On the nested p-center problem

Christof Brandstetter, Markus Sinnl
Institute of Business Analytics and Technology Transformation, Johannes Kepler University Linz
2024-02-26

Introduction

- *p*-center problem (pCP): open *p* number of facilities, such that the maximum distance between a customer and its closest open facility minimized

Introduction

- *p*-center problem (pCP): open *p* number of facilities, such that the maximum distance between a customer and its closest open facility minimized
- nested: considering more than one time period in which facilities are opened, facilities once open cannot be closed

Introduction

- *p*-center problem (pCP): open *p* number of facilities, such that the maximum distance between a customer and its closest open facility minimized
- nested: considering more than one time period in which facilities are opened, facilities once open cannot be closed
- nested *p*-center problem (npCP): open p^h number of nested facilities in period *h*, such that the sum of the maximum distances between a customer and its closest open facility in this time period is minimized

# *p*-center problem vs nested *p*-center problem

Figure: Feasible solution for the nested and the non-nested *p*-center problem with $p = p^h = 4, 5, 6$

Research question

How can the nesting concept be applied to the p-center problem?

- proposed by McGarvey and Thorsen (2022)

Research question

How can the nesting concept be applied to the p-center problem?
- proposed by McGarvey and Thorsen (2022)
- Which mixed integer programming (MILP) formulations can be used?
- Which MILP formulations have the best runtime?
- How can the nested p-center problem affect managerial decisions?

Definition of the nested p-center problem I

- given a set of customer demand points $\mathcal{I}$,
- potential facility locations $\mathcal{J}$,
- time periods $\mathcal{H} = \{1, \ldots, H\}$,
- integers $\mathcal{P} = \left\{ p^1, \ldots p^H \right\}$
  - where $p^h \leq p^{h+1}$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H-1$ and
  - $p^H \leq |\mathcal{J}|$
- distances $d_{ij} \geq 0$ between each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $j \in \mathcal{J}$

Definition of the nested p-center problem II

- a feasible solution to the nested p-center problem consists of a set $\mathcal{J}^h \subseteq \mathcal{J}$
  - with $|\mathcal{J}^h| = p^h$ for $h \in \mathcal{H}$,
  - for which $\mathcal{J}^h \subseteq \mathcal{J}^{h+1}$ for $h = 1, \ldots, H-1$ holds
- the goal is to find a feasible solution which minimizes $\sum_{h=1}^{H} d_h(\mathcal{J}^h)$,
  - where $d_h(\mathcal{J}^h) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}^h} d_{ij}$ for $h \in \mathcal{H}$

Related work

p-center problem

- First introduction of the *p*-center problem by Hakimi (1964)
- The standard textbook formulation of the *p*-center problem can be found in Daskin (2013)
- Solution approach based on the set cover problem by Contardo, Iori, and Kramer (2018)
- A compact formulation by Ales and Elloumi (2018) and Elloumi, Labbé, and Pochet (2004)
- A formulation with a projection-based branch-and-cut algorithm for the *p*-center problem by Gaar and Sinnl (2022)

Nested facility location problems

- First introduction of the nesting property and constraint by Roodman and Schwarz (1975)

- Extension of the nesting to a phase-in and phase-out by Roodman and Schwarz (1977)

- Reintroduction of the nesting on the example of the *p*-median problem by McGarvey and Thorsen (2022)

- Other work on multi-period facility locations problems mainly focus on varying demand, distances, or cost over time f.e. Calogiuri et al. (2021)

Mixed Integer Linear Programming formulations

First MILP formulation

Decision variables

$$x_{ij}^h \dots \begin{cases} 1 \dots \text{if customer } i \text{ is assigned to facility location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \dots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

First MILP formulation

Decision variables

$x_{ij}^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if customer } i \text{ is assigned to facility location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$y_j^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if a facility is opened at location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

First MILP formulation

Decision variables

$x_{ij}^h \dots \begin{cases} 1 \dots \text{if customer } i \text{ is assigned to facility location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \dots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$y_j^h \dots \begin{cases} 1 \dots \text{if a facility is opened at location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \dots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$z^h \dots$ maximum distance between any customer i and its nearest open facility in period h

