

Kth-Best Algorithm for Fuzzy Bilevel Programming

Guangquan Zhang, Jie Lu, Tharam Dillon

Faculty of Information Technology, University of Technology, Sydney
PO Box 123, Broadway, NSW 2007, Australia
email: {zhangg, jielu, tharam}@it.uts.edu.au

Abstract

Organizational decision making often involves two decision levels. When the leader at the upper level attempts to optimize his/her objective, the follower at the lower level tries to find an optimized strategy according to each of possible decisions made by the leader. Furthermore, such bilevel decision making may involve uncertain parameters which appear either in the objective functions or constraints of the leader or the follower. Following our previous work, this study first proposes a fuzzy parameter bilevel programming model and related theories. It then develops an approximation Kth-Best algorithm for solving such fuzzy bilevel programming problems. A numerical example further illustrates the proposed algorithm.

Keywords: Bilevel programming, Kth-Best algorithm, Fuzzy set, Fuzzy optimization, Decision making

1. Introduction

Bilevel decision making (also called bilevel programming, BLP) techniques, first introduced by Von Stackelberg [19], have been developed for mainly solving decentralized planning problems with decision makers in a hierarchical organization [3, 9, 21]. Decision maker at the upper level is termed as the leader, and at the lower level, the follower. Each decision maker (leader or follower) tries to optimize his/her own objective function, but the decision of each level affects the objective value of the other level [4].

Bilevel decision making theory and technology have been applied with remarkable success in different domains, for example, decentralized resource planning, electric power market, logistics, civil engineering, chemical engineering and road network management. [1,2, 10-12]. The vast majority of research on BLP has centered on the linear version of the problem, i.e., linear BLP problems. A set of approaches and algorithms have been well developed such as well known Kuhn-Tucker approach [4,5], Kth-best approach [6,7] and Branch-and-bound algorithm [8]. However, existing BLP approaches mainly suppose

the situation in which the objective functions and constraints are characterized with precise parameters. Therefore, the parameters are required to be fixed at some values in an experimental and/or subjective manner through the experts' understanding of the nature of the parameters in the problem-formulation process. It has been observed that, in most real-world situations, for example, in a logistics planning, the possible values of these parameters are often only imprecisely or ambiguously known to the experts who establish this model. With this observation, it would be certainly more appropriate to interpret the experts' understanding of the parameters as fuzzy numerical data which can be represented by means of fuzzy sets [22]. A BLP problem in which the parameters, either in objective functions or in constraints of the leader or the follower, are described by fuzzy values is called a fuzzy bilevel programming (FBLP) or a fuzzy bilevel decision making (FBLDM) problem in the study.

The FBLP problem was first researched by Sakawa et al. in 2000 [14]. Sakawa et al. formulates BLP problems with fuzzy parameters from the perspective of experts' imprecision and proposes a fuzzy programming approach for cooperative BLP problems. However, the solution concept for a cooperative BLP problem proposed by Lai [9,18] is different from the solution concept of Bard who deals with uncooperative BLP problem.

Our recent research work has extended Bard's solution concept of BLP by proposing an extended solution concept which can overcome the arbitrary linear form problem indicated above. We then proposed a set of extended approaches based on the new solution concept for solving linear BLP problems [15-17]. This paper is deals with FBLP problems based on the extended solution concept and related theorems [23-7]. In particular, it proposes a general fuzzy number based extended Kth-Best algorithm. This algorithm can solve uncooperative FBLP problems where fuzzy parameters can be expressed by any forms of membership functions. Following the introduction, Section 2 proposes a definition of optimal solution for FBLP problem and related transformation theory. A fuzzy number based approximation Kth Best algorithm is presented in Section 3. Section 4 shows a numeral example for illustrating the proposed approximation

K th Best algorithm. Conclusion and further study are discussed in Section 5.

2. Fuzzy Parameter Linear Bilevel Programming Problem Related Solution Transformation Theory

Definition 3.1 A topological space is compact if every open cover of the entire space has a finite subcover. For example, $[a, b]$ is compact in R (the Heine-Borel theorem) [20].

Consider the following fuzzy linear bilevel programming (FLBLP) problem:

$$\text{For } x \in X \subset R^n, \quad y \in Y \subset R^m,$$

$$F : X \times Y \rightarrow F^*(R), \text{ and } f : X \times Y \rightarrow F^*(R),$$

$$\min_{x \in X} F(x, y) = \tilde{c}_1 x + \tilde{d}_1 y \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \tilde{A}_1 x + \tilde{B}_1 y \preceq \tilde{b}_1 \quad (2.1b)$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \tilde{c}_2 x + \tilde{d}_2 y \quad (2.1c)$$

$$\text{subject to } \tilde{A}_2 x + \tilde{B}_2 y \preceq \tilde{b}_2 \quad (2.1d)$$

where $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2 \in F^*(R^n)$, $\tilde{d}_1, \tilde{d}_2 \in F^*(R^m)$,

$\tilde{b}_1 \in F^*(R^p)$, $\tilde{b}_2 \in F^*(R^q)$, $\tilde{A}_1 = (\tilde{a}_{ij})_{p \times n}$,

$\tilde{a}_{ij} \in F^*(R)$, $\tilde{B}_1 = (\tilde{b}_{ij})_{p \times m}$, $\tilde{b}_{ij} \in F^*(R)$,

$\tilde{A}_2 = (\tilde{e}_{ij})_{q \times n}$, $\tilde{e}_{ij} \in F^*(R)$,

$\tilde{B}_2 = (\tilde{s}_{ij})_{q \times m}$, $\tilde{s}_{ij} \in F^*(R)$.

