## Exercises on ILP formulations

1. Given the following set S of integer solutions:
$S=\{(0,0,0,0),(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1),(0,1,0,1),(0,0,1,1)\}$ and the two polyhedron:
$P_{1}=\left\{x \in \mathfrak{R}^{4}: 0 \leq x \leq 1,83 x_{1}+61 x_{2}+49 x_{3}+20 x_{4} \leq 100\right\}$
$P_{2}=\left\{x \in \mathfrak{R}^{4}: 0 \leq x \leq 1,4 x_{1}+3 x_{2}+2 x_{3}+x_{4} \leq 4\right\}$
a) verify that both P 1 and P 2 are formulations for $S$;
b) establish which of the two formulations is the best one.
2. Consider a transport problem with $m$ possible sources (plants) and $n$ destinations (customers). In many applications, the problem of determining which of the possible origins must work arises, since opening a source $i$ generates a startup fixed cost $F_{i}$. Are also known costs $c_{i j}$ to transport a single product from the source $i$ to the destination $j$ and the demand $d_{j}$ of customer $j$. The aim is to determine the opening strategy of the plants and the transport plan with minimum total cost.
Let us introduce the variables $x_{i j} \geq 0$ to represent the quantity transported from origin $i$ to destination $j$ and the binary variables $y_{i}$ such that:
$y_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}1 \text { if plant } i \text { is active } \\ 0 \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$
The problem can be modeled as $P_{1}$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{i j} x_{i j}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} F_{i} y_{i} \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i j}=d_{j} \text { for } j=1, \ldots, n  \tag{3.1}\\
& \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i j} \leq D y_{i} \text { for } i=1, . ., m  \tag{3.2}\\
& x_{i j} \geq 0 \text { for } i=1, \ldots, m, \text { for } j=1, . ., n \\
& y_{i} \in\{0,1\} \text { for } i=1, . ., m
\end{align*}
$$

with $D=\sum_{j=1}^{n} d_{j}$.
Another possible formulation is $P_{2}$ that differs from $P_{1}$ only in constraints (3.2) that are replaced with the following $m n$ constraints:

$$
x_{i j} \leq d_{j} y_{i} \quad \text { for } j=1, \ldots, n(3.3)
$$

State and prove which of the two formulations is better.

