

LABORATOIRE d'ANALYSE et d'ARCHITECTURE des SYSTEMES

**INTEGER PROGRAMMING, DUALITY and
SUPERADDITIVE FUNCTIONS**

Jean B. LASSERRE

IMA workshop, July 2005

The integer program

$$\max_x \{ c'x \mid Ax = b; \quad x \in \mathbb{N}^n \}$$

with $A = [A_1, \dots, A_n] \in \mathbf{Z}^{m \times n}, b \in \mathbf{Z}^m$ has a dual problem

$$D : \min_{f \in \Gamma} \{ f(b) \mid f(A_j) \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \}$$

where Γ is the space of functions $f : \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ that are **superadditive** ($f(a + b) \geq f(a) + f(b)$), and with $f(0) = 0$. (Jeroslow, Wolsey, etc ...)

Elegant but rather abstract and not very practical; however, used to derive valid inequalities. Moreover, the celebrated **Gomory cuts** used in Solvers (CPLEX, XPRESS-MP, ..) can be interpreted as such superadditive functions.

In addition, the optimization problem

$$D : \min_{f \in \Gamma} \{ f(b) \mid f(A_j) \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \}$$

is **too rich**, and somehow, a **rephrasing** of the problem: Indeed, the set Γ contains in particular the optimal value function $f : \mathbf{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$

$$b \mapsto f(b) := \max_x \{ c'x \mid Ax = b; \quad x \in \mathbf{N}^n \}$$

Similarly, the standard LP problem $\max_x \{ c'x \mid Ax = b; x \geq 0 \}$ has an abstract dual problem

$$D_L : \min_{f \in \Delta} \{ f(b) \mid f(A_j) \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \}$$

where Δ is now the set of functions $f : \mathbf{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ that are **concave** (or even **concave piecewise linear**).

But the **simpler** linear program

$$D_L^* : \min_{f \text{ linear}} \{ f(b) \mid f(A_j) \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \}$$

that is,

$$D_L^* : \min_{\lambda} \{ b' \lambda \mid A_j' \lambda \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \}$$

is a valid dual ... for a *fixed* value of b . It does **not** use concave piecewise linear functions (but does not contain the optimal value function $b \mapsto f(b) := \max_{x \geq 0} \{ c'x \mid Ax = b \}$).

Hence, for integer programs, one should also obtain a dual **simpler** than the **superadditive** dual

CONTINUOUS OPTIM.

$$f(b, c) := \max c'x$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{cases} Ax \leq b \\ x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \end{cases}$$

INTEGRATION

$$\hat{f}(b, c) := \int_{\Omega} e^{c'x} dx$$

$$\Omega := \begin{cases} Ax \leq b \\ x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \end{cases}$$

DISCRETE OPTIM.

$$f_d(b, c) := \max c'x$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{cases} Ax \leq b \\ x \in \mathbf{N}^n \end{cases}$$

SUMMATION

$$\hat{f}_d(b, c) := \sum_{\Omega} e^{c'x}$$

$$\Omega := \begin{cases} Ax \leq b \\ x \in \mathbf{N}^n \end{cases}$$

$$e^{f(b,c)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}(b, rc)^{1/r}; \quad e^{f_d(b,c)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}_d(b, rc)^{1/r}.$$

or, equivalently

$$f(b, c) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \ln \hat{f}(b, rc); \quad f_d(b, c) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \ln \hat{f}_d(b, rc).$$

CONTINUOUS OPTIM.

—
**Legendre-Fenchel
Duality**



INTEGRATION
—
**Laplace-Transform
Duality**

DISCRETE OPTIM.

—
??



SUMMATION
—
**Z-Transform
Duality**



Legendre-Fenchel duality : $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ convex; $f^* : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

$$\lambda \mapsto f^*(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) := \sup_y \{\lambda'y - f(y)\}.$$

(One-sided) Laplace-Transform: $f : \mathbf{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$; $F : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$.

$$\lambda \mapsto F(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}(f)(\lambda) := \int_{\mathbf{R}_+^n} e^{-\lambda'y} f(y) dy.$$

(One-sided) Z-Transform: $f : \mathbf{Z}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$; $F : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$.

$$\lambda \mapsto F(z) = \mathcal{Z}(f)(z) := \sum_{m \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n} z^{-m} f(m).$$

with $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax \leq y; x \geq 0\}$