Associated with the (FLBLP) problem, we now consider the following (MLBLP) problem:

$$\text{For } x \in X \subset R^n, \quad y \in Y \subset R^m,$$

$$F : X \times Y \rightarrow F^*(R), \text{ and } f : X \times Y \rightarrow F^*(R),$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\alpha^L = c_{1\alpha}^L x + d_{1\alpha}^L y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (2.2a)$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\alpha^R = c_{1\alpha}^R x + d_{1\alpha}^R y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

subject to

$$A_{1\lambda}^L x + B_{1\lambda}^L y \preceq b_{1\lambda}^L, \quad A_{1\lambda}^R x + B_{1\lambda}^R y \preceq b_{1\lambda}^R, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (2.2b)$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_\alpha^L = c_{2\alpha}^L x + d_{2\alpha}^L y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (2.2c)$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_\alpha^R = c_{2\alpha}^R x + d_{2\alpha}^R y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

subject to

$$A_{2\lambda}^L x + B_{2\lambda}^L y \preceq b_{2\lambda}^L, \quad A_{2\lambda}^R x + B_{2\lambda}^R y \preceq b_{2\lambda}^R, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \quad (2.2d)$$

where $c_{1\lambda}^L, c_{1\lambda}^R, c_{2\lambda}^L, c_{2\lambda}^R \in R^n$, $d_{1\lambda}^L, d_{1\lambda}^R, d_{2\lambda}^L, d_{2\lambda}^R \in R^m$,

$b_{1\lambda}^L, b_{1\lambda}^R \in R^p$, $b_{2\lambda}^L, b_{2\lambda}^R \in R^q$,

$$A_{1\lambda}^L = (a_{ij\lambda}^L), \quad A_{1\lambda}^R = (a_{ij\lambda}^R) \in R^{p \times n},$$

$$B_{1\lambda}^L = (b_{ij\lambda}^L), \quad B_{1\lambda}^R = (b_{ij\lambda}^R) \in R^{p \times m},$$

$$A_{2\lambda}^L = (e_{ij\lambda}^L), \quad A_{2\lambda}^R = (e_{ij\lambda}^R) \in R^{q \times n},$$

$$B_{2\lambda}^L = (s_{ij\lambda}^L), \quad B_{2\lambda}^R = (s_{ij\lambda}^R) \in R^{q \times m}.$$

Theorem 2.1 [25] Let (x^*, y^*) be the solution of the (MLBLP) problem (2.2). Then it is also a solution of the (FLBLP) problem defined by (2.1).

Theorem 2.2 For $x \in X \subset R^n$, $y \in Y \subset R^m$, If all the fuzzy coefficients \tilde{a}_{ij} , \tilde{b}_{ij} , \tilde{e}_{ij} , \tilde{s}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_i and \tilde{d}_i have trapezoidal membership functions of the (MLBLP) problem (2.1).

$$\mu_{\tilde{z}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < z_\beta^L \\ \frac{\alpha - \beta}{z_\alpha^L - z_\beta^L} (t - z_\beta^L) + \beta & z_\beta^L \leq t < z_\alpha^L \\ \alpha & z_\alpha^L \leq t < z_\alpha^R \\ \frac{\alpha - \beta}{z_\beta^R - z_\alpha^R} (-t + z_\beta^R) + \beta & z_\alpha^R \leq t \leq z_\beta^R \\ 0 & z_\beta^R < t \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where \tilde{z} denotes \tilde{a}_{ij} , \tilde{b}_{ij} , \tilde{e}_{ij} , \tilde{s}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_i and \tilde{d}_i respectively. Then, it is the solution of the problem (2.1) that $(x^*, y^*) \in R^n \times R^m$ satisfying

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\alpha^L = c_{1\alpha}^L x + d_{1\alpha}^L y,$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\alpha^R = c_{1\alpha}^R x + d_{1\alpha}^R y,$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\beta^L = c_{1\beta}^L x + d_{1\beta}^L y,$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_\beta^R = c_{1\beta}^R x + d_{1\beta}^R y,$$

