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#### Abstract

We study the capacitated $m$-ring-star problem ( $C m R S P$ ) that faces the design of minimum cost network structure that connects customers with $m$ rings using a set of ring connections that share a distinguished node (depot), and optionally star connections that connect customers to ring nodes. Ring and star connections have some associated costs. Also, rings can include transit nodes, named Steiner nodes, to reduce the total network cost if possible. The number of customers in each ringstar (ring's customers and customer connected to it through star connections) have an upper bound (capacity).


These kind of networks are appropriate in optical fiber urban environments. $C m R S P$ is know to be NP-Hard. In this paper we propose an integer linear programming formulation and a branch-and-cut algorithm.
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## 1 Introduction

The Capacitated $m$-Ring-Star Problem ( $C m R S P$ ) consists in design of a minimum cost network to connect a set of customers using: a set of $m$ rings (cycles) containing a distinguished node (depot) shared by all of them and connections between a customer that does not belong to any ring and a ring through star connections. Rings may include transit nodes (Steiner nodes) so that star connections can be established between a customer and a ring through a transit node. Each ring and its star connections (ring-star) can contain at most $Q$ customers. In optical fiber networks each customer in a ring receives a pair of fibers to send/receive data in a clockwise and counter-clockwise way, so if a ring connection fails, the network does not lose connectivity. Star connections are used between nearby nodes, so the repairing cost time is reasonable with respect to the ring connections' problems. CmRSP was introduced by Baldacci, Dell'Amico and Salazar González in [1] where they propose exact resolution approachs based on integer linear models and branch-and-cut algorithms. In [3] is presented a resolution based on a metaheuristic approach, and [2] propose an exact resolution approach based on integer linear model and column generation algorithms.

## 2 Model

We consider customers denoted by $U=\left\{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{|U|}\right\}, W=\left\{w_{1}, \ldots, w_{|W|}\right\}$ the transit nodes, and the depot is represented by $d_{0}$ and $d_{1}$ (copy of $d_{0}$ ). The rings are represented with directed paths between $d_{0}$ and $d_{1}$. Ring and star connection costs are denoted by $c_{v v^{\prime}}$ for $v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}, v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\}$ and $d_{u v}$ for $u \in U, v \in V$ respectively with $V=U \cup W$. Variables defined for the model are: $\forall v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\} \quad \forall v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\}: x_{v v^{\prime}} \in\{0,1\}, x_{v v^{\prime}}=1$ if $v$ and $v^{\prime}$ are directly connected through a ring connection, otherwise $x_{v v^{\prime}}=0$. We also define $\forall u \in U, \forall v \in V: y_{u v}=1$ when $u$ is directly connected to $v$ through a star connection, in other case $y_{u v}=0$, and we use $\forall v \in V: f_{v}$ for the number of customers visited in a directed path from $d_{0}$ to $v$ in a ring-star (including star connections), $f_{v} \in Z$. Next we show a new formulation for the $C m R S P$.

$$
\min \sum_{v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}} \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\}, v^{\prime} \neq v} c_{v v^{\prime}} x_{v v^{\prime}}+\sum_{u \in U} \sum_{v \in V, v \neq u} d_{u v} y_{u v}
$$

subject to
(i) $\sum_{v \in V} x_{d_{0} v}=m$
(ii) $\sum_{v \in V} x_{v d_{1}}=m$
(iii) $\sum_{v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}, v \neq u} x_{v u}+\sum_{v \in V, v \neq u} y_{u v}=1 \quad \forall u \in U$
(iv) $\sum_{v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}, v \neq w} x_{v w} \leq 1 \quad \forall w \in W$
(v) $\sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}, v^{\prime} \neq v} x_{v^{\prime} v}=\sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\}, v^{\prime} \neq v} x_{v v^{\prime}} \quad \forall v \in V$
(vi) $y_{u v} \leq \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}, v^{\prime} \neq v} x_{v^{\prime} v} \quad \forall u \in U \quad \forall v \in V \quad u \neq v$
(vii) $f_{u} \geq 1+\sum_{u^{\prime} \in U, u^{\prime} \neq u} y_{u^{\prime} u} \quad \forall u \in U$
(viii) $f_{w} \geq \sum_{u \in U} y_{u w} \quad \forall w \in W$
(ix) $f_{u} \geq\left(f_{v}+1+\sum_{u^{\prime} \in U, u^{\prime} \neq u} y_{u^{\prime} u}\right)-|U|\left(1-x_{v u}\right) \quad \forall u \in U \quad \forall v \in V \quad u \neq v$
(x) $f_{w} \geq\left(f_{v}+\sum_{u \in U} y_{u w}\right)-|U|\left(1-x_{v w}\right) \quad \forall w \in W \quad \forall v \in V \quad w \neq v$
(xi) $1 \leq f_{v} \leq Q \quad \forall v \in V$

