

Note

Note on: N.E. Aguilera, M.S. Escalante,
G.L. Nasini, “The disjunctive procedure and
blocker duality”[☆]V. Leoni^{a, b}, G. Nasini^a^aUNR, Depto. de Matemática, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Ingeniería y Agrimensura, Av. Pellegrini 250, 2000
Rosario, Argentina^bFundación Antorchas

Received 20 May 2003; received in revised form 12 May 2004; accepted 2 September 2004

Available online 27 April 2005

Abstract

Aguilera et al. [Discrete Appl. Math. 121 (2002) 1–13] give a generalization of a theorem of Lehman through an extension $\tilde{P}_j$ of the disjunctive procedure defined by Balas, Ceria and Cornuéjols. This generalization can be formulated as

(A) For every clutter $\mathcal{C}$, the disjunctive index of its set covering polyhedron $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{C})$ coincides with the disjunctive index of the set covering polyhedron of its blocker, $\mathcal{Q}(b(\mathcal{C}))$.

In Aguilera et al. [Discrete Appl. Math. 121 (2002) 1–3], (A) is indeed a corollary of the stronger result

$$(B) \tilde{P}_j([\tilde{P}_j(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{C}))]^B) = [\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{C})]^B.$$

Motivated by the work of Gerards et al. [Math. Oper. Res. 28 (2003) 884–885] we propose a simpler proof of (B) as well as an alternative proof of (A), independent of (B). Both of them are based on the relationship between the “disjunctive relaxations” obtained by $\tilde{P}_j$ and the set covering polyhedra associated with some particular minors of $\mathcal{C}$.

© 2005 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Disjunctive procedure; Blocking type polyhedra; Blocker duality; Clutter

[☆] Partially supported by grants of Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas PIP 2807/2000, Argentina.

E-mail addresses: valeoni@fceia.unr.edu.ar (V. Leoni), nasini@fceia.unr.edu.ar (G. Nasini).

In this note we work with the notation and concepts used in [1] and add some other specific notation. Let us first recall some definitions and known results.

Given $U \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, $\text{conv}(U)$ denotes the convex hull of the elements of U . For a polyhedron $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, $\mathcal{Q}^*$ denotes the polyhedron

$$\mathcal{Q}^* = \text{conv}(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathbf{Z}^n).$$

A polyhedron $\mathcal{Q}$ is of *blocking type* if $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbf{R}_+^n$ and if $y \geq x \in \mathcal{Q}$ implies $y \in \mathcal{Q}$. It is known that if $\mathcal{Q}$ is of blocking type, then $\mathcal{Q}^*$ also is. The *blocker* $\mathcal{Q}^B$ of a blocking type polyhedron $\mathcal{Q}$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}^B = \{\pi \in \mathbf{R}_+^n : \pi \cdot x \geq 1, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{Q}\},$$

and it is known that $(\mathcal{Q}^B)^B = \mathcal{Q}$.

In [1], Aguilera et al. work on $[0, 1]$ blocking type polyhedra, i.e. blocking type polyhedra with extreme points in $[0, 1]^n$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, they define a disjunctive procedure over $\mathcal{Q}$ as

$$\bar{P}_j(\mathcal{Q}) = P_j(\mathcal{Q}_0) + \mathbf{R}_+^n,$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \mathcal{Q} \cap [0, 1]^n$ and P_j denotes the procedure defined by Balas, Ceria and Cornuéjols.

This new procedure satisfies similar properties as those of P_j , all of them proved in [1]. In particular, given $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, since applying iteratively the procedure does not depend on the order, $\bar{P}_{i_1}(\bar{P}_{i_2}(\dots(\bar{P}_{i_k}(\mathcal{Q}))))$ can be denoted by $\bar{P}_J(\mathcal{Q})$.

Given $R \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, let

$$\mathcal{H}_R = \{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n : x_i = 0 \text{ for } i \in R\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_R = \{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n : x_i \geq 1 \text{ for } i \in R\}.$$

Throughout the rest of this note, J will be a fixed subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and we will write any $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ as $x = (\bar{x}, \tilde{x})$, where $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{R}^{|J|}$ and $\tilde{x} \in \mathbf{R}^{n-|J|}$.

Given $R \subset J$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ a $[0, 1]$ blocking type polyhedron, we denote $\bar{R} = J \setminus R$ and $\mathcal{Q}_R = \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\bar{R}} \cap \mathcal{G}_R$.

In [1] it is proved that

$$\bar{P}_J(\mathcal{Q}) = \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{R \subset J} \mathcal{Q}_R \right). \quad (1)$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{Q}^* \subset \bar{P}_J(\mathcal{Q}) \subset \mathcal{Q} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{P}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{Q}^*. \quad (2)$$

This last equality allows talking about the minimum number of iterations needed so as to find $\mathcal{Q}^*$, which is called the *disjunctive index* of $\mathcal{Q}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{Q}^* = \mathcal{Q}$ if and only if the disjunctive index of $\mathcal{Q}$ is zero.

From (1) every extreme point of $\bar{P}_J(\mathcal{Q})$ is an extreme point of $\mathcal{Q}_R$, for some $R \subset J$. Let x^R denote, for any $R \subset J$, the point in $\{0, 1\}^{|J|}$ with $x_i^R = 1$ if and only if $i \in R$. We have the following:

Lemma 1. Let $x = (\bar{x}, \tilde{x}) \in \mathbf{R}_+^n$. If x is an extreme point of $\mathcal{Q}_R$ then $\bar{x} = x^R$.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/9655166>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/9655166>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)