First MILP formulation

$$(\text{nPC1}) \quad \min \quad \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} z^h \tag{1a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} y_j^h = p^h \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1b}$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} x_{ij}^h = 1 \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1c}$$

$$x_{ij}^h \leq y_j^h \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1d}$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} d_{ij} x_{ij}^h \leq z^h \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1e}$$

$$y_j^h \geq y_j^{h-1} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{1\} \tag{1f}$$

$$x_{ij}^h, \in \{0, 1\} \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1g}$$

$$y_j^h, \in \{0, 1\} \qquad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1h}$$

$$z^h \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{1i}$$

Second MILP formulation

$$(\text{nPC2}) \quad \min \quad \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} z^h \tag{2a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} y_j^h = p^h \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2b}$$

$$z^h \geq d_{ij} - \sum_{j' : d_{ij'} < d_{ij}} (d_{ij} - d_{ij'}) y_{j'}^h \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2c}$$

$$y_j^h \geq y_j^{h-1} \qquad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{1\} \tag{2d}$$

$$y_j^h \in \{0, 1\} \qquad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2e}$$

$$z^h \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2f}$$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

$\mathcal{K}$ ... set of indices in $\mathcal{D}$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

$\mathcal{K}$ ... set of indices in $\mathcal{D}$

S_i ... set of indices $k \in \mathcal{K}$ for which there exists a facility $j \in \mathcal{J}$ with $d_{ij} = D_k$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

$\mathcal{K}$ ... set of indices in $\mathcal{D}$

S_i ... set of indices $k \in \mathcal{K}$ for which there exists a facility $j \in \mathcal{J}$ with $d_{ij} = D_k$

Decision variables

y_j^h ... $\begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if a facility is opened at location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

$\mathcal{K}$ ... set of indices in $\mathcal{D}$

S_i ... set of indices $k \in \mathcal{K}$ for which there exists a facility $j \in \mathcal{J}$ with $d_{ij} = D_k$

Decision variables

$y_j^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if a facility is opened at location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$u_k^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if the optimal value of } z^h \text{ is greater or equal than } D_k \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Third MILP formualtion

$\mathcal{D}$ ... set of distinct distances where $D_0 \leq \cdots \leq D_K$ are the values in $\mathcal{D}$

$\mathcal{K}$ ... set of indices in $\mathcal{D}$

S_i ... set of indices $k \in \mathcal{K}$ for which there exists a facility $j \in \mathcal{J}$ with $d_{ij} = D_k$

Decision variables

$y_j^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if a facility is opened at location } j \text{ in period } h \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$u_k^h \ldots \begin{cases} 1 \ldots \text{if the optimal value of } z^h \text{ is greater or equal than } D_k \\ 0 \ldots \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

z^h ... maximum distance between any customer i and its nearest open facility in period h

Third formulation

$$\text{(nPC3)} \quad \min \quad \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} z^h \tag{3a}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} y_j^h = p^h \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{3b}$$

$$D_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} (D_k - D_{k-1}) u_k^h \leq z^h \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{3c}$$

$$u_k^h + \sum_{j : d_{ij} < D_k} y_j^h \geq 1 \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall k \in S_i \cup \{K\} \tag{3d}$$

$$u_k^h \geq u_{k+1}^h \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{K\} \tag{3e}$$

$$y_j^h \leq y_j^{h-1} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \tag{3f}$$

$$y_j^h \in \{0, 1\} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \tag{3g}$$

$$u_k^h \in \{0, 1\} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K} \tag{3h}$$

$$z^h \in \mathbb{R} \qquad \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \tag{3i}$$

Comparing formulations

Table: Comparison of complexity of the formulations

	(nPC1)	(nPC2)	(nPC3)
Variables	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{K}|)|\mathcal{H}|)$
Constraints	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(\min(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}|, |\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{K}|)|\mathcal{H}|)$

Comparing formulations

Table: Comparison of complexity of the formulations

	(nPC1)	(nPC2)	(nPC3)
Variables	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{K}|)|\mathcal{H}|)$
Constraints	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}||\mathcal{H}|)$	$\mathcal{O}(\min(|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{J}|, |\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{K}|)|\mathcal{H}|)$

The (pCP) version of formulation (nPC3) has the best known linear programming ($\mathcal{LP}$)-bounds for the (pCP), while the (pCP) versions of (nPC1) and (nPC2) have equally but worse $\mathcal{LP}$-bounds.

