Re: Discussion regarding Mr. Diabys algorithm

Source: http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2006−11/msg00290.html

- *From*: moustapha.diaby@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

- *Date*: 17 Nov 2006 10:45:12 −0800

On Nov 17, 5:02 am, "Radoslaw Hofman" <rad...@xxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> Uzytkownik <moustapha.di...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> napisal w
> wiadomoscinews:1163756083.390932.8850@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>
> I don't agree. For y_isj_*** this *** is nothing more then nested x_isj
> model. For z_isj_upv_*** is the same.
>
> Then we can build such models for every z_isj_upv_*** that each of them will
> be:
> − incorrect (using many times same cities k,t where k,t are not equal to
> i,j,u,v) − IS THERE ANYTHING TO AVOID IT??
> − balanced − they will sum up to make y_isj_*** incorrect models

Yes, the combination of constraints 2.8 − 2.11, 2.14, and Lemma 1.

> Look − your belief that this is correct is based only on thinking "sum of
> nested sub models for z makes y being correct" − but sum (as I mentioned)
> does not give you possibility to answer what was taken to sum...

There is nothing "nested". It is not only sums that are balanced in my
model. Resaon is the same as above.

> The "formal proof" is Proposition 2. The proof of that proposition is
> ve