Constraints (i) and (ii) ensure that $m$ arcs have an origin in $d_{0}$ and $m$ arcs arrive to $d_{1}$ respectively, and (iii) assert that every customer must belong either to some (unique) ring or be connected to one of them using a star connection. Constraints (iv) allow Steiner nodes to be part of a ring, and (v) ensure that every node has an input arc in a ring if and only if it also has an output arc. With (vi) constraints we ensure that a star connection between a customer $u$ and node $v$ is possible if $v$ belongs to a ring. Constraints (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x) limit the number of customers to $Q$ in each ring. Constraints (vii) and (viii) bound every node beyond the position in the ring-star. These are necessary for single node rings, while (ix) and (x) increase the number of customers visited from $d_{0}$ considering the current node (if it is a customer), the number of customers visited in the previous node and the star connections to $u$ or $w$ respectively.

Constraints (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x) also ensure subtour elimination that includes a customer. Subtours composed by only steiner nodes can be part of feasible solutions. Since by eliminating Steiner nodes subtours we can get a feasible solution with lower objective value, such feasible solutions are not minimum. However including the following constraints using $z \in Z^{|U|+|W|}$ variables we can exclude every subtour improving in some cases the computational performance.
(i) $z_{v^{\prime}} \geq\left(z_{v}+1\right)-|V|\left(1-x_{v v^{\prime}}\right) \quad \forall v, v^{\prime} \in V \quad v \neq v^{\prime}$
(ii) $1 \leq z_{v} \leq|V| \quad \forall v \in V$

## 3 Polyhedral results

In order to develop a branch-and-cut algorithm, we propose specific families of valid inequalities for the formulation given in Section 2. The Propositions 3.1, $3.2,3.3$ and 3.4 inequalities are based on a similar idea presented in [4] and are also considered in [1], adapted to the formulation presented in the Model 2. Due to space limitations, proofs are not presented. We define $U(S)=U \cap S$.

## Proposition 3.1 Capacity inequalities

$$
\forall S \subseteq V: \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\} \backslash S} x_{v v^{\prime}}+\sum_{u \in U(S)} \sum_{v \in V \backslash S} y_{u v} \geq \frac{1}{Q}\left(\sum_{v \in S} \sum_{u \in U(S)} x_{v u}+\sum_{u \in U} \sum_{v \in S} y_{u v}\right)
$$

are valid inequalities.
Proposition 3.2 Connectivity inequalities

$$
\forall S \subseteq V, \forall u \in U(S),|U(S)| \geq 1: \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\} \backslash S} x_{v v^{\prime}} \geq \sum_{v \in V \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\}} x_{v u}+\sum_{v \in S} y_{u v}
$$

are valid inequalities.
Proposition 3.3 Multistar inequalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
\forall S \subseteq V: \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\} \backslash S} x_{v v^{\prime}}+\sum_{u \in U(S)} \sum_{v \in V \backslash S} y_{u v} \geq & \frac{1}{Q}\left(\sum_{v \in S} \sum_{u \in U(S)} x_{v u}+\sum_{u \in U} \sum_{v \in S} y_{u v}\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{u \in U \cup\left\{d_{0}\right\} \backslash S} \sum_{v \in S} x_{u v}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

are valid inequalities.
Proposition 3.4 Capacity bounded by constant

$$
\forall S \subseteq V, K=\left\lceil\frac{|U(S)|}{Q}\right\rceil: \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{v^{\prime} \in V \cup\left\{d_{1}\right\} \backslash S} x_{v v^{\prime}}+\sum_{u \in U(S)} \sum_{v \in V \backslash S} y_{u v} \geq K
$$

are valid inequalities.
Proposition 3.5 Customers' sum inequalities

$$
\forall u, u^{\prime} \in U \quad u \neq u^{\prime}: x_{u^{\prime} u}+y_{u^{\prime} u} \leq x_{u d_{1}}+\sum_{v^{\prime} \in V, v^{\prime} \neq u, v^{\prime} \neq u^{\prime}} x_{u v^{\prime}}+y_{u v^{\prime}}
$$

are valid inequalities.

