

## Modelling

Christina Burt, Stephen J. Maher, Jakob Witzig

Zuse Institute Berlin  
Berlin, Germany

29th September 2015



Research Center MATHEON  
Mathematics for Key Technologies



Berlin  
Mathematical  
School



MODAL  
Mathematical Optimization and Data Analysis Laboratories

# Modelling Reformulations

Christina Burt

Two comparisons are most interesting to us:

- ▶ showing that two formulations are equivalent; and
- ▶ showing that one formulation dominates the other with respect to linear relaxation.

The first of these tells us that if we solve the same instance with two equivalent models, we will get the same answer from both models.

The second tells us which model is likely to be faster.

To show that two formulations are equivalent, we must show:

1. that there exists a bijective mapping from one feasible region to the other; and
2. that the optimal solutions from both models will be the same point or region.

To show that formulation A dominates formulation B, we must show for the linear relaxation:

- ▶ that no part of the feasible region (of the LP) for A steps outside the feasible region (of the LP) for B; and
- ▶ that some part of the feasible region (of the LP) for A is strictly inside the feasible region (of the LP) for B.

Simple approaches that are likely to obtain a good formulation include:

- ▶ finding a compact formulation with respect to number of integer/binary variables, and constraints;
- ▶ tightening the linear relaxation.

However, this is not the whole picture, and these suggestions are not guaranteed to give fast models.

Recall the classical combinatorial optimisation problem introduced in Martin Grötschel's lecture on linear and mixed integer linear programming. Here, we consider the *asymmetric* version of that problem.

## Definition (Travelling Salesman Problem)

Given a weighted di-graph,  $D = (V, A)$ , where each node  $i \in V$  corresponds to a city and each arc  $(i, j)$  corresponds to paths between  $i$  and  $j$ . Let  $c_{ij}$  be the arc weights representing the distance between  $i$  and  $j$ , such that  $c_{ij} = c_{ji} \forall (i, j) \in A$ . Find a tour of minimal cost that visits each city exactly once.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.



$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} MTZ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & u_i - u_j + (|V| - 1)x_{i,j} \leq |V| - 2 && \forall i \neq j, j > 1, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & u_{i-1} \leq u_i && \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A, \\ & u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ && \forall i \in V. \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most compact formulations of the TSP. However, it is generally not used because it has a loose linear relaxation.

$$\begin{aligned} DFJ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & x(A(W)) \leq |W| - 1 && \forall \emptyset \subsetneq W \subsetneq V, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation has a tighter linear relaxation than *MTZ*.

However, this formulation has exponentially many subtour elimination constraints, since we must search the power set of  $V$ . The model is not compact, and suffers computationally from this flaw if the complete model is explicitly given to a solver.

$$\begin{aligned} DFJ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & x(A(W)) \leq |W| - 1 && \forall \emptyset \subsetneq W \subsetneq V, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation has a tighter linear relaxation than *MTZ*.

However, this formulation has exponentially many subtour elimination constraints, since we must search the power set of  $V$ . The model is not compact, and suffers computationally from this flaw if the complete model is explicitly given to a solver.



$$\begin{aligned} DFJ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & x(A(W)) \leq |W| - 1 && \forall \emptyset \subsetneq W \subsetneq V, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i,j) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation has a tighter linear relaxation than *MTZ*.

However, this formulation has exponentially many subtour elimination constraints, since we must search the power set of  $V$ . The model is not compact, and suffers computationally from this flaw if the complete model is explicitly given to a solver.

$$\begin{aligned} DFJ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & x(A(W)) \leq |W| - 1 && \forall \emptyset \subsetneq W \subsetneq V, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation has a tighter linear relaxation than *MTZ*.

However, this formulation has exponentially many subtour elimination constraints, since we must search the power set of  $V$ . The model is not compact, and suffers computationally from this flaw if the complete model is explicitly given to a solver.

$$\begin{aligned} DFJ : \quad & \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta^+(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(out-degree)} \\ & x(\delta^-(i)) = 1 && \forall i \in V, && \text{(in-degree)} \\ & x(A(W)) \leq |W| - 1 && \forall \emptyset \subsetneq W \subsetneq V, && \text{(sub-tour elim)} \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation has a tighter linear relaxation than *MTZ*.

However, this formulation has exponentially many subtour elimination constraints, since we must search the power set of  $V$ . The model is not compact, and suffers computationally from this flaw if the complete model is explicitly given to a solver.

The best way to use the DFJ formulation is to avoid writing the complete model explicitly.

We will look at how to do this, and implement it, in the lecture and exercise on constraint integer programming by Ambros Gleixner, Gregor Hendel and Felipe Serrano.

The algorithms that solve mathematical programming problems are complex. Some heuristics within the algorithms may work better on less compact formulations.

For example:

- ▶ Primal Heuristics search for feasible solutions.
- ▶ Polishing Heuristics search for improved solutions from incumbent solutions (e.g., using local search)
- ▶ Cut Generator Heuristics will search for particular structure.

Martin Grötschel introduced us to the power of cuts in the lecture on Basics of Polyhedral Theory.

In the lecture on Integer Programming, Tobias Achterberg will discuss some of these heuristics.

However, as a general rule, using the guidelines on the previous slide is a good start.

