

THE FACETS OF THE POLYHEDRAL SET DETERMINED BY THE GALE-HOFFMAN INEQUALITIES [†]

Stein W. Wallace

Norwegian Institute of Technology
The University of Trondheim, Trondheim, Norway

Roger J-B Wets

Optimization Center
T.J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, U.S.A.

Abstract. The Gale-Hoffman inequalities characterize feasible external flow in a (capacitated) network. Among these inequalities, those that are redundant can be identified through a simple arc-connectedness criterion.

Keywords: facets, convex polyhedral set, feasible flow, Gale-Hoffman inequalities.

Date: January 20, 1992

Version: January 24, 2003

[†] Research supported in part by NATO Collaborative Research Grant 0785/87

The Gale-Hoffman lemma characterizes feasible external flow (supply, demand) in a (directed, capacitated) network in terms of a number of linear inequalities generated by considering all possible node subsets and requiring that the external flow associated with each such subset be less or equal to the total capacity of arcs exiting from it, for a particularly appealing statement of this result consult [11]. This paper is devoted to a refinement of this result. We are concerned with characterizing feasibility in terms of a *minimal* number of these inequalities. The main result provides us with a (simple) criterion that identifies the linear inequalities that are redundant. One can also express this geometrically: the Gale-Hoffman inequalities determine a (convex) polyhedral set and we are now interested in finding the facets of this polyhedral set. Thus, one can view this as another description of the facets of a polyhedral set encountered in combinatorial optimization, see e.g., [5], [10]. Actually, at a formal level, the criterion is similar in nature to the one obtained by Balas and Pulleyblank [1] for the perfectly matchable subgraph polytope of a bipartite graph.

Our own motivation came from some questions in stochastic programming [9], [12] where one is interested in the probability that under a certain choice of capacities for the arcs, there will be feasible flow, given that the external flow is only known in probability (i.e., external flows are random quantities with known probability distributions).

The framework of this paper is somewhat more general than that in the Gale [3], Hoffman [6] papers. We shall be interested in the polyhedral set (which turns out to be a polyhedral convex cone) of feasible external flows *and* capacities. This requires a minor reformulation of Gale-Hoffman result, but no new argumentation is necessary.

Let $[\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A}]$ denote the nodes and (directed) arcs of a network. For $Y \subset \mathcal{N}$, let

$$\vec{Y} := \{k \in \mathcal{A} | k = (i, j), i \in Y, j \in \mathcal{N} \setminus Y\}$$

be the (directed) arcs connecting Y to $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$, and

$$F^+(Y) := \{j \in \mathcal{N} | (i, j) \in \vec{Y}\} \cup Y$$

consist of Y itself and all the nodes that can be reached (in 1 step) from Y .

The vector $b(Y) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|}$ is the node-membership vector associated with Y , i.e.,

$$b(Y)_i = 1 \text{ if node } i \text{ belongs to } Y, \quad b(Y)_i = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

External flow is denoted by $f \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|}$ and represents supply and demand: $f_i > 0$ means that node i is a supply node, $f_i < 0$ means that i is a demand node, and $f_i = 0$ corresponds to a transshipment node. The total external flow associated with a collection of nodes Y is thus $\langle b(Y), f \rangle$; this quantity could be positive (supply exceeds demand in Y), negative (demand exceeds supply in Y), or 0 (supply and demand are balanced in Y).

Similarly, $a(\vec{Y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ records arc-membership in \vec{Y} , i.e.,

$$a(\vec{Y})_k = 1 \text{ means that arc } k \text{ is in } \vec{Y}, \quad \text{otherwise } a(\vec{Y})_k = 0.$$

Arc capacities will be denoted by a nonnegative vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$. The total capacity of the flow that can exit a collection of nodes Y is thus limited by $\langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle$; this quantity is necessarily nonnegative.

A pair $(f, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ is said to be *feasible* if there exists an (internal) flow that satisfies the capacity constraint so that each node is flow-balanced (flow on out-arcs = flow on in-arcs + external flow).