(2.4a)

subject to

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{1\alpha}^L x + B_{1\alpha}^L y &\leq b_{1\alpha}^L, \\
A_{1\alpha}^R x + B_{1\alpha}^R y &\leq b_{1\alpha}^R, \\
A_{1\beta}^L x + B_{1\beta}^L y &\leq b_{1\beta}^L, \\
A_{1\beta}^R x + B_{1\beta}^R y &\leq b_{1\beta}^R,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha}^L &= c_{2\alpha}^L x + d_{2\alpha}^L y, \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha}^R &= c_{2\alpha}^R x + d_{2\alpha}^R y, \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\beta}^L &= c_{2\beta}^L x + d_{2\beta}^L y, \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\beta}^R &= c_{2\beta}^R x + d_{2\beta}^R y,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4c}$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{2\alpha}^L x + B_{2\alpha}^L y &\leq b_{2\alpha}^L, \\
A_{2\alpha}^R x + B_{2\alpha}^R y &\leq b_{2\alpha}^R, \\
A_{2\beta}^L x + B_{2\beta}^L y &\leq b_{2\beta}^L, \\
A_{2\beta}^R x + B_{2\beta}^R y &\leq b_{2\beta}^R.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4d}$$

Prof. We can easy to prove it by Definition of fuzzy number order.

Theorem 2.3 For $x \in X \subset R^n$, $y \in Y \subset R^m$, If all the fuzzy coefficients \tilde{a}_{ij} , \tilde{b}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_{ij} , \tilde{s}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_i and \tilde{d}_i have trapezoidal membership functions of the (MLBLP) problem (2.1).

$$\mu_{\tilde{z}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < z_{\alpha_0}^L \\ \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_0}{z_{\alpha_1}^L - z_{\alpha_0}^L} (t - z_{\alpha_0}^L) + \alpha_0 & z_{\alpha_0}^L \leq t < z_{\alpha_1}^L \\ \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_0}{z_{\alpha_2}^L - z_{\alpha_1}^L} (t - z_{\alpha_1}^L) + \alpha_1 & z_{\alpha_1}^L \leq t < z_{\alpha_2}^L \\ \dots & \dots \\ \alpha & z_{\alpha_n}^L \leq t < z_{\alpha_n}^R \\ \frac{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n-1}}{z_{\alpha_{n-1}}^R - z_{\alpha_n}^R} (-t + z_{\alpha_{n-1}}^R) + \alpha_{n-1} & z_{\alpha_n}^R \leq t < z_{\alpha_{n-1}}^R \\ \dots & \dots \\ \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha_1}{z_{\alpha_1}^R - z_{\alpha_0}^R} (-t + z_{\alpha_0}^R) + \alpha_0 & z_{\alpha_1}^R \leq t \leq z_{\alpha_0}^R \\ 0 & z_{\alpha_0}^R < t \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where \tilde{z} denotes \tilde{a}_{ij} , \tilde{b}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_{ij} , \tilde{s}_{ij} , \tilde{c}_i and \tilde{d}_i respectively. Then, it is the solution of the problem (3.1) that $(x^*, y^*) \in R^n \times R^m$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^L &= c_{1\alpha_0}^L x + d_{1\alpha_0}^L y, \\
&\vdots \\
\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^L &= c_{1\alpha_n}^L x + d_{1\alpha_n}^L y, \\
\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^R &= c_{1\alpha_0}^R x + d_{1\alpha_0}^R y, \\
&\vdots \\
\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^R &= c_{1\alpha_n}^R x + d_{1\alpha_n}^R y,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{subject to } A_{1\alpha_0}^L x + B_{1\alpha_0}^L y &\leq b_{1\alpha_0}^L, \\
&\vdots \\
A_{1\alpha_n}^L x + B_{1\alpha_n}^L y &\leq b_{1\alpha_n}^L, \\
A_{1\alpha_0}^R x + B_{1\alpha_0}^R y &\leq b_{1\alpha_0}^R, \\
&\vdots \\
A_{1\alpha_n}^R x + B_{1\alpha_n}^R y &\leq b_{1\alpha_n}^R,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^L &= c_{2\alpha_0}^L x + d_{2\alpha_0}^L y, \\
&\vdots \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^L &= c_{2\alpha_n}^L x + d_{2\alpha_n}^L y, \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^R &= c_{2\alpha_0}^R x + d_{2\alpha_0}^R y, \\
&\vdots \\
\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^R &= c_{2\alpha_n}^R x + d_{2\alpha_n}^R y,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{subject to } A_{2\alpha_0}^L x + B_{2\alpha_0}^L y &\leq b_{2\alpha_0}^L, \\
&\vdots \\
A_{2\alpha_n}^L x + B_{2\alpha_n}^L y &\leq b_{2\alpha_n}^L, \\
A_{2\alpha_0}^R x + B_{2\alpha_0}^R y &\leq b_{2\alpha_0}^R, \\
&\vdots \\
A_{2\alpha_n}^R x + B_{2\alpha_n}^R y &\leq b_{2\alpha_n}^R.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6d}$$

