimax problem (no integer variables needed!)
- ullet Let t be the makespan; $t = \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{ij} d_j
 ight)$
- Model: minimize t subject to:

$$t \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{ij} d_j$$
 for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$

Logic constraints

- A proposition is a statement that evaluates to true or false. One example we've seen: a linear constraint $a^Tx \leq b$.
- We'll use binary variables δ_i to represent propositions P_i :

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if proposition } P_i \text{ is true} \\ 0 & \text{if proposition } P_i \text{ is false} \end{cases}$$

The term for this is that δ_i is an **indicator variable**.

How can we turn logical statements about the P_i 's into algebraic statements involving the δ_i 's?

Some standard notation:

- \neg means "not" \oplus means "exclusive or"

Boolean algebra

Basic definitions:

Р	Q	$P \wedge Q$	$P \lor Q$	$P \oplus Q$
1	1	1	1	0
1	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0

Useful relationships:

•
$$\neg(P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_k) = \neg P_1 \vee \cdots \vee \neg P_k$$

•
$$\neg (P_1 \lor \cdots \lor P_k) = \neg P_1 \land \cdots \land \neg P_k$$

•
$$P \wedge (Q \vee R) = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$$

•
$$P \lor (Q \land R) = (P \lor Q) \land (P \lor R)$$

•
$$P \oplus Q = (P \land \neg Q) \lor (\neg P \land Q)$$

Logic to algebra

Statement	Constraint
$\neg P_1$	$\delta_1 = 0$
$P_1 \vee P_2$	$\delta_1 + \delta_2 \ge 1$
$P_1 \oplus P_2$	$\delta_1 + \delta_2 = 1$
$P_1 \wedge P_2$	$\delta_1=$ 1, $\delta_2=$ 1
$\neg (P_1 \lor P_2)$	$\delta_1=$ 0, $\delta_2=$ 0
$P_1 \implies P_2$	$\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ (equivalent to: $(\neg P_1) \lor P_2$)
$P_1 \implies (\neg P_2)$	$\delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq 1$ (equivalent to: $\neg (P_1 \land P_2)$)
$P_1 \iff P_2$	$\delta_1 = \delta_2$
$P_1 \implies (P_2 \wedge P_3)$	$\delta_1 \le \delta_2$, $\delta_1 \le \delta_3$
$P_1 \implies (P_2 \vee P_3)$	$\delta_1 \le \delta_2 + \delta_3$
$(P_1 \wedge P_2) \implies P_3$	$\delta_1 + \delta_2 \le 1 + \delta_3$
$(P_1 \vee P_2) \implies P_3$	$\delta_1 \le \delta_3$, $\delta_2 \le \delta_3$
$P_1 \wedge (P_2 \vee P_3)$	$\delta_1=1$, $\delta_2+\delta_3\geq 1$
$P_1 \vee (P_2 \wedge P_3)$	$\delta_1 + \delta_2 \ge 1$, $\delta_1 + \delta_3 \ge 1$

More logic to algebra

Statement	Constraint
$P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \cdots \vee P_k$	$\sum^k \delta_i \geq 1$
$(P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_k) \implies (P_{k+1} \vee \cdots \vee P_n)$	$\sum_{i=1}^{i=1}(1-\delta_i)+\sum_{i=k+1}^n\delta_i\geq 1$
at least k out of n are true	$\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i \ge k$
exactly k out of n are true	$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_i = k$
at most k out of n are true	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{i} \le k$
$P_n \iff (P_1 \vee \cdots \vee P_k)$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_i \geq \delta_n, \ \delta_n \geq \delta_j, \ j=1,\ldots,k$
$P_n \iff (P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_k)$	$\delta_n + k \ge 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \delta_i, \ \delta_j \ge \delta_n, \ j = 1, \dots, k$

Modeling a restricted set of values

- We may want variable x to only take on values in the set $\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$.
- We introduce binary variables y_1, \ldots, y_m and the constraints

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^{m} a_j y_j, \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{m} y_j = 1, \qquad y_j \in \{0, 1\}$$

- y_i serves to select which a_i will be selected.
- The set of variables $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$ is called a special ordered set (SOS) of variables.

Example: building a warehouse

- Suppose we are modeling a facility location problem in which we must decide on the size of a warehouse to build.
- The choices of sizes and associated cost are shown below:

Size	Cost		
10	100		
20	180		
40	320		
60	450		
80	600		

Warehouse sizes and costs

Example: building a warehouse

• Using binary decision variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_5 , we can model the cost of building the warehouse as

$$cost = 100x_1 + 180x_2 + 320x_3 + 450x_4 + 600x_5.$$

The warehouse will have size

size =
$$10x_1 + 20x_2 + 40x_3 + 60x_4 + 80x_5$$
,

and we have the SOS constraint

$$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 = 1.$$

What about integers?

- What if x is an integer, i.e. $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$
- First option: use 10 separate variables:

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{10} k y_k, \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{10} y_k = 1, \qquad y_k \in \{0, 1\}$$

Another option: use 4 binary variables (less symmetry):

$$x = y_1 + 2y_2 + 4y_3 + 8y_4$$
, $1 \le x \le 10$, $y_k \in \{0, 1\}$

Performance is solver-dependent. If the solver allows integer constraints directly, that's often the right choice.

Example: Sudoku

					1			
2	7			9		5		
	8				5			3
		8		3			2	
	5		1		2		9	
	1			5		7		
5			6				3	
		9		1			6	2
			2					

- fill grid with numbers $\{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$
- each row and each column contains distinct numbers
- each 3 × 3 cluster contains distinct numbers

Example: Sudoku

• Decision variables: $X \in \{0,1\}^{9 \times 9 \times 9}$ (729 binary variables)

$$X_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i,j) \text{ entry is a } k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Can fill in known entries right away.

- Basic constraints: (324 in total)

 - ▶ $\sum_{i=1}^{9} X_{ijk} = 1 \quad \forall j, k \text{ (column } j \text{ contains exactly one } k\text{)}$

 - ▶ $\sum_{(i,j)\in C} X_{ijk} = 1 \quad \forall C, k \text{ (cluster } C \text{ contains exactly one } k)$
- Much trickier to model using other integer representations!
- Julia code: Sudoku.ipynb