


# On the hop-constrained Steiner tree problems

Adalat Jabrayilov ✉ 

Institute of Computer Science, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

---

## Abstract

The *hop-constrained Steiner tree problem (HSTP)* is a generalization of the classical *Steiner tree problem*. It asks for a minimum cost subtree that spans some specified nodes of a given graph, such that the number of edges between each node of the tree and its root respects a given hop limit. This NP-hard problem has many variants, often modeled as integer linear programs. Two of the models are so-called *assignment* and *partial-ordering* based models, which yield (up to our knowledge) the best two state-of-the-art formulations for the variant *Steiner tree problem with revenues, budgets, and hop constraints (STPRBH)*. The solution of the HSTP and its variants such as the STPRBH and the *hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem (HMSTP)* is a hop-constrained tree, a rooted tree whose depth is bounded by a given hop limit. This paper provides some theoretical results that show the polyhedral advantages of the partial-ordering model over the assignment model for solving this class of problems. Computational results in this paper and the literature for the HSTP, STPRBH, and HMSTP show that the partial-ordering model outperforms the assignment model in practice, too; it has better linear programming relaxation and solves more instances.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Mathematics of computing → Graph theory; Mathematics of computing → Mathematical optimization

**Keywords and phrases** Graph theory, Linear programming, Polyhedral theory, Fourier-Motzkin elimination, Steiner Tree

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

**Funding** This work was partially supported by DFG, RTG 1855.

## 1 Introduction

Many network design applications ask for a minimum cost subtree connecting some required nodes of a graph. These applications can be modeled as the *Steiner tree problem (STP)*: Given a weighted undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with positive edge costs  $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{>0}$  and a subset  $R \subseteq V$  of the required nodes, called *terminals*, find a subtree  $T$  of  $G$ , which contains all terminals and has minimum costs, i.e.,  $\sum_{e \in E(T)} c_e$  is minimal. The STP belongs to the classical optimization problems and is NP-hard (Garey et al. [11]). For a survey on the STP, see [18, 31]. In the special case  $R = V$ , the problem is known as the *minimum spanning tree problem (MSTP)* and is solvable in polynomial time (Kruskal [21], Prim [26]). Hop constraints, also known as *height constraints* [23], are originated from telecommunication applications and limit the number of hops (edges) between the given service provider (root) and terminals of the network to control the availability and reliability of the service (Woolston and Albin [32]). *Availability* is the probability that all edges in the connection (path) between the server and a terminal are working. *Reliability* is the probability that this connection will not be interrupted by an edge failure. The failure probability of the path with at most  $H$  edges does not exceed  $1 - (1 - p)^H$ , where  $p$  is the failure probability of an edge. For a survey on more general network design problems with hop constraints, see [3, 20, 25].

*Hop-constrained Steiner tree problem (HSTP)* is defined as follows: Given a weighted undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with edge costs  $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ , a set  $R \subseteq V$  of terminals, a root  $r \in R$ , and a hop limit  $H \in \mathbb{N}^{\geq 0}$ , find a minimum cost subtree  $T$  of the graph, which contains all terminals such that the number of edges in the path from  $r$  to any  $v \in V(T)$  does not exceed  $H$ . There are several variants of the HSTP. The well-studied special case  $R = V$  is known as the *hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem (HMSTP)*. While the MSTP is solvable in polynomial time, the HMSTP is NP-hard (Dahl [6], Gouveia [12]). Moreover, the HMSTP is not in  $\mathcal{APX}$  (Manyem and Stallmann [23]), i.e., the class of problems for which it is possible to have a polynomial-time constant-factor approximation. *Steiner tree problem with revenues, budgets, and hop constraints (STPRBH)* is another well-studied variant of the HSTP: Given a weighted undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with positive edge costs  $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{>0}$ , nonnegative node revenues  $\rho: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ , a root  $r \in V$ , a hop limit  $H \in \mathbb{N}^{\geq 0}$ , and a budget  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ , find a subtree  $T$  of the graph, which contains  $r$ , maximizes the collected revenues  $\sum_{v \in V(T)} \rho_v$ , such that the number of edges in the



© Adalat Jabrayilov;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:18



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

path from  $r$  to any node  $v \in V(T)$  does not exceed  $H$ , and the total edge costs of the tree respect the budget  $B$ , i.e.  $\sum_{e \in E(T)} c_e \leq B$ .

