## 8 The Two-Phase Simplex Method

The LP we solved in the previous lecture allowed us to find an initial BFS very easily. In cases where such an obvious candidate for an initial BFS does not exist, we can solve a different LP to find an initial BFS. We will refer to this as phase I. In phase II we then proceed as in the previous lecture.

Consider the LP to

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\operatorname{minimize} & 6 x_{1}+3 x_{2} \\
\text { subject to } & x_{1}+x_{2} \geqslant 1 \\
& 2 x_{1}-x_{2} \geqslant 1 \\
& 3 x_{2} \leqslant 2 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2} \geqslant 0 .
\end{array}
$$

We change from minimization to maximization and introduce slack variables to obtain the following equivalent problem:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\operatorname{maximize} & -6 x_{1}-3 x_{2} \\
\text { subject to } & x_{1}+x_{2}-z_{1}=1 \\
& 2 x_{1}-x_{2}-z_{2}=1 \\
& 3 x_{2}+z_{3}=2 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2}, z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3} \geqslant 0
\end{array}
$$

Unfortunately, the basic solution with $x_{1}=x_{2}=0, z_{1}=z_{2}=-1$, and $z_{3}=2$ is not feasible. We can, however, add an artificial variable to the left-hand side of each constraint where the slack variable and the right-hand side have opposite signs, and then minimize the sum of the artificial variables starting from the obvious BFS where the artificial variables are non-zero instead of the corresponding slack variables. In the example, we

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\operatorname{minimize} & y_{1}+y_{2} & \\
\text { subject to } & x_{1}+x_{2}-z_{1}+y_{1} & =1 \\
& 2 x_{1}-x_{2}-z_{2}+y_{2}=1 \\
& 3 x_{2}+z_{3} & =2 \\
& x_{1}, x_{2}, z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2} \geqslant 0
\end{array}
$$

and the goal of phase I is to solve this LP starting from the BFS where $x_{1}=x_{2}=z_{1}=$ $z_{2}=0, y_{1}=y_{2}=1$, and $z_{3}=2$. If the original problem is feasible, we will be able to find a BFS where $y_{1}=y_{2}=0$. This automatically gives us an initial BFS for the original problem.

In summary, the two-phase simplex method proceeds as follows:

1. Bring the constraints into equality form. For each constraint in which the slack variable and the right-hand side have opposite signs, or in which there is no slack variable, add a new artificial variable that has the same sign as the right-hand side.
2. Phase I: minimize the sum of the artificial variables, starting from the BFS where the absolute value of the artificial variable for each constraint, or of the slack variable in case there is no artificial variable, is equal to that of the right-hand side.
3. If some artificial variable has a positive value in the optimal solution, the original problem is infeasible; stop.
4. Phase II: solve the original problem, starting from the BFS found in phase I.

While the original objective is not needed for phase I, it is useful to carry it along as an extra row in the tableau, because it will then be in the appropriate form at the beginning of phase II. In the example, phase I therefore starts with the following tableau:

|  | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\chi_{2}$ | $z_{1}$ | $z_{2}$ | $z_{3}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $y_{1}$ | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | 2 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $z_{3}$ | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| II | -6 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I | 3 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Note that the objective for phase I is written in terms of the non-basic variables. This can be achieved by first writing it in terms of $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$, such that we have -1 in the columns for $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ and 0 in all other columns because we are maximizing $-y_{1}-y_{2}$, and then adding the first and second row to make the entries for all variables in the basis equal to zero.

Phase I now proceeds by pivoting on $a_{21}$ to get

|  | $\chi_{1}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $z_{1}$ | $z_{2}$ | $z_{3}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | $\frac{3}{2}$ | -1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | $-\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | 1 | $-\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $-\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| II | 0 | -6 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| I | 0 | $\frac{3}{2}$ | -1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | $-\frac{3}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |

and on $a_{14}$ to get

|  | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\chi_{2}$ | $z_{1}$ | $z_{2}$ | $z_{3}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 |
|  | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| II | 0 | 3 | -6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 |

Note that we could have chosen $\mathrm{a}_{12}$ as the pivot element in the second step, and would have obtained the same result.

This ends phase I as $y_{1}=y_{2}=0$, and we have found a BFS for the original problem with $x_{1}=z_{2}=1, z_{3}=2$, and $x_{2}=z_{1}=0$. After dropping the columns for $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ and the row corresponding to the objective for phase $I$, the tableau is in the right form for phase II:

| $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $z_{1}$ | $z_{2}$ | $z_{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | 3 | -6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

By pivoting on $a_{12}$ we obtain the following tableau, corresponding to an optimal solution of the original problem with $x_{1}=2 / 3, x_{2}=1 / 3$, and value -5 :

| $x_{1}$ | $x_{2}$ | $z_{1}$ | $z_{2}$ | $z_{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | $-\frac{2}{3}$ | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{3}$ |
| 1 | 0 | $-\frac{1}{3}$ | $-\frac{1}{3}$ | 0 | $\frac{2}{3}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | -4 | -1 | 0 | 5 |

It is worth noting that the problem we have just solved is the dual of the LP in Example 1.1, which we solved in the previous lecture, augmented by the constraint $3 x_{2} \leqslant 2$. Ignoring the column and row corresponding to $z_{3}$, the slack variable for this new constraint, the final tableau is essentially the negative of the transpose of the final tableau we obtained in the previous lecture. This makes sense because the additional constraint is not tight in the optimal solution, as we can see from the fact that $z_{3} \neq 0$.