In these terms, the Gale-Hoffman result takes on the following form:

Gale-Hoffman Lemma. *Given a network $[\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A}]$, a pair of vectors $(f, c) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$ (external flow, capacities) is feasible if and only if the external flow is balanced*

$$\langle e, f \rangle = 0$$

with $e = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, and for all $Y \subset \mathcal{N}$:

$$\langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle.$$

We refer to the preceding inequalities as the *Gale-Hoffman inequalities*.

When trying to make use of the Gale-Hoffman characterization of feasibility one is usually somewhat overwhelmed by the size of the system of linear inequalities so generated. For example, if \mathcal{N} has 30 nodes, one has to cope with 1,073,741,825 inequalities ($2^{|\mathcal{N}|} + 1$). Fortunately, in most applications, a significant number (sometimes more than 99%) of the Gale-Hoffman inequalities may be redundant; an inequality is *redundant* if it is implied by a combination of the other inequalities. This opens the door to a reduction in size by eliminating the redundant inequalities. Getting rid of redundant constraints is usually achieved by means of linear programming-based procedures, see [2, 4] and references therein. But this approach runs quickly out of steam as soon as $|\mathcal{N}|$ is mildly large (larger than 10, for example).

The following theorem provides a simple characterization of redundancy for the Gale-Hoffman inequalities, which can be checked without recourse to linear programming-based techniques. In fact, all that is required is a procedure that checks for arc-connectedness.

Recall that given a system of linear inequalities $\langle d_k, x \rangle \leq 0$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$, a linear inequality $\langle d_{\hat{k}}, x \rangle \leq 0$ is *redundant* (i.e., implied by the other inequalities) if $d_{\hat{k}}$ can be obtained as a positive linear combination of the remaining d_k , $k \in (\mathcal{K} \setminus \hat{k})$.

Theorem. (characterization of redundancy) *For all nonempty $Y \subset \mathcal{N}$, the associated inequality*

$$\langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle$$

is redundant if and only if Y or $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ are not arc-connected, i.e., there exist sets V_1, V_2 that partition Y such that $F^+(V_1) \cap F^+(V_2) \cap Y = \emptyset$, or there exist sets U_1, U_2 that partition $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ such that $F^+(U_1) \cap F^+(U_2) \cap (\mathcal{N} \setminus Y) = \emptyset$.

Proof. If the sets V_1, V_2 partition Y then $b(V_1) + b(V_2) = b(Y)$. Moreover, if they are not arc-connected there are no arcs from V_1 to V_2 and vice-versa, i.e., $a(\vec{V}_1) + a(\vec{V}_2) = a(\vec{Y})$. Thus the inequality $\langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle$ is implied by the two inequalities:

$$\langle b(V_1), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{V}_1), c \rangle, \quad \langle b(V_2), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{V}_2), c \rangle.$$

Similarly, if U_1, U_2 partition $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$, let $U'_1 := U_1 \cup Y$, $U'_2 := U_2 \cup Y$, then $b(U'_1) + b(U'_2) = b(Y) + e$. Also, $a(\vec{Y}) = a(\vec{U}'_1) + a(\vec{U}'_2)$ since the condition $F^+(U_1) \cap F^+(U_2) \cap (\mathcal{N} \setminus Y) = \emptyset$ implies that \vec{U}'_1 consists of the arcs from Y into U_2 , and \vec{U}'_2 consists of the arcs from Y into U_1 , i.e., $\vec{U}'_1 \cup \vec{U}'_2 = \vec{Y}$ and $\vec{U}'_1 \cap \vec{U}'_2 = \emptyset$.

To prove the “only if” direction, we need to show that the vector $(-a(Y), b(Y))$ cannot be obtained as a positive linear combination of all other such pairs and the vector $(0, -e)$ where this last vector comes from the inequality $\langle -e, f \rangle \leq 0$ associated with the condition that the external flow must be balanced; the inequality $\langle e, f \rangle \leq 0$ is the same as $\langle b(\mathcal{N}), f \rangle \leq 0 = \langle a(\vec{\mathcal{N}}), c \rangle$.

