

# An Efficient Local Search Algorithm for Large GD Advertising Inventory Allocation with Multilinear Constraints

Anonymous Author(s)

**Table 1: Results of LS-IMP for solving real-world ad benchmark under different parameter settings. P0 is the parameter in paper.**

Parameter settings	$t$	$\zeta$	Total #win (60s)	Total #win (300s)	Avg #UR (60s)	Avg #FR (60s)
<b>P0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>62.8</b>
P1	50	10	848	755	15.7	61.7
P2	75	10	858	754	15.8	62.2
P3	100	10	854	750	15.5	62.1
P4	125	10	855	748	15.9	61.2
P5	150	10	845	745	15.2	61.8
P6	200	10	846	757	15.1	62.3
P7	50	50	867	759	16.2	64.1
P8	75	50	852	774	16.3	62.8
P9	100	50	857	747	16.3	61.3
P10	125	50	878	745	16.5	64.4
P11	150	50	864	762	16.7	62.1
P12	200	50	859	776	16.0	63.0
P13	50	80	850	759	16.3	62.0
P14	75	80	876	769	16.6	61.9
P15	100	80	847	759	16.2	62.3
P16	125	80	840	764	16.6	62.5
P17	150	80	851	744	16.8	63.1
P18	200	80	848	746	15.8	63.7
P19	50	100	867	784	16.1	62.5
P20	75	100	869	753	16.1	62.4
P21	125	100	873	773	16.1	62.1
P22	150	100	839	788	15.8	63.4
P23	200	100	861	757	16.5	63.8
P24	50	200	861	775	16.4	62.1
P25	75	200	870	759	16.0	62.0
P26	100	200	852	740	16.3	61.2
P27	125	200	852	781	16.2	63.0
P28	150	200	836	769	16.0	61.1
P29	200	200	850	778	16.2	63.3
P30	50	500	855	758	15.1	61.3
P31	75	500	852	750	15.7	62.1
P32	100	500	844	756	15.1	61.6
P33	125	500	852	742	15.4	61.5
P34	150	500	841	752	15.9	61.0
P35	200	500	853	750	15.6	61.7

**Table 2: The numeric comparison in minplib instances**

Instance	Gurobi-Exact	Gurobi-Heur	LS-IMP
cutoff = 60s			
sonet17v4	1233700	<b>1182604.5</b>	<b>1182604.5</b>
sonet18v6	3709850	3562770	<b>3389110</b>
sonet19v5	2590910	2557780	<b>2528144</b>
sonet20v6	3747400	<b>3311060</b>	3480810
sonet21v6	8317140	<b>7701520</b>	7731250
sonet22v4	2698220	<b>2386630</b>	2397132
sonet23v6	8411680	7474600	<b>7197950</b>
sonet24v2	5073420	6763260	<b>5060259</b>
sonet25v5	7852600	7185020	<b>7064664</b>
cutoff = 300s			
sonet17v4	1184730	<b>1182604.5</b>	<b>1182604.5</b>
sonet18v6	<b>3389110</b>	<b>3389110</b>	<b>3389110</b>
sonet19v5	2590910	2549380	<b>2528144</b>
sonet20v6	3658580	<b>3311060</b>	3390200
sonet21v6	7908790	<b>7600750</b>	<b>7600750</b>
sonet22v4	2517840	<b>2379970</b>	2387835
sonet23v6	8411680	7150690	<b>7078810</b>
sonet24v2	3312580	3312580	<b>3312579</b>
sonet25v5	7525050	7093900	<b>7064664</b>