Reducing set $\mathcal{K}$ in (nPC3)

Lemma 1

Let $\underline{z^h}$ be a valid lower bound and $\overline{z^h}$ be a valid upper bound on the decision variable z^h for $h \in \mathcal{H}$, then the distinct distance D_k can only be the optimal distance for z^h if $\underline{z^h} \leq D^k \leq \overline{z^h}$ holds.

Therfore let set $S_i^h \subseteq S_i$ for $h \in \mathcal{H}$, where S_i^h contains only the indices k where $\underline{z^h} \leq D^k \leq \overline{z^h}$ holds and constraint (3d) can be replaced with

$$u_k^h + \sum_{j:d_{ij}<D_k} y_j^h \geq 1 \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall k \in S_i^h \cup \{K\} \tag{4}$$

Depending on the bounds $\underline{z^h}$ and $\overline{z^h}$ the sets S_i^h can be much smaller than S_i.

Strengthening constraints (nPC2)

Lemma 2

Let LB_h be a lower bound on the decision variable z_h of (nPC2) for every $i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}, h \in \mathcal{H}$ then

$$z^h \geq \max\{LB^h, d_{ij}\} - \sum_{j':d_{ij'} < d_{ij}} (\max\{LB^h, d_{ij}\} - \max\{LB^h, d_{ij'}\})y_{j'}^h \qquad \text{(nL-OPT)}$$

is a valid inequality for (nPC2), i.e., every feasible solution of (nPC2) fulfills (nL-OPT)*. Theorem is based on Lemma 5 in Gaar and Sinnl (2022).*

A similar strengthening can be done for (1e) in fromulation (nPC1).

Obtaining bounds I

Lemma 3

Let z'^{h*} be the optimal objective function value of (pCP) with $p = p^h$ for $h \in \mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, \ldots, H\}$ where $p^h > p^{h+1}$, then $UB = H z'^{1*}$ is a valid upper bound on the optimal objective function value of (npCP).

Then

$$\overline{z^h} = \frac{UB - \sum_{x=h+1}^{H} z'^{x*}}{h + 1}$$

where $\overline{z^h}$ is a valid upper bound on the decision variable z^h of the (npCP) for $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

Obtaining bounds II

Lemma 4

Let z'^* be the optimal objective function value of (pCP) for a certain p'. Then z'^* is a valid lower bound $\underline{z^h}$ on the decision variable z^h of (npCP) with $p^h = p'$.

Implementation and outline of the results

Implementation

- Implemented in C⁺⁺ using the CPLEX API of CPLEX 20.1.0.0
- Formulation (nPC2) solved by branch-and-cut and seperation based on the customers
- Preprocessing for all formulations
  - solving the (pCP) for p^h, $h \in \mathcal{H}$ starting with $h = H$
  - p^h is a valid lower bound for the (pCP) with p^{h-1}
- Single core of an Intel Xeon X5570 machine
  - 2.93 GHz
  - 48 GB RAM
  - Each run limited to 9 GB RAM and 3600 sec

Data

- data set PMED from "A note on solving large p-median problems" by Beasley (1985)
  - set of 40 test instances
  - the sets contain between 100 and 900 nodes
  - number of facilities to open initially ranging from 5 to 200
  - $\mathcal{P} = \{p, p+1, p+2\}$

Data

- data set PMED from "A note on solving large p-median problems" by Beasley (1985)
  - set of 40 test instances
  - the sets contain between 100 and 900 nodes
  - number of facilities to open initially ranging from 5 to 200
  - $\mathcal{P} = \{p, p + 1, p + 2\}$

- data set TSPLIB 2D-Euclidean distances from "TSPLIB—A Traveling Salesman Problem Library" by Reinelt (1991)
  - set of 80 test instances
  - the sets contain between 51 and 1002 nodes
  - rounded to the nearest integer value
  - $\mathcal{P} = \{4, 5, 6\}$