Consider the equitable coach time allocation problem where we wish to determine the **time** each player can spend on the field. Let us define the variables as follows:

$x_{r,i}$  [integer] is the amount of time [minutes]  $r$  plays in position  $i$ ;

$\epsilon_r^+$  [continuous] is the number of minutes player  $r$  plays above the average;

$\epsilon_r^-$  [continuous] is the number of minutes player  $r$  plays below the average.

$R$  is the set of players;

$N$  is the set of positions;

$T$  is the total number of game minutes.

$$ECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i} = T \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (2)$$

$$x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$
$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.

$$ECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i} = T \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (2)$$

$$x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.



$$ECPT : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i} = T \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (2)$$

$$x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.

$$ECPT : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i} = T \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (2)$$

$$x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.

$$ECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i} = T \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_i \left[ x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} \right] = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (2)$$

$$x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.

Consider the equitable coach time allocation problem where we wish to determine the time each player can spend on the field. Let us define the variables as follows:

$x_{r,i,t}$  [binary] is 1 if player  $r$  plays in position  $i$  in minute  $t$ ;

$\epsilon_r^+$  [continuous] is the number of minutes player  $r$  plays above the average;

$\epsilon_r^-$  [continuous] is the number of minutes player  $r$  plays below the average.

$R$  is the set of players;

$N$  is the set of positions;

$T$  is the total number of game minutes.

$$\begin{aligned} ncECPt : \quad & \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

$$\begin{aligned} ncECPt : \quad & \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

$$ncECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

$$ncECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.



$$\begin{aligned} ncECPt : \quad \min \quad & \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

$$ncECPt : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_{t,r} x_{r,i,t} = M_i \quad \forall i \in N, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{t,i,r} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} - \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (5)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

## Proposition

*ECPt and ncECPt are equivalent models.*

## Proof.

Since  $x_{r,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\sum_t x_{r,i,t} = x_{r,i}$ . With this substitution, it is clear that constraint (1) is equivalent to constraint (3). Using the substitution into constraints (4) and (5) gives:

$$\sum_i x_{r,i} - \sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} \leq \epsilon_r^+ \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i}}{|R|} - \sum_i x_{r,i} \leq \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R. \quad (4)$$

Since we minimise  $\epsilon_r^+$  and  $\epsilon_r^-$ ,  $\epsilon_r^+$  will take on the positive difference or 0, and  $\epsilon_r^-$  will take on the negative difference or 0. Thus constraint (2) is equivalent to constraints (4) and (5). The feasible regions are therefore equivalent. The objective functions are the same, so the optimal solutions will be equivalent.  $\square$

So, we have shown that *ECPt* and *ncECPt* are equivalent.

However, the original model *ECPt* has only  $|N||R| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + |R|$  constraints.

This is significantly less variables and constraints than the *ncECPt* model, which has  $|R||N||T| + 2|R|$  variables and  $|N| + 2|R|$  constraints.

Is it significant enough to make a difference to solve times?

We now consider the version of the ECP where we allocate players to positions at particular times.

$x_{r,i,t}$  [binary] is 1 if player  $r$  plays in position class  $i$  in play period  $t$ ;

$\epsilon_r^+$  [continuous] is the number of periods player  $r$  plays above the average;

$\epsilon_r^-$  [continuous] is the number of periods player  $r$  plays below the average.

$R$  is the set of players;

$N$  is the set of position classes;

$T$  is the total number of game minutes.

$$\text{aggECPd: } \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$
$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$\text{aggECPd: } \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{aggECPd : } \quad & \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5) \\ & \sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6) \\ & \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7) \\ & x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T, \\ & \epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$



$$\text{aggECPd} : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$\text{aggECPd} : \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{aggECPd : } \quad & \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_r x_{r,i,t} = R_i \quad \forall i \in N, t \in T, \quad (5) \\ & \sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall r \in R, t \in T, \quad (6) \\ & \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (7) \\ & x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T, \\ & \epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the version of the ECP where we allocate players to positions at particular times.

$x_{r,i,t}$  [binary] is 1 if player  $r$  plays in position  $i$  in play period  $t$ ;

$\epsilon_r^+$  [continuous] is the number of periods player  $r$  plays above the average;

$\epsilon_r^-$  [continuous] is the number of periods player  $r$  plays below the average.

$R$  is the set of players;

$N$  is the set of positions;

$T$  is the total number of game minutes.

$$ECPd: \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$ECPd: \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} ECPd : \quad & \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-) \\ & \sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8) \\ & \sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9) \\ & \sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10) \\ & x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T, \\ & \epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

$$ECPd: \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$



$$ECPd: \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

$$ECPd: \quad \min \sum_r (\epsilon_r^+ + \epsilon_r^-)$$
$$\sum_r x_{r,i,t} = 1 \quad \forall t \in T, i \in N, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_i x_{r,i,t} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, r \in R, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{t,i} x_{r,i,t} - \sum_{t,i,r'} \frac{x_{r',i,t}}{|R|} = \epsilon_r^+ - \epsilon_r^- \quad \forall r \in R, \quad (10)$$

$$x_{r,i,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \forall r \in R, i \in N, t \in T,$$

$$\epsilon_r^+, \epsilon_r^- \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

This model performs better because the algorithms detected a Set-Packing constraint structure in the model. This can be seen by the number of setppc constraints in the SCIP output statistics.

This structure is well studied, and there are many known cuts for this type of structure. The topics of structure and cuts will be discussed in more detail in the coming days.