We note

$$\bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1 \quad (2.6b')$$

$$\bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2 \quad (2.6d')$$

where

$$\bar{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ A_{1\alpha_n}^L \\ A_{1\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ A_{1\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix}, \bar{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{2\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ A_{2\alpha_n}^L \\ A_{2\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ A_{2\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix}, \bar{B}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} B_{1\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ B_{1\alpha_n}^L \\ B_{1\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ B_{1\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix}, \bar{B}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} B_{2\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ B_{2\alpha_n}^L \\ B_{2\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ B_{2\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\bar{b}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} b_{1\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ b_{1\alpha_n}^L \\ b_{1\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ b_{1\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix}, \bar{b}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} b_{2\alpha_0}^L \\ \vdots \\ b_{2\alpha_n}^L \\ b_{2\alpha_0}^R \\ \vdots \\ b_{2\alpha_n}^R \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we can re-write (2.6) by using

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^L = c_{1\alpha_0}^L x + d_{1\alpha_0}^L y, \quad (2.6a')$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^L = c_{1\alpha_n}^L x + d_{1\alpha_n}^L y,$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^R = c_{1\alpha_0}^R x + d_{1\alpha_0}^R y,$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^R = c_{1\alpha_n}^R x + d_{1\alpha_n}^R y,$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1, \quad (2.4b')$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^L = c_{2\alpha_0}^L x + d_{2\alpha_0}^L y,$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^L = c_{2\alpha_n}^L x + d_{2\alpha_n}^L y,$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_0}^R = c_{2\alpha_0}^R x + d_{2\alpha_0}^R y,$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\alpha_n}^R = c_{2\alpha_n}^R x + d_{2\alpha_n}^R y,$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2. \quad (2.6c')$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2. \quad (2.6d')$$

To solve the problem (2.6'), we can use the method of weighting [12] to this problem, such that it is the following problem:

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y)) = \sum_{i=0}^n \left((c_{1\alpha_i}^L x + d_{1\alpha_i}^L y) + (c_{1\alpha_i}^R x + d_{1\alpha_i}^R y) \right) \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1, \quad (2.7b)$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y)) = \sum_{i=0}^n \left((c_{2\alpha_i}^L x + d_{2\alpha_i}^L y) + (c_{2\alpha_i}^R x + d_{2\alpha_i}^R y) \right) \quad (2.7c)$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2. \quad (2.7d)$$

Definition 2.2

(a) Constraint region of the linear BLP problem:

$$S = \{(x, y) : x \in X, y \in Y, \bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1, \bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2\}$$

(b) Feasible set for the follower for each fixed $x \in X$:

$$S(x) = \{y \in Y : \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2 - \bar{A}_2 x\}$$

(c) Projection of S onto the leader's decision space:

$$S(X) = \{x \in X : \exists y \in Y, \bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1, \bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2\}$$

Follower's rational reaction set for $x \in S(X)$:

$$P(x) = \{y \in Y : y \in \arg \min[(f(x, \hat{y})) : \hat{y} \in S(x)]\}$$

where

$$\arg \min[f(x, \hat{y}) : \hat{y} \in S(x)]$$

$$= \{y \in S(x) : (f(x, y)) \leq (f(x, \hat{y})), \hat{y} \in S(x)\}$$

Inducible region:

$$IR = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in S, y \in P(x)\}$$

The rational reaction set $P(x)$ defines the response while the inducible region IR represents the set over which the leader may optimize his objective. Thus in terms of the above notations, the linear BLP problem can be written as

$$\min \{F(x, y) : (x, y) \in IR\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Theorem 2.4 The inducible region can be written equivalently as piecewise linear equality constraint comprised of supporting hyperplane of constraint region S .

Proof. Let us begin by writing the inducible region of Definition 3.1(e) explicitly as follower:

$$IR = \left\{ (x, y) : (x, y) \in S, \bar{d}_2 y = \min[\bar{d}_2 \tilde{y} : \bar{B}_i \tilde{y} \leq \bar{b}_i - \bar{A}_i x, i = 1, 2, \tilde{y} \geq 0] \right\}, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\bar{c}_i = c_i + c_{i_0}^L + c_{i_0}^R, \bar{d}_i = d_i + d_{i_0}^L + d_{i_0}^R, i = 1, 2.$$

Now we define

$$Q(x) = \min \{ \bar{d}_2 y : \bar{B}_i y \leq \bar{b}_i - \bar{A}_i x, i = 1, 2, y \geq 0 \} \quad (2.10)$$

Let us define

$$\bar{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{B}_1 \\ \bar{B}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_1 \\ \bar{A}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b}_1 \\ \bar{b}_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We rewrite (2.10) as follows

$$Q(x) = \min \{ \bar{d}_2 y : \bar{B}y \leq \bar{b} - \bar{A}x, y \geq 0 \} \quad (2.11)$$