Fenchel-duality:

$$f(y, c) := \max_{x \in \Omega} c'x$$

$$f^*(\lambda, c) := \min_y \{\lambda'y - f(y, c)\}$$

Laplace-duality

$$\hat{f}(y, c) := \int_{\Omega} e^{c'x} dx$$

$$\hat{F}(\lambda, c) := \int e^{-\lambda'y} \hat{f}(y, c) dy$$

$$= \int_{x \geq 0} e^{c'x} \left[\int_{Ax \leq y} e^{-\lambda'y} dy \right] dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \prod_{k=1}^n (A'\lambda - c)_k}$$

with : $A'\lambda - c \geq 0; \lambda \geq 0$

with : $\Re(A'\lambda - c) > 0; \Re(\lambda) > 0$

In standard form, with $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b; x \geq 0\}$

$$\hat{F}(\lambda, c) = \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^n (A'\lambda - c)_k}$$

and one retrieves $\hat{f}(y, c)$ by

$$\hat{f}(y, c) = \int_{\Gamma} e^{y'\lambda} \hat{F}(\lambda, c) d\lambda = \int_{\Gamma} \frac{e^{y'\lambda}}{\prod_{j=1}^n (A'\lambda - c)_j} d\lambda$$

Integration by Cauchy's residue techniques \rightarrow

- The (multidimensional) poles λ of \hat{F} solve $\pi^\sigma A_\sigma = c_\sigma$ for all bases A_σ of the continuous LP, ... which yields

Brion and Vergne 's continuous formula

Terminology of LP in standard form:

Let $A_\sigma := [A_{\sigma_1} | \dots | A_{\sigma_m}]$ be a **basis** of $\max\{c'x \mid Ax = b; x \geq 0\}$, with $x(\sigma)$ the corresponding **vertex**, $\pi^\sigma := c'_\sigma A_\sigma^{-1}$ the associated **dual variable** and the **reduced cost** vector $c_k - \pi^\sigma A_k$, $k \notin \sigma$. Then :

$$\hat{f}(b, c) = \sum_{x(\sigma): \text{vertex of } \Omega(b)} \frac{e^{c'x(\sigma)}}{\det(A_\sigma) \prod_{k \notin \sigma} (-c_k + \pi^\sigma A_k)}$$

from which it easily follows that

$$\log \left[\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{f}(b, rc) \right]^{1/r} = \max_{x(\sigma): \text{vertex of } \Omega(b)} c'x(\sigma).$$

Discrete Z-duality

Let $\Omega(\mathbf{y}) := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = \mathbf{y}; \quad x \geq 0\}$.

$$\hat{f}_d(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{c}) := \sum_{x \in \Omega(\mathbf{y}) \cap \mathbf{Z}^n} e^{\mathbf{c}'x}$$

Then the *generating function* or **Z-transform** of \hat{f}_d reads

$$z \mapsto \hat{F}_d(z, \mathbf{c}) := \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^m} z^{-\mathbf{y}} \hat{f}_d(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{c}),$$

and, by simple algebra

$$\hat{F}_d(z, \mathbf{c}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - e^{c_j} z^{-A_j}} \quad \left(= \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{1 - e^{c_j} z_1^{-A_{1j}} \dots z_m^{-A_{mj}}} \right)$$

$$\text{with } |z^{A_j}| > e^{c_j} \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n.$$

To compute $f_d(y, c)$ it then suffices to invert the generating function, that is:

$$f_d(y, c) = \int_{|z|=\gamma} z^{y-1} \hat{F}_d(z, c) dz$$

which can be done by repeated application of Cauchy's residue Theorem, which in turn requires computing the poles of the generating function \hat{F}_d .

- The Poles of \hat{F}_d are also associated with the bases of the LP $\max \{ c'x \mid Ax = y, x \geq 0 \}$!!

Let $\sigma := [A_{\sigma_1} | \cdots | A_{\sigma_m}]$ be a feasible basis of the LP $\max_x \{c'x \mid Ax = y, x \geq 0\}$, with $\mu(\sigma) := \det(A_\sigma)$, and associated “dual” variables π^σ , which are solutions of $\pi A_\sigma = c_\sigma$.

