DM545/DM871
Linear and Integer Programming

IP Modeling, Formulations, Relaxations

Marco Chiarandini

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

November 2 and 9, 2026

Outline

1. Formulations
    Uncapacited Facility Location
    Alternative Formulations

2. Relaxations

Outline

1. Formulations
    Uncapacited Facility Location
    Alternative Formulations
2. Relaxations

Outline

1. Formulations
    Uncapacited Facility Location
    Alternative Formulations
2. Relaxations

Uncapacited Facility Location (UFL)

Given:

- depots $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$
- clients $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$
- f_j fixed cost to use depot j
- transport cost for all orders c_{ij}

Task: Which depots to open and which depots serve which client

Variables: $y_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if depot opened} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, x_{ij} fraction of demand of i satisfied by j

Objective:

$$\min \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in N} c_{ij} x_{ij} + \sum_{j \in N} f_j y_j$$

Constraints:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \qquad \forall i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$\sum_{i \in M} x_{ij} \leq m y_j \qquad \forall j \in N$$

Outline

1. Formulations
    Uncapacited Facility Location
    Alternative Formulations
2. Relaxations

Good and Ideal Formulations

Definition (Formulation)

A polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ is a **formulation** for a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$ if and only if $X = P \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p)$

That is, if it does not leave out any of the solutions of the feasible region X.

There are **infinitely many** formulations

Definition (Convex Hull)

Given a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ the **convex hull** of X is defined as:

$$\text{conv}(X) = \Big\{ \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lambda_i \mathbf{x}^i, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lambda_i = 1, \qquad \lambda_i \geq 0, \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, t,$$
$$\text{for all finite subsets } \{\mathbf{x}^1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^t\} \text{ of } X \Big\}$$

Proposition

$conv(X)$ is a polyhedron (ie, representable as $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$)

Proposition

Extreme points of $conv(X)$ all lie in X

Hence:

$$\max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in X\} \equiv \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in \text{conv}(X)\}$$

However it might require exponential number of inequalities to describe $\text{conv}(X)$
What makes a formulation better than another?

$$X \subseteq \text{conv}(X) \subseteq P_2 \subset P_1$$

P_2 is better than P_1

Definition

Given a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and two formulations P_1 and P_2 for X, P_2 is a better formulation than P_1 if $P_2 \subset P_1$

Example

$P_1 =$ UFL with $\sum_{i \in M} x_{ij} \leq m y_j \quad \forall j \in N$
$P_2 =$ UFL with $x_{ij} \leq y_j \quad \forall i \in M, j \in N$

$$P_2 \subset P_1$$

- $P_2 \subseteq P_1$ because summing $x_{ij} \leq y_j$ over $i \in M$ we obtain $\sum_{i \in M} x_{ij} \leq m y_j$
- $P_2 \subset P_1$ because there exists a point in P_1 but not in P_2:
  Example: $m = 6$, $n = 2$ (ie, 6 clients, 2 depots)

  Point for P_1:

  $$x_{10} = 1, \; x_{20} = 1, \; x_{30} = 1, \; x_{41} = 1, \; x_{51} = 1, \; x_{61} = 1$$

  $$\sum_i x_{i0} \leq 6 y_0 \qquad y_0 = 1/2$$
  $$\sum_i x_{i1} \leq 6 y_1 \qquad y_1 = 1/2$$

  is not a point for P_2 because $x_{10} \leq y_0$ is violated.

Outline

1. Formulations
Uncapacited Facility Location
Alternative Formulations
2. Relaxations

Optimality and Relaxation

$$z = \max\{c(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n\}$$

How can we prove that $\mathbf{x}^*$ is optimal?
$\overline{z}$ is UB
$\underline{z}$ is LB
stop when $\overline{z} - \underline{z} \leq \epsilon$



- **Primal bounds** (here lower bounds): every feasible solution gives a primal bound, it may be easy or hard to find, heuristics
- **Dual bounds** (here upper bounds): Relaxations

Optimality gap (SCIP):

- If primal and dual bounds have opposite signs, the gap is "Infinity".
- If primal and dual bounds have the same sign, the gap is

$$\frac{|pb - db|}{\min(|pb|, |db|) + \epsilon}$$

decreases monotonously during the solving process.

Proposition

$$\begin{array}{rll} \textit{Given:} \quad (IP) & z & = \max\{c(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\} \\ \textit{a relaxation of it is:} \quad (RP) & z^R & = \max\{f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\} \quad \textit{if:} \end{array}$$

(i) $X \subset T$ *or*

(ii) $X = T$ *and* $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq c(\mathbf{x}) \; \forall \mathbf{x} \in X$

Also:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in T} f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in T} c(\mathbf{x}) \\ \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} f(\mathbf{x}) \end{array} \right\} \geq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} c(\mathbf{x})$$

- T: candidate solutions;
- $X \subseteq T$ feasible solutions;
- $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq c(\mathbf{x}) \; \forall \mathbf{x} \in X$

Relaxations

How to construct relaxations?

1. $IP : \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n\}, \qquad P = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$
   $LP : \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$
   Better formulations ($P_1 \subseteq P_2$) give better bounds.

Proposition

(i) *If a relaxation LP is infeasible, the original problem IP is infeasible.*

(ii) *Let $\mathbf{x}^*$ be optimal solution for LP. If $\mathbf{x}^* \in X$ and $f(\mathbf{x}^*) = c(\mathbf{x}^*)$ then $\mathbf{x}^*$ is optimal for IP.*

2. **Combinatorial relaxations** to easy problems that can be solved rapidly
   Eg: TSP to Assignment problem
   Eg: Symmetric TSP to 1-tree

3. Lagrangian relaxation

$$IP: \qquad z = \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \in X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n\}$$

$$LR: \qquad z(\mathbf{u}) = \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in X\}$$

$$z(\mathbf{u}) \geq z \qquad \forall \mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{0}$$

4. Duality:

Definition

Two problems:

$$z = \max\{c(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in X\} \qquad w = \min\{w(\mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{u} \in U\}$$

form a **weak-dual pair** if $c(\mathbf{x}) \leq w(\mathbf{u})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and all $\mathbf{u} \in U$.
When $z = w$ they form a **strong-dual pair**

Proposition

Let IP and D be weak-dual pair:

(i) *If D is unbounded, then IP is infeasible*

(ii) *If* $\mathbf{x}^* \in X$ *and* $\mathbf{u}^* \in U$ *satisfy* $c(\mathbf{x}^*) = w(\mathbf{u}^*)$ *then* $\mathbf{x}^*$ *is optimal for IP and* $\mathbf{u}^*$ *is optimal for D.*

Proposition

$z = \max\{\mathbf{c}^T\mathbf{x} : A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+\}$ *and* $w^{LP} = \min\{\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{b} : A^T\mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m_+\}$
(ie, dual of linear relaxation) form a weak-dual pair.

The advantage is that we do not need to solve an LP like in the LP relaxation to have a bound, any feasible dual solution gives a bound.

Examples

Weak pairs:

Matching: $z = \max\{\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{x} : A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m\}$

V. Covering: $w = \min\{\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{y} : A^T y \geq \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n\}$

Proof: consider LP relaxations, then $z \leq z^{LP} = w^{LP} \leq w$.
(strong when graphs are bipartite)

Weak pairs:

S. Packing: $z = \max\{\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{x} : A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n\}$

S. Covering: $w = \min\{\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{y} : A^T\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m\}$