

COWLES FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH IN ECONOMICS

AT YALE UNIVERSITY

Box 2125, Yale Station  
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

COWLES FOUNDATION DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 728

Note: Cowles Foundation Discussion Papers are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment. Requests for single copies of a Paper will be filled by the Cowles Foundation within the limits of the supply. References in publications to Discussion Papers (other than mere acknowledgment by a writer that he has access to such unpublished material) should be cleared with the author to protect the tentative character of these papers.

NEIGHBORHOOD SYSTEMS FOR PRODUCTION SETS WITH INDIVISIBILITIES

by

Herbert E. Scarf

October 1984

# NEIGHBORHOOD SYSTEMS FOR PRODUCTION SETS WITH INDIVISIBILITIES\*

by

Herbert E. Scarf

## I. Introduction

I have written in this journal before on the subject of production sets with indivisibilities [11, 12]. In the present paper I would like to present some simplifications of the previous arguments, which I hope will make them more accessible to the general reader, and to describe some recent work on this topic by other authors and by myself.

Our inability to incorporate efficiencies of large-scale production and other forms of non-convexity in a conceptual framework which possess the generality of the Walrasian model, has long seemed to me to be a major deficiency of economic theory. When I first became aware of the game theoretic concept of the core it seemed to be ideally suited to the study of increasing returns to scale in production. If the production possibility set is a convex cone a competitive equilibrium will typically exist and be in the core. Moreover, when the number of consumers is large (and when all coalitions have access to the same production set), a feasible production and distribution plan, which is undominated by any coalition will be close to a competitive equilibrium. When the production possibility set displays increasing returns to scale, the grand coalition, which can employ larger stocks of factors than those

---

\*This paper, which is based on the Presidential Address of the Econometric Society delivered at Northwestern University and at Pisa in 1983, was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. I am very much indebted to Andrew Caplin, Philip White and Ludo van der Heyden for many stimulating conversations on the subject of this paper.

of a small coalition, is proportionately stronger than in the case of constant returns to scale. Outcomes proposed by the collection of all consumers would seem to have a lesser chance of being dominated by smaller coalitions, and as a consequence the existence of a non-empty core seems likely in the presence of increasing returns to scale.

This intuition is surely correct in the most elementary example in which production involves a single input, say labor, producing a single generalized output according to the production function  $y = f(\ell)$ , with  $f(\ell)/\ell$  increasing in  $\ell$ . If the  $i^{\text{th}}$  consumer has an initial endowment




FIGURE 1

of labor given by  $\ell_i$ , and a utility function which only values output, then the allocation

$$y_i = \frac{f(\ell)}{\ell} \cdot \ell_i, \quad \text{with } \ell = \sum_{j=1}^n \ell_j,$$

is collectively feasible and undominated by any coalition.

Unfortunately the existence of a non-empty core is not guaranteed under more general conditions. Let  $Y$  be a production possibility set

in  $m$  dimensional Euclidean space, with inputs represented by negative entries and outputs by positive entries of the typical production plan  $y \in Y$ . We shall require that  $Y$  be a closed set, contain the origin, and satisfy the customary free disposal assumption. Moreover, let  $Y$  be additive, in the sense that  $y^1, y^2 \in Y$  implies  $y^1 + y^2 \in Y$ ; and possess the property that  $\{y \in Y \mid y \geq -\omega\}$  is bounded for any non-negative vector  $\omega$ ; all very mild assumptions.

The  $i^{\text{th}}$  consumer (for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) will have the utility function  $u_i(x)$  and vector of initial holdings  $w^i$ . Let the productive knowledge available to an arbitrary coalition  $S \subseteq N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  be described by the same set  $Y$ . The coalition may therefore achieve, by its own efforts, any utility vector  $u_i$ , for  $i \in S$ , with  $u_i \leq u_i(x^i)$ , for some  $\{x^i\}$  and  $y \in Y$  satisfying

$$\sum_{i \in S} x^i = y + \sum_{i \in S} w^i .$$

As usual a utility vector  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  is in the core if it is feasible for the grand coalition  $N$ , and if no coalition  $S$  can achieve an alternative utility vector which is strictly preferable for all of its members.

The following rather surprising conclusion may be shown to be correct. If  $Y$  is *not* a convex cone, then it can be incorporated in an economy described by a given number of consumers  $n$ , a distribution of strictly positive initial assets  $\{w^i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ , and an assignment of continuous, concave, and monotone utility functions  $u_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), each defined on the non-negative orthant of  $R^m$ , for which *the core of the resulting economy is empty*.

I continue to find this result quite disturbing ever since I first came upon it over twenty years ago. It is true that the counterexamples which yield an empty core are somewhat unrealistic in that they involve utility functions which depend on all of the goods and services in the economy, and initial distributions of assets which are positive for all commodities. Certain restrictions on the generality of the economy which do yield a non-empty core have been found by Sharkey [14], Ichiishi [5], Quinzii [9], Ichiishi and Quinzii [6], and by myself [10]. But the conditions are by and large artificial and they do not yield a fully satisfactory cooperative solution to the general Walrasian model in the presence of increasing returns to scale.

Economies of scale are the major economic argument for the existence of large productive units, which by virtue of their size have an ability to influence the prices at which outputs are sold. The strategic selection of prices and outputs by economic agents may be analyzed by non-cooperative game theory, an approach which has been taken by many authors during the last decade in reexamining theories of imperfect competition originally proposed some fifty years ago. But in spite of this substantial body of work (an excellent survey may be found in Hart [3]), a theory of imperfect competition with the range and generality of the Walrasian model is not yet available, even in the case in which economies of scale are absent.

The work of Brown and Heal [1, 2] is also concerned with increasing returns to scale, but their analysis makes no use of game theoretic considerations. Their contribution is to provide existence theorems for marginal cost pricing and average cost pricing equilibria--less ambitious, to be sure, than a game theoretic approach--but perhaps more satisfactory

at this moment precisely because of its simplicity.

The general equilibrium model and its game theoretic counterparts place a heavy reliance on an *a priori* designation of consumer preferences, which are independent of the productive side of the economy. The efficiencies of large scale production, however, may be realized largely in the provision of new goods and services for which consumers have no measure of utility prior to their actual availability. To take only one of many obvious examples, the degree to which a typical consumer will substitute between the acquisition of computer services and other commodities has been drastically changed by the remarkable technical innovations in the computer industry during the post war period. The emptiness of the core in an economic model based on stable preferences for computer services may be entirely irrelevant in examining the consequences of increasing returns to scale in this industry.

When the economy is in competitive equilibrium with the production side described by a convex cone, the question of whether a newly discovered activity may be used to provide an improvement in the utility of each consumer, has a remarkably simple answer. Under mild technical assumptions a necessary and sufficient condition that such an improvement be possible is that the new activity make a positive profit at the old equilibrium prices. This conclusion has an important counterpart in the simplex method for the solution of linear programming problems, in which prices are used to test whether a feasible solution to a system of linear inequalities is indeed optimal. Given a basic feasible solution, a vector of prices is determined which yields a profit of zero for each activity in use. A necessary and sufficient condition that this solution be optimal is that the remaining activities make a profit which is less than or equal

to zero.

If, in the competitive model, a new activity is discovered which can only be used at *integral levels*, its profitability at the equilibrium prices is no longer sufficient to guarantee higher utility levels for all consumers. The analogous conclusion for integer programming problems, in which all activity levels are required to be *integral*, is that there need not exist prices which permit us to conclude that a feasible solution is indeed optimal.