**Table 3: The number of instances which can find the optimal solution.**

Dataset	Gurobi				LS-IMP		LS-IMP + Gurobi	
	Exact		Heur					
	#sol	#feas	#sol	#feas	#sol	#feas	#sol	#feas
cutoff = 60s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	8	12	10	12	<b>85</b>	<b>179</b>	84	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	2	4	9	26	<b>92</b>	<b>166</b>	89	<b>166</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	0	13	43	<b>79</b>	<b>178</b>	77	<b>178</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	4	29	<b>82</b>	<b>171</b>	78	<b>171</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	0	8	41	<b>97</b>	<b>176</b>	94	<b>176</b>
Total	10	16	44	151	<b>435</b>	<b>870</b>	422	<b>870</b>
cutoff = 300s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	50	96	12	17	86	<b>180</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>180</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	51	82	18	44	94	<b>167</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>167</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	35	66	13	56	80	<b>179</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	32	74	12	43	83	<b>172</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	31	67	15	53	99	<b>176</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>176</b>
Total	199	385	70	213	442	<b>874</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>874</b>
cutoff = 1000s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	100	150	30	81	87	<b>180</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>180</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	99	151	32	91	96	<b>167</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>167</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	79	124	28	87	80	<b>179</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	83	132	31	71	84	<b>172</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	95	141	28	90	100	<b>176</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>176</b>
Total	456	698	149	420	447	<b>874</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>874</b>

**Table 4: The number of Feaible and violated instances in Gurobi with real variable.**

Dataset	Gurobi	Gurobi-Real			LS-IMP
	#feas	#feas	#vio	#vio_rate	#feas
cutoff = 60s					
$\mathcal{D}_1$	12	0	0	0	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	4	0	0	0	<b>164</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	0	0	0	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	0	0	<b>170</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	0	0	0	<b>175</b>
Total	16	0	0	0	<b>860</b>
cutoff = 300s					
$\mathcal{D}_1$	96	98	19	4.6%	<b>180</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	82	85	15	4.2%	<b>167</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	66	66	10	3.3%	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	74	75	12	5.3%	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	67	68	13	6.3%	<b>176</b>
Total	385	392	69	4.7%	<b>874</b>
cutoff = 1000s					
$\mathcal{D}_1$	150	157	22	4.3%	<b>180</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	151	158	23	4.1%	<b>167</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	124	133	17	3.1%	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	132	141	17	4.9%	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	141	149	14	5.8%	<b>176</b>
Total	698	738	92	4.4%	<b>874</b>

**Table 5: The number of Feaible and violated instances in Gurobi with real variable.**

Dataset	Gurobi		Gurobi-Real						LS-IMP
	Exact	Heur	Exact			Heur			
	#feas	#feas	#feas	#vio	#vio_rate	#feas	#vio	#vio_rate	#feas
cutoff = 60s									
$\mathcal{D}_1$	12	12	0	0	0	99	19	4.3%	<b>179</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	4	11	0	0	0	96	18	3.8%	<b>164</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	16	0	0	0	96	22	6.7%	<b>172</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	5	0	0	0	84	17	3.2%	<b>170</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	10	0	0	0	95	16	6.2%	<b>175</b>
Total	16	54	0	0	0	470	92	5.0%	<b>860</b>
cutoff = 300s									
$\mathcal{D}_1$	96	17	98	19	4.6%	<b>189</b>	31	7.6%	180
$\mathcal{D}_2$	82	44	85	15	4.2%	<b>193</b>	36	6.5%	167
$\mathcal{D}_3$	66	56	66	10	3.3%	<b>192</b>	28	7.2%	179
$\mathcal{D}_4$	74	43	75	12	5.3%	<b>191</b>	26	7.0%	172
$\mathcal{D}_5$	67	53	68	13	6.3%	<b>191</b>	27	6.8%	176
Total	385	213	392	69	4.7%	<b>956</b>	148	7.0%	874
cutoff = 1000s									
$\mathcal{D}_1$	150	81	157	22	4.3%	<b>189</b>	31	7.6%	180
$\mathcal{D}_2$	151	91	158	23	4.1%	<b>193</b>	36	6.5%	167
$\mathcal{D}_3$	124	87	133	17	3.1%	<b>192</b>	28	7.2%	179
$\mathcal{D}_4$	132	71	141	17	4.9%	<b>191</b>	26	7.0%	172
$\mathcal{D}_5$	141	90	149	14	5.8%	<b>191</b>	27	6.8%	176
Total	698	420	738	92	4.4%	<b>956</b>	148	7.0%	874