Let $\ell, \underline{\ell}$ be such that $Y_\ell := Y$ and $Y_{\underline{\ell}} = \mathcal{N} \setminus Y_\ell$. Let us also define $b^j := b(Y_j)$, $a^j = a(\vec{Y}_j)$ and $J_\ell := \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{N}|}\} \setminus \{\ell, \underline{\ell}\}$. What we have to show is that the following linear system has no solution:

$$\begin{aligned} a^\ell &= \sum_{j \in J_\ell} x_j a^j + x_{\underline{\ell}} a^{\underline{\ell}}, \\ b^\ell &= \sum_{j \in J_\ell} x_j b^j + x_{\underline{\ell}} b^{\underline{\ell}} - x_0 e, \\ x_0 &\geq 0, \quad x_{\underline{\ell}} \geq 0, \quad x_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in J_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

To the contrary, let us suppose that $(\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_\ell, (\bar{x}_j, j \in J_\ell))$ is a (feasible) solution, and let us examine the properties that such a solution must possess. Let

$$J_\ell^+ := \{j \in J_\ell \mid \bar{x}_j > 0\}.$$

Observe that if $k \notin \vec{Y}_\ell$, $a_k^\ell = 0$ and thus

$$0 = \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j a_k^j + \bar{x}_{\underline{\ell}} a_k^{\underline{\ell}}, \quad \forall k \notin \vec{Y}_\ell$$

which would mean that $\bar{x}_j = 0$ if $\vec{Y}_j \not\subset \vec{Y}_\ell$, i.e., $j \notin J_\ell^+$, or equivalently,

$$j \in J_\ell^+ \quad \implies \quad \vec{Y}_j \subset \vec{Y}_\ell.$$

For all $Y_j \subset \mathcal{N}$, we define

$$\tilde{Y}_j := Y_j \cap Y_\ell, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Y}_j := Y_j \cap Y_{\underline{\ell}}.$$

We are going to argue that if Y_j is such that either \tilde{Y}_j is a proper subset of Y_ℓ ($\emptyset \neq \tilde{Y}_j \neq Y_\ell$), or \bar{Y}_j is a proper subset of Y_ℓ ($\emptyset \neq \bar{Y}_j \neq Y_\ell$) then $j \notin J_\ell^+$.

To see this we consider the system of equations involving b^ℓ which we now write as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \bar{x}_0) &= \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_i^j, \quad \forall i \in Y_\ell, \\ (\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_\ell) &= \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_i^j, \quad \forall i \in Y_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

If $q \in J_\ell^+$ and $\emptyset \neq \tilde{Y}_q \neq Y_\ell$, from the arc-connectedness assumption it follows that

$$\text{either } F^+(\tilde{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell \neq \emptyset, \text{ or } F^+(Y_\ell \setminus \tilde{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $q \in J_\ell^+$, $\vec{Y}_q \subset \vec{Y}_\ell$, we always have $F^+(\tilde{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell = \emptyset$, hence

$$\exists (i \in Y_\ell \setminus \tilde{Y}_q, i' \in \tilde{Y}_q) \text{ such that } i' \in F^+(i).$$

Now observe that whenever this node $i \in Y_j$ for some $j \in J_\ell^+$, then i' necessarily belongs to Y_j . Indeed, $j \in J_\ell^+$ implies $\vec{Y}_j \subset \vec{Y}_\ell$ and thus the arc $(i, i') \notin \vec{Y}_j$, i.e., $i' \in Y_j$. For this pair i, i' , we would have

$$(1 + \bar{x}_0) = \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_{i'}^j < \bar{x}_q + \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_{i'}^j \leq \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_i^j = (1 + \bar{x}_0),$$

a clear contradiction. Thus, there are no $q \in J_\ell^+$ with \tilde{Y}_q a proper subset of Y_ℓ .

The same argument is used to prove that there are no $q \in J_\ell^+$ with \bar{Y}_q a proper subset of Y_ℓ , using this time the system of equations:

$$(\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_\ell) = \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_i^j, \quad \forall i \in Y_\ell.$$

We give the details for the sake of completeness. If $q \in J_\ell^+$ and $\emptyset \neq \bar{Y}_q \neq Y_\ell$, from the arc-connectedness assumption it follows that

$$\text{either } F^+(\bar{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell \neq \emptyset, \text{ or } F^+(Y_\ell \setminus \bar{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $q \in J_\ell^+$, $\vec{Y}_q \subset \vec{Y}_\ell$, we always have $F^+(\bar{Y}_q) \cap Y_\ell = \emptyset$, hence

$$\exists (i \in Y_\ell \setminus \bar{Y}_q, i' \in \bar{Y}_q) \text{ such that } i' \in F^+(i).$$

