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Abstract—The linear ordering problem (LOP) arises in a number of divers domains. The notoriously hard class of LOP instances, even for sizes \( L < 50 \), is represented by Paley tournament graphs. Instances of these graphs, along with best-known-values (BKVs), some of them proven optimum, are now readily available on the Internet. There is no published record of asymptotic complexity to solve instances of Paley tournament graphs, also known as the \( \text{pal} \) instances.

In this paper we propose a new stochastic solver based on a variation of a self-avoiding walk. The solver we propose has the platform-independent asymptotic walkLength complexity of \( 0.09336 \times 1.7727^L \) (in number of steps). We demonstrate close correlation of walkLength with the asymptotic runtime complexity on different platforms as well under two rapid prototype implementations: one in Tcl, one in Python. Most importantly, the paper presents two significant improvements in BKVs: \( \text{pal}(31, 300) \) improves on \( \text{pal}(31, 285) \) and \( \text{pal}(43, 597) \) improves on \( \text{pal}(43, 543) \).

I. INTRODUCTION

The linear ordering problem (LOP) arises in a number of divers domains, ranging from applications in triangulation of input-output matrices in economics, chronological ordering of artifacts in archeology, job-shop scheduling, scheduling of tournaments, query processing of wireless data broadcast, ordering of mutations as well as amino acid replacements in polypeptide, learning by ordering for better language translation, mathematical psychology, among others. For a comprehensive overview of the linear ordering problem, and the solutions provided by exact and heuristic methods, see [1].

While there is a prolific number of heuristic solvers, only a few exact methods and LOP solvers are known to exist. The relatively short list of solvers that implement exact algorithms includes [2], [3], and [4]. The importance of finding an exact solution for given LOP cannot be overstated: clearly they are important in a number of practical applications where runtime constraints are not critical and we can afford to wait for several days to get an exact solution. However, they also are important as the initial source of best-known-solutions (BKVs). These solutions provide a foundation for an experimental statistical model that reliably predicts the asymptotic complexity of a heuristic linear ordering solver — when running a well-defined class of LOP instances of increasing size \( L \).

The notoriously hard set of LOP instances, even for sizes \( L < 50 \), is represented by Paley tournament graphs [5]. These and many other instances are introduced in the survey paper [6] and the appendix [7]. To access all instances and the Excel file lolib_method_exp.xls with BKVs, see [8]. Names of files representing matrices of Paley graph tournaments contain the string \( \text{pal} \) which we also use in Eq. 1 below.

The asymptotic experiments with the LOP solver introduced in this paper return two new BKVs for \( L = 31 \) and \( L = 43 \). The improved BKVs are significant, see the paragraph following Eq. 1 for details.

\[
\text{BKV}(L, \text{pal}) = \{ \text{pal}(11, 35), \text{pal}(13, 55), \text{pal}(19, 107), \text{pal}(23, 161), \text{pal}(27, 252), \text{pal}(31, 300)\}^*, \text{pal}(43, 597)^*, \text{pal}(55, 1084)^* \}
\]

In the Excel file lolib_method_exp.xls under [8] we find best-known-values for \( \text{pal} \) instances, but no runtimes. The solvers listed are \{TS, MA, VNS, SA, SS, GRASP\}. The condensed summary is below:

- \( \text{pal}(31, 285) \) as the best value by some but not all solvers
- \( \text{pal}(43, 543) \) as the best value by some but not all solvers
- \( \text{pal}(55, 1045) \) as the best value by some but not all solvers

The same Excel file also lists \( \text{pal}(31, 300)\), \( \text{pal}(43, 597)\), \( \text{pal}(55, 1084) \) as the Upper Bound Norm. In view of results with our solver, we suggest to use the values in Eq. 1 as the set of target BKVs when designing asymptotic experiments with \( \text{pal} \) instances for any LOP solvers in the future.