Consider the following example of an integer program:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & -4h_1 - 3h_2 \\ & 2h_1 + h_2 \geq 3 \\ & h_1, h_2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The constraint set is given in Figure 2, with the objective function de-




FIGURE 2

noted by a dashed line. If the integrality condition were relaxed the solution of the corresponding linear program would occur at the point

$(3/2, 0)$  . If the prices associated with the objective function and the inequality are 1 and 2, respectively, then the profit of the activity in use is zero, and the profit of the second activity is -1. The integer programming solution is at the point  $(1,1)$ , and there are no prices which yield a zero profit for both activities.

Production sets with indivisibilities, and the related integer programming problems that arise when an endowment of factors is specified, represent the most extreme form of non-convexities in production. Such production sets capture some of the major features which give rise to the efficiencies of large scale production: set up costs which must be laid out prior to the use of a particular activity, and the construction of large, indivisible pieces of machinery whose employment is economically merited only for high levels of output. My own research has been to concentrate on integer programming problems, and to replace the pricing argument for optimality by a search through neighboring lattice points which are, in a specific sense, close to a given feasible activity vector. Instead of prices we shall be concerned with quantity information in verifying that a feasible plan is optimal.

Let the general integer program have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & a_{01}h_1 + \dots + a_{0n}h_n \\ & a_{11}h_1 + \dots + a_{1n}h_n \geq b_1 \\ & \vdots \\ & a_{m1}h_1 + \dots + a_{mn}h_n \geq b_m, \end{aligned}$$

and  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$  integral. Non-negativity inequalities, to the extent that they appear, will be assumed to be incorporated in the constraints of the problem. By a *neighborhood system* we mean an assignment



to each integral vector  $h = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$  of a *finite* set of integral vectors  $N(h)$ , satisfying the following two conditions:

1.  $N(h) = h + N(0)$
2. if  $k \in N(h)$  then  $h \in N(k)$ .

The first condition states that the set of neighbors associated with different lattice points are simply translates of each other, and the second condition that the neighborhood relation is symmetric.

A local maximum, with respect to a given neighborhood system, is a feasible integral vector, all of whose neighbors are either infeasible, or yield an inferior value of the objective function. A local maximum for a particular neighborhood system need not be a global maximum to the integer program. It may be shown, however, under mild conditions on the technology matrix  $A$ , that a unique, smallest neighborhood system will always exist, for which a local maximum is indeed global. The minimal neighborhood system will depend on the technology matrix alone and not on the factor endowment.

The demonstration that such a minimal neighborhood system exists is quite elementary and is best illustrated by a specific example, such as that of Figure 2, in which the technology matrix is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} -4 & -3 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We shall show that the neighbors of the origin for this example are given by the six lattice points of Figure 3; the neighbors of other points are obtained by translation.




FIGURE 3

In order to verify, for example, that the point  $(1,-2)$  is a neighbor of the origin in the minimal neighborhood system, it is sufficient to show that there is a specification of  $b = (b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3)'$  so that the only integral vectors satisfying the inequalities

$$-4h_1 - 3h_2 \geq b_0$$

$$h_1 \geq b_1$$

$$h_2 \geq b_2$$

$$2h_1 + h_2 \geq b_3$$

are the points  $(0,0)$  and  $(1,-2)$  themselves. For if this were so, the constraints of the integer program

$$\max -4h_1 - 3h_2$$

$$h_1 \geq b_1$$

$$h_2 \geq b_2$$

$$2h_1 + h_2 \geq b_3 ,$$

would be satisfied by  $(0,0)$  and  $(1,-2)$  (with the latter point giving the higher value of the objective function). No other lattice point would

both satisfy the constraints and yield a value of the objective function greater than 0. If  $(1,-2)$  were not in the neighborhood system,  $(0,0)$  would, therefore, be judged incorrectly to be optimal.

To see whether there is a specification of the inequalities for which  $(0,0)$  and  $(1,-2)$  are the only feasible lattice points, we ask whether the smallest convex body--obtained by parallel movements of the inequalities--which contains these two lattice points, will contain any other lattice points. This smallest convex body is the set in Figure 4. The absence of other lattice points from this body verifies that  $(1,-2)$  is a neighbor of the origin in the minimal neighborhood system.




FIGURE 4

Figure 5 displays the minimal convex bodies containing  $(0,0)$  and  $(-1,1)$ ,  $(0,-1)$ , respectively. Since both of these bodies are free of other lattice points,  $(-1,1)$  and  $(0,-1)$  must each be neighbors of the origin in the minimal neighborhood system. In Figure 6 we see that




FIGURE 5

$(2,-3)$  is not a neighbor of the origin. Notice first that  $(2,-3)$  yields




FIGURE 6

a higher value of the objective function  $-4h_1 - 3h_2$  than does  $(0,0)$ . If the right hand side of the integer program is specified so that  $(0,0)$  is a feasible solution, then the feasibility of  $(2,-3)$  will certainly imply that  $(0,0)$  is not an optimal solution. But the feasibility of both  $(0,0)$  and  $(2,-3)$  implies the feasibility of a lattice point we have already verified to be a neighbor of the origin,  $(1,-2)$ , and this lattice point also yields a higher value of the objective than does  $(0,0)$ . Therefore  $(2,-3)$  need not be examined in order to decide on the optimality of  $(0,0)$ . This argument can be used to show that no lattice points other than those appearing in Figure 3 are neighbors of the origin.

For a general technology matrix  $A$ , two lattice points  $k$  and  $k'$  will be neighbors of each other if the smallest convex body--obtained by parallel movements of the linear inequalities--which contains  $k$  and  $k'$  contains no other lattice points. Conditions on  $A$  which are somewhat stronger than necessary to guarantee the existence of a unique, minimal, finite neighborhood system are the following:

1.1 [Assumption]. For each  $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m)'$  the set of integral vectors  $h$  for which  $Ah \geq b$  is finite.

1.2 [Non-Degeneracy Assumption]. For each  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , the origin is the only integral vector satisfying  $\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}h_j = 0$ .

Assumption 1.2, which is not valid in our previous example, can be obtained by perturbing the coefficients of the matrix  $A$ .

Given these two assumptions the proof of existence of the unique, minimal neighborhood system is quite straightforward. For each integral vector  $k$ , different from 0, define

$$S_k = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j \geq \min \left( 0, \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}k_j \right), \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, m \right\}.$$

$S_k$  is the smallest convex set obtained by parallel movements of the inequalities which contains both 0 and  $k$ . Then define a partial ordering of the non-zero lattice points by  $k \preceq k'$  if  $S_k \subseteq S_{k'}$ . From Assumption 1.1, each lattice point is preceded by a finite number of lattice points in this ordering, and from 1.2 there are no pairs with  $k \preceq k'$  and  $k' \preceq k$ . The lattice points which are minimal with respect to this ordering form the neighbors of the origin in the minimal neighborhood system for which a local maximum is global.\*

If the entries in the technology matrix are perturbed slightly the minimal neighborhood system will be unchanged unless Assumption 1.2 is violated. Figure 4 illustrates such a case (based on a matrix with three rows and two columns) in which *either* of the lattice points  $k$  or  $k'$  can be included in a minimal neighborhood of the origin. This




FIGURE 4

\*This argument is due to Andrew Caplin and Philip White.

arbitrariness can be removed if a lexicographic tie-breaking rule is used to order the components of  $y = Ah$  as  $h$  ranges over the integral vectors in  $R^n$ . Finiteness of the minimal neighborhood system is also guaranteed by the lexicographic rule [11], or, as Philip White has shown in his thesis [15], by the assumption that all  $n \times n$  minors of  $A$  have rank  $n$ , in conjunction with assumption 1.2.