For each value of $x \in S(X)$, the resulting feasible region to problem (2.5) is nonempty and compact. Thus $Q(x)$, which is a linear program parameterized in x , always has a solution. From duality theory, we get

$$\max \{ u(\bar{A}x - \bar{b}) : u\bar{B} \geq -\bar{d}_2, u \geq 0 \}, \quad (2.12)$$

which has the same optimal value as (3.7) at the solution u^* . Let u^1, \dots, u^r be a listing of all the vertices of the constraint region of (2.12) given by $U = \{ u : u\bar{B} \geq -\bar{d}_2, u \geq 0 \}$. Because we know that a solution to (2.12) occurs at a vertex of U , we get the equivalent problem

$$\max \{ u^j(\bar{A}x - \bar{b}) : u^j \in \{ u^1, \dots, u^r \} \}, \quad (2.13)$$

which demonstrates that $Q(x)$ is a piecewise linear function. Rewriting IR as

$$IR = \{ (x, y) \in S : Q(x) - \bar{d}_2 y = 0 \}, \quad (2.14)$$

yields the desired result.

Corollary 2.1 The linear BLP problem (2.7) is equivalent to minimizing F over a feasible region comprised of a piecewise linear equality constraint.

Proof. From (2.8) and Theorem 2.3, we have the desired result.

Corollary 2.2 A solution for the linear BLP problem occurs at a vertex of IR .

Proof. A linear BLP programming can be written (2.8). Since F is linear, if a solution exists, one must occur at a vertex of IR . The proof is completed.

Theorem 2.5 The solution (x^*, y^*) of the linear BLP problem occurs at a vertex of S .

Proof. Let $(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^r, y^r)$ be the distinct vertices of S . Since any point in S can be written a convex combination of these vertices, let $(x^*, y^*) =$

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i (x^i, y^i), \quad \text{where}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1, \alpha_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r} \text{ and } \bar{r} \leq r.$$

It must be shown that $\bar{r} = 1$. To see this let us write the constraints to (2.5) at (x^*, y^*) in their piecewise linear form (2.6).

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Q(x^*) - \bar{d}_2 y^* \\ &= Q(\sum_i \alpha_i x^i) - \bar{d}_2 (\sum_i \alpha_i y^i) \\ &\leq \sum_i \alpha_i Q(x^i) - \sum_i \alpha_i \bar{d}_2 y^i \end{aligned}$$

by convexity of $Q(x)$

$$= \sum_i \alpha_i (Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i).$$

But by definition,

$$Q(x^i) = \min_{y \in S(x^i)} \bar{d}_2 y \leq \bar{d}_2 y^i.$$

Therefore, $Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$. Noting that $\alpha_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$, the equality in the preceding expression must hold or else a contradiction would result in the sequence above. Consequently, $Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i = 0$ for all i . This implies that $(x^i, y^i) \in IR, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$ and (x^*, y^*) can be written as a convex combination of points in IR . Because (x^*, y^*) is a vertex of IR , a contradiction results unless $\bar{r} = 1$.

Corollary 2.3 If x is an extreme point of IR , it is an extreme point of S .

Proof: Let (x^*, y^*) be an extreme point of IR and assume that it is not an extreme point of S . Let $(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^r, y^r)$ be the distinct vertices of S . Since any point in S can be written a convex combination of these vertices, let $(x^*, y^*) = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i (x^i, y^i)$, where

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1, \alpha_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r} \text{ and } \bar{r} \leq r.$$

It must be shown that $\bar{r} = 1$. To see this let us write the constraints to (2.5) at (x^*, y^*) in their piecewise linear form (2.6).

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Q(x^*) - \bar{d}_2 y^* \\ &= Q(\sum_i \alpha_i x^i) - \bar{d}_2 (\sum_i \alpha_i y^i) \\ &\leq \sum_i \alpha_i Q(x^i) - \sum_i \alpha_i \bar{d}_2 y^i \end{aligned}$$

by convexity of $Q(x)$

$$= \sum_i \alpha_i (Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i).$$

But by definition,

$$Q(x^i) = \min_{y \in S(x^i)} \bar{d}_2 y \leq \bar{d}_2 y^i.$$

Therefore, $Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$. Noting that $\alpha_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$, the equality in the preceding expression must hold or else a contradiction would result in the sequence above. Consequently, $Q(x^i) - \bar{d}_2 y^i = 0$ for all i . This implies that $(x^i, y^i) \in IR, i = 1, \dots, \bar{r}$ and (x^*, y^*) can be written as a convex combination of points in IR . Because (x^*, y^*) is an extreme point of IR , a contradiction results unless $\bar{r} = 1$. This means that (x^*, y^*) is an extreme point of S . The proof is completed.

Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.3 have provided theoretical foundation for our new algorithm. It means that by searching extreme points on the constraint region S , we can efficiently find an optimal solution for a linear BLP problem. The basic idea of our extended properties algorithm is that according to the objective function of the upper level, we descendent order all the extreme points on S , and select the first extreme point to check if it is on the inducible region IR . If yes, the current extreme point is the optimal solution. If not, select the next one and check.