Now observe that whenever this $i \in Y_j$ for some $j \in J_\ell^+$, then i' necessarily belongs to Y_j . Indeed, $j \in J_\ell^+$ implies $\vec{Y}_j \subset \vec{Y}_\ell$ and thus the arc $(i, i') \notin \vec{Y}_j$, i.e., $i' \in Y_j$. For this pair i, i' , we would have

$$(\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_\ell) = \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_{i'}^j < \bar{x}_q + \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_{i'}^j \leq \sum_{j \in J_\ell^+} \bar{x}_j b_i^j = (\bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_\ell),$$

a contradiction. Thus, there are no $q \in J_\ell^+$ with \bar{Y}_q a proper subset of Y_ℓ .

Thus the only index that could possibly belong to J_ℓ^+ is the index corresponding to \mathcal{N} , say $Y_p = \mathcal{N}$. This would mean that $(\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_\ell, \bar{x}_p)$ satisfies the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \bar{x}_0 &= \bar{x}_p, \\ \bar{x}_0 - \bar{x}_\ell &= \bar{x}_p, \\ \bar{x}_0 \geq 0, \bar{x}_\ell \geq 0, \bar{x}_p &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is not possible. Thus J_ℓ^+ must be empty. But that also is not possible, since then we would have $b^\ell = \bar{x}_\ell b^\ell - \bar{x}_0 e$ with $\bar{x}_0 \geq 0, \bar{x}_\ell \geq 0$.

Thus, when Y and $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ are arc-connected,

$$\langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle$$

is never redundant. □

If, capacities \bar{c} are given, and one is interested in the facets of the polyhedron

$$P_f = \{ f \mid \langle -e, f \rangle \leq 0, \quad \langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle, \forall Y \subset \mathcal{N} \}$$

the frontal approach would again lead to linear programming problems of huge size (with $2^{|\mathcal{N}|} + 1$ rows or columns depending on the formulation). Fortunately, we can first use the criterion provided by the preceding theorem to identify the facets of the polyhedral convex cone

$$P_{(f,c)} = \{ (f, c) \mid \langle -e, f \rangle \leq 0, \quad \langle b(Y), f \rangle - \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle \leq 0, \forall Y \subset \mathcal{N} \}$$

determined by the Gale-Hoffman inequalities, assign the value \bar{c} to c , and only then have recourse to linear programming-based techniques.

Implementation. Given the arc-connectedness criterion, it is fairly easy to design a recursive procedure based an examination of the subsets of \mathcal{N} . Because of the symmetry of our criterion in Y and $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$, it will really suffice to parse through only half of the subsets of \mathcal{N} , and for each $Y \subset \mathcal{N}$ corresponding to a nonredundant inequality, we shall then also output the “complementary” inequality:

$$\langle b(\mathcal{N} \setminus Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{\mathcal{N} \setminus Y}), c \rangle.$$

The following procedure, initialized with $Y = \emptyset$, and $W = \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i\}$ for some node i will do the job.

```

procedure Facets( $Y, W$  : set of nodes);
begin
  if  $Y \neq \emptyset$  then begin
    PickNode( $i, W$ );
     $W := W \setminus \{i\}$ ;
    Facets( $Y, W$ );
     $Y := Y \cup \{i\}$ ;
    Facets( $Y, W$ );
    if Connected( $Y$ ) and Connected( $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ ) then CreateIneq( $Y$ );
  end;
end;

```

The **procedure** PickNode(i, W) simply picks a node i from the set W , and **procedure** CreateIneq(Y) outputs the two inequalities: $\langle b(Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{Y}), c \rangle$ and $\langle b(\mathcal{N} \setminus Y), f \rangle \leq \langle a(\vec{\mathcal{N} \setminus Y}), c \rangle$. The **function** Connected(Y) simply checks if the network defined by the nodes in Y is arc-connected. An example of such an algorithm appears in Section 6.2 in [7]. The preceding procedure will produce all the nonredundant inequalities except $\langle -e, f \rangle \leq 0$ associated with the requirement that the external flow must be balanced (total supply equals total demand).




