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We present a characterization of the 'normal' optimal solution of the linear program given in canonical form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left\{c^{t} x: A x=b, x \geqslant 0\right\} \tag{P}
\end{equation*}
$$

We show that $x^{*}$ is the optimal solution of $(\mathrm{P})$, of minimal norm, if and only if there exists an $R>0$ such that, for each $r \geqslant R$, we have

$$
x^{*}=\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+}
$$

Thus, we can find $x^{*}$ by solving the following equation for $\lambda_{r}$

$$
A\left(r c-A^{t} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+}=b
$$

Moreover, $(1 / r) \lambda_{r}$ then 'converges' to a solution of the dual program.
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## 1. Introduction

We consider the linear programming problem in canonical form

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=\max \left\{c^{\mathrm{t}} x: A x=b, x \geqslant 0\right\} \tag{P}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{1}$ denotes transpose and $A$ is an $m \times n$ matrix. We assume that $p$ is finite. The dual program to ( P ) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
d=\min \left\{b^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda: A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda \geqslant c\right\} . \tag{D}
\end{equation*}
$$

We present a characterization of a solution, $x^{*}$, of ( $\mathbf{P}$ ) in terms of a nonlinear equation, see (1.1) below.

In Section 2 we present the characterization of the normal optimal solution, $x^{*}$, of ( P ) as the solution of a nonlinear equation, i.e. for $r \geqslant R$, for some fixed $R>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+}=b \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]and
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}=\left(r c-A^{\prime} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where the vector $y_{+}$denotes the projection of $y$ onto the nonnegative orthant, i.e. $\left(y_{+}\right)_{i}=\max \left(0, y_{i}\right)$. Moreover, if $(1 / r) \lambda_{r} \rightarrow \lambda^{*}$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lambda^{*}$ solves the dual program, (D); while, if $\lambda^{*}$ solves ( $D$ ), then there exists a sequence $\lambda_{r}$, of solutions of (1.2), such that $(1 / r) \lambda_{r} \rightarrow \lambda^{*}$. These results are presented in Theorem 2.1.

The characterization (1.1) follows from the characterization of $(\mathrm{P})$ as a nearest point problem given in [4]. We then apply the approach in [5] to obtain the explicit equation for this characterization.

## 2. The nonlinear equation

We now present the main result, the characterization of the normal optimal solution of $(\mathrm{P})$ as the solution of a nonlinear equation.

Theorem 2.1. (i) The point $x^{*}$ is the optimum of ( P ), of minimum norm, if and only if there exists $R>0$ such that, for each $r \geqslant R$, the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+}=b \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is solveable for $\lambda_{r}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}=\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) If the solutions of (2.1) satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{r} \lambda_{r} \rightarrow \lambda^{*} \quad \text { as } r \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $\lambda^{*}$ is optimal for (D).
(iii) For each optimal solution $\lambda^{*}$ of (D), there exists a sequence of solutions, $\lambda_{r}$, of (2.1), such that (2.3) holds.

To prove Theorem 2.1 we combine a result from [5] and one from [4], which we now present. The result in [4] characterizes the normal solution of $(\mathrm{P})$ as the solution of a quadratic program. (Here $\|\cdot\|$ denotes Euclidean norm.)

Theorem 2.2. The point $x^{*}$ is the solution of ( P ), of minimum norm, if and only if there exists $R>0$ such that, for $r \geqslant R$, we have $x^{*}$ feasible and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|r c-x^{*}\right\|=\min \{\|r c-x\|: A x=b, x \geqslant 0\} . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. See [4, Theorem 2.1].
The result in [5] characterizes the solution of the problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min \{\|x\|: A x=b, x \geqslant 0\} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

as the solution of (2.1) and (2.2) with $c=0$. We now prove Theorem 2.1 by obtaining the characterization for the problem (2.4).