The number of heuristic methods and solvers is indeed prolific, one more reason to categorize them [1]. For a brief chronological perspective, we list some of the representative approaches: [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19]. The only paper that includes experiments with \( \text{pal} \) instances is [17]. None of these experiments reach the BKVs posted in the appendix [7]. What they report is a measure of distances from these BKVs.

Uncensored Experiments. Our experiments with combinatorial problems in three different domain have demonstrated intrinsic merits of statistical models that can predict the asymptotic runtime complexity of any solver that returns BKVs associated a well-defined instance set in the problem domain of choice: see Figure 7 in [20], a number of plots in [21], and Figure 5 in [22]. We expect no less for the LOP solver outlined in this paper, given the instance set defined in Eq. 1.
Students also learned to rapidly prototype, test, and present the executable prototypes in Tcl, prepared by the instructor. Only, students learned about new concepts and algorithms from topics in combinatorial optimization: solving the linear ordering problem described as an asymptotic progression of puzzles formulated with binary coordinates, the lights-out problem described as an asymptotic progression as an asymptotic prediction model which is based on the least-squares fit with respect to the observed uncensored runtime mean values.

The larger the set of instances in the experiment, the more reliable is the asymptotic prediction model which is based on the least-squares fit with respect to the observed uncensored runtime mean values.

The player can select any pair of columns to swap (corresponding rows) will track, then click for the swap to be completed.

We follow the same four principles in all of these experiments:
(1) Select a set of at least 3 instances of increasing size from a well-defined problem class such as shown in Eq. 1.
(2) Select \( N \) random initial seeds and invoke \( N \) solver instances under the conservative runtime limit \( t_{\text{limit}} \) on the same instance class; consider either \( N \) runs on a single processor or \( N \) runs on the grid of \( N \) processors.
(3) Continue the runs until at least \( N_u \geq 100 \) runs reach the target first-passage-time \( < t_{\text{limit}} \). We say that any such run is uncensored. In other words, the mean runtime value we measure is based strictly on at least 100 uncensored observations from the experiment.
(4) Increase the instance size and repeat the experiment with new initial seeds and an increased runtime limit \( t_{\text{limit}} \).

The larger the set of instances in the experiment, the more reliable is the asymptotic prediction model which is based on the least-squares fit with respect to the observed uncensored runtime mean values.

**Paper outline.** Section 2 introduces notation and definitions, Section 3 outlines the \( \text{LOP} \) algorithm and the \( \text{LOP} \) solver instrumentation, Section 4 summarizes asymptotic experiments to date. Section 5 concludes with plans for future work.

Typical papers on solutions of the linear ordering problem are more formal than the content of Figures 1, 2, and 3 in this paper. The tutorial presentation style has been conditioned by related work [21] for clarifications about the notation.

**The \( \text{LOP} \) puzzle.** An example of the \( \text{LOP} \) puzzle is shown in Figure 1. Each configuration is expressed with a permutation coordinate \( \zeta \) of length \( L \). For \( L = 4 \), two permutation coordinates are \( 1,2,3,4 \) and \( 3,2,1,4 \). The cost of arrangement \( \Theta(\zeta) \) under any permutation is defined as the negative sum of all numbers in the matrix above the diagonal. The objective is to simultaneously swap pairs of rows and columns such that the negative sum above the diagonal is minimum.

The puzzle is played as follows. The player selects the column pair such as \( 2,3 \) (a pair of bold green lines above column). By clicking on one of the pairs, columns 2,3 and rows 2,3 are swapped and shown as the Step=1, decreasing the negative sum of numbers above the diagonal to -9. This puzzle is solved in 4 steps. To solve this puzzle from any starting configuration, in the least number of steps, requires an efficient probing strategy to select the best coordinate for each step as well as a good memory of the steps taken.

Formally, given a \( L \times L \) matrix \( M \) of numbers with an all-zero diagonal, the cost function \( \Theta(\zeta) \), to be minimized in terms of its permutation coordinate, is expressed with Eq. 2:

\[
\Theta(\zeta) = (-1) \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{j=i+1}^{L} M(\zeta_i, \zeta_j)
\]

See Figure 2 for an illustration of how Eq. 2 is evaluated.