Precise knowledge of the minimal neighborhood system associated with  $A$  would yield an obvious algorithm for integer programs based on a specification of the factor endowment  $b$ . When a feasible lattice point is given, its neighbors are examined to see whether one of them satisfies the constraints and yields a higher value of the objective function. If there is such a neighbor we move to it and iterate; if not the current feasible lattice point is optimal.

In the next section I will present some specific examples of neighborhood systems associated with certain classes of integer programming problems. As we shall see, the cardinality of the set of neighbors of the origin may be quite high when compared to the magnitude of the coefficients in the matrix  $A$ . This cardinality is the most immediate measure of the complexity of an algorithm based on iterated neighborhood searches. It specifies the number of alternative lattice points that are required to be examined in order to verify the optimality of a particular feasible solution.

On the other hand, the set of neighbors of the origin may have sufficient structure so that each of its members need not be considered independently. For example, the determination of whether a particular linear inequality is satisfied by some member of a finite set of lattice points may be simplified considerably if the set can be decomposed into

a small number of linear segments. Each of our examples will display structural properties of this type permitting the development of an algorithm which proceeds much more rapidly than might be imagined by simply counting the number of neighbors of the origin. If the approach taken in this paper is to lead to efficient algorithms for integer programming it will be necessary to extend these structural simplifications from our examples to the general problem.

A possible conjecture concerning the structure of minimal neighborhood systems may be phrased using the language of complexity theory. Assume, to be specific, that the entries in the technology matrix  $A$  are themselves integral. A measure of the complexity of  $A$  is given by the number of binary bits required to store all of the entries of  $A$  (including their sign) in a computer; a quantity which may be shown to be

$$S = \sum_m \sum_n (1 + \lceil \log_2(1 + |a_{ij}|) \rceil) ,$$

with  $\lceil x \rceil$  defined as the least integer greater than or equal to  $x$ . An algorithm for solving integer programs based on  $A$  is then said to be *polynomial* if the number of iterations of its basic steps--or more precisely its running time--is bounded from above by a polynomial function of  $S$  (to be accurate  $S$  should be increased by the number of bits required to store the vector of factor endowments specifying the particular problem).

Using techniques of the Geometry of Numbers, Lenstra [8] has demonstrated the remarkable result that there is a polynomial algorithm for all integer programs in which the number of variables is fixed in advance. It is easy to show, by means of examples [12], that the cardinality of the set of neighbors of the origin is definitely *not* polynomial in the

data, but Lenstra's result suggests the very interesting and difficult conjecture that the minimal neighborhood system has sufficient structure so that it can be described in a polynomial fashion. I feel that such a result, if correct, might be capable of interpretation in terms of the internal organization of a large firm whose production possibility set involves large indivisibilities. Such a firm, faced with the necessity of revising its decisions because of changing factor endowments, may construct a mode of organization in which the examination and testing of alternative plans can be carried out in the most efficient way. But at the present time, I am far from being able to provide a convincing argument which relates the structure of neighborhood systems to the administrative arguments that might be undertaken by a large industrial enterprise.

## II. Examples of Neighborhood Systems

In the present section I shall present several examples of technology matrices whose minimal neighborhood systems can easily be described. In each of these examples the neighborhood structure can be exploited so as to yield rapid algorithms for the corresponding integer programming problems.

### a. A Special Leontief Matrix

Let the technology matrix consist of  $m+1$  rows and  $n$  columns. Row zero will have all of its entries negative, and the remaining  $m$  rows will be partitioned into  $n$  subsets  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$  with the property that  $a_{ij} > 0$  if  $i \in I_j$  and  $a_{ij} < 0$  otherwise. We make the special assumption that  $\sum_j a_{ij} > 0$ . This last condition is restrictive; because of the assumption of integral activity levels the multiplication of the columns of  $A$  by arbitrary scalars is not permitted. As



we shall see, the neighbors of the origin consist of all non zero vectors  $h = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$  whose entries are zero or ones, or the negatives of these vectors. The argument begins by establishing the following well known lemma.




FIGURE 8

2.1 [Lemma]. Let the vector  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)'$  be selected so that the  $m+1$  inequalities  $Ah \geq b$  are satisfied by the two vectors  $k$  and  $k'$ . Then the same inequalities are satisfied by  $k'' = (\min(k_1, k'_1), \dots, \min(k_n, k'_n))$ .

Notice first of all that  $\sum_j a_{ij} k_j \geq b_i$ , for  $i \in I_\ell$ , implies that  $a_{i\ell} k_\ell \geq b_i - \sum_{j \neq \ell} a_{ij} k_j \geq b_i - \sum_{j \neq \ell} a_{ij} \min(k_j, k'_j)$ , since  $a_{ij} < 0$  for  $j \neq \ell$ . Replacing  $k$  by  $k'$  yields a similar inequality so that  $a_{i\ell} \min(k_\ell, k'_\ell) \geq b_i - \sum_{j \neq \ell} a_{ij} \min(k_j, k'_j)$ . This verifies that inequalities 1, 2, ...,  $m$  are satisfied by  $k''$ . The zero<sup>th</sup> inequality is certainly satisfied by  $k''$ , establishing Lemma 2.1.

This conclusion may be described geometrically by saying that the smallest convex set obtained by parallel movements of the inequalities, which contains  $k$  and  $k'$ , will also contain  $k''$ . But that immediately implies that the two lattice points  $k$  and  $k'$  will not be neighbors of each other unless one of them is, in fact, equal to  $k''$ , i.e. unless  $k \leq k'$  or  $k' \leq k$ . It follows that a neighbor of the

origin must have all of its coordinates greater than or equal to zero, or less than or equal to zero.

Now let  $k = (k_1, \dots, k_n) \geq 0$  be a neighbor of the origin; we shall demonstrate that  $k_j \leq 1$  for all  $j$ . By assumption the vector  $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$  will satisfy  $\sum_j a_{ij} e_j > 0 \geq \min(0, \sum_j a_{ij} k_j)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and from the arguments of Lemma 2.1, it follows that  $\sum_j a_{ij} \min(k_j, e_j) \geq \min(0, \sum_j a_{ij} k_j)$  for these values of  $i$ . Since  $\sum_j a_{0j} \min(k_j, e_j) \geq \sum_j a_{0j} k_j \geq \min(0, \sum_j a_{0j} k_j)$  it follows that  $\min(k, e)$  must be in the smallest convex set (obtained by translating the  $m+1$  inequalities) which contains 0 and  $k$ . This eliminates the possibility that a neighbor of the origin has some coordinates greater than one.