More specifically, let $(x_{[1]}, y_{[1]}), \dots, (x_{[N]}, y_{[N]})$ denote the N ordered extreme points to the linear programming problem

$$\min \{ \bar{c}_1 x + \bar{d}_1 y : (x, y) \in S \}, \quad (2.15)$$

such that

$$\bar{c}_1 x_{[i]} + \bar{d}_1 y_{[i]} \leq \bar{c}_1 x_{[i+1]} + \bar{d}_1 y_{[i+1]}, i = 1, \dots, N-1.$$

Let \tilde{y} denote the optimal solution to the following problem

$$\min (f(x_{[i]}, y) : y \in S(x_{[i]})). \quad (2.16)$$

We only need to find the smallest i ($i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) under which $y_{[i]} = \tilde{y}$.

Let write (2.16) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(x, y) \\ \text{subject to } y \in S(x) \\ x = x_{[i]}. \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 2.1(a) and (c), we have

$$\min f(x, y) = \bar{c}_2 x + \bar{d}_2 y \quad (2.17a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \bar{A}_1 x + \bar{B}_1 y \leq \bar{b}_1 \quad (2.17b)$$

$$\bar{A}_2 x + \bar{B}_2 y \leq \bar{b}_2 \quad (2.17c)$$

$$x = x_{[i]} \quad (2.17d)$$

$$y \geq 0. \quad (2.17e)$$

The solving is equivalent to select one ordered extreme point $(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})$, then solve (2.17) to obtain the optimal solution \tilde{y} . If $\tilde{y} = y_{[i]}$, $(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})$ is the global optimum to (2.7). Otherwise, check the next extreme point.

3. An Approximation K -best Algorithm for Solving Fuzzy Linear Bilevel Programming

Based on Theorem 2.5, we present an approximation K -best approach for solving fuzzy bilevel programming (FLBLP) problem (2.1) as follows:

- Step 1 The problem (2.1) is transferred to the problem (2.6)
- Step 2 Let the interval $[0, 1]$ be decomposed into 2^{l-1} mean sub-intervals with $(2^{l-1} + 1)$ nodes λ_j ($j = 0, \dots, 2^{l-1}$) which are arranged in the order of $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_{2^{l-1}} = 1$ and a range of errors $\varepsilon > 0$.
- Step 3 Set $l = 1$, then solve $(MLBLP)_2^l$, i.e. (2.6) by using Branch approach when $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, we obtain optimization solution $(x, y)_{2^l}$.
- Step 4 Put $i \leftarrow 1$. Solve (2.15) with the simplex method to obtain the optimal solution $(x_{[1]}, y_{[1]})$. Let $W = \{(x_{[1]}, y_{[1]})\}$ and $T = \emptyset$. Go to Step 5.
- Step 5 Solve (2.17) with the bounded simplex method. Let \tilde{y} denote the optimal solution to (2.17). If $\tilde{y} = y_{[i]}$, stop; $(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})$ is the global optimum to (2.5) with $K^* = i$. Otherwise, go to Step 6.
- Step 6 Let $W_{[i]}$ denote the set of adjacent extreme points of $(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})$ such that $(x, y) \in W_{[i]}$ implies $\bar{c}_1 x + \bar{d}_1 y \geq \bar{c}_1 x_{[i]} + \bar{d}_1 y_{[i]}$. Let $T = T \cup \{(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})\}$ and $W = (W \cup W_{[i]}) \setminus T$. Go to Step 7.

Step 7 Set $i \leftarrow i+1$ and choose $(x_{[i]}, y_{[i]})$ so that

$$f x_{[i]} + g y_{[i]} = \min \{ \bar{c}_1 x + \bar{d}_1 y : (x, y) \in W \}$$

. Go to Step 5.

Step 8 Solve $(MLBLP)_2^{i+1}$ by Step 4 to Step 7 and we obtain optimization solution $(x, y)_{2^{i+1}}$.

Step 9 If $\|(x, y)_{2^{i+1}} - (x, y)_{2^i}\| < \varepsilon$, then the solution (x^*, y^*) of the fuzzy linear bilevel problem is $(x, y)_{2^{i+1}}$. Otherwise, update l to $2l$ and go back to Step 8.

Step 10 Show the result.

4. An Illustrative Example

This section will give an example to illustrate the proposed algorithm.