**Coordinate rank and rankMax.** Both variables are computed from the standard inversion number of a permutation.

\[
\text{rank}(\zeta) = \text{inversionNumber}(\zeta)
\]

\[
\text{rankMax} = L \times (L - 1)/2
\]

For simplicity of notation, we shall use \( \text{rank} \) and \( \text{rankMax} \).

**Coordinate distance.** The distance between two permutation coordinates \( a \) and \( b \) is defined as the absolute difference between the two ranks of each coordinate:

\[
d(a, b) = |\text{rank}(a) - \text{rank}(b)|
\]
The landscape graph. We maintain several views of the landscape graph, a data structure underlying the implementation of each of our stochastic combinatorial solvers; introductory examples for a variety of problem-specific structures are examined in [23] and [24]. The landscape graph example in Figure 2 is an extension of the puzzle instance in Figure 1.

The principal columns in the table, coordinate and weight, are generated by exhaustive enumeration of the Eq. 2. The column state is a list of symbolic names for each coordinate, values under the column rank correspond to distances of each coordinate from the reference coordinate, 1,2,3,...,L-1,L. Symbolic names rather than specific coordinates are typically used to represent configurations or states when annotating Markov chains. The graph bidirectional edges in the landscape graph next to the table are induced by computing unit distances between the binary coordinates; we associate no self-loops with this graph. The vertex labels are state-weight pairs which can be expanded to coordinate-weight pairs $\xi : \Theta(\xi)$. On x-axis, vertices are ordered by the coordinate rank; on y-axis, vertices are ordered by the vertex weight. The two walks are examples of self-avoiding walks, both reaching the absorbing state $Z1$.

Formally, the landscape graph is represented with a weighted graph adjacency matrix and just like in the state transition probability graph, we can define simple walks on the landscape graph. A single state-weight pairs, $Z1:18$ is associated with the minimum weight and is denoted as absorbing state. Since the vertex is declared absorbing, it has incoming edges only. In the context of stochastic combinatorial optimization, the concept of absorbing states is replaced with solution coordinates, reaching the target value or BVK.

Contiguous walks and pivot coordinates. Let the coordinate $\xi_j$ be the initial coordinate from which the walk takes the first step. Then the sequence

$$\{\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_j, \ldots, \xi_\omega\}$$

is called a walk list or a walk of length $\omega$, the coordinates $\xi_j$ are denoted as pivot coordinates and $\Theta(\xi_j)$ are denoted as pivot values. Given an instance of size $L$ and its best upper bound $\Theta(\xi_L)$, we say that the walk reaches its target value (and stops) when $\Theta(\xi_j) \leq \Theta(\xi_L)$.

We say that the walk is contiguous if the distance between adjacent pivots is 1; i.e., given Eq. 5, we find

$$d(\xi_j, \xi_{j-1}) = 1, \quad j = 1, 2, ..., \omega \quad (7)$$

Distance=1 neighborhood. The distance=1 neighborhood of a pivot coordinate $\xi_j$ is a set of permutation coordinates:

$$N(\xi_j) = \{ \xi_j^i \mid d(\xi_j, \xi_j^i) = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, L - 1 \} \quad (8)$$

Self-avoiding walks (SAWs). We say that the walk is self-avoiding if all pivots in Eq. 6 are unique. We say that the walk is composed of two or more walk segments if the initial pivot of each walk segment has been induced by a heuristic such as random restarts.

III. SAW.WANDERING: SOLVER AND INSTRUMENTATION

We view each walk or walk segment as a sequence of steps that chain a set of pivot coordinates:

- at each step we compute the set of all adjacent coordinates $N(\xi_j)$, also known as the local neighborhood of the pivot coordinate $\xi_j$.
- for each adjacent coordinate $\xi_j^i$, we probe or evaluate the cost function such as Eq. 2 for its value.

