

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

### Title

A note on capacity models for network design

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9d01w366>

### Journal

Operations Research Letters, 46(4)

### ISSN

0167-6377

### Authors

Atamtürk, Alper

Günlük, Oktay

### Publication Date

2018-07-01

### DOI

10.1016/j.orl.2018.05.002

Peer reviewed



# A note on capacity models for network design

Alper Atamtürk<sup>a,\*</sup>, Oktay Günlük<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Industrial Engineering & Operations Research, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>b</sup> Mathematical Sciences, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 28 November 2017

Received in revised form 16 March 2018

Accepted 8 May 2018

Available online 22 May 2018

### Keywords:

Valid inequalities

Network design

Capacity

Traffic

## ABSTRACT

In network design problems, capacity constraints are modeled in three different ways depending on the application: *directed*, *bidirected* and *undirected*. In the literature, polyhedral investigations for strengthening mixed-integer formulations are done separately for each model. In this note, we examine the relationship between these models to provide a unifying approach and show that one can indeed translate valid inequalities from one to the others.

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In network design problems, capacity constraints are modeled in three different ways depending on the application and the underlying technology for installing capacity: *directed*, *bidirected*, and *undirected*. In *directed* models, the total flow on an arc is limited by the capacity of the directed arc. In *bidirected* models, if a certain capacity is installed on an arc, then the same capacity also needs to be installed on the reverse arc. Whereas in *undirected* models, the sum of the flow on an arc and its reverse arc is limited by the capacity of the undirected edge associated with the two arcs.

In the literature, polyhedral investigations for strengthening mixed-integer formulations are done separately for each model. Undirected capacity models are considered in [2,10,11,13–16]. Bidirected capacity models are studied in [7,9]. Whereas directed models are considered in [1,3–6,8,12]. Oriolo [16] gives a characterization of domination between symmetric traffic matrices for the undirected capacity model. In this paper, we examine the relationship between these three separately-studied models to provide a unifying approach and show how one can translate valid inequalities from one to the others. In particular, we show that the projections of the undirected and bidirected models onto the capacity variables are the same. We demonstrate that valid inequalities previously given for undirected and bidirected models can be derived as a consequence of the relationship between these models and the directed model.

Let  $G = (N, E)$  be an undirected graph with node set  $N$  and edge set  $E$ . Let  $A$  be the arc set obtained from  $E$  by including the

arcs in each direction for the edges in  $E$ . Let  $M$  denote the set of facility types where a unit of facility  $m \in M$  provides capacity  $c_m$ . Depending on the model, facilities are installed either on the edges or on the arcs of the network and accordingly, we use  $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{R}^E$  or  $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{R}^A$  to denote the existing capacities on the edges or arcs of the network. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $c_m \in \mathbb{Z}$  for all  $m \in M$  and  $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_{|M|}$ . Let the demand data for the problem be given by the square matrix  $T = \{t_{ij}\}$ , where  $t_{ij} \geq 0$  is the amount of directed traffic that needs to be routed from node  $i \in N$  to  $j \in N$ . Let  $K = \{(ij) \in N \times N : i \neq j\}$  and define the  $|K| \times |N|$  demand matrix  $D = \{d_{ij}^k\}$ , where

$$d_{ij}^k = \begin{cases} t_{ij} & \text{if } u = j, \\ -t_{ij} & \text{if } u = i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $(ij) = k \in K$  and  $u \in N$ .

## 2. Undirected capacity model

In the undirected network design problem, the sum of the flow on an arc and its reverse arc is limited by the capacity of the undirected edge associated with the two arcs. This problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min f(x, y) \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{j \in N_i^+} x_{ij}^k - \sum_{j \in N_i^-} x_{ji}^k = d_i^k, \quad \text{for } k \in K, i \in N, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k + \sum_{k \in K} x_{ji}^k \leq \bar{c}_e + \sum_{m \in M} c_m y_{m,e}, \quad \text{for } e = \{i, j\} \in E, \quad (2)$$

$$x, y \geq 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}^{M \times E}, \quad (3)$$

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [atamturk@berkeley.edu](mailto:atamturk@berkeley.edu) (A. Atamtürk), [gunluk@us.ibm.com](mailto:gunluk@us.ibm.com) (O. Günlük).

where  $x$  and  $y$  denote the flow and capacity variables, respectively, and  $f$  denotes the cost function. In most applications, the function  $f$  can be decomposed as  $f(x, y) = f^1(x) + f^2(y)$  and, furthermore, it is typically linear.

