## 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 $a^{\top} x \leq b$.
- Let $M$ be an upper bound for $a^{\top} x-b$.
- Write: $a^{\top} x-b \leq M z$
- If $z=0$, then $a^{\top} x-b \leq 0$ as required.

Otherwise, we get $a^{\top} x-b \leq M$, which is always true.

## If-then constraints

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

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

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

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


## If-then constraints

The converse: if $a^{\top} x \leq b$ then $z=1$

- Equivalent to: if $z=0$ then $a^{\top} x>b$ (contrapositive).
- The strict inequality is not really enforceable. Instead, write: if $z=0$ then $a^{\top} x \geq b+\varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon$ is small.
- Let $m$ be a lower bound for $a^{\top} x-b$ and we obtain the equivalent constraint: $a^{\top} x-b \geq m z+\varepsilon(1-z)$
- If $z=0$, we get $a^{\top} x \geq b+\varepsilon$, as required.

Otherwise, we get: $a^{\top} x-b \geq m$, 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 $a^{\top} x \leq b$ | $a^{\top} x-b \leq M z$ |
| if $z=0$ then $a^{\top} x \geq b$ | $a^{\top} x-b \geq m z$ |
| if $z=1$ then $a^{\top} x \leq b$ | $a^{\top} x-b \leq M(1-z)$ |
| if $z=1$ then $a^{\top} x \geq b$ | $a^{\top} x-b \geq m(1-z)$ |
| if $a^{\top} x \leq b$ then $z=1$ | $a^{\top} x-b \geq m z+\varepsilon(1-z)$ |
| if $a^{\top} x \geq b$ then $z=1$ | $a^{\top} x-b \leq M z-\varepsilon(1-z)$ |
| if $a^{\top} x \leq b$ then $z=0$ | $a^{\top} x-b \geq m(1-z)+\varepsilon z$ |
| if $a^{\top} x \geq b$ then $z=0$ | $a^{\top} x-b \leq M(1-z)-\varepsilon z$ |

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

## Return to fixed costs and lower bounds

- Modeling a fixed cost: if $x>0$ then $z=1$.
- Use the contrapositive: if $z=0$ then $x \leq 0$.
- Apply the $1^{\text {st }}$ rule on Slide 20-5.
- Modeling a lower bound: either $x=0$ or $x \geq m$.
- Equivalent to: if $x>0$ then $x \geq m$.
- Equivalent to the following two logical constraints: if $x>0$ then $z=1$, and if $z=1$ then $x \geq m$.
- The first one is a fixed cost (see above)
- The second one is the $4^{\text {th }}$ rule on Slide 20-5.


## Generalized assignment problems (GAP)

- Set of machines: $\mathcal{M}=\{1,2, \ldots, m\}$ 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: $\mathcal{N}=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$ that must be performed. (think of these as the customers in the facility problem)
- Job $j$ requires $a_{i j}$ units of work to be completed if it is completed on machine $i$.
- Job $j$ will cost $c_{i j}$ if it is completed on machine $i$.
- Each job must be assigned to exactly one machine.


## GAP model

$\underset{x, z}{\operatorname{minimize}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} h_{i} z_{i}+\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} c_{i j} x_{i j} \quad$ (fixed cost + assignment cost)
subject to: $\quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} x_{i j}=1 \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{N} \quad$ (one machine per job)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} a_{i j} x_{i j} \leq b_{i} & \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \quad \text { (work budget) } \\
x_{i j} \leq z_{i} & \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, j \in \mathcal{N} \quad \text { (if } x_{i j}>0 \text { then } z_{i}=1 \text { ) } \\
x_{i j}, z_{i} \in\{0,1\} & \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, j \in \mathcal{N}
\end{array} \quad \text { (all binary!) }
$$

- $z_{i}=1$ if machine $i$ is used, and
- $x_{i j}=1$ 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 $\lambda$.
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 $\lambda$.