The possible non-negative neighbors of the origin are therefore vectors  $e^S = (e_1^S, e_2^S, \dots, e_n^S)$  with  $e_j^S = 1$  if  $j \in S$  and  $e_j^S = 0$  if  $j \notin S$ , with  $S$  an arbitrary subset of  $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ . To show that such a vector is indeed a neighbor of the origin it is sufficient to show that no other vector  $e^{S'}$  is in the smallest convex body, obtained by translations of the inequalities, which contains 0 and  $e^S$ . This is equivalent to showing that for any other subset  $S'$  the inequalities

$$\sum_j a_{ij} e_j^{S'} \geq \min[0, \sum_j a_{ij} e_j^S], \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, m$$

are not all satisfied. But  $\sum_j a_{ij} e_j^S$  is positive for all  $i \in I_\ell$  if  $\ell \in S$  and negative otherwise. The above inequalities for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  therefore imply that  $S' \supset S$  and this is inconsistent with

$$\sum_j a_{0j} e_j^{S'} \geq \sum_j a_{0j} e_j^S. \quad \text{We have therefore demonstrated}$$

2.2 [Theorem]. The neighbors of the origin consist precisely of those vectors whose coordinates are 0's and 1's and their negatives.

Consider the integer program

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_j a_{0j} h_j \\ & \sum_j a_{ij} h_j \geq b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned}$$

with  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m$  a specific right hand side. A direct application of neighborhood searches may lead to an extremely slow algorithm if the initial feasible solution is far from the optimum. As we shall see, there is an alternative algorithm which reaches the optimum solution in a number of steps which is bounded above by some function of  $n$ , independently of the entries in the matrix  $A$ . Let us begin by solving the associated *linear* program

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_j a_{0j} x_j \\ & \sum_j a_{ij} x_j \geq b_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \end{aligned}$$

with optimal solution  $x = x^*$ . For simplicity of notation we shall assume that  $0 < x_j^* \leq 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

Our first observation is that the optimal solution to the integer program must satisfy  $h_j \leq \max_{\ell \neq j} h_\ell + 1$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that  $(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$  is the optimal solution and that  $h_1 \geq h_j + 2$  for  $j = 2, \dots, n$ . But then the neighbor  $(h_1 - 1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$  will certainly satisfy all of the inequalities in rows  $I_2, I_3, \dots, I_n$ . We

then use Lemma 2.1 to argue that  $(x_1^* + h_1 - 2, h_2, \dots, h_n)$   
 $= \min((h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n), (x_1^* + h_1 - 2, x_2^* + h_1 - 2, \dots, x_n^* + h_1 - 2))$  is feasible. Since  $x_1^* + h_1 - 2 \leq h_1 - 1$ , we see immediately that the inequalities in  $I_1$  are also satisfied by  $(h_1 - 1, h_2, \dots, h_n)$  and  $h$  is therefore not optimal.

It follows from this argument that the optimal solution must have a pair of coordinates, say  $h_j$  and  $h_k$ , whose difference is either +1, 0, or -1. If this pair were known the two variables  $h_j$  and  $h_k$  could be replaced by a single variable  $t$  with one of the following conditions holding

$$h_j = t \quad , \quad h_k = t \quad ;$$

$$h_j = t \quad , \quad h_k = t+1 \quad ;$$

$$h_j = t+1 \quad , \quad h_k = t \quad .$$

The original integer program would then be reduced to three integer programs involving  $n-1$  rather than  $n$  variables. Moreover the new technology matrix would be obtained by adding together columns  $j$  and  $k$ , and would therefore satisfy precisely the same conditions as the original problem.

Of course, the precise pair  $j$  and  $k$  is not known in advance. But there are  $n(n-1)/2$  such pairs; when all of these are considered at each step, we obtain an algorithm whose running time is bounded above by a function of  $n$ , independently of the remaining data.

The neighborhood system may be considerably more complex when the assumption  $\sum_j a_{ij} > 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  is relaxed. In this more

general case there will be a smallest positive integer vector  $h_1^*, \dots, h_n^*$  satisfying  $\sum a_{ij} h_j^* > 0$ , and the neighbors of the origin will be non-negative vectors  $h \leq h^*$ , or their negatives. But substantially more analysis seems necessary in order to develop an algorithm which is polynomial in the data.

#### b. The Transportation Problem

As our second example we shall consider the classical Hitchcock-Koopmans transportation problem. We are given  $m$  sources of a single homogeneous commodity and  $n$  destinations. The unit cost of shipping from source  $i$  to destination  $j$  is a positive number  $c_{ij}$ . The available supply at source  $i$  is denoted by  $s_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and the demand at destination  $j$  by  $d_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ; it is typically assumed that  $\sum_i s_i \geq \sum_j d_j$ .

Let  $x_{ij} \geq 0$  be the amount shipped from source  $i$  to destination  $j$ . Such a shipping plan will be feasible--consistent with the available supplies and the demands--if  $\sum_j x_{ij} \leq s_i$  and  $\sum_i x_{ij} \geq d_j$ . The goal of the transportation problem is to select a feasible shipping plan which minimizes the total cost  $\sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} x_{ij}$ . As such the problem is an ordinary linear program involving  $m \cdot n$  variables  $x_{ij}$  and  $m+n$  linear inequalities in addition to the non-negativity requirements on the variables themselves. It can be solved in a most expeditious fashion by the simplex method.

The problem becomes an integer program when the variables  $x_{ij}$  are required to be integral. But even in this form the problem is elementary since it may be shown that the optimal solution to the linear program will yield variables  $x_{ij}$  which are integral if the supplies

$s_i$  and the demands  $d_j$  are themselves integral. And even if this were not so, the supplies could be rounded down and the demands rounded up to integral values so that the simplex method is available to solve this integer programming problem.

Our purpose will be to exhibit the neighborhood system for the integral transportation problem and to show that an accelerated neighborhood search is identical to the simplex method. For this problem the technology matrix  $A$  will consist of  $1+n+m+m \cdot n$  rows and  $m \cdot n$  columns. The matrix will map a vector of integral activity levels  $h_{ij}$  into a production plan

$$\begin{aligned} y &= - \sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} h_{ij} \\ t_1 &= \sum_i h_{i1} \\ &\vdots \\ t_n &= \sum_i h_{in} \\ u_1 &= - \sum_j h_{1j} \\ &\vdots \\ u_m &= - \sum_j h_{mj} \\ h_{11} &= h_{11} \\ &\vdots \\ h_{mn} &= h_{mn} . \end{aligned}$$

A typical neighbor of the origin will be an integral vector  $\{h'_{ij}\}$  whose coordinates may be of mixed sign. Such a vector will be a neighbor of the origin if there is no other integral vector  $h'_{ij}$  with  $y' \geq \min(0, y)$ ,  $t'_j \geq \min(0, t_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $u'_i \geq \min(0, u_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $h'_{ij} \geq \min(0, h_{ij})$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Let

us begin our analysis by considering a potential neighbor of the origin for which one of the  $t_j$ 's, say  $t_1$ , is different from zero. Since the negative of a neighbor is also a neighbor there is no loss of generality in assuming that  $t_1 > 0$ . But then one or more of the coordinates  $h_{i1}$  must also be strictly positive, say  $h_{i^*1} > 0$ . The integral vector  $\{h'_{ij}\}$  defined to be

$$h'_{ij} = h_{ij} \quad \text{for all } (i,j) \neq (i^*,1)$$

$$h'_{i^*1} = h_{i^*1} - 1$$

will yield a production plan  $\{y', t', u', h'\}$  which differs from  $\{y, t, u, h\}$  in only four coordinates:

$$y' = y + c_{i^*1}$$

$$t'_1 = t_1 - 1$$

$$u'_{i^*} = u_{i^*} + 1$$

$$h'_{i^*1} = h_{i^*1} - 1.$$

Since  $t'_1$  and  $h'_{i^*1}$  are both  $\geq 0$ , this new production plan will certainly be in the smallest convex body containing 0 and  $h$ , obtained by translating the inequalities of the transportation problem. For  $h$  to be a neighbor,  $h'$  must therefore be the zero vector, so that  $h$  is a plan which ships a single unit from source  $i^*$  to destination 1. All other neighbors of the origin must satisfy  $t_j = 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

As our next step in the analysis we shall consider a neighbor for which  $t_j = 0$  for all  $j$ , and for which all of the  $u_i$  are also equal to zero. It is useful to introduce the graph  $G$  associated with the transportation problem which has as its set of nodes, the  $m$  sources

and  $n$  destinations, and as its arcs, all simple paths from a source to a destination. A cycle of the graph is a sequence of arcs  $(n_1, n_2), (n_2, n_3), \dots, (n_k, n_1)$  each of which connects a source and a destination, beginning and ending with the same node.