Let  $U(T)$  denote the set of feasible solutions to inequalities (1)–(3). A capacity vector  $\bar{y}$  accommodates traffic  $T$  if there exists a feasible flow vector  $x$  such that  $(x, \bar{y}) \in U(T)$ . In other words,  $\bar{y}$  accommodates  $T$  if  $\bar{y} \in \text{proj}_y(U(T))$ , where  $\text{proj}_y(\cdot)$  denotes the orthogonal projection operator onto the space of the  $y$  variables. We say that two traffic matrices  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$  are pairwise similar if  $t_{ij} + t_{ji} = \hat{t}_{ij} + \hat{t}_{ji}$  for all  $(ij) \in K$ . We next show that  $\text{proj}_y(U(T)) = \text{proj}_y(U(\hat{T}))$  provided that  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$  are pairwise similar.

**Lemma 1.** Capacity vector  $y$  accommodates  $T$  if and only if it accommodates all  $\hat{T}$  pairwise similar to  $T$ .

**Proof.** Let  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$  be pairwise similar. Consider a pair of nodes  $u, v \in N$  with nonzero traffic, i.e.,  $\sigma = t_{uv} + t_{vu} = \hat{t}_{uv} + \hat{t}_{vu} > 0$ .

Assuming  $y$  accommodates  $T$ , let  $x$  be a flow vector such that  $(x, y) \in U(T)$ . Construct  $\hat{x}$  from  $x$  by letting all entries of  $\hat{x}$  corresponding to  $k \in K \setminus \{uv, vu\}$  be same as that of  $x$ . Let  $\alpha = \hat{t}_{uv}/\sigma$ . For the remaining entries of  $\hat{x}$  associated with commodities  $uv$  and  $vu$ , we set  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} = \alpha(x_{ij}^{uv} + x_{ji}^{vu})$  and  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{vu} = (1 - \alpha)(x_{ij}^{vu} + x_{ji}^{uv})$  for all  $(ij) \in A$ .

Notice that  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{vu} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu} = x_{ij}^{uv} + x_{ji}^{vu} + x_{ij}^{vu} + x_{ji}^{uv}$  for all  $\{i, j\} \in E$ . Therefore,  $\hat{x}$  satisfies the capacity constraints (2). In addition,  $\hat{x}$  also satisfies the flow balance constraints (1) as  $\hat{d}_i^{uv} = \alpha(d_i^{uv} + d_i^{vu})$  and  $\hat{d}_i^{vu} = (1 - \alpha)(d_i^{vu} + d_i^{uv})$  for all  $i \in N$ . Repeating the same argument for the remaining pairs of nodes proves the claim.  $\square$

Lemma 1 can also be shown using the metric inequalities as done in [16].

**Definition 1.** An objective function  $f$  is called arc-symmetric if  $f(x, y) = f(\hat{x}, y)$  whenever

$$x_{ij}^{vu} + x_{ji}^{uv} + x_{ij}^{uv} + x_{ji}^{vu} = \hat{x}_{ij}^{vu} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu}$$

for  $uv, vu \in K$  and  $\{i, j\} \in E$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $T$  and  $\hat{T}$  be pairwise similar and  $f$  be arc-symmetric. If  $(x, y) \in U(T)$ , then there exists  $(\hat{x}, y) \in U(\hat{T})$  such that  $f(x, y) = f(\hat{x}, y)$ .