There is a large family of self-avoiding walks; some are more efficient than others, depending on the problem. While still new to LOP, we implemented the wandering walk first.

Wandering Walk. We describe the wandering walk in its simplest form; formal details can be found in [23] and [24].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>index</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>coord</th>
<th>weight</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,1,3,4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,3,4,2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3,1,2,4</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,3,1,4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2,1,4,3</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,3,4,2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,4,2,3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2,3,4,1</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,2,4,1</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2,4,1,3</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3,1,4,2</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>4,1,2,3</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1,4,3,2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>3,2,4,1</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2,4,3,1</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3,4,1,2</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4,1,3,2</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4,2,1,3</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,3,1,2</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3,4,2,1</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4,2,3,1</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4,3,2,1</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2: Canonic views of the LOP puzzle instance in Figure 1. The permutation coordinate length $L = 4$ induces $4! = 24$ states or permutations, each evaluated by Equation 2. The graph bidirectional edges in the landscape graph next to the table are induced by computing unit distances between the permutation coordinates. The vertex labels are state-weight pairs which can be expanded to coordinate-weight pairs $\xi : \Theta(\xi)$. On x-axis, vertices are ordered by the coordinate rank; on y-axis, vertices are ordered by the vertex weight. The two walks are examples of self-avoiding walks, both reaching the absorbing state $Z1$. 

![Landscape graph](image-url)
**Fig. 3:** An extended view of the LOP puzzle instance in Figure 2. Consider $M_{-11}$ as the pivot vertex with three adjacent vertices: $E_{-6}$, $Q_{-15}$, and $I_{-14}$. The cost of probing each vertex for its value directly with Equation 2 represents the *simple or naive probing* approach. The *tableau-based probing* returns values for each of the adjacent vertices in constant time, leveraging the values already computed by the pivot. For details about the complexity of probing the pivot and its *entire neighborhood* of constant size $L-1$, see text in the paper.

```plaintext
1: procedure SAW.wander()
2: while true do
3:   (1) select a random coordinate and mark it as the 'initial pivot'.
4:   (2) probe all unmarked adjacent coordinates, then select and mark the coordinate with the 'best value' as the new pivot. If multiple coordinates return the same value, a random choice is made to avoid biasing the walk.
5:   (3) continue the walk until either the 'best value' < 'target value' or the walk is being trapped by adjacent coordinates that are already pivots;
6:   (4) if the walk is trapped, restart the walk from a randomly selected 'new initial pivot';
7:   (5) manage the memory constraints with an efficient data structure such as a hash table.
8: end while
9: end procedure
```

For illustrations of two ‘wandering walks’ that find the minimum of the LOP example in relatively few steps, see the landscape graph in Figure 2.

**Trapped pivots** have been observed only rarely, and only for very small instances. Issues that that arise when running this algorithm on LOP instances include:

- with large instances, the length of the walk may increase the number of hash collision and impact the runtime of the solver; a random restart clears the hash.
- as the size of the problem increases, the computational cost of probing *each adjacent coordinate* of the pivot coordinate before making the decision on the next step of the walk can become an important factor. For any LOP instance, the complexity of probing the pivot and its *entire neighborhood* under what we denote as *simple or naive approach* is

$$O(L^2 + (L-1) * L^2)$$

In [23] we illustrate efficient data structures to significantly reduce the complexity of probing the *entire distance=1 neighborhood* of the pivot coordinate — under binary, permutation, and other coordinate encodings. In contrast to *simple or naive probing*, we denote the more efficient approach as the *tableau-based probing*. We illustrate the differences between the two approaches with the LOP puzzle instance in Figure 3. We see by inspection why the tableau-based probing of the pivot neighborhood is more efficient: rather than performing independent evaluation of each neighborhood coordinate, we leverage the already computed data about the pivot to find, in constant time, the cost at each neighborhood coordinate. The complexity of probing the pivot and its *entire neighborhood under the tableau-based probing* is thus

$$O(L^2 + L - 1)$$

### Solver Instrumentation.

The *wandering walk* implementation of the current tcl/python solvers P.lopT/P.lopP is based
Fig. 4: Mean values of walkLength (in steps), based on observations and the asymptotic model of the tcl and the python ‘lop’ solvers, each under two options: ‘S’ (isSimple) and ‘T’ (tableau). Under 100 randomly selected initial seeds for each instance in class ‘pal’, both solvers return 100 solutions with the known optimum value (‘valueTarget’).