Indeed, each basis σ provides $\mu(\sigma)$ complex poles $z = e^\lambda$ in \mathbb{C}^m , which are solutions of the polynomial equations $e^{A'_\sigma \lambda} = e^{c_\sigma}$. (Compare with $\pi^\sigma A_\sigma = c_\sigma$)

The $\mu(\sigma)$ solutions $z = e^\lambda$ are of the form

$$\lambda = \pi^\sigma + 2i\pi \frac{v}{\mu(\sigma)}; \quad v \in V_\sigma \subset \mathbf{Z}^m$$

$$V_\sigma = \{v \in \mathbf{Z}^m \mid v' A_\sigma = 0 \pmod{\mu(\sigma)}\}$$

Brion and Vergne 's discrete formula

Re-interpreted with these data, Brion and Vergne 's original discrete formula reads (Lasserre)

$$\hat{f}_d(y, c) = \sum_{x(\sigma): \text{vertex of } \Omega(y)} e^{c' x(\sigma)} \times$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu(\sigma)} \left[\sum_{v \in V_\sigma} \frac{e^{2i\pi v' y / \mu(\sigma)}}{\prod_{k \notin \sigma} (1 - e^{-(2i\pi v' A_k / \mu(\sigma))} e^{(c_k - \pi^\sigma A_k)})} \right]$$

Back to **optimization** : $f_d(b, c) = \max\{c'x \mid Ax = b; x \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$.

Theorem . Assume that

$$\max_{\sigma} e^{c'x(\sigma)} \times \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{v \in V_{\sigma}} \frac{e^{2i\pi v'b/\mu(\sigma)}}{\prod_{k \notin \sigma} (1 - e^{-(2i\pi v'A_k/\mu(\sigma))} e^{r(c_k - \pi^{\sigma} A_k)})} \right]^{1/r}$$

is attained at a **unique** basis σ^* . Then :

$$f_d(b, c) = c'x(\sigma^*) + \sum_{k \notin \sigma^*} (c_k - \pi^{\sigma^*} A_k) x_k^* = \sum_j c_j x_j^*.$$

σ^* is an optimal basis of the linear program, and $x(\sigma^*)$ (resp. x^*) is an optimal solution of the **linear** (resp. **integer**) program.

In this case :

$$f_d(b, c) = c'x(\sigma^*) + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \max \quad \sum_{k \notin \sigma^*} (c_k - \pi^{\sigma^*} A_k) x_k \\ A_{\sigma^*} u \quad + \sum_{k \notin \sigma^*} A_k x_k \quad = b \\ u \in \mathbf{Z}^m; \quad x_k \in \mathbf{N} \quad \forall k \notin \sigma^* \end{array} \right.$$

$f_d(b, c) = c'x(\sigma^*) + \rho := \text{opt. value of GOMORY relaxation!}$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{v \in V_\sigma} \frac{e^{2i\pi v' b / \mu(\sigma)}}{\prod_{k \notin \sigma} (1 - e^{-(2i\pi v' A_k / \mu(\sigma))} e^{r(c_k - \pi^\sigma A_k)})} \right]^{1/r}$$

is the same as detecting the **leading term** u^ρ of the rational fraction

$$u \mapsto \left[\sum_{v \in V_\sigma} \frac{e^{2i\pi v' b / \mu(\sigma)}}{\prod_{k \notin \sigma} (1 - e^{-(2i\pi v' A_k / \mu(\sigma))} u^{(c_k - \pi^\sigma A_k)})} \right]$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$.

With $u := e^r$, $\hat{f}_d(y, rc)$ is the rational fraction

$$\begin{aligned}
 u &\mapsto \sum_{x(\sigma): \text{ vertex of } \Omega(y)} u^{c' x(\sigma)} \times \\
 &\frac{1}{\mu(\sigma)} \left[\sum_{v \in V_\sigma} \frac{e^{2i\pi v' y / \mu(\sigma)}}{\prod_{k \notin \sigma} \left(1 - e^{-(2i\pi v' A_k / \mu(\sigma))} u^{(c_k - \pi^\sigma A_k)} \right)} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{\text{bases } \sigma \text{ of } \Omega(y)} g_\sigma(u)
 \end{aligned}$$

When Gomory relaxation is **not exact**, the leading term as $u \rightarrow \infty$ is not **unique** and cancellations occur.