- 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 $6^{\text {th }}$ rule on Slide 20-5 and obtain:

$$
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} z_{i} \leq m \delta_{1}+(k-1)\left(1-\delta_{1}\right)
$$

- 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 $2: z_{1}+z_{2} \geq 1$.
- Not operating machines 3 and 4: $z_{3}+z_{4} \leq 1$
- We must model $z_{1}+z_{2} \geq 1 \Longrightarrow z_{3}+z_{4} \leq 1$
- Same trick as before: model this in two steps:

$$
z_{1}+z_{2} \geq 1 \Longrightarrow \delta_{2}=1 \quad \text { and } \quad \delta_{2}=1 \Longrightarrow z_{3}+z_{4} \leq 1
$$

- First follows from $6^{\text {th }}$ rule on Slide 20-5
- Second follows from $3^{\text {rd }}$ rule on Slide 20-5
- Result: $z_{1}+z_{2} \leq 2 \delta_{2}$ and $z_{3}+z_{4}+\delta_{2} \leq 2$.


## 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 $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{i j} \geq 1$
- Use the $4^{\text {th }}$ rule on Slide 20-5.
- Result: $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{i j} \geq z_{i}($ 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: $z_{1}+z_{2} \geq 2$
- Capacity of machine 3 drops: $b_{3}$ becomes $0.4 b_{3}$.
- Two parts to the implementation:
- $z_{1}+z_{2} \geq 2 \Longrightarrow \delta_{3}=1$. ( $6^{\text {th }}$ rule on Slide 20-5)
- $\delta_{3}=1 \Longrightarrow \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} a_{3 j} x_{3 j} \leq 0.4 b_{3}$. (3 rd rule on Slide 20-5)
- Equivalently, just replace $b_{3}$ by: $b_{3}\left(1-\delta_{3}\right)+0.4 b_{3} \delta_{3}$.


## 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: $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{i j} d_{j}$
- Minimax problem (no integer variables needed!)
- Let $t$ be the makespan; $t=\max _{i \in \mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{i j} d_{j}\right)$
- Model: minimize $t$ subject to:

$$
t \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} x_{i j} d_{j} \quad \text { for all } i \in \mathcal{M}
$$

## Logic constraints

- A proposition is a statement that evaluates to true or false. One example we've seen: a linear constraint $a^{\top} x \leq b$.
- We'll use binary variables $\delta_{i}$ 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 $\delta_{i}$ is an indicator variable.
How can we turn logical statements about the $P_{i}$ 's into algebraic statements involving the $\delta_{i}$ 's?

Some standard notation:

| $\vee$ | means "or" |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\wedge$ | means "and" |
| $\neg$ | means "not" |

$\Longrightarrow$ means "implies"
$\Longleftrightarrow$ means "if and only if"
$\oplus \quad$ means "exclusive or"

## Boolean algebra

Basic definitions:

| $P$ | $Q$ | $P \wedge Q$ | $P \vee Q$ | $P \oplus Q$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Useful relationships:

- $\neg\left(P_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge P_{k}\right)=\neg P_{1} \vee \cdots \vee \neg P_{k}$
- $\neg\left(P_{1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{k}\right)=\neg P_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \neg P_{k}$
- $P \wedge(Q \vee R)=(P \wedge Q) \vee(P \wedge R)$
- $P \vee(Q \wedge R)=(P \vee Q) \wedge(P \vee R)$
- $P \oplus Q=(P \wedge \neg Q) \vee(\neg P \wedge Q)$