**Table 6: The metric in Gurobi with real variable.**

Dataset	Gurobi						Gurobi-Real						LS-IMP		
	Exact			Heur			Exact			Heur					
	#win	#UR	#FR	#win	#UR	#FR	#win	#UR	#FR	#win	#UR	#FR	#win	#UR	#FR
cutoff = 60s															
$\mathcal{D}_1$	12	1.7%	5.8%	12	1.7%	5.8%	0	0	0	32	5.5%	15.7%	<b>179</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>64.7%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	4	0.6%	1.9%	11	1.7%	5.7%	0	0	0	26	3.0%	9.6%	<b>164</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	0	0	16	2.3%	9.0%	0	0	0	30	15.0%	36.0%	<b>172</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>62.0%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	0	5	1.2%	5.0%	0	0	0	21	14.0%	35.0%	<b>170</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>61.6%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	0	0	10	1.8%	4.8%	0	0	0	19	3.0%	9.8%	<b>175</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
Total/Avg	16	0.4%	1.9%	54	1.4%	4.9%	0	0	0	128	8.1%	21.2%	<b>860</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
cutoff = 300s															
$\mathcal{D}_1$	69	7.7%	39.6%	13	1.8%	7.0%	67	7.5%	36.7%	40	5.9%	20.3%	<b>146</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	61	6.0%	35.5%	24	2.6%	13.9%	66	6.3%	38.5%	35	3.7%	10.9%	<b>141</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	42	5.1%	22.8%	17	4.3%	14.7%	39	4.7%	20.6%	37	16.3%	38.7%	<b>159</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>64.3%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	47	5.9%	28.8%	17	2.4%	11.7%	53	6.9%	30.8%	29	15.4%	37.7%	<b>153</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	42	5.3%	24.7%	21	3.4%	11.2%	46	5.7%	24.7%	31	6.4%	11.1%	<b>165</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>65.7%</b>
Total/Avg	261	6.0%	30.3%	92	2.7%	11.7%	271	6.2%	30.2%	144	9.5%	23.7%	<b>764</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>64.8%</b>
cutoff = 1000s															
$\mathcal{D}_1$	115	15.3%	62.3%	34	6.6%	24.1%	<b>123</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	66.7%	40	5.9%	20.3%	117	17.7%	<b>68.9%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	109	14.7%	61.3%	40	6.3%	28.4%	<b>116</b>	15.3%	64.5%	35	3.7%	10.9%	112	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>62.9%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	87	11.4%	46.8%	30	7.0%	25.2%	89	12.7%	50.6%	37	16.3%	38.7%	<b>131</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>64.4%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	92	12.1%	52.6%	35	4.2%	22.2%	95	13.9%	55.8%	29	15.4%	37.7%	<b>124</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	105	14.6%	55.6%	33	6.8%	23.8%	107	15.7%	56.7%	31	6.4%	11.1%	<b>130</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>
Total/Avg	508	13.6%	55.7%	172	6.2%	24.7%	530	14.8%	58.8%	172	9.5%	23.7%	<b>614</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>

**Table 7: The metric with Lagrange multiple method**

Dataset	Lagrange multiple method				LS-IMP			
	#feas	#win	#UR	#FR	#feas	#win	#UR	#FR
cutoff = 60s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	4	0	0.4%	2.1%	<b>179</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>64.7%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	4	0	0.4%	2.0%	<b>166</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>60.7%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	0	0	0	<b>178</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>62.0%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	0	0	<b>171</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>61.6%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	0	0	0	<b>176</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
Total/Avg	8	0	0.08%	0.1%	<b>870</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
cutoff = 300s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	5	1	0.5%	2.5%	<b>180</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	7	2	0.7%	3.6%	<b>167</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	0	0	0	0	<b>179</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>64.3%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	0	0	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	0	0	0	0	<b>176</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>65.7%</b>
Total/Avg	12	3	0.3%	1.2%	<b>874</b>	<b>874</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>64.8%</b>
cutoff = 1000s								
$\mathcal{D}_1$	6	2	0.6%	3.2%	<b>180</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>68.9%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_2$	9	3	1.0%	6.2%	<b>167</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>62.9%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_3$	1	0	0.1%	0.4%	<b>179</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>64.4%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_4$	0	0	0	0	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>
$\mathcal{D}_5$	1	0	0.1%	0.5%	<b>176</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>
Total/Avg	17	5	0.3%	2.2%	<b>874</b>	<b>874</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>