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 1, it is possible to construct a flow vector  $\hat{x}$  such that  $(\hat{x}, y) \in U(\hat{T})$ . Furthermore, as  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{vu} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu} = x_{ij}^{vu} + x_{ji}^{uv} + x_{ij}^{uv} + x_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and the function is arc-symmetric, the result follows.  $\square$

Given a traffic matrix  $T$ , we define its symmetric counterpart to be  $T^* = (T + T^T)/2$ . In other words,  $t_{uv}^* = t_{vu}^* = (t_{uv} + t_{vu})/2$ . Also note that  $T$  and  $T^*$  are pairwise similar. We have so far established that optimizing an arc-symmetric cost function  $f$  over  $U(T)$  is equivalent to optimizing it over  $U(T^*)$ .

**Lemma 3.** Let  $f$  be an arc-symmetric function and  $T^*$  be a symmetric matrix. If  $(x, y) \in U(T^*)$ , then there exists  $(\hat{x}, y) \in U(T^*)$  such that  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} = \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ . Furthermore,  $f(x, y) = f(\hat{x}, y)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\tilde{x}$  be such that  $\tilde{x}_{ij}^{uv} = x_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ . As  $T^*$  is symmetric,  $(\tilde{x}, y) \in U(T^*)$ . Furthermore, by convexity, defining  $\hat{x} = (x + \tilde{x})/2$  we have  $(\hat{x}, y) \in U(T^*)$ . In addition,  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} = \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ . Finally, as  $f$  is arc-symmetric and  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu} + \hat{x}_{ij}^{vu} + \hat{x}_{ji}^{uv} = x_{ij}^{uv} + x_{ji}^{vu} + x_{ij}^{vu} + x_{ji}^{uv}$ , for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ , the claim holds.  $\square$

Let  $U^=(T)$  denote the set of feasible solutions  $(x, y)$  to constraints (1)–(3) together with the following equations

$$x_{ij}^{uv} = x_{ji}^{vu} \quad \text{for all } (ij) \in A, (uv) \in K. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 3 in conjunction with Lemma 2 establishes that when  $f$  is an arc-symmetric function, optimizing  $f$  over  $U(T)$  is same as optimizing it over  $U^=(T^*)$ .

**Proposition 1.** Let  $f$  be an arc-symmetric function,  $T$  be a traffic matrix and let  $T^*$  be its symmetric counterpart. Then

$$\min_{(x,y) \in U(T)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in U(T^*)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in U^=(T^*)} f(x, y).$$

Furthermore, given an optimal solution to any one of the problems, optimal solutions to the other two can be constructed easily.

Furthermore, notice that if (4) holds, then

$$\sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k + \sum_{k \in K} x_{ji}^k = 2 \max \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k, \sum_{k \in K} x_{ji}^k \right\} \tag{5}$$

for all  $(ij) \in A$ . We next relate these observations on undirected capacity models to network design problems with bidirected capacity constraints.

### 3. Bidirected capacity model

In the bidirected network design problem, the total flow on an arc and total flow on its reverse arc are each limited by the capacity of the undirected edge associated with these arcs. This problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\min f(x, y)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{j \in N_i^+} x_{ij}^k - \sum_{j \in N_i^-} x_{ji}^k = d_i^k, \quad \text{for } k \in K, i \in N, \tag{6}$$

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k, \sum_{k \in K} x_{ji}^k \right\} \leq \bar{c}_e + \sum_{m \in M} c_m y_{m,e}, \quad \text{for } e = \{i, j\} \in E, \tag{7}$$

$$x, y \geq 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}^{M \times E}. \tag{8}$$

Let  $B(T)$  be the set of feasible solutions  $(x, y)$  to inequalities (7)–(8). We next show that if  $T$  is symmetric and  $(x, y) \in B(T)$ , then there exists a flow vector  $\hat{x}$  such that  $(\hat{x}, y) \in B(T)$  and  $\hat{x}$  satisfies (4). Furthermore if  $f$  is an arc-symmetric cost function, then  $f(x, y) = f(\hat{x}, y)$ .

**Lemma 4.** Let  $f$  be an arc-symmetric function and  $T^*$  be a symmetric matrix. If  $(x, y) \in B(T^*)$ , then there exists  $(\hat{x}, y) \in B(T^*)$  such that  $\hat{x}_{ij}^{uv} = \hat{x}_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ . Furthermore,  $f(x, y) = f(\hat{x}, y)$ .

