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## Motivation

- Building polynomial Linear Program (LP) models for problems that only have Exponential Extension Complexity (Rothvoss [1])
$\mathrm{EP}_{n}=\mathrm{CH}\left\{x \in\{0,1\}^{\binom{n}{2}}: x\right.$ is the edge-vector of a perfect matching in $\left.K_{n}\right\}$
$\sum_{i j \in \delta(S)} x_{i j} \geqslant 1$,
$\sum_{i j \in \delta(i)} x_{i j}=1$
$0 \leqslant x_{i j} \leqslant 1$,
$i \leqslant 1,2, \ldots, n$


Fig1: Extended Formulation [2]

- Possibility of modeling Integer Programs (IP) as a single compact IP that has a polynomial time oracle encoded in the LP

- Modeling LPs through more intuitive higher level programming languages in comparison to Algebraic Modeling Systems (AMS) Sparktope Compiler

- $Q$ is Weak Extended Formulation (WEF) if
- x-0/1 property
- If "yes" $z^{*}=m+d$
$Q=\left\{(x, w, s): x \in[0,1]^{q}, w \in[0,1], s \in[0,1]^{r}, A x+b w+C s \leqslant h\right\}$
$z^{*}=\max \left\{c^{T} x+d w:(x, w, s) \in Q\right\}$
Where $\quad c_{j}=\left\{\begin{aligned} 1 & \text { if } \bar{x}_{j}=1 \\ -1 & \text { if } \bar{x}_{j}=0\end{aligned}\right.$
$0<d \leqslant 1 / 2$


## Problem

- Sparktope produces extremely large LPs for reasonably small codes which passes solver's limit on the number of constraints.

| name | n | max steps | main.LB | init.UB | rows | columns | non-zeros | GB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{mm} 8 . \mathrm{lp}$ | 8 | $4000(9747)$ | 307 | 393 | $21,490,809$ | $2,567,920$ | $80,568,489$ | $1.4(3.4)$ |
| $\mathrm{mm10.lp}$ | 10 | $7000(19629)$ | 472 | 611 | $54,809,388$ | $5,354,967$ | $210,572,706$ | $3.6(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{mm12.lp}$ | 12 | $10000(34771)$ | 673 | 877 | $94,860,776$ | $8,200,011$ | $371,213,800$ | $6.3(23)$ |
| $\mathrm{mm16.lp}$ | 16 | $16000(83003)$ | 1183 | 1553 | $212,451,096$ | $14,288,092$ | $854,715,828$ | $15(80)$ |

Table1: LPs produced for the Maximum Matching problem with n nodes [3]

## Proposed Methods

Reduce the size of LP by sharing different LP and Sparks features.

- Constraint sharing
- Controlled $x-0 / 1$ property and Unique Execution Step constraints

- Time sharing
- Multiple Clocks in the LP model for Semi-independent Blocks of Code (SIB)

$$
\begin{gathered}
S(1,1)=1 \\
\sum_{i=1}^{l} S(i, t)=1
\end{gathered}
$$
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Fig2: Trace of run $S(i, t)$ [3]

## - Code sharing

- Allow functions by introducing new constraints for Goto statements based on register values
- Eliminate expensive stack structure for nonrecursive functions

$$
S(i, t)-S(k, t+1) \leqslant 0
$$
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