A Discrete Farkas Lemma

Let $A \in \mathbf{N}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbf{N}^m$ and consider the problem deciding **whether or not** $Ax = b$ has a solution $x \in \mathbf{N}^n$, or, equivalently, deciding **whether or not** $\hat{f}_d(b, c) \geq 1$.

Theorem: (i) $Ax = b$ has a solution $x \in \mathbf{N}^n$ if and only if the polynomial $b \mapsto z^b - 1$ in $\mathbf{R}[z_1, \dots, z_m]$ can be written

$$z^b - 1 = \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(z)(z^{A_j} - 1) \quad (= \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(z)(z_1^{A_{1j}} \dots z_m^{A_{mj}} - 1))$$

for some polynomials $z \mapsto Q_j(z)$ with **nonnegative coefficients**.

(ii) The **degree** of the Q_j 's is bounded by $\sum_{j=1}^m b_j - \max_k \sum_{j=1}^m A_{jk}$.

A **single LP** to solve with $n \times \binom{b^*+m}{b^*}$ variables, $\binom{b^*+m}{m}$ constraints and a (sparse) matrix of coefficients in $\{0, \pm 1\}$

One also retrieves the classical **Farkas Lemma** in \mathbf{R}^n , that is,

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b; x \geq 0\} \neq \emptyset \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [A'u \geq 0 \Rightarrow b'u \geq 0]$$

Indeed, if $Ax = b$ has a solution $x \in \mathbf{N}^n$, then with $u = \ln z$,

$$e^{b'u} - 1 = \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(e^{u_1}, \dots, e^{u_m})(e^{(A'u)_j} - 1).$$

Therefore,

$$A'u \geq 0 \Rightarrow e^{(A'u)_j} - 1 \geq 0 \Rightarrow e^{b'u} - 1 \geq 0 \Rightarrow b'u \geq 0,$$

and so $Ax = b$ has a nonnegative solution $x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n$.

The general case $A \in \mathbf{Z}^{m \times n}, b \in \mathbf{Z}^m$.

Let $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b; \quad x \geq 0\}$ be a **polytope**.

Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}^n$ be such that for every column A_j of A ,

$A_{kj} + \alpha_j \geq 0 \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, m$; let $\mathbf{N} \ni \beta \geq \rho(\alpha) := \max\{\alpha'x \mid x \in \Omega\}$.

Theorem: (i) $Ax = b$ has a solution $x \in \mathbf{N}^n$ if and only if the polynomial $z \mapsto z^b (zy)^\beta - 1$ in $\mathbf{R}[z_1, \dots, z_m]$ can be written

$$z^b (zy)^\beta - 1 = Q_0(z, y)(zy - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(z, y)(z^{A_j} (zy)^{\alpha_j} - 1),$$

for some polynomials $Q_j(z)$, all with **nonnegative coefficients**.

(ii) The degree of the Q_j 's is bounded by $b^* := (m + 1)\beta + \sum_{j=1}^m b_j$.

Back to standard Farkas lemma

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b; x \geq 0\} \neq \emptyset \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [A'\lambda \geq 0 \Rightarrow b'\lambda \geq 0]$$

But, **equivalently** $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if the polynomial $\lambda \mapsto b'\lambda$ can be written

$$b'\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(\lambda)(A'\lambda)_j,$$

for some polynomials $\{Q_j\} \subset \mathbf{R}[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m]$, all with **nonnegative** coefficients.

In this case, each Q_j is necessarily a **constant**, that is, $Q_j \equiv Q_j(0) = x_j \geq 0$, and $Ax = b$!

$P = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$	$P \cap \mathbf{Z}^n$
$x \in P$ $\Leftrightarrow x = Q(0, \dots, 0) \text{ with}$ $Q \in \mathbf{R}[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m]$ $b' \lambda = \langle Q, A' \lambda \rangle$ $Q \succeq 0$	$x \in \text{integer hull}(P)$ $\Leftrightarrow x = Q(1, \dots, 1) \text{ with}$ $Q \in \mathbf{R}[e^{\lambda_1}, \dots, e^{\lambda_m}]$ $e^{b' \lambda} - 1 = \langle Q, e^{A' \lambda} - 1_n \rangle$ $Q \succeq 0$

Comparing continuous and discrete Farkas lemma

An equivalent Linear program

Let $0 \leq q = \{q_{j\alpha}\} \in \mathbf{R}^{ns}$ be the coefficients of the Q_j 's in

$$z^b - 1 = \sum_{j=1}^n Q_j(z) (z^{A_j} - 1)$$

They are solutions of a linear system

$$Mq = r, \quad q \geq 0$$

for some matrix M and vector r , both with $0, \pm 1$ coefficients.