**Proof.** The proof is essentially identical to that of Lemma 3. First we construct  $\tilde{x} \in U(T^*)$  by letting  $\tilde{x}_{ij}^{uv} = x_{ji}^{vu}$  for all  $(ij) \in A$  and  $(uv) \in K$ . Then we define  $\hat{x} = (x + \tilde{x})/2$  and observe that  $(\hat{x}, y) \in U(T^*)$  and that it satisfies the properties in the claim.  $\square$

Therefore, if  $T^*$  is a symmetric traffic matrix, then

$$\min_{(x,y) \in B(T^*)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in B^=(T^*)} f(x, y), \tag{9}$$

where  $B^=(T^*)$  is the set of feasible solution  $(x, y)$  to constraints (6)–(8) together with Eq. (4). We next show that optimizing an arc-symmetric cost function over  $U(T)$  is equivalent to optimizing a slightly different function over  $B(2T^*)$ .

**Proposition 2.** Let  $f$  be an arc-symmetric function,  $T$  be a traffic matrix and let  $T^*$  be its symmetric counterpart. Then

$$\min_{(x,y) \in U(T)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in B(2T^*)} g(x, y),$$

where  $g(x, y) = f(\frac{1}{2}x, y)$ . Furthermore, optimal solutions to each problem can be easily mapped into the other.

**Proof.** By Proposition 1, we have  $\min_{(x,y) \in U(T)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in U(T^*)} f(x, y)$  and a common optimal solution to both problems can easily be constructed from an optimal solution to the first one. In addition, by Lemma 4,  $\min_{(x,y) \in B(T^*)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in B(T)} f(x, y)$  and a common optimal solution to both problems can easily be constructed from an optimal solution to the first one. Therefore, it suffices to show the result for  $U=(T^*)$  and  $B=(2T^*)$  instead of  $U(T)$  and  $B(2T)$ .

Consider a point  $p = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in U=(T^*)$ . As  $\bar{x}$  satisfies Eq. (4) and therefore (5), we have  $p' = (2\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in B=(2T^*)$ . As  $g(x, y) = f(\frac{1}{2}x, y)$ , we also have  $g(p') = f(p)$ . Conversely, and given a solution  $q = (x', y') \in B=(2T^*)$  we construct  $q' = (\frac{1}{2}x', y') \in U=(T^*)$  with  $g(q) = f(q')$ . Combining these observations, we conclude that

$$\min_{(x,y) \in U=(T)} f(x, y) = \min_{(x,y) \in B=(2T^*)} g(x, y)$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

As an application of Proposition 2, consider a valid inequality  $ax + cy \geq b$

for  $U(T)$  where vectors  $a$  and  $c$  are of appropriate size. If  $ax + cy$  is arc-symmetric, that is, if

$$a_{ij}^{uv} = a_{ji}^{vu} = a_{ij}^{vu} = a_{ji}^{uv} \text{ for all } (ij) \in A \text{ and } (uv) \in K, \tag{10}$$

then

$$\min_{(x,y) \in U(T)} ax + cy = \min_{(x,y) \in B(2T^*)} \frac{1}{2}ax + cy = \hat{b} \geq b$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{2}ax + cy \geq b$$

is valid for  $B(2T^*)$ . Conversely, if  $ax + cy \geq b$  is valid for  $B(2T^*)$ , then  $2ax + cy \geq b$  is valid for  $U(T)$ . Therefore, valid inequalities that are defined by coefficients satisfying (10) can easily be translated between  $U(T)$  and  $B(2T^*)$ .

In particular, consider an inequality  $cy \geq b$  that depends on the capacity variables only. Clearly  $cy$  is arc-symmetric and if  $cy \geq b$  is a valid inequality for  $U(T)$ , then it is valid for  $B(2T^*)$  as well. Similarly, if  $cy \geq b$  is valid for  $B(2T^*)$ , then it is also valid for  $U(T)$ . Combining this with Proposition 1 and Eq. (9), we make the following observation.