Fig. 1.. All cuts drawn give rise to two nonredundant inequalities.

As a small example, consider Figure 1. It shows a network with 5 nodes and 7 arcs, and all the cuts shown in Figure 1 give rise to two inequalities. In addition to the inequality that guarantees balanced (external) flow, there are $2^5 = 32$ Gale-Hoffman inequalities. **procedure** Facets checks $2^{5-1} - 1 = 15$ subsets of \mathcal{N} . It turns out that 12 out of the 15 sets give rise to nonredundant inequalities. We initialize **procedure** Facets with $W = \mathcal{N} \setminus \{5\}$, so that $5 \in \mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ for all sets Y . The three sets giving rise to redundant inequalities are $Y = \{1, 4\}$ and

$Y = \{2, 3\}$, both resulting in a disconnected Y and $Y = \{2, 3, 4\}$ making $\mathcal{N} \setminus Y$ disconnected. In total, the example therefore has $(12 + 1) * 2 = 26$ nonredundant inequalities.

The procedure was also tested for some larger examples. Using NETGEN [8], we generated a number of test networks. As one would expect it, the number of nonredundant inequalities (for a fixed number of nodes) is generally related to arc-density of the network. In a network with 20 nodes and 100 arcs starting with $2^{20} = 1,048,576$ Gale-Hoffman inequalities, we found that only 14.2% of the inequalities were redundant; excluding input/output times, it took about 50 minutes on a SUN 3/50 to identify all the redundant inequalities. In another example with 20 nodes and 31 arcs (in other words with much lower arc-density) we found that 99.65% of the inequalities were redundant, and the calculation took about 20 seconds on the same computer; using this time some performance improving (algorithmic) schemes outlined in [12]. This last example is very illustrative because it has a number of important features. Firstly, the number of Gale-Hoffman inequalities is so huge that one cannot hope to use them successfully for any purpose and certainly not to compute network reliability. Secondly, removing dominated inequalities based on linear programming-like algorithms is as good as out of the question because of the size of the linear programs involved. But the number of facets of the feasibility set is low enough (3632) that one can make use of them in different applications.

References

- [1] Egon Balas & William Pulleyblank, "The perfectly matchable subgraph polytope of a bipartite graph," *Networks* **13** (1983), 495–516.
- [2] J.W. Chinneck, "Localizing and diagnosing infeasibilities in networks," Working Paper SCE-90-14, Carleton University, 1990.
- [3] David Gale, "A theorem of flows in networks," *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **7** (1957), 1073–1082.
- [4] Harvey J. Greenberg, "Diagnosing infeasibility in min-cost network flow problems. Part I: Primal infeasibility," *IMA Journal of Mathematics in Management* **2** (1988), 39–51.
- [5] Martin Grötschel, *Polyedrische Charakterisierungen Kombinatorischer Optimierungsprobleme*, Anton Hain, Meisenheim am Glan, 1977.
- [6] Alan Hoffman, "Some recent applications of the theory of linear inequalities to extremal combinatorial analysis," *Proceedings Symposium Applied Mathematics* **10** (1960), 113–128.
- [7] E. Horowitz & S. Shani, *Fundamentals of Data Structures*, Pitman, London, 1976.
- [8] D. Klingman, A. Napier & J. Stutz, "NETGEN - a program for generating large scale (un)capacitated assignment, transportation and minimum cost flow networks," *Management Science* **20** (1974), 814–822.
- [9] András Prékopa & Endre Boros, "On the existence of a feasible flow in a stochastic transportation network," *Operation Research* **39** (1991), 119–129.
- [10] William Pulleyblank, "Polyhedral combinatorics," in *Mathematical Programming: The State of the Art*, A. Bachem, M. Grötschel & B. Korte, eds., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, 312–345.
- [11] R.T. Rockafellar, *Network Flows and Monotropic Optimization*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, New York, 1984.
- [12] Stein W. Wallace & Roger J-B Wets, "Preprocessing in stochastic programming: the case of capacitated networks," Working Paper, University of Trondheim, 1992.