

Be sure that this examination has 7 pages including this cover

**The University of British Columbia**

Midterm Examinations - March 2008

**Mathematics 340–201**

Closed book examination

Time: 50 minutes

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Student Number \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Section Number \_\_\_\_\_

**Special Instructions:**

Calculators, notes, or other aids may not be used. Answer questions on the exam.

**Rules governing examinations**

**1. Each candidate should be prepared to produce his library/AMS card upon request.**

**2. Read and observe the following rules:**

No candidate shall be permitted to enter the examination room after the expiration of one half hour, or to leave during the first half hour of the examination.

Candidates are not permitted to ask questions of the invigilators, except in cases of supposed errors or ambiguities in examination questions.

**CAUTION -** Candidates guilty of any of the following or similar practices shall be immediately dismissed from the examination and shall be liable to disciplinary action.

(a) Making use of any books, papers or memoranda, other than those authorized by the examiners.

(b) Speaking or communicating with other candidates.

(c) Purposely exposing written papers to the view of other candidates. The plea of accident or forgetfulness shall not be received.

**3. Smoking is not permitted during examinations.**

1		8
2		5
3		6
4		2
5		6
Total		27

Marks

[8] 1. Consider the two matrix games

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

Assume that  $A_1$  is irreducible (i.e., that every strategy is essential) and use linear algebra to find the value of the game and the equilibrium strategies. How do you know that the irreducibility assumption on  $A_1$  was correct (explain carefully)? Assume that  $A_2$  is irreducible, and try to do the same for  $A_2$ ; how do you know that the irreducibility assumption on  $A_2$  was wrong (explain carefully)?

$$\vec{x}^T \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} = [v \ v] \Rightarrow x_1 - 4x_2 = v = -x_1 + 4x_2 \text{ and } x_1 + x_2 = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow v = 0, \quad x_1 = \frac{4}{5}, \quad x_2 = \frac{1}{5}. \text{ Similarly } \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w \\ w \end{bmatrix}, \quad y_1 + y_2 = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow w = 0, \quad y_1 = y_2 = \frac{1}{2}. \text{ So value} = 0, \text{ equ. are } \begin{bmatrix} 4/5 \\ 1/5 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Irreducibility assumption correct since  $\vec{x}, \vec{y}$  unique and  $> \vec{0}$ .

=

$$\vec{x}^T \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} = [v \ v] \Rightarrow x_1 + 4x_2 = -x_1 + 4x_2 = v, \quad x_1 + x_2 = 1 \Rightarrow x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1$$

$v = 4$

but  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$  is not  $> \vec{0}$ . Also  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w \\ w \end{bmatrix}, \quad y_1 + y_2 = 1$

gives  $y_1 - y_2 = 4y_1 + 4y_2 = w$  so  $3y_1 + 5y_2 = 0$  gives  $\vec{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 5/2 \\ -3/2 \end{bmatrix}$

which is not  $> \vec{0}$ .

- [5] 2. Consider the problem: maximize  $x_1$  subject to  $x_1 + x_2 \leq 5$ ,  $x_1 \geq 6$ ,  $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$ . Write this as a linear program in standard form. Use the two-phase method, **adding an auxiliary variable  $x_0$  to EVERY slack variable equation in the dictionary**, to show that this linear program is infeasible.

$$\begin{array}{l} \max z = x_1 \text{ s.t.} \\ x_1 + x_2 \leq 5 \\ -x_1 \leq -6 \\ x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{array} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_3 = 5 - x_1 - x_2 + x_0 \\ x_4 = -6 + x_1 + x_0 \\ z = x_1 \quad \omega = -x_0 \end{array} \right.$$

$x_0$  enters,  $x_4$  leaves

$$\begin{array}{l} x_0 = 6 - x_1 + x_4 \\ x_3 = 11 - 2x_1 - x_2 + x_4 \\ \omega = -6 + x_1 - x_4 \end{array}$$

$x_1$  enters,  $x_3$  leaves

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 = \frac{11}{2} - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_4 \\ x_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}x_3 + \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_4 \\ \omega = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_4 \end{array}$$

so  $\omega$  max is  $-1/2$

so LP infeasible

- [6] 3. Consider the problem: maximize  $x_1 + x_2$  subject to  $x_1 + 2x_2 \leq 4$ ,  $2x_1 + x_2 \leq 5$ , and  $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$ . Write the slack variables for this linear program, and write down the dual linear program and dual slack variables.

$$\begin{array}{l|l|l}
 x_3 = 4 - x_1 - 2x_2 & \min & 4y_1 + 5y_2 \text{ s.t.} \\
 x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - x_2 & & y_1 + 2y_2 \geq 1 \\
 & & 2y_1 + y_2 \geq 1 \\
 & & y_1, y_2 \geq 0
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{l}
 y_3 = -1 + y_1 + 2y_2 \\
 y_4 = -1 + 2y_1 + y_2
 \end{array}$$

Check to see if the following are optimal solutions to the primal linear program using complementary slackness:

- (a)  $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$ ;

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll}
 x_1 = 2 & y_3 = 0 \\
 x_2 = 1 & y_4 = 0 \\
 x_3 = 0 & y_1 = ? \\
 x_4 = 0 & y_2 = ?
 \end{array} \right\}
 \begin{array}{l}
 y_1 + 2y_2 = 1, 2y_1 + y_2 = 1 \Rightarrow y_1 = y_2 = \frac{1}{3} \\
 \text{satisfies comp. slackness, so} \\
 x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1 \text{ is optimal}
 \end{array}$$

- (b)  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 2$ ;

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll}
 x_1 = 0 & \\
 x_2 = 2 \Rightarrow y_4 = 0 & \\
 x_3 = 0 & \\
 x_4 = 3 \Rightarrow y_1 = 0 &
 \end{array} \right\}
 \begin{array}{l}
 y_3 = -1 + y_1 \\
 0 = -1 + 2y_1
 \end{array}
 \Rightarrow y_1 = \frac{1}{2}; y_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$$

but  $y_3 = -1/2$  is negative, so  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 2$  can't be optimal

- [2] 4. Explain why the following linear program must involve a degenerate pivot: maximize  $x_1$  subject to  $x_1 \leq x_2 + x_3$ ,  $x_1 + x_2 + 4x_3 \leq 2$ ,  $x_2 + 5x_3 \leq 10$ ,  $3x_1 + 3x_2 + 5x_3 \leq 7$ ,  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$ .