FIGURE 9

Now let  $\{h_{ij}\}$  be a neighbor of the origin for which  $u_i = \sum_j h_{ij} = 0$  and  $t_j = \sum_i h_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Assume, for specificity, that  $h_{11} > 0$ . It follows that  $h_{i1} < 0$  for some  $i$ , say  $i_1$ . As a consequence  $h_{i_1 j} > 0$  for some  $j$ , say  $j_1$ . By continuing in this fashion we shall find a cycle along which the corresponding  $h_{ij}$ 's alternate in sign. We define  $\{e_{ij}\}$  to be +1 if  $(i,j)$  is in the cycle and  $h_{ij} > 0$ , to be -1 if  $(i,j)$  is in the cycle and  $h_{ij} < 0$ , and to be 0 otherwise. The production plan  $\{e_{ij}\}$ , illustrated in Figure 10, consists of shipping a single unit of the commodity around the arcs of a cycle.




FIGURE 10



Let us assume that the cost  $\sum \sum c_{ij} e_{ij}$  associated with this elementary shipping plan is positive. If we then define  $h'_{ij} = h_{ij} - e_{ij}$ , it will be true that  $y' > y$ ,  $t'_j = 0$  and  $u'_i = 0$  for all  $(i,j)$ , that  $h'_{ij} \geq h_{ij}$  for  $h_{ij} \leq 0$ , and that  $h'_{ij} \geq 0$  for  $h_{ij} > 0$ . It follows that  $h'$  is in the smallest convex body containing 0 and  $h$ , obtained by translating the inequalities of the transportation problem;  $h$  will therefore be a neighbor of the origin only if it is equal to the elementary shipping plan  $e$ . If, on the other hand the cost  $\sum \sum c_{ij} e_{ij} < 0$ , consideration of the plan  $h' = -h + e$  will also show that  $h$  is equal to  $e$ . We conclude that a neighbor of the origin for which  $u_i$  and  $t_j$  are all 0 is an elementary plan consisting of shipping a single unit in some direction around a cycle.

To complete our analysis we consider those neighbors of the origin for which  $t_j = 0$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and for which one of the  $u_i$ , say  $u_1$ , is negative. Since  $u_1 < 0$ , it follows that there is some  $j$ , say  $j_1$ , for which  $h_{1j_1} > 0$ , and as a consequence there will be some  $i$ , say  $i_1$  for which  $h_{i_1 j_1} < 0$ . There is no loss in generality in assuming that  $u_{i_1} > 0$ , since if this were not so the argument could be continued to find  $h_{i_1 j_2} > 0$  and  $h_{i_2 j_2} < 0$ , etc., and must terminate with a positive  $u$ , since a cycle is ruled out by precisely those arguments which have just been employed.




FIGURE 11

If  $c_{1j_1} > c_{i_1j_1}$  the plan

$$h'_{ij} = h_{ij} \quad \text{for all } (i,j) \neq (1, j_1) \text{ or } (i_1, j_1)$$

$$h'_{1j_1} = h_{1j_1} - 1$$

$$h'_{i_1j_1} = h_{i_1j_1} + 1$$

is in the smallest translated convex body containing 0 and  $h$ , and we conclude that  $h_{1j_1} = 1$ ,  $h_{i_1j_1} = -1$  and is otherwise 0. If  $c_{1j_1} < c_{i_1j_1}$ ,  $-h'$  will lie in the smallest translated convex body containing 0 and  $-h$ , and the same conclusion follows. We have therefore demonstrated the following theorem.

2.3 [Theorem]. The neighbors of the origin for the transportation problem are of three types: shipping a single unit from a source to a destination (or its negative), shipping a single unit around a cycle, and replacing the shipment of a single unit from a particular source to a destination by the shipment of a single unit from a different source to the same destination.

Before proceeding to the accelerated neighborhood search a remark should be made about degeneracy. The transportation problem is degenerate in the sense used in Section I of this paper and some procedure must be used to break ties in two vectors of the form  $\{y, t, u, h\}$ . The simplest such procedure is to make use of the lexicographic ordering, starting from  $y$  and then moving through the remaining coordinates. It is easy to see that our arguments are valid if  $c_{ij} > 0$ ,  $c_{ij_1} \neq c_{ij_2}$ , for

$j_1 \neq j_2$  and  $\sum c_{ij}e_{ij} \neq 0$  around any cycle.

Now let  $h_{ij}$  be a feasible solution to the transportation problem with a given set of supplies  $s_i$  and demands  $d_j$ ; we shall assume that  $\sum s_i = \sum d_j$ . (We shall also make the standard non-degeneracy assumption of the transportation problem that the sum of the supplies is different from the sum of the demands for any proper subset of nodes.) In this case the neighbors of a feasible plan  $h$  obtained by shipping one more (or less) unit along a given arc will not be feasible, nor will those obtained by shipping one more unit along a given arc and one less from a different source to the same destination. We need only concern ourselves with neighbors that arise by shipping one unit around a cycle.

Let us suppose that the feasible solution is positive for a set of arcs which contain a cycle and let  $e$  be the plan which ships one unit



FIGURE 12

around that cycle, with the orientation selected in such a way that  $\sum c_{ij}e_{ij} < 0$ . Then  $h+e$  will remain feasible and yield an improvement in the objective function. But this neighborhood search can easily be accelerated by adding the largest integral multiple of  $e$  to  $h$  which retains feasibility; in so doing we shall obtain an improved feasible solution containing fewer positive arcs than the previous solution.

Repeated application of the same procedure will yield an improved solution for which the set of positive arcs forms a *tree*: a subgraph of  $G$  containing no cycles. And given the non-degeneracy assumption of the transportation problem, this tree is maximal in the sense that adding any arc to the tree will yield a subgraph containing precisely one cycle. The reader familiar with linear programming will know that at this point we have reached a *feasible basis* for the transportation problem.




FIGURE 13

In order to see whether  $h+e$  remains feasible, where  $e$  is a plan which ships a single unit around any particular cycle, we need only select an arc which is not in the tree. If  $h+e$  ships a positive amount along this arc and remains feasible, the cycle--and its orientation--will be uniquely determined. Once the cycle is known we evaluate the cost  $\sum c_{ij}e_{ij}$ . If this cost is positive this particular neighbor should not be selected, since it results in a worsening of the objective function. If the cost is negative, we add to  $h$  the largest possible multiple of  $e$  which retains feasibility, yielding a new tree containing the new arc and with one of the arcs of the original tree deleted.