**Corollary 1.** Projections of the sets  $U(T)$ ,  $U(T^*)$ ,  $U=(T^*)$ ,  $B(2T^*)$ , and  $B=(2T^*)$  onto the space of capacity variables are equal.

Therefore, for the undirected case it suffices to study symmetric traffic matrices to characterize all valid inequalities that involve capacity variables only. The same, however, is not the case for the bidirected case.

**Remark 1.** The observation above suggests that the polyhedral structure of the bidirected network design problem is more complicated than that of the undirected one. To demonstrate this, consider an instance of the bidirected network design problem that has a single facility type with  $c_m = 1$ . Let  $G = (N, E)$  be the complete (undirected) graph on three nodes and assume that there is no existing capacity. It is known that [7] the projection of feasible solutions onto the space of capacity variables is

$$\text{proj}_y(B(T)) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y(i) \geq T(i) \forall i \in N, \sum_{e \in E} y_e \geq \max \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{\sum_{i \in N} T(i)}{2} \right\rceil, \lceil \Theta \rceil \right\} \right\},$$

where for  $i \in N$  we let  $j$  and  $k$  denote the remaining two nodes in  $N \setminus \{i\}$  and define  $y(i) = y_{(i,j)} + y_{(i,k)}$ ,  $T(i) = \lceil \max\{t_{ij} + t_{ik}, t_{ji} + t_{ki}\} \rceil$ , and  $\Theta = \max_{(i,j,k) \in \Pi} \{t_{ij} + t_{jk} + t_{ki}\}$  where  $\Pi$  contains all triplets obtained by permuting the nodes in  $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Now consider  $T^*$ , the symmetric counterpart of  $T$ , and notice that for all  $i \in N$ , we have  $t_{ij}^* + t_{ik}^* = t_{ji}^* + t_{ki}^*$  and therefore  $T^*(i) = \lceil t_{ij} + t_{ik} \rceil$ . In addition, for all  $(i, j, k) \in \Pi$  we have  $\Theta = t_{ij}^* + t_{ik}^* + t_{jk}^*$  and  $\lceil (T^*(1) + T^*(2) + T^*(3))/2 \rceil \geq \lceil \Theta \rceil$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lceil \frac{\lceil t_{12}^* + t_{13}^* \rceil + \lceil t_{12}^* + t_{23}^* \rceil + \lceil t_{13}^* + t_{23}^* \rceil}{2} \right\rceil \\ & \geq \left\lceil \frac{2t_{12}^* + 2t_{13}^* + 2t_{23}^*}{2} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have the simpler projection

$$\text{proj}_y(B(T^*)) = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y(i) \geq T^*(i) \forall i \in N, \sum_{e \in E} y_e \geq \left\lceil \frac{\sum_{i \in N} T^*(i)}{2} \right\rceil \right\} = \text{proj}_y(U(T/2))$$

for the undirected model.

#### 4. Directed capacity model

In the directed network design problem, the capacities are added on the arcs so that the total flow on an arc is limited by the capacity of the arc. The problem is modeled as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min f(x, y) \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{j \in N_i^+} x_{ij}^k - \sum_{j \in N_i^-} x_{ji}^k = d_i^k, \text{ for } k \in K, i \in N, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k \leq \bar{c}_{ij} + \sum_{m \in M} c_m y_{m,ij}, \text{ for } (ij) \in A, \tag{12}$$

$$x, y \geq 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}^{M \times A}. \tag{13}$$

Let  $D(T)$  denote the set of feasible solutions  $(x, y)$  to inequalities (11)–(13). Let  $y^1$  be the vector of capacity variables on arcs  $(ij)$  with  $i < j$  and  $y^2$  be the vector of capacity variables on arcs  $(ij)$  with  $i > j$ . Similarly define existing capacity vectors  $\bar{c}^1, \bar{c}^2$ . Observe for a graph that has a reverse arc  $(ji)$  for each arc  $(ij)$  that adding constraints  $y^1 = y^2$  to  $D(T)$  gives an equivalent formulation to  $B(T)$  provided that  $\bar{c}_{ij} = \bar{c}_{ji} = \bar{c}_e$  for all  $(ij)$  and  $e = \{i, j\}$ . Let  $D=(T) = D(T) \cap \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^{M \times A} : y^1 = y^2\}$ .