Example Consider the following fuzzy linear BLP problem with $x \in R^1$, $y \in R^1$, and $X = \{x \geq 0\}$, $Y = \{y \geq 0\}$,

$$\min_{x \in X} F(x, y) = \tilde{1}x - \tilde{2}y$$

$$\text{subject to } -\tilde{1}x + \tilde{3}y \leq \tilde{4}$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y) = \tilde{1}x + \tilde{1}y$$

$$\text{subject to } \begin{aligned} \tilde{1}x - \tilde{1}y &\leq \tilde{0} \\ -\tilde{1}x - \tilde{1}y &\leq \tilde{0} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu_{\tilde{1}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 0 \\ t^2 & 0 \leq t < 1 \\ 2-t & 1 \leq t < 2 \\ 0 & 2 \leq t \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_{\tilde{2}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 1 \\ t-1 & 1 \leq t < 2 \\ 3-t & 2 \leq t < 3 \\ 0 & 3 \leq t \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_{\tilde{3}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 2 \\ t-2 & 2 \leq t < 3 \\ 4-t & 3 \leq t < 4 \\ 0 & 4 \leq t \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_{\tilde{4}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 3 \\ t-3 & 3 \leq t < 4 \\ 5-t & 4 \leq t < 5 \\ 0 & 5 \leq t \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_{\tilde{0}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < -1 \\ t+1 & -1 \leq t < 0 \\ 1-t^2 & 0 \leq t < 1 \\ 0 & 1 \leq t \end{cases}$$

To solve this fuzzy linear bilevel programming problem by using above the approximation Kuhn-Tucker approach.

Step 1 The FBLP problem is transferred to the following LMMBLP problem by using Theorem 2.2

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\lambda}^L = \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^L x + (-\tilde{2})_{\lambda}^L y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

$$\min_{x \in X} (F(x, y))_{\lambda}^R = \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^R x + (-\tilde{2})_{\lambda}^R y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

subject to

$$(-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^L x + \tilde{3}_{\lambda}^L y \leq \tilde{4}_{\lambda}^L, (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^R x + \tilde{3}_{\lambda}^R y \leq \tilde{4}_{\lambda}^R, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\lambda}^L = \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^L x + \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^L y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} (f(x, y))_{\lambda}^R = \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^R x + \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^R y, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

subject to

$$\tilde{1}_{\lambda}^L x + (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^L y \leq \tilde{0}_{\lambda}^L, \tilde{1}_{\lambda}^R x + (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^R y \leq \tilde{0}_{\lambda}^R, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

$$(-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^L x + (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^L y \leq \tilde{0}_{\lambda}^L, (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^R x + (-\tilde{1})_{\lambda}^R y \leq \tilde{0}_{\lambda}^R, \quad \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

Step 2. Let the interval $[0, 1]$ be decomposed into 2^{l-1} mean sub-intervals with $(2^{l-1}+1)$ nodes $\lambda_i (i = 0, \dots, 2^{l-1})$ which are arranged in the order of $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_{2^{l-1}} = 1$ and a range of errors $\varepsilon = 10^{-6} > 0$.

Step 3-step 7. When $l = 1$, we solve this following multi-objective multi-follower programming by use original K -best approach

$$\min_{x \in X} F(x, y) = 3x - 6y$$

$$\text{subject to } -1x + 3y \leq 4$$

$$-2x + 2y \leq 3$$

$$0x + 4y \leq 5$$

$$\min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y) = 3x + 3y$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to } & 1x - 1y \leq 0 \\ & 0x - 2y \leq -1 \\ & 2x - 0y \leq 1 \\ & -1x - 1y \leq 0 \\ & -2x - 2y \leq -1. \end{aligned}$$

We found that the optimal solution occurs at the point $(x^*, y^*) = (0, 0.5)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in X} F_1(x, y) &= 1x - 2y = -1 \\ \min_{x \in X} F_2(x, y) &= 0x - 3y = -1.3 \\ \min_{x \in X} F_3(x, y) &= 2x - 1y = -0.5 \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y) &= 0.5 \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_2(x, y) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

Step 8. When $l = 2$, we solve another linear multi-objective multi-follower programming problem and get the following result.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in X} F(x, y)_1^{L(R)} &= 1x - 2y = -1 \\ \min_{x \in X} F(x, y)_1^L &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}x - \frac{3}{2}y = -\frac{3}{4} \\ \min_{x \in X} F(x, y)_0^L &= 0x - 3y = -\frac{3}{2} \\ \min_{x \in X} F(x, y)_1^R &= \frac{3}{2}x - \frac{5}{2}y = -\frac{5}{4} \\ \min_{x \in X} F(x, y)_0^R &= 2x - 1y = -\frac{1}{2} \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y)_1^{L(R)} &= 1x + 1y = \frac{1}{2} \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y)_1^L &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}x + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}y = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y)_1^R &= 2x + 2y = 1 \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y)_1^R &= \frac{3}{2}x + \frac{3}{2}y = \frac{3}{4} \\ x &= 0, y = 0.5 \end{aligned}$$

Step 9. $x = 0, y = 0.5$ is the optimal solution the example because $\|(x, y)_{2'} - (x, y)_2\| = 0 < \varepsilon$.