This movement from one feasible basis to an adjacent one with an

improvement in the objective function is precisely a pivot step of the ordinary simplex method. As we see an accelerated neighborhood search is identical to the simplex method for the transportation problem. A similar conclusion is undoubtedly correct for other types of network flow problems as well.

c. The Knapsack Problem with Two Variables

The problem of minimizing a linear function of non-negative integral variables subject to a single linear inequality is known as the knapsack problem. It is an extremely difficult problem and undoubtedly does not possess an algorithm which is polynomial in the data when the number of variables is considered as well as the coefficients of the two linear inequalities. In this section we shall provide a complete description of the neighborhood structure when the number of variables is equal to two and verify that an accelerated neighborhood search does lead to a polynomial algorithm.

A polynomial algorithm for the two variable knapsack problem was first provided by Hirschberg and Wong [4]. This was followed by a generalization to a larger class of integer programs involving two variables by Kannan [7], and extended to the general two variable problem by myself [12].<sup>1</sup> The analysis of the neighborhood structure for the two variable knapsack problem can be applied with minor modifications to the general integer program with two variables; the knapsack problem has been selected in order to simplify the exposition.

The technology matrix  $A$  for the knapsack problem has the form

---

<sup>1</sup>As previously mentioned, Lenstra has demonstrated the existence of a polynomial algorithm when the number of variables is fixed at any value.

$$\begin{bmatrix} - & - \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ + & + \end{bmatrix} .$$

The middle two rows of  $A$  express the non-negativity constraints, the top row the objective function (we are minimizing a linear function with positive coordinates), and the last row states that a positive linear function of the two variables is greater than or equal to a preassigned right hand side. We adopt the lexicographic tie breaking rule which stipulates that a 0 coordinate in the vector  $y = Ah$  is to be considered positive if and only if the vector  $y$  is lexicographically positive. With this convention the 0's in  $A$  are interpreted as being negative.

The analysis of the neighborhood system is greatly facilitated by the following elementary observation.

2.4 [Lemma]. Let the matrix  $A$  have the sign pattern

$$\begin{bmatrix} - & - \\ + & - \\ - & + \\ + & + \end{bmatrix}$$

Then  $(1,0)$ ,  $(0,1)$  and  $(1,1)$  are neighbors of the origin.

When the four linear inequalities, corresponding to the four rows of  $A$ , are placed on the vertices of the unit square, as in Figure 14, the resulting convex body will contain no other lattice points. Therefore the smallest convex body--obtained by translating the four linear inequalities--containing the origin and any one of the other three lattice




FIGURE 14

points will be free of additional lattice points. This demonstrates Lemma 2.4.

Now let us assume that the difference between the two columns of  $A$  has the same sign pattern as one of the columns; for example that  $a^1 - a^2$  has the same sign pattern as  $a^1$ , where  $a^j$  denotes column  $j$ . But then Lemma 2.4 can be applied to the matrix  $B$  given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{01} - a_{02} & a_{02} \\ 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \\ a_{31} - a_{32} & a_{32} \end{bmatrix},$$

and we conclude that  $a^1 - a^2 = B \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  is a neighbor of the origin for the matrix  $B$ . But since  $B \cdot h'$  and  $A \cdot h$  generate the same set of vectors as  $h$  and  $h'$  range over the lattice points in the plane it follows that  $(1, -1)$  is a neighbor of the origin for the original problem.

This process of subtraction may be continued. If  $k_1$  is the largest integer such that  $a^1 - k_1 a^2$  has the same sign pattern as  $a^1$ , then  $(1, -1), (1, -2), \dots, (1, -k_1)$  will all be neighbors of the origin. Letting  $a^3 = a^1 - k_1 a^2$ , the result of these repeated subtractions will

be a matrix

$$A^2 = \begin{matrix} & a^3 & a^2 \\ \begin{bmatrix} a_{01} - k_1 a_{02} & a_{02} \\ 1 & 0 \\ -k_1 & 1 \\ a_{31} - k_1 a_{32} & a_{32} \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

whose sign pattern is identical to that of the original matrix.

It will no longer be correct that  $a^3 - a^2$  has the same sign pattern as  $a^3$ , but it is possible that  $a^2 - a^3$  has the same sign pattern as  $a^2$ . If this is so we let  $k_2$  be the largest integer such that  $a^4 = a^2 - k_2 a^3$  has the same sign pattern as  $a^2$ . This produces a new linear sequence of neighbors  $(-1, 1+k_1)$ ,  $(-2, 1+2k_1)$ , ...,  $(-k_2, 1+k_2 k_1)$ , and a final matrix  $A^3$  whose columns are given by  $a^3$ ,  $a^4$ .

The process moves through a sequence of matrices

$A^1 = A, A^2, A^3, \dots, A^{n+1}$  each having the same sign pattern as  $A$ .

$A^j$  has columns  $(a^{j+1}, a^j)$  if  $j$  is even and  $(a^j, a^{j+1})$  if  $j$  is odd, where  $a^{j+1} = a^{j-1} - k_{j-1} a^j$ ;  $k_{j-1}$  is the largest integer such that  $a^{j+1}$  and  $a^{j-1}$  have the same sign pattern. The process terminates at the matrix  $A^{n+1}$  which has the property that neither column difference has the same sign pattern as one of the columns. In moving from  $A^j$  to  $A^{j+1}$  a new set of  $k_j$  neighbors is determined:

$$(a_1^j - a_1^{j+1}, a_2^j - a_2^{j+1}), \dots, (a_1^j - k_j a_1^{j+1}, a_2^j - k_j a_2^{j+1}) = (a_1^{j+2}, a_2^{j+2}).$$

As is quite apparent, this set of neighbors, which we denote by  $S_j$ , is linear.



I shall reserve for the appendix the proof that all of the neighbors of the origin--aside from sign--are obtained by this procedure. Assuming this conclusion to be correct, the neighbors of the origin are partitioned into  $S_0 = \{(1,0), (0,1), (1,1)\}$  and  $n$  linear subsets--an observation which permits a considerable acceleration of the repeated neighborhood search for an optimal solution.

An example may be useful at this point. Let the knapsack problem be

$$\begin{aligned} \min & 329h_1 + 103h_2 \\ & 195h_1 + 61h_2 \geq b \\ \text{with } & h_j \text{ non-negative integers.} \end{aligned}$$

The sequence of matrices  $A^1, A^2, A^3, A^4$  is then given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} -329 & -103 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 195 & 61 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -20 & -103 \\ 1 & 0 \\ -3 & 1 \\ 12 & 61 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -20 & -3 \\ 1 & -5 \\ -3 & 16 \\ 12 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -2 & -3 \\ 31 & -5 \\ -99 & 16 \\ 6 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

with neighbors  $(1,0), (0,1), (1,1)$  and

$$\begin{array}{lll} (1,-1) & (-1,4) & (6,-19) \\ (1,-2) & (-2,7) & (11,-35) \\ (1,-3) & (-3,10) & (16,-51) \\ & (-4,13) & (21,-67) \\ & (-5,16) & (26,-83) \\ & & (31,-99) \end{array}$$

In  $S_j$ , for  $j \geq 1$ , the neighbors are  $h^j(t) = (a_1^j - ta_1^{j+1}, a_2^j - ta_2^{j+1})$  with  $t = 1, 2, \dots, k_j$ . If  $j$  is odd then  $h_1^j(t) > 0$  and is monotonically increasing,  $h_2^j(t) < 0$  and is monotonically

decreasing; moreover  $h_1^j(k_j) < h_1^{j+2}(1)$  and  $h_2^j(k_j) > h_2^{j+2}(1)$ . The sign patterns and inequalities are reversed if  $j$  is even. The values of the constraint function at this sequence of neighbors are given by

$$a_3 \cdot h^j(t) = a_3^j - t a_3^{j+1}$$

for  $t = 1, \dots, k_j$ , and  $a_3 \cdot h^j(k_j)$  is equal to  $a_3^{j+2}$ .