The objective is  $Z = x_1$ , so  $x_1$  enters.  $x_1 \leq x_2 + x_3$  gives slack variable  $x_4 = 0 - x_1 + x_2 + x_3$  which forces  $x_4$  to leave immediately in a degenerate pivot.

- [6] 5. Show that for all  $m \times n$  matrix games,  $A$ , and stochastic  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}$  of dimension  $m$  we have

$$\text{Scream}_{\text{Alice}}((\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{t})/2) \geq (1/2)\text{Scream}_{\text{Alice}}(\mathbf{s}) + (1/2)\text{Scream}_{\text{Alice}}(\mathbf{t})$$

Evaluate each term in this formula for the game Rock-Paper-Scissors, where  $\mathbf{s}$  represents "play Rock always" and  $\mathbf{t}$  represents "play Scissors always." Does equality hold? [This is standard Rock-Paper-Scissors: rock beats scissors, scissors beats paper, paper beats rock, and each win pays one unit to the winner.]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scream}_A\left(\frac{\vec{s} + \vec{t}}{2}\right) &= \text{MinComp}\left(\frac{1}{2}\vec{s}^T A + \frac{1}{2}\vec{t}^T A\right) \\ &\geq \text{MinComp}\left(\frac{1}{2}\vec{s}^T A\right) + \text{MinComp}\left(\frac{1}{2}\vec{t}^T A\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\text{Scream}_A(\vec{s}) + \frac{1}{2}\text{Scream}_A(\vec{t}). \end{aligned}$$

For "play Rock always,"  $\text{Scream} = -1$  (Betty will play paper)  
 " " " Scissors " " " " " " " ( " " " rock)

For 50% Rock - 50% Scissors, playing rock gives  $-1/2$  payout, which is best for Betty (scissors gives  $1/2$ , paper gives  $0$ ). So

$-1/2 > (1/2)(-1) + (1/2)(-1)$  so equality does NOT hold Continued on page 6



**The End**

## Math 340 Note Sheet for Midterm, Spring 2008

$$\text{Scream}_{\text{Alice}}(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{y} \text{ stoch}} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} = \text{MinEntry}(\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A}), \quad \text{Scream}_{\text{Betty}}(\mathbf{y}) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \text{ stoch}} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} = \text{MaxEntry}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{y}).$$

$$\text{value} = \text{MaxScream}_{\text{Alice}} = \text{MinScream}_{\text{Betty}}.$$

If all strategies “essential,” (i.e.,  $A$  irreducible), then are unique solutions to  $\mathbf{x}^T A = \mathbf{1}^T v$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{1} = 1$ ,  $A \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1} w$ , and  $\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{1} = 1$ , and they have  $v = w$  (the value),  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} > \mathbf{0}$ .

$\text{MaxScream}_{\text{Alice}}$  is given by the LP: maximize  $v$  subject to  $\mathbf{1}^T v \leq \mathbf{x}^T A$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{1} = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ . For example,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{gives } v \leq x_1 + 3x_2, \quad v \leq 2x_1 + 4x_2, \quad \text{etc.}$$

2-phase method: (1) introduce  $x_0$  on right, (2) pivot  $x_0$  into the basis for a feasible dictionary, and try to minimize  $w = -x_0$ , (3) if  $w$  reaches 0, pivot  $x_0$  out of dictionary and eliminate all  $x_0$ ; e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= -7 + \dots + x_0 \\ x_2 &= -8 + \dots + x_0 \end{aligned} \quad x_0 \text{ enters, } x_3 \text{ leaves}$$

Degenerate pivots: say  $x_3$  enters, and have  $x_3 = 0 + x_2 - 2x_5 + \dots$ . Then  $x_3$  cannot tolerate any positive  $x_5$  value, and leaves without changing the basic feasible solution (and  $z$  value).

Bland’s rule: to prevent/stop cycling, always break ties in entering/leaving variable by choosing variable with the smallest subscript.

Duality example:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & 3x_1 + 4x_2 \text{ s.t.} \\ 5x_1 + 6x_2 & \leq 7 \\ 8x_1 + 9x_2 & \leq 10 \\ x_1, x_2 & \geq 0 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} & 7y_1 + 10y_2 \text{ s.t.} \\ 5y_1 + 8y_2 & \geq 3 \\ 6y_1 + 9y_2 & \geq 4 \\ y_1, y_2 & \geq 0 \end{array}$$

$y_1$  is what first  $x$  inequality is multiplied by to form the dual; so  $y_1$  corresponds to  $x_3$ , and similarly  $y_2$  to  $x_4$ , and similarly  $y_3$  to  $x_1$  and  $y_4$  to  $x_2$ . Dual slacks:

$$y_3 = 3 - 5y_1 - 8y_2, \quad y_4 = 4 - 6y_1 - 9y_2;$$

those must be non-negative.