on the pseudo-code outlined in this section. Both solvers are instrumented to measure runtime (in seconds) and stop either after recording the first-passage-time on reaching BKV or after the reaching runtime limit tmt. The solvers also maintain counters such as cntProbe, cntTrapped, cntRestart, walkLength and decision variables such as isCensored, targetReached. For each run under different initial seeds, results are returned in standardized output table for statistical evaluation after completion of N runs.

These counters are of critical importance: cntProbe and walkLength provide a way to test and compare platform-independent equivalence of two solver implementation, such as tcl/python solvers P.lopT/P.lopP. Before we pair any two solver for runtime comparisons, we should ask whether the uncensored asymptotic models for cntProbe and walkLength are equivalent.

IV. SUMMARY OF EXPERIMENTS

Our experiments follow the methodology that rigorously established the asymptotic performance model of the state-of-the-art stochastic solver for the low autocorrelation binary sequence problem [21].

All computations rely on individual processors accessed remotely. Each processor requires reservations and is also subject to expiring tokens in 24 hours. As a consequence, we could not avoid censored experiments for the largest instances.
Fig. 5: Mean values of runtime (in seconds), based on observations and the asymptotic model of the tcl and the python 'lop' solvers, each under two options: 'S' (isSimple) and 'T' (tableau). Under 100 randomly selected initial seeds for each instance in class 'pal', both solvers return 100 solutions with the known optimum value ('valueTarget').

A typical processor is an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5645 @ 2.40GHz, 4 GB virtual memory [25].

All asymptotic experiments are summarized in three figures. Figures 4 and 5 compare asymptotic performance of two solver prototypes: one implemented in Tcl, the other in Python. These experiments were completed as 'uncensored' and were part of the project course with students. The instances included pal(11,35), pal(13,55), pal(19,107), and pal(23,161). Figure 6 was completed after the course with all instances from Eq. 1.

Figure 4. This figure presents four asymptotic models for walkLength: (a) with and without the tableau-probing under Tcl. (b) with simple-probing only, but with two solvers: Tcl and Python. (c) with tableau-probing only, but with two solvers: Tcl and Python. (d) with and without the tableau-probing under Python. Not surprisingly, in this series of experiments, we observe cntProbe and walkLength and ideally, there is little if any observable difference between simple-probing and tableau-probing. Similarly, we observe negligible differences in observed values from either solver. As expected, these observations are platform-independent and the two solver implementations are indeed functionally equivalent.

Figure 5. This figure summarizes the same 4-factor experiments discussed in Figure 4 except that now, we observe runtime: (a) with and without the tableau-probing under Tcl; with tableau-probing the Tcl solver clearly much faster and the
Fig. 6: A summary of the currently most accurate model of asymptotic complexity for \texttt{pal} instances, achieved with the current \texttt{LOP} solver prototype \texttt{Plop}: \texttt{walkLengthModel} = 0.09336 * 1.7727^L, \texttt{runtimeModel} = 0.00000917 * 1.9349^L (in seconds).

The gap should increase as the instance size increases. (b) with simple-probing only, but with two solvers: Tcl and Python. Here, Python is the faster solver by about factor of 2. (c) with tableau-probing only, but with two solvers: Tcl and Python. Again, Python solver is faster by about factor of 2. (d) with and without the tableau-probing under Python; with tableau-probing the Python solver clearly much faster and the gap should increase as the instance size increases. Since all experiments have been performed on similar processors, these comparisons are fair.