Now let  $h$  be a feasible solution to the knapsack problem for a particular value of the right hand side  $b$ , i.e.  $h \geq 0$  and  $a_3 \cdot h \geq b$ . As we shall see, a single division is required to determine whether one of the neighbors of the origin in  $S_j$ , for  $j \geq 1$ , can be subtracted from  $h$  (addition of one of these neighbors will worsen the objective function) and still retain feasibility.

2.5 [Lemma]. Let  $h$  be a feasible solution, and define  $t^*$  to be the smallest positive integer such that

$a_3 \cdot (h - h^j(t)) = a_3 \cdot h - a_3^j + t a_3^{j+1} \geq b$ . If  $h - h^j(t)$  is feasible for some  $t = 1, 2, \dots, k_j$ , then  $h - h^j(t^*)$  is feasible. (If  $t^* > k_j$  then  $h - h^j(t)$  is infeasible for all  $t = 1, 2, \dots, k_j$ .)

The proof of the Lemma is quite direct. If  $h - h^j(t^*)$  is not feasible, then  $h_i - h_i^j(t^*) < 0$  for  $i = 1$  or  $2$ . Assume, to be specific that  $j$  is odd, so that  $h_1^j(t) > 0$  and increasing in  $t$ . This implies that  $h_1 - h_1^j(t^*) < 0$  and therefore  $h_1 - h_1^j(t) < 0$  for  $t > t^*$ . On the other hand, for  $t < t^*$  we have  $a_3 \cdot (h - h^j(t)) = a_3 \cdot h - a_3^j + t a_3^{j+1} < b$ . This demonstrates Lemma 2.5.

We see that at most  $n$  computations (plus some trivial ones associated with subtracting  $(1,0)$ ,  $(0,1)$  and  $(1,1)$  from  $h$ ) are required to test for the optimality of a given feasible vector  $h$ . But even more

can be said. Let  $h$  be an arbitrary feasible vector such that neither  $h - (1,0)$  nor  $h - (0,1)$  are feasible. Then at most  $2n$  steps are required to pass from  $h$  to the optimal solution if at each step we subtract the largest multiple of a neighbor of the origin from a feasible vector so as to retain feasibility.

To establish this assertion, let  $j$  be the smallest integer (assume that  $j \geq 2$ ) such that  $S_j$  contains a neighbor  $h^j(t)$  with  $h - h^j(t)$  feasible. By Lemma 2.5 it will be correct that  $h' = h - h^j(t^*)$  is feasible with  $t^*$  the smallest positive integer such that  $a_3 \cdot (h - h^j(t)) = a_3 \cdot h - a_3^j + t a_3^{j+1} \geq b$ . Consider first the case in which  $t^* > 1$ . In this case  $a_3 \cdot h' = a_3 \cdot h - a_3^j + t^* a_3^{j+1} < b + a_3^{j+1}$ . Since  $a_3 \cdot h^k(t) \geq a_3^{j+1}$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, j-1$  and any  $t = 1, 2, \dots, k_\ell$ , it follows that the only neighbors of the origin which can be subtracted from  $h'$  with feasibility retained must lie in  $S_j, S_{j+1}, \dots, S_n$ . Moreover, since  $a_3 \cdot h^j(t) > a_3^{j+1}$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, k_j - 1$  the only possible neighbor in  $S_j$  that can be subtracted is the last one,  $h^j(k_j)$ . If we subtract the largest possible multiple of  $h^j(k_j)$  which retains feasibility then no further subtractions are available in any of the sets  $S_1, \dots, S_j$ .

To complete the argument we consider the case in which  $t^* = 1$ .

But then I claim that

$$a_3 \cdot (h - h^j(1)) = a_3 \cdot h - a_3^j + a_3^{j+1} < a_3^{j+1} + b.$$

If this were not so then  $a_3 \cdot h \geq b + a_3^j$ . Since  $h^{j-2}(k_{j-2}) = a_3^j$  it follows that  $a_3 \cdot (h - h^{j-2}(k_{j-2})) \geq b$ . From the fact that the positive coordinate of  $h^{j-2}(k_{j-2})$  is less than the same coordinate of  $h^j(1)$ , we see that  $h - h^{j-2}(k_{j-2})$  is feasible, contradicting the assumption

that  $S_j$  is the first set containing a neighbor which can be subtracted from  $h$ . It follows that even in the case in which  $t^* = 1$ ,  $a_3 \cdot h' = a_3 \cdot (h - h^j(1)) < b + a_3^j$  and the only subsequent subtraction in  $S_j$  is  $h^j(k_j)$ . Again we subtract the largest possible multiple of  $h^j(k_j)$  which retains feasibility, and are left with the situation that all subsequent subtractions are from  $S_{j+1}, \dots, S_n$ . This demonstrates that the optimal solution may be found in no more than  $2n$  steps.

Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & 329h_1 + 103h_2 \\ & 195h_1 + 61h_2 \geq 6999 \\ \text{with } & h_j \text{ non-negative integers,} \end{aligned}$$

whose neighbors have been determined above. The feasible solution  $h = (28, 26)$  yields a value of the constraint of 7046. The only neighbor in  $S_1$  which can be subtracted is  $(1, -3)$ . Subtracting this neighbor three times yields  $h' = (25, 35)$  with a value of the constraint function given by 7010. The only neighbor in  $S_2$  which can then be subtracted is  $(-5, 16)$ . Subtracting this neighbor twice yields  $h'' = (35, 3)$  with a value of the constraint given by 7008. No subsequent subtraction is possible and we have reached the optimal solution.

It is elementary to show [12] that  $n$ , the number of linear subsets into which the neighborhood system is partitioned is no larger than  $S/2$  where

$$S = \sum_{i=0,3} \sum_{j=1,2} \left( 1 + \lceil \log_2(|a_{ij}| + 1) \rceil \right),$$

the number of binary bits required to store the data of the problem. In

the terminology of complexity theory the accelerated neighborhood search leads to a linear algorithm for the knapsack problem. As I have previously mentioned, virtually identical arguments can be applied to the general integer programming problem with two variables.

d. Integer Programs with Three Variables and Three Inequalities

In this section I will briefly describe some recent work on neighborhood systems associated with a technology matrix  $A$  with four rows and three columns. The matrix is assumed to satisfy Assumption 1.1.

A matrix  $U$  is defined to be unimodular if it has integral entries and a determinant of  $\pm 1$ . If  $U$  is unimodular the transformation  $h' = U^{-1}h$  maps the set of lattice points in three space onto itself. Since  $Ah = AUU^{-1}h = AUh'$  it follows that the two technology matrices  $A$  and  $AU$  generate equivalent integer programs, and we are free to select the unimodular matrix  $U$  in a way that simplifies the description of the neighborhood system.