## 4 Solution methodology

We develop a branch-and-cut algorithm based on LP relaxations. To reduce the number of nodes explored, lower bounds are strengthend with valid inequalities (cutting planes) using separation procedures. Different strategies to explore the tree and variable selection criteria were analyzed. We present here different aspects of our branch-and-cut algorithm:

- Initial heuristic: we consider a two-phase method. In the first phase, an heuristic chooses $m$ intial customers. The second phase is a greedy algorithm that builds the $m$ rings (starting with the $m$ initial customers) introducing a new customer iteratively considering some ring and star connections.
- Separation routines: For the family of valid inequalities in Proposition 3.5 the corresponding separation problem is tackled through direct enumeration. For family in Propositions 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 we use a greedy heuristic as the separation procedure.
- Branching strategies: we tested various branching strategies that the CPLEX package offers. The best configuration for the instances tested in our formulation that we have found is using best-bound and reduced pseudo-costs for node and selection criteria respectively.


## 5 Computational results

Our computational experiments were conducted on a SUN UltraSparc III (CPU of $1 \mathrm{Ghz}, \mathrm{RAM}$ of 2 GB with SunOS 5.9). The algorithms were coded in C++, and compiled using GNU gcc version 3.4.6 compiler. The code was linked to CPLEX 10.1 optimization routines. We consider some instances evaluated in [1], [2] and [3]. Those instances are based on TSPLIB with 26 and 51 nodes, taking $\lfloor\alpha(n-1)\rfloor$ nodes as customers and the remaining as steiners for $\alpha \in\{0.25,0.50,0.75,1.0\}$ for $m \in\{3,4,5\}$. We can see in Table 1 that $B C$ outperforms CPLEX considerably in almost all instances considered. Each line shows instances parameters, the number of nodes explored nod ${ }_{C P X}$ and $\operatorname{nod}_{B C}$, the computational time $t_{C P X}$ and $t_{B C}$ (* for unsolved instances within 1800 seconds) and the \%gap $g a p_{C P X}$ and $g a p_{B C}$ for $C P X$ (using best-bound and reduced pseudo-costs for node and variable selection criteria respectively, and the default cuts provided by CPLEX) and $B C$ algorithm respectively.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we introduce a new formulation for the Capacitated $m$-Ring-Star Problem. We analyze computational results with different strategies related to branch-and-bound tree construction and exploration and propose valid inequalities and separation procedures to develop a branch-and-cut algorithm in order to evaluate them. Finally we evaluate CPLEX and our algorithm on different known instances and we get favorable results for our BC algorithm. As future research, it would be interesting to investigate about a primal heuristic,
separation procedures alternatives for the exponential size families and analyze different variable and node selection criteria specific for this formulation.

| $n$ | $\|U\|$ | $\|W\|$ | $m$ | $Q$ | $n o d_{C P X}$ | $t_{C P X}$ | $\%^{\prime 2 a p_{C P X}}$ | nod $_{B C}$ | $t_{B C}$ | $\% g a p_{B C}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 26 | 12 | 13 | 3 | 5 | 26600 | 143 | 0.0 | 954 | 14 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 25000 | 126 | 0.0 | 192 | 4 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 61500 | 356 | 0.0 | 230 | 4 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 112900 | $*$ | 14.37 | 3660 | 77 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 99800 | $*$ | 19.32 | 5341 | 111 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 18 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 107600 | $*$ | 20.0 | 15357 | 361 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 25 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 111100 | $*$ | 6.71 | 1373 | 26 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 91100 | $*$ | 12.89 | 2731 | 61 | 0.0 |
| 26 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 87600 | $*$ | 12.19 | 2351 | 51 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 12 | 38 | 3 | 5 | 112100 | $*$ | 12.26 | 14936 | 1290 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 12 | 38 | 4 | 4 | 113100 | $*$ | 12.98 | 5180 | 542 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 12 | 38 | 5 | 3 | 112100 | $*$ | 14.70 | 6150 | 776 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 25 | 25 | 3 | 10 | 110800 | $*$ | 15.48 | 14287 | $*$ | 2.73 |
| 51 | 25 | 25 | 4 | 7 | 109200 | $*$ | 15.76 | 11348 | $*$ | 3.06 |
| 51 | 25 | 25 | 5 | 6 | 111900 | $*$ | 15.92 | 10842 | $*$ | 8.95 |

Table 1: Computational times (in seconds) with $n \in\{26,51\}(n=|U|+|W|+1)$
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