**Figure 6.** This figure extends the range of experiments that are summarized in the preceding two figures. With a runtime limit of 3600 seconds, we can now report on \( N_n > 100 \) uncensored runs with \texttt{pal}(27, 252) which represent \texttt{BKV} for this instance. Significantly, while the current computational environment is not adequate to handle larger \texttt{pal} instance over a long run, we were fortunate: a few uncensored runs returned \texttt{BKV} that significantly exceed the ones posted to date.

- a new \texttt{BKV} of \texttt{pal}(31, 300) improves on \texttt{pal}(31, 285)
- a new \texttt{BKV} of \texttt{pal}(43, 597) improves on \texttt{pal}(43, 543)

All this with only a self-avoiding walk running under a simple ‘wandering heuristic’ as a rapid solver prototype in Tcl.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

One of our observations is that currently, we have no reference point how our model of platform-independent asymptotic walkLength complexity of $0.09336 \times 1.7727^L$ compares to any other solver when applied to the class of $\text{pal}$ instances in Eq. 1. However, it should serve us well when we consider expanding our heuristic to other than wandering self-avoiding walk.

We definitely plan to move to a grid-based computer platform such as [26] to better harness advantages of massively parallel computation. Concurrently, we expect to accelerate the solver prototype PlopT by a factor of at least 5000 just by recoding it in C++. With the current solver under C++, the expected average uncensored runtime to solve pal(55,1084) would then be about $0.00000917 \times 1.9349^{55}/(24 \times 3600 \times 5000) = 124$ days. Herein is the motivation to devise a faster algorithm!

Finally, we argue that testing the true performance of two algorithms can most reliably be performed by designing a series of asymptotic experiments on well-defined classes of instances that increase in size. The example for the $\text{pal}$ class as expressed in Eq. 1 is just a start. Only by running an asymptotic experiment with two solvers can we observe whether the asymptotic lines run in parallel or whether they cross, and at what instance size they cross. Only by observing the increasing gap between one solver runtime or walkLength will we know for sure which is the dominating solver on the given instance class.
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$ ./P.lopT
# .. sourced all tcl libraries defined under the sandbox
# Mon Feb 06 11:35:54 EST 2017

USAGE:
./P.lopT <instanceDef> [optional_arguments]

EXAMPLES:
./P.lopT ../benchm/lop/pal/pal19.lop -seedInit 1914
./P.lopT ../benchm/lop/pal/pal19.lop -walkSegmCoef 128 -runtimeLmt 5

DESCRIPTION:
P.lopT takes one REQUIRED argument

instanceDef (here, a filePath with an extension .lop or NO extension)
and a number of OPTIONAL arguments in any order. Here is a list of pairs 'name defaultValue', with short in-line descriptions:

- runtimeLmt 30 Stop if the solver exceeds these many seconds.
- seedInit NA If NA, a random positive integer is created to initialize a random number generator.
- coordInit NA If NA, a random permutation coordinate is generated internally -- unless user enters an initial coordinate
- walkSegmLmt NA Inactive unless assigned an integer or if walkSegmCoef > 0
- walkSegmCoef NA A coefficient that determines walkSegmLmt as walkSegmCoef*instanceDim.
- isSimple FALSE If asserted, simpler-to-code but an inefficient procedure to probe neighborhood coordinates is invoked.

DETAILS:
This solver reads an instance of the 'linear ordering problem' in a matrix format and returns a column/row ordering that minimizes the negative sum of matrix elements above the diagonal. The example below shows an instance of such a matrix with sum = -8 under its 'natural order', and an instance under an optimal permutation of 3,1,4,2 with a sum of -13. For this matrix, there are two more such optimal permutations: 2,3,1,4 and 4,2,3,1.

natural order under permutation
1,2,3,4 3,1,4,2
sum = -8 sum = -13

4 4
0 0 0 5 0 4 1 1
1 0 2 0 0 0 5 0
4 1 0 1 1 3 0 2
3 2 1 0 2 1 0 0

$