** M and r are easily obtained from A, b with **no** computation

Write $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ with each $q_j = \{q_{j\alpha}\} \in \mathbf{R}^s$, and let $\hat{c}_{j\alpha} := c_j$ for all α

Theorem : Let $A \in \mathbf{N}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbf{N}^m$, $c \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

(i) The **integer** program $\mathbf{P} \rightarrow \max_x \{ c'x \mid Ax = b, x \in \mathbf{N}^n \}$ has same value as the **linear** program

$$\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \max_q \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{c}'_j q_j \mid Mq = r; q \geq 0 \right\}.$$

(ii) Let q^* be an optimal vertex, and let

$$x_j^* := \sum_{\alpha} q_{j\alpha}^* = Q_j(\mathbf{1}) \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then $x^* \in \mathbf{N}^n$ and x^* is an optimal solution of \mathbf{P} .

The link with superadditive functions

The LP-dual Q^* of the linear program Q reads

$$Q^* \rightarrow \min_{\pi} \{ \pi' r \mid M' \pi \geq \hat{c} \}.$$

More precisely, with $\mathcal{D} := \prod_{j=1}^n \{0, 1, \dots, b_j\} \subset \mathbf{N}^m$,

$$Q^* \rightarrow \begin{cases} \min_{\pi} \pi(b) - \pi(0) \\ \text{s.t. } \pi(A_j + \alpha) - \pi(\alpha) \geq c_j, \quad \alpha + A_j \in \mathcal{D}, j = 1, \dots, n \end{cases}$$

Let $\Pi := \{ \pi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \}$, and for every $\pi \in \Pi$, let $f_{\pi} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be the function

$$f_{\pi}(x) := \inf_{x+\alpha \in \mathcal{D}} \pi(x + \alpha) - \pi(\alpha), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}$$

For every $\pi \in \Pi$, the function f_π is **superadditive** and $f_\pi(0) = 0$.

With \mathbf{Q}^* one may then associate the optimization problem

$$\mathbf{S}^* \rightarrow \begin{cases} \min_{\pi \in \Pi} & f_\pi(b) \\ \text{s.t.} & f_\pi(A_j) \geq c_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

Thus, \mathbf{S}^* is a **simplified and explicit form** of the abstract **super-additive** dual, as we only consider **finite** superadditive functions $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, instead of $f : \mathbf{N}^m \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$.

It is the analogue for IP with $Ax = b$ of Wolsey's dual for IP with $Ax \leq b$. Note that \mathbf{Q}^* is simpler than \mathbf{S}^* .

Moreover \mathbf{Q}^* is simpler than \mathbf{S}^* as in the LP \mathbf{Q}^* , the function $\pi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is NOT required to be super additive!! In \mathbf{S}^* one has to write the $O(|\mathcal{D}|^2)$ *superadditivity* constraints

$$\pi(x + \alpha) - \pi(\alpha) \geq \pi(x), \quad x, \alpha \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{with } x + \alpha \in \mathcal{D},$$

and the n additional constraints $\pi(A_j) \geq c_j, j = 1, \dots, n$.

On the other hand, in \mathbf{Q}^* one only has the $n O(|\mathcal{D}|)$ constraints

$$\pi(A_j + \alpha) - \pi(\alpha) \geq c_j \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{with } A_j + \alpha \in \mathcal{D},$$

For instance, in the unbounded knapsack problem

$$\max_x \{c'x \mid \sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j = b; \quad x \in \mathbf{N}^n\}$$

One has $n + b^2/2$ constraints in \mathbf{S}^* , and $nb - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j$ in \mathbf{Q}^* .