Step 10. Show the solution of the problem is $x = 0, y = 0.5$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in X} F(x, y) &= \tilde{1}x - \tilde{2}y = -\frac{\tilde{2}}{2} \\ \min_{y \in Y} f_1(x, y) &= \tilde{1}x + \tilde{1}y = \frac{\tilde{1}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu_{\frac{\tilde{2}}{2}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < -1.5 \\ \frac{t+1.5}{0.5} & -1.5 \leq t < -1 \\ \frac{-0.5-t}{0.5} & -1 \leq t < -0.5 \\ 0 & -0.5 \leq t \end{cases},$$

$$\mu_{\frac{\tilde{1}}{2}}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 0 \\ t^2 & 0 \leq t < 0.5 \\ \frac{0.5}{1-t} & 0.5 \leq t < 1 \\ 0 & 1 \leq t \end{cases}.$$

5. Conclusion and Further Study

Following our previous research [21, 22, 30], this paper proposes a fuzzy number based extended Kth best approach to solve proposed FPBLP problem. A numeral example is shown to illustrate the proposed fuzzy number based extended Kth best approach. Further study will include the development of fuzzy parameter based multi-follower and multi-objective bilevel programming problems.

Acknowledgments

The work presented in this paper was supported by Australian Research Council (ARC) under discovery grants DP0557154 and DP0559213.

References

- [1] E. Aiyoshi and K. Shimizu, Hierarchical decentralized systems and its new solution by a barrier method, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* 11, 444-449, 1981.
- [2] J. F. Amat and B. McCarl, A representation and economic interpretation of a two-level programming problem, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 32, 783-792, 1981.
- [3] G. Anandalingam and T. Friesz, Hierarchical optimization: An introduction, *Annals of Operations Research* Vol. 34, 1-11, 1992.
- [4] J. Bard, *Practical Bilevel Optimization: Algorithms and Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Amsterdam, 1998.
- [5] J. Bard and J. Falk, An explicit solution to the programming problem, *Computers and Operations Research* 9, 77-100, 1982.
- [6] J. Bracken and J. McGill, Mathematical programs with optimization problems in the constraints. *Operations Research* 21, 37-44, 1973.
- [7] W. Candler and R. Townsley, A linear two-level programming problem, *Computers and Operations Research* 9, 59-76, 1982.
- [8] P. Hansen, B. Jaumard, and G. Savard, New branch-and-bound rules for linear bilevel

- programming. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing* 13, 1194-1217, 1992.
- [9] Y.J. Lai, Hierarchical optimization: A satisfactory solution, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 77, 321-335, 1996.
- [10] L. Leblanc and D. Boyce, A bilevel programming algorithm for exact solution of the network design problem with user-optimal flows, *Transportation Research* 20, 259-265, 1986.
- [11] P. Marcotte, Network optimization with continuous control parameters, *Transportation Science* 17, 181-197, 1983.
- [12] T. Miller, T. Friesz and R. Tobin, Heuristic algorithms for delivered price spatially competitive network facility location problems, *Annals of Operations Research* 34, 177-202, 1992.
- [13] M. Sakawa, *Fuzzy sets and interactive multiobjective optimization*, Plenum Press, New York, 1993.
- [14] M. Sakawa, I. Nishizaki, and Y. Uemura, Interactive fuzzy programming for multilevel linear programming problems with fuzzy parameters, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 109, 3-19, 2000.
- [15] C. Shi, J. Lu and G. Zhang, An extended Kuhn-Tucker approach for linear bilevel programming, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 162, 51-63, 2005.
- [16] C. Shi, J. Lu and G. Zhang, An extended Kth-best approach for linear bilevel programming, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 164, 843-855, 2004.
- [17] C. Shi, G. Zhang and J. Lu, On the definition of linear bilevel programming solution, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 160, 169-176, 2005.
- [18] H.S. Shih, Y.J. Lai and E.S. Lee, Fuzzy approach for multilevel programming problems, *Computers and Operations Research* 23(1996) 73-91.
- [19] H. Von Stackelberg, *The Theory of the Market Economy* Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford, 1952
- [20] University of Cambridge.
<http://thesaurus.maths.org/dictionary/map/word/10037>, 2001.
- [21] D. White and G. Anandalingam, A penalty function approach for solving bi-level linear programs, *Journal of Global Optimization*, 3, 397-419, 1993.
- [22] L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, *Inform & Control* 8, 338-353, 1965.
- [23] G. Zhang, J. Lu and Y. Wu, Formulation of linear programming problems with fuzzy coefficients of objective functions and constraints, *Asian Information-Science-Life* 2, 57-68, 2003.
- [24] G. Zhang, Y. Wu, M. Remia, and J. Lu, Formulation of fuzzy linear programming problems as four-objective constrained problems, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 139, 383-399, 2003
- [25] G. Zhang and J. Lu, The definition of optimal solution and an extended Kuhn-Tucker approach for fuzzy linear bilevel programming, *The IEEE Computational Intelligence Bulletin*, 1-7, 2005.
- [26] G. Zhang and J. Lu, Model and approach of fuzzy bilevel decision making for logistics planning problem, to appear in *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 2005.
- [27] G. Zhang, J. Lu, R. Steele and C. Shi, An Extended Kth-best approach for fuzzy linear bilevel problems, *The 10th International Conference on Fuzzy Theory and Technology*, July 21-26, Salt Lake City, USA, 2005.