

Viewpoints

DANTZIG-WOLFE DECOMPOSITION ALGORITHM

MR. GONCALVES'S attempt to derive a criterion¹ for recognizing when a basic feasible solution to the master program in Dantzig-Wolfe's decomposition method corresponds to a non-basic feasible solution of the original problem is both inaccurate and unhelpful.

The original problem is

$$\text{Max } x_0 = C_1 X + C_2 Y$$

subject to

$$A_1 X + A_2 Y = b \dots m \text{ equations,}$$

$$AX \leq p \dots n \text{ inequalities, } X \geq 0, Y \geq 0.$$

X and Y are column vectors of dimension r and s respectively.

If we take a column vector Z of dimension n and transform

$$AX \leq p \text{ into } AX + IZ = p$$

then a basic feasible solution is obtained if and only if

$$V = V_x + V_y + V_z \geq r + s - m,$$

where

$$V_x = \text{the number of vanishing } x_i,$$

$$V_y = \text{the number of vanishing } y_i,$$

and

$$V_z = \text{the number of vanishing } z_i$$

in the solution.

Mr. Goncalves omits V_z and writes $V = V_x + V_y \geq r + s - m$ as necessary and sufficient condition.

However, his equation for V_x is really the equation for $V_x + V_z$, so that the two errors compensate for each other, producing the correct result.

But what is the point of it all? To use his criterion we have to go from a basic feasible solution of the master program, to the corresponding solution of the original problem. Having done that, why is it better to use a formula requiring the dimension of the face that contains X as in the convex polyhedron $AX \leq p, X \geq 0$, the degree of degeneracy of that face and of the basic feasible solution to the master program, and the number of not-vanishing t_i variables in the master program than to count simply $V_x + V_y + V_z$?

G. M. APPA

Enfield College of Technology

REFERENCE

¹ A. S. GONCALVES (1968) Basic feasible solutions and the Dantzig-Wolfe decomposition algorithm. *Opt Res. Q.* 19, 465.