In [13], I have shown that there is a unimodular transformation  $U$ , with the property that all of the neighbors of  $(0,0,0)$ , associated with  $A' = AU$ , lie on one of the three planes  $h_1 = -1$ ,  $h_1 = 0$ ,  $h_1 = +1$ . This implies that in testing for the optimality of a feasible solution  $h = (h_1, h_2, h_3)$  to the integer program

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & a_0^i \cdot h \\ & a_i^i \cdot h \geq b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \\ \text{and } & h \text{ integral} \end{aligned}$$

it is sufficient to solve the three two variable integer programs obtained by fixing the first variable at  $h_1 - 1$ ,  $h_1$ ,  $h_1 + 1$ . Each one of these

problems has, of course, a polynomial algorithm by the arguments of the previous example.

In fact, something more can be demonstrated. When the two variable integer program, obtained by fixing the first variable at any level, is solved, the information available at the solution is sufficient to tell whether the optimal solution to the three variable problem has a higher or lower value of its first coordinate. This is a very surprising conclusion which, unfortunately, does not seem capable of generalization to problems with more than three variables.

At present, the structure of the neighborhood system for the general integer program is very imperfectly understood. It seems likely that progress will best be made by the study of special classes of problems, such as those of this paper.

#### Postscript

In the presentation of my Presidential address considerable time was spent in discussing an important result recently obtained by Philip White, Andrew Caplin and Ludo van der Heyden [16]. Their paper establishes a close connection between a particular algorithm for integer programs, based on neighborhood searches, and the dual simplex method for the corresponding linear program obtained by relaxing the requirement that the variables be integral. Unfortunately, the space limitations of the present article do not permit a discussion of their work.

## APPENDIX

We shall demonstrate that the procedure of Section II.c finds all of the neighbors of the origin for the two variable knapsack problem. It is easy to see that the only neighbors in the non-negative quadrant are  $(1,0)$ ,  $(0,1)$  and  $(1,1)$ ; all other neighbors are in the second or fourth quadrant.

Let  $h = (q_1, -q_2)$  be a neighbor in the fourth quadrant, with  $q_1, q_2$  non-negative integers, and consider the smallest convex body --obtained by translating the four inequalities--containing  $h$  and the origin. In Figure 15 I have made a particular assumption--which will be maintained throughout the argument--about the way in which the linear




FIGURE 15

inequalities relate to these two points; the small number of alternative assumptions can be dealt with by analogous arguments.

Figure 15 implies that

$$Ah = \begin{bmatrix} - & - \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ + & + \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ -q_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} - \\ + \\ - \\ + \end{bmatrix}$$

Case 1.  $q_2 > q_1$

We have

$$0 < q_1 a_3^1 - q_2 a_3^2 = q_1(a_3^1 - a_3^2) - (q_2 - q_1)a_3^2, \text{ and}$$

$$0 > q_1 a_0^1 - q_2 a_0^2 = q_1(a_0^1 - a_0^2) - (q_2 - q_1)a_0^2.$$

The first of these inequalities implies  $a_3^1 - a_3^2 > 0$  and the second  $a_0^1 - a_0^2 < 0$ . It follows that the matrix  $A'$  with columns  $(a^1 - a^2, a^2)$  has the same sign pattern as  $A$ , and that  $(q_1, -q_2 + q_1)$  represents the same neighbor of the origin when  $A$  is replaced by  $A'$ .

Case 2.  $q_2 < q_1$




FIGURE 16

In this case we write



$$\begin{aligned}
A \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ -q_2 \end{pmatrix} &= q_1 a^1 - q_2 a^2 \\
&= (q_1 - q_2) a^1 - q_2 (a^2 - a^1) \\
&= A' \begin{pmatrix} q_1 - q_2 \\ -q_2 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

so that  $(q_1 - q_2, -q_2)$  represents the original neighbor of the origin when  $A$  is replaced by  $A'$ , the matrix with columns  $(a^1, a^2 - a^1)$ . To verify that  $A'$  is the matrix arising in the computations of Section II.c, we need to verify that  $a_3^2 - a_3^1 > 0$  and  $a_0^2 - a_0^1 < 0$ . The first of these inequalities arises from the fact that  $(1, -1)$  does not satisfy inequality 3 when it is placed through the origin, and the second from the observation that  $(q_1 - 1, -q_2 + 1)$  does not satisfy inequality 0 when it is placed through the point  $(q_1, -q_2)$ .

In either case when the smaller of the two numbers is subtracted from the larger we obtain a new representation of the same neighbor with  $A$  replaced by  $A'$ . Since the pair of integers  $q_1, q_2$  are relatively prime, a continuation of the process will ultimately represent the original neighbor using weights  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, -1)$  with  $A$  replaced by a matrix arising in the computation of Section II.c. We have therefore verified that the neighbors of Section II.c are--aside from sign--all of the neighbors of the two variable knapsack problem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, Donald J. and Geoffrey M. Heal, "Marginal vs. Average Pricing in the Presence of a Public Monopoly," Amer. Econ. Rev., 73 (1983), 189-193.
- [2] Brown, Donald J. and Geoffrey M. Heal, "The Optimality of Regulated Pricing: A General Equilibrium Analysis," Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper No. 684, Dec. 1983.
- [3] Hart, Oliver D., "Imperfect Competition in General Equilibrium," London School of Economics, 1982.
- [4] Hirschberg, D. S. and C. K. Wong, "A Polynomial Time Algorithm for the Knapsack Problem in Two Variables," Jour. Ass. Comp. Math. 23 (1976), 147-154.
- [5] Ichiishi, T., "A Social Coalitional Existence Lemma," Econometrica, 49 (1981), 369-377.
- [6] Ichiishi, T. and M. Quinzii, "Decentralization for the Core of a Production Economy with Increasing Returns," Ecole Polytechnique, 1981.
- [7] Kannan, Rovindran, "A Polynomial Algorithm for the Two Variable Integer Programming Problem," J. Assoc. Comp. Math., 27 (1980), 118-122.
- [8] Lenstra, H. W., Jr., "Integer Programming with a Fixed Number of Variables," Math. of Oper. Res., 8 (1983), 538-548.
- [9] Quinzii, M., "An Existence Theorem for the Core of a Production Economy with Increasing Returns," Journal of Economic Theory, 28 (1982).
- [10] Scarf, Herbert E., "Notes of the Core of a Productive Economy," mimeo, 1963.
- [11] Scarf, Herbert E., "Production Sets with Indivisibilities, Part I: Generalities," Econometrica, 49 (1981), 1-32.
- [12] Scarf, Herbert E., "Production Sets with Indivisibilities, Part II: The Case of Two Activities," Econometrica, 49 (1981), 395-423.
- [13] Scarf, Herbert E., "Integral Polyhedra in Three Space," to be published in Math. of Oper. Res. (1984).

- [14] Sharkey, W. W., "Existence of a Core When There Are Increasing Returns," Econometrica, 47 (1979), 869-876.
- [15] White, Philip, Discrete Activity Analysis, Ph.D. Thesis, Yale University, 1983.
- [16] White, Philip, Andrew Caplin and Ludo van der Heyden, "Scarf's Procedure for Integer Programming and a Dual Simplex Method," Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper No. 649, Nov. 1982.