#### Contents

1	What is vertex packing problem (VP)	1
2	The generalized vertex packing problem (GVP-k) that this article cares about	1
3	Some application	1
4	Introduction 4.1 Integer Programming Model (for VP)	1
5	TODO Facets and partial convex hull representations for $\operatorname{GVP-k}$	2

## 1 What is vertex packing problem (VP)

The traditional vertex packing problem dened on an undirected graph identies the largest weighted independent set of nodes, that is, a set of nodes whose induced subgraph contains no edges.

# 2 The generalized vertex packing problem (GVP-k) that this article cares about

k edges may exist within the subgraph induced by the chosen set of nodes.

### 3 Some application

A particular context in which such problems arise is in the national airspace planning model

#### 4 Introduction

G = (N, E), weighted  $c_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

#### 4.1 Integer Programming Model (for VP)

Maximize: cxSubject to:  $Ax \le e$  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ 

- 1. A is a p  $\times$  n matrix  $a_{hi}=1$  means vertex  $i\in edge\ h$
- 2. e is a all-one vector.
- 3.  $\Rightarrow$  Ax  $\leq$  e means that each edges 2 end-points should not be in the answer x simutaneously.

#### 4.2 Prefect Graph

chromatic number = maximum clique cardinality (for each  $G' \subseteq G$ )

#### 4.3 Integer Programming Model (for GVP-k)

Maximize: cxSubject to:  $\sum_{(i,j)\in E} z_{ij} \le k$  $z_{ij} \ge x_i + x_j - 1, z_{ij} \ge 0$  $x_j \in \{0,1\}, \forall j \in N$ 

note that edge (i, j) is in the answer when  $z_{ij} = 1 = x_i x_j$ 

## 5 TODO Facets and partial convex hull representations for GVP-k

**Proposition 1**: Consider a graph G and a subgraph  $\hat{G}$  of G. If  $Dx \leq d$  represents a set of valid inequalities for GVP-k dened on  $\hat{G}$ , then  $Dx \leq d$  is valid for GVP-k dened on G.

**Proof**: Since GVP-k for  $\hat{G}$  is a relaxation of GVP-k dened on G, the restrictions that govern a feasible generalized vertex packing solution on  $\hat{G}$  are a subset of those valid for G. This completes the proof.

**Note**: You could use less restrictions on  $\hat{G}$  than on G (maybe a subset).