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $R>0$ be found using Theorem 2.2 and let $r \geqslant R$. Now let us solve (2.4), after replacing the norm, $\|\cdot\|$, by its square and dividing by 2 . The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions, e.g. [2], yield the system

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}=r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda+s, \quad s \geqslant 0, \quad s^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}=0 . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda\right)_{i}>0$, then $x_{i}^{*}>0$ and $s_{i}=0$, i.e. $x_{i}^{*}=\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda\right)_{i}$. If $\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda\right)_{i}<0$, then $s_{i}>0$ and $x_{i}^{*}=0$. If $\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda\right)_{i}=0$, then $s_{i}=0$ and $x_{i}^{*}=0$. Thus, we have shown (2.2). Since $x^{*}$ must necessarily be feasible, we see that (2.1) must hold. This proves the characterization (2.1) and (2.2) in (i).

Now, if $x^{*}$ solves (2.4), the optimality conditions (2.6) yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}-\frac{1}{r}\left\|x^{*}\right\|^{2}-b^{\mathrm{t}} \frac{1}{r} \lambda=0, \quad A x^{*}=b, \quad x^{*} \geqslant 0 \\
& c-\frac{1}{r} x^{*}-A^{\mathrm{t}}\left(\frac{1}{r} \lambda\right)+\frac{1}{r} s=0, \quad s \geqslant 0, \quad s^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $r \rightarrow \infty,(1 / r) \lambda \rightarrow \lambda^{*}$, shows that $x^{*}$ and $\lambda^{*}$ are feasible for ( P ) and (D), respectively, with the optimal values $c^{t} x^{*}=b^{t} \lambda^{*}$, i.e. they are both optimal. This proves (ii).

Now suppose that $\lambda^{*}$ solves the dual (D) and $x^{*}$ is the minimum norm solution of $(\mathrm{P})$. Then the optimality conditions for $(\mathrm{P})$ yield

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\mathrm{t}}\left(r \lambda^{*}\right)-r c=r \bar{s} \geqslant 0, \quad \bar{s}^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}=0 . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, $x^{*}$ solves the program

$$
\min \left\{z^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}: A z=b, c^{\mathrm{t}} z \geqslant p, z \geqslant 0\right\}
$$

and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}+A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda+\beta c=s \geqslant 0, \quad s^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}=0, \quad \beta \leqslant 0 . \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Upon adding (2.7) and (2.8) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}+A^{\mathrm{t}}\left(r \lambda^{*}+\lambda\right)-(r-\beta) c=r \bar{s}+s \geqslant 0, \quad(r \bar{s}+s)^{\mathrm{t}} x^{*}=0 . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This shows that $\lambda_{r}=(r+\beta) \lambda^{*}+\lambda$ solves (2.6) and so also (2.1). Since (2.3) holds, we have shown (iii).

Remarks. The optimality conditions for (P) (e.g. (2.7) along with feasibility of $x^{*}$ ) yield $n+m+1$ equations with $2 n$ inequalities. These characterize the optimum solutions of ( $\mathbf{P}$ ).

The solution of only $m$ equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+}=b \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\lambda_{r}$ provides the solution

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{*}=\left(r c-A^{\mathrm{t}} \lambda_{r}\right)_{+} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the linear program ( P ). The equation (2.1) is nonlinear and nondifferentiable due to the plus. Also one needs to find an estimate for $R$ in order to find $r \geqslant R$ in (2.1).

At the points where (2.1) is differentiable, the Jacobian is

$$
J(\lambda)=-A D_{\lambda} A^{\mathrm{t}}
$$

where $D_{\lambda}$ is a diagonal, zero-one matrix with diagonal elements

$$
d_{i i}= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } r c_{i}<\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{j i} \lambda_{j} \\ 1 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Note that the points of nondifferentiability occur exactly when $r c_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{j i} \lambda_{j}$. One can now try Newton type methods to solve (2.1).

Consider the abstract linear program ( P ) where the constraint $x \geqslant 0$ is replaced by $x \geqslant_{s} 0$, the operator $A: X \rightarrow Y, X$ and $Y$ are normed spaces, $S$ is a convex cone, and $x \geqslant_{s} y$ if and only if $x-y \in S$. A duality theory for ( P ) is given in [1]. The characterization (2.1) of ( P ) can be extended to include these abstract linear programs.

The above ideas will be presented in a forthcoming study.
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