**Lemma 5.** Suppose  $\bar{c}^1 = \bar{c}^2 = \bar{c}$ . The point  $(x, y)$  is feasible for  $B(T)$  if and only if  $(x, y^1, y^2)$  with  $y^1 = y^2 = y$  is feasible for  $D=(T)$ .

**Proof.** If  $(x, y)$  is feasible for  $B(T)$ , then letting  $y^1 = y^2 = y$  gives a point  $(x, y^1, y^2)$  in  $D(T)$  satisfying  $y^1 = y^2$ . Conversely, if  $(x, y^1, y^2)$  is feasible for  $D=(T)$ , then  $(x, y^1)$  is feasible for  $B(T)$  as

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k, \sum_{k \in K} x_{ji}^k \right\} \leq \bar{c}_{(i,j)} + y_{(i,j)}^1. \quad \square$$

Consequently, every valid inequality for  $D(T)$  yields a valid inequality for  $B(T)$  as shown in the next proposition.

**Proposition 3.** If  $\pi x + \beta^1 y^1 + \beta^2 y^2 \geq \pi_0$  is valid for  $D(T)$ , then  $\pi x + (\beta^1 + \beta^2) y \geq \pi_0$  is valid for  $B(T)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $(x, y)$  be a feasible point in  $B(T)$ . For  $y^1 = y^2 = y$ , we have

$$\pi x + (\beta^1 + \beta^2)y = \pi x + \beta^1 y + \beta^2 y = \pi x + \beta^1 y^1 + \beta^2 y^2 \geq \pi_0.$$

Thus inequality holds.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Now we will show that some of the valid inequalities derived for  $B(T)$  in the literature can be obtained directly from valid inequalities for  $D(T)$  via Proposition 3.

Consider a nonempty two-partition  $(U, V)$  of the vertices of the network. Let  $b^k$  denote the net demand of commodity  $k$  in  $V$  from  $U$ . Let  $A^+$  be the set of arcs directed from  $U$  to  $V$ ,  $A^-$  be the set of arcs directed from  $V$  to  $U$ . Suppose  $A = A^+ \cup A^-$ . For  $Q \subseteq K$  let  $x_Q(S) = \sum_{k \in Q} x^k(S)$  and  $b_Q = \sum_{k \in Q} b^k$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $b_Q \geq 0$ .

For  $Q \subseteq K$  and  $s \in M$  let  $r_{s,Q} = b'_Q - \lfloor b'_Q/c_s \rfloor c_s$  and  $\eta_{s,Q} = \lceil b'_Q/c_s \rceil$ , where  $b'_Q = b_Q - \bar{c}(S^+) + \bar{c}(S^-)$ . Then multi-commodity multi-facility cut-set inequality [3]

$$\sum_{m \in M} \phi_{s,Q}^+(c_m) y_m(S^+) + x_Q(A^+ \setminus S^+) + \sum_{m \in M} \phi_{s,Q}^-(c_m) y_m(S^-) - x_Q(S^-) \geq r_{s,Q} \eta_{s,Q}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\phi_{s,Q}^+(c) = \begin{cases} c - k(c_s - r_{s,Q}) & \text{if } kc_s \leq c < kc_s + r_{s,Q}, \\ (k+1)r_{s,Q} & \text{if } kc_s + r_{s,Q} \leq c < (k+1)c_s, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\phi_{s,Q}^-(c) = \begin{cases} c - kr_{s,Q} & \text{if } kc_s \leq c < (k+1)c_s - r_{s,Q}, \\ k(c_s - r_{s,Q}) & \text{if } kc_s - r_{s,Q} \leq c < kc_s, \end{cases}$$

and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , is valid for  $D(T)$ . Above  $\phi_{s,Q}^+$  and  $\phi_{s,Q}^-$  are subadditive MIR functions written in closed form. Let  $E^+$  be the undirected edges corresponding to  $S^+$  and  $E^-$  be the undirected edges corresponding to  $S^-$ . Then, Proposition 3 implies the bidirected valid inequality

$$\sum_{m \in M} \phi_{s,Q}^+(c_m) y_m(E^+) + x_Q(A^+ \setminus S^+) + \sum_{m \in M} \phi_{s,Q}^-(c_m) y_m(E^-) - x_Q(S^-) \geq r_{s,Q} \eta_{s,Q} \quad (15)$$

for  $B(T)$ , which is given by Raack et al. [17].