With $\mathbf{P} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n \mid Ax = b\}$, the integer hull $\text{co}(\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{Z}^n)$ reads

$$\text{co}(\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{Z}^n) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid - \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^* x_j \leq b' \pi^*\},$$

for finitely many (π^*, λ^*) , generators of the convex cone $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \times \mathbf{R}^n$

$$\Omega := \left\{ (\pi, \lambda) \in \mathbf{R}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \times \mathbf{R}^n \mid \begin{aligned} \pi(\alpha + A_j) - \pi(\alpha) + \lambda_j &\geq 0, \\ \alpha + A_j &\in \mathcal{D}, j = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Equivalently, again with

$$x \mapsto f_{\pi^*}(x) := \inf_{\alpha + x \in \mathcal{D}} \pi^*(x + \alpha) - \pi^*(\alpha), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}$$

$$\text{co}(\mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{Z}^n) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n f_{\pi^*}(A_j) x_j \leq f_{\pi^*}(b)\},$$

CONCLUSION

Generating functions permit to exhibit a natural **duality** for integer programming, an **IP**-analogue of **LP duality**.

This duality permits to simplify the abstract **superadditive** dual, and so, might help providing **efficient Gomory cuts** in MIP solvers like CPLEX, or XPRESS-MP.

Lasserre J.B. (2005). Integer Programming, duality and super-additive functions, *Cont. Math* 474, pp. 138-150

Lasserre J.B. (2004). Integer Programming Duality. in: Trends in Optimization. *Proc. Symp. Appl. Math.* 61, pp. 67–83

Lasserre J.B. (2004). The integer hull of a convex rational polytope. *Discr. Comp. Geom* 32, pp. 129–139.

Lasserre J.B. (2004). Generating functions and duality for integer programs. *Discrete Optim.* 1, pp. 167–187.

Lasserre J.B. (2004). A discrete Farkas lemma. *Discrete Optimization* 1, pp. 67-75. .

Another dual problem

Let $A \in \mathbf{Z}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbf{Z}^m$, $c \in \mathbf{R}^n$. Let $y \mapsto f(y, c) = \max\{c'x \mid Ax = y; x \geq 0\}$. The Fenchel transform $(-f)^*$ of the convex function $-f(\cdot, c)$ is the convex function

$$\lambda \mapsto (-f)^*(\lambda, c) = \sup_{y \in \mathbf{R}^m} \lambda'y + f(y, c).$$

The dual problem of the linear program is obtained from Fenchel duality as

$$\begin{aligned} f(b, c) &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^m} b'\lambda + (-f)^*(-\lambda, c) \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^m} b'\lambda + \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^m} (c - A'\lambda)'x = \min_{\lambda} \{b'\lambda \mid A'\lambda \geq c\} \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently

$$e^{f(b, c)} = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^m} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^m} e^{(b - Ax)'\lambda} e^{c'x}$$

Define

$$\rho^* := \inf_{z \in \mathbf{C}^m} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{N}^n} \Re \left(z^{b-Ax} e^{c'x} \right) = \inf_{z \in \mathbf{C}^m} f_d^*(z, c).$$

Hence,

$$f_d^*(z, c) = \Re \left(z^b \prod_{j=1}^n (z^{-A_j} e^{c_j})^{x_j} \right) < \infty \quad \text{if } |z^{A_j}| \geq e^{c_j} \quad \forall j$$

(that is, $A' \ln |z| \geq c$). Next, (writing $z \in \mathbf{C}$ as $e^\lambda e^{i\theta}$)

$$\rho^* \leq \inf_{z \in \mathbf{R}^m} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n} \Re \left(z^{b-Ax} e^{c'x} \right) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^m} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^n} e^{(b-Ax)' \lambda} e^{c'x} = e^{f(b,c)}$$

Finally, with $z \in \mathbf{C}^m$ arbitrary fixed

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbf{N}^n} \Re \left(z^{b-Ax} e^{c'x} \right) \geq e^{c'x^*} = e^{f_d(b,c)}$$

Hence $f_d(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leq \ln \rho^* \leq f(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$.

Theorem: Let σ^* be an **optimal basis** of the **linear program**. Under **uniqueness** of the “ \max_{σ} ” in Brion and Vergne ’s formula, and an additional technical condition

$$e^{f_d(b,c)} = \rho^* = \max_{x \in \mathbb{N}^n} \Re \left(\hat{z}^{b-Ax} e^{c'x} \right) = f_d^*(\hat{z}, c)$$

where $\hat{z}^{A_j} = \gamma e^{c_j} \quad \forall j \in \sigma^*$ for some real $\gamma > 1$.

\hat{z} is an **optimal** solution of the **dual** problem

$$\inf_{z \in \mathbb{C}^m} f_d^*(z, c)$$