Preprocessing

(a) Preprocessing PMED

(b) Preprocessing TSPLIB

Figure: Preprocessing

(nPC1)-results

(a) (nPC1) optimality gap

(b) (nPC1) runtime

(nPC2)-results


(c) (nPC2) optimality gap

(d) (nPC2) runtime

(nPC3)-results

(e) (nPC3) optimality gap

(f) (nPC3) runtime

Formulation comparison

(g) models optimality gap

(h) models runtime

JYU **Institute of Business Analytics and Technology Transformation**

Managerial insights

(i) Relative regret

(j) Relative regret of # of facilities

Figure: On a subset of instances: Only if the problem was solved to optimality

Conclusion

- (nPC3) had the best runtimes over all instances
- For optimality gap the results are rather mixed
- The (nPC2) outperforms the (nPC1)
- Maximal relative regret of the objective value of 15%
- Maximal relative regret of number of facilities above 140%
- min-max regret as objective function was also analysed and can be found later in the thesis

On the nested p-center problem

Christof Brandstetter, Markus Sinnl

Institute of Business Analytics and Technology Transformation, Johannes Kepler University Linz

2024-02-26

Formulations with non optimal instances

Institute of
Business Analytics and
Technology Transformation

References I

[1] Zacharie Ales and Sourour Elloumi. Compact MILP Formulations for the p-Center Problem. In: Combinatorial Optimization. Ed. by Jon Lee, Giovanni Rinaldi, and A. Ridha Mahjoub. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 14–25. ISBN: 978-3-319-96151-4.

[2] J.E. Beasley. A note on solving large p-median problems. In: European Journal of Operational Research 21.2 (1985), pp. 270–273. ISSN: 0377-2217. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(85)90040-2.

References II

[3] Tobia Calogiuri et al. The multi-period p-center problem with time-dependent travel times. In: Computers & Operations Research 136 (2021), p. 105487. ISSN: 0305-0548. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2021.105487. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305054821002343.

[4] Claudio Contardo, Manuel Iori, and Raphael Kramer. A scalable exact algorithm for the vertex p-center problem. In: Computers & Operations Research 103 (Mar. 2018). DOI: 10.1016/j.cor.2018.11.006.

References III

[5]   Mark S. Daskin. Center Problems. In: Network and Discrete Location: Models, Algorithms, and Applications, Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013. Chap. 5, pp. 193–234. ISBN: 9781118537015. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118537015.ch05.

[6]   Sourour Elloumi, Martine Labbé, and Yves Pochet. A New Formulation and Resolution Method for the p-Center Problem. In: INFORMS Journal on Computing 16 (Feb. 2004), pp. 83–94. DOI: 10.1287/ijoc.1030.0028.

References IV

[7] Elisabeth Gaar and Markus Sinnl. A scaleable projection-based branch-and-cut algorithm for the p-center problem. In: European Journal of Operational Research 303.1 (2022), pp. 78–98. ISSN: 0377-2217. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2022.02.016.

[8] S. L. Hakimi. Optimum Locations of Switching Centers and the Absolute Centers and Medians of a Graph. In: Operations Research 12.3 (1964), pp. 450–459. DOI: 10.1287/opre.12.3.450.

[9] Ronald McGarvey and Andreas Thorsen. Nested-Solution Facility Location Models. In: Optimization Letters 16 (Mar. 2022). DOI: 10.1007/s11590-021-01759-4.

References V

[10] Gerhard Reinelt. TSPLIB—A Traveling Salesman Problem Library. In: ORSA Journal on Computing 3.4 (1991), pp. 376–384. DOI: 10.1287/ijoc.3.4.376.

[11] Gary M. Roodman and Leroy B. Schwarz. Extensions of the Multi-Period Facility Phase-Out Model: New Procedures and Application to a Phase-In/Phase-Out Problem. In: A I I E Transactions 9.1 (1977), pp. 103–107. DOI: 10.1080/05695557708975128.

[12] Gary M. Roodman and Leroy B. Schwarz. Optimal and Heuristic Facility Phase-out Strategies. In: A I I E Transactions 7.2 (1975), pp. 177–184. DOI: 10.1080/05695557508975000.