## Logic to algebra

Statement

| $\neg P_{1}$ | $\delta_{1}=0$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $P_{1} \vee P_{2}$ | $\delta_{1}+\delta_{2} \geq 1$ |
| $P_{1} \oplus P_{2}$ | $\delta_{1}+\delta_{2}=1$ |
| $P_{1} \wedge P_{2}$ | $\delta_{1}=1, \delta_{2}=1$ |
| $\neg\left(P_{1} \vee P_{2}\right)$ | $\delta_{1}=0, \delta_{2}=0$ |
| $P_{1} \Longrightarrow P_{2}$ | $\delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2}$ (equivalent to: $\left.\left(\neg P_{1}\right) \vee P_{2}\right)$ |
| $P_{1} \Longrightarrow\left(\neg P_{2}\right)$ | $\delta_{1}+\delta_{2} \leq 1$ (equivalent to: $\left.\neg\left(P_{1} \wedge P_{2}\right)\right)$ |
| $P_{1} \Longleftrightarrow P_{2}$ | $\delta_{1}=\delta_{2}$ |
| $P_{1} \Longrightarrow\left(P_{2} \wedge P_{3}\right)$ | $\delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2}, \delta_{1} \leq \delta_{3}$ |
| $P_{1} \Longrightarrow\left(P_{2} \vee P_{3}\right)$ | $\delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2}+\delta_{3}$ |
| $\left(P_{1} \wedge P_{2}\right) \Longrightarrow P_{3}$ | $\delta_{1}+\delta_{2} \leq 1+\delta_{3}$ |
| $\left(P_{1} \vee P_{2}\right) \Longrightarrow P_{3}$ | $\delta_{1} \leq \delta_{3}, \delta_{2} \leq \delta_{3}$ |
| $P_{1} \wedge\left(P_{2} \vee P_{3}\right)$ | $\delta_{1}=1, \delta_{2}+\delta_{3} \geq 1$ |
| $P_{1} \vee\left(P_{2} \wedge P_{3}\right)$ | $\delta_{1}+\delta_{2} \geq 1, \delta_{1}+\delta_{3} \geq 1$ |

## More logic to algebra

Statement

| $P_{1} \vee P_{2} \vee \cdots \vee P_{k}$ | $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{i} \geq 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\left(P_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge P_{k}\right) \Longrightarrow\left(P_{k+1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{n}\right)$ | $\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k}}\left(1-\delta_{i}\right)+\sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \delta_{i} \geq 1$ |
| at least $k$ out of $n$ are true | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{i} \geq k$ |
| exactly $k$ out of $n$ are true | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{i}=k$ |
| at most $k$ out of $n$ are true | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{i} \leq k$ |
| $P_{n} \Longleftrightarrow\left(P_{1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{k}\right)$ | $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{i} \geq \delta_{n}, \delta_{n} \geq \delta_{j}, j=1, \ldots, k$ |
| $P_{n} \Longleftrightarrow\left(P_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge P_{k}\right)$ | $\delta_{n}+k \geq 1+\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{i}, \delta_{j} \geq \delta_{n}, j=1, \ldots, k$ |

## Modeling a restricted set of values

- We may want variable $x$ to only take on values in the set $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m}\right\}$.
- We introduce binary variables $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}$ and the constraints

$$
x=\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{j} y_{j}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} y_{j}=1, \quad y_{j} \in\{0,1\}
$$

- $y_{i}$ serves to select which $a_{i}$ will be selected.
- The set of variables $\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{m}\right\}$ 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 $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{5}$, we can model the cost of building the warehouse as

$$
\operatorname{cost}=100 x_{1}+180 x_{2}+320 x_{3}+450 x_{4}+600 x_{5}
$$

- The warehouse will have size

$$
\text { size }=10 x_{1}+20 x_{2}+40 x_{3}+60 x_{4}+80 x_{5}
$$

- 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. $x \in\{1,2, \ldots, 10\}$
- First option: use 10 separate variables:

$$
x=\sum_{k=1}^{10} k y_{k}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{10} y_{k}=1, \quad y_{k} \in\{0,1\}
$$

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

$$
x=y_{1}+2 y_{2}+4 y_{3}+8 y_{4}, \quad 1 \leq x \leq 10, \quad y_{k} \in\{0,1\}
$$

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 $\{1,2, \ldots, 9\}$
- each row and each column contains distinct numbers
- each $3 \times 3$ cluster contains distinct numbers


## Example: Sudoku

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

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

Can fill in known entries right away.

- Basic constraints: (324 in total)
- $\sum_{k=1}^{9} X_{i j k}=1 \quad \forall i, j$ (SOS constraint)
- $\sum_{i=1}^{9} X_{i j k}=1 \quad \forall j, k$ (column $j$ contains exactly one $k$ )
- $\sum_{j=1}^{9} X_{i j k}=1 \quad \forall i, k$ (row $i$ contains exactly one $k$ )
- $\sum_{(i, j) \in C} X_{i j k}=1 \quad \forall C, k$ (cluster $C$ contains exactly one $k$ )
- Much trickier to model using other integer representations!
- Julia code: Sudoku.ipynb