For the single facility case with  $c_m = 1$ , the directed inequality (14) reduces to

$$r_Q y(S^+) + x_Q(A^+ \setminus S^+) + (1 - r_Q) y(S^-) - x_Q(S^-) \geq r_Q \eta_Q, \quad (16)$$

where  $r_Q = b'_Q - \lfloor b'_Q \rfloor$  and  $\eta_Q = \lceil b'_Q \rceil$ . Proposition 3 implies the corresponding bidirected valid inequality

$$r_Q y(E^+) + x_Q(A^+ \setminus S^+) + (1 - r_Q) y(E^-) - x_Q(S^-) \geq r_Q \eta_Q, \quad (17)$$

for  $B(T)$ .

### Acknowledgments

Alper Atamtürk is supported, in part, by grant FA9550-10-1-0168 from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. Oktay Günlük would like to thank the Numerical Analysis Group at the University of Oxford Mathematical Institute for hosting him during this project.

### References

- [1] T. Achterberg, C. Raack, The MCF-separator: Detecting and exploiting multi-commodity flow structures in MIPs, *Math. Program. Comput.* 2 (2010) 125–165.
- [2] Y.K. Agarwal, K-partition-based facets of the network design problem, *Networks* 47 (2006) 123–139.
- [3] A. Atamtürk, On capacitated network design cut-set polyhedra, *Math. Program.* 92 (2002) 425–437.
- [4] A. Atamtürk, O. Günlük, Network design arc set with variable upper bounds, *Networks* 50 (2007) 17–28.
- [5] A. Atamtürk, D. Rajan, On splittable and unsplittable flow capacitated network design arc-set polyhedra, *Math. Program.* 92 (2002) 315–333.
- [6] A. Atamtürk, G.L. Nemhauser, M.W.P. Savelsbergh, Valid inequalities for problems with additive variable upper bounds, *Math. Program.* 91 (2001) 145–162.
- [7] D. Bienstock, O. Günlük, Capacitated network design - polyhedral structure and computation, *INFORMS J. Comput.* 8 (1996) 243–259.
- [8] D. Bienstock, S. Chopra, O. Günlük, C.-Y. Tsai, Minimum cost capacity installation for multicommodity networks, *Math. Program.* 81 (1998) 177–199.
- [9] O. Günlük, A branch-and-cut algorithm for capacitated network design problems, *Math. Program.* 86 (1999) 17–39.
- [10] F. Hamid, Y.K. Agarwal, Solving the two-facility network design problem with 3-partition facets, *Networks* 66 (2015) 11–32.
- [11] T.L. Magnanti, P. Mirchandani, Shortest paths, single origin–destination network design, and associated polyhedra, *Networks* 23 (1993) 103–121.
- [12] T.L. Magnanti, R.T. Wong, Network design and transportation planning: Models and algorithms, *Transp. Sci.* 18 (1984) 1–55.
- [13] T.L. Magnanti, P. Mirchandani, R. Vachani, The convex hull of two core capacitated network design problems, *Math. Program.* 60 (1993) 233–250.
- [14] T.L. Magnanti, P. Mirchandani, R. Vachani, Modeling and solving the two-facility capacitated network loading problem, *Oper. Res.* 43 (1995) 142–157.
- [15] P. Mirchandani, Projections of the capacitated network loading problem, *European J. Oper. Res.* 122 (2000) 534–560.
- [16] G. Oriolo, Domination between traffic matrices, *Math. Oper. Res.* 33 (2008) 91–96.
- [17] C. Raack, A.M.C.A. Koster, S. Orłowski, R. Wessälly, On cut-based inequalities for capacitated network design polyhedra, *Networks* 57 (2011) 141–156.