The majority of the integer linear programming (ILP) formulations in the literature for these NP-hard problems can be divided into “*node-oriented*” and “*edge-oriented*” formulations. To formulate the hop constraints, the node-oriented models use node variables, which describe the depth of nodes in the tree. Akgün and Tansel [2], Gouveia [12] have presented several node-oriented formulations based on Miller-Tucker-Zemlin (MTZ) subtour elimination constraints [24] for the HMSTP. The MTZ constraints involve an integer variable  $U_v \in \{1, \dots, H\}$  for each node  $v$ , which specifies the depth of  $v$  in the solution tree, i.e., the number of edges between the root and  $v$ . Voß [30] has used the MTZ constraints to model the HSTP. Costa et al. [5] and Layeb et al. [22] have proposed several models for the STPRBH based on the MTZ constraints. Sinnl and Ljubić [29] have suggested an assignment model for the STPRBH, which uses a binary variable  $y_{vh}$  for each node  $v$  and each depth  $h$ , where  $y_{vh} = 1$  indicates that the depth of  $v$  in the tree is  $h$ . Recently, Jabrayilov and Mutzel [19] have presented a partial-ordering based model for the STPRBH. Instead of directly assigning a depth  $h$  to node  $v$ , the variables of this model indicate whether the depth of  $v$  is greater or less than  $h$ .

The edge-oriented formulations use edge variables to describe the hop constraints. Gouveia [13] has presented a multicommodity flow (MCF) model for the HMSTP. Although this edge-oriented model’s linear programming (LP) bound is much better than the MTZ model’s [12], it leads to large ILP models. While the MTZ model has  $O(|V|^2)$  variables and constraints, the MCF model has  $O(|V|^3)$  variables and constraints. Gouveia [14] has proposed the “*hop-dependent*” multicommodity flow (HMCF) model for the HMSTP and HSTP, yielding better LP bounds than the MCF model. The HMCF, with its  $O(H|V|^3)$  variables, is even larger than the MCF and applicable to small graphs. Gouveia et al. [16] have reported that the HMCF model cannot solve the LP relaxation after a couple of days for most instances with 40 nodes. They have introduced a Lagrangian relaxation for the HMCF model. Gouveia et al. [17] modeled the HMSTP as the STP in the so-called layered graph and introduced an ILP with  $O(H|E|)$  variables and an exponential number of constraints for this STP. Costa et al. [5] have presented an edge-oriented model with  $O(H|E|)$  variables for the STPRBH.

There are also some heuristics (Costa et al. [4], Fernandes et al. [8], Fu and Hao [9, 10], Gouveia et al. [15]), and ILP models with an exponential number of constraints or variables, which require sophisticated *branch-and-cut* or *branch-and-price* algorithms (Costa et al. [5], Dahl et al. [7], Sinnl [28]).

The advantage of node- and edge-oriented formulations is that they have a polynomial size and can be fed directly into a standard ILP solver. Although the latter have stronger LP relaxations than the former, they lead to large ILPs and are suitable for small graphs. On the other hand, the node-oriented models use far fewer variables and allow to tackle large instances. In fact, the best state-of-the-art models for the STPRBH are node-oriented models, namely the assignment and the partial-ordering based models. Computational results in the literature show that for a majority of the large STPRBH instances with 500 nodes and 12 500 edges from the DIMACS benchmark set [1], these two models find optimal integer solutions within seconds [19, 29], whereas the previous models cannot even solve the LP relaxation within a time limit of two hours [4].

*Our contribution.* The solution of the HSTP, HMSTP and STPRBH is a hop-constrained tree, a rooted tree whose depth is bounded by a given hop limit. In this paper, we provide some theoretical results that show the polyhedral advantages of the partial-ordering model over the assignment model for solving this class of problems. Computational results in this paper and the literature [19] for the HSTP, HMSTP and STPRBH show that the partial-ordering model outperforms the assignment model in practice, too. It has better linear programming relaxation and solves more instances.

*Outline.* We start with some notations (Section 2). In Section 3, we describe the assignment and partial-ordering based models. The polyhedral and computational results are presented in Sections 4 and 5. We conclude with Section 6.

## 2 Notations

For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , we denote its node set by  $V(G)$  and edge set by  $E(G)$ . Each edge of an undirected graph  $G$  is a 2-element subset  $e = \{u, v\}$  of  $V$ . For clarity, we may write  $e = uv$ . The end nodes of an

edge are called neighbors. Each edge of a directed graph is an ordered pair  $a = (u, v)$  of nodes and is called an arc. The arc  $(u, v)$  is outgoing from  $u$  and incoming to  $v$ . The node  $u$  is the tail of  $a$ , written  $u = \text{tail}(a)$ , and  $v$  is the head of  $a$ , written  $v = \text{head}(a)$ . A directed walk  $W$  in a graph is a sequence  $W = v_0, a_1, v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, a_k, v_k$  of nodes and arcs, such that  $a_i = (v_{i-1}, v_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . We may describe  $W$  as the sequence of its nodes  $v_0, \dots, v_k$  or arcs  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ . We call  $W$  a  $(v_0, v_k)$ -walk. Let  $A$  be a list or set of arcs  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ , and let  $x_a$  be a variable associated with arc  $a$ . We use the abbreviation  $x(A) := x_{a_1} + \dots + x_{a_k}$ . A walk is a path if all its nodes are distinct. The number of not necessarily distinct arcs in  $W$  is called the length of  $W$ , written  $\ell_W$ . We denote the set of incoming arcs to a node  $v$  in  $W$  by  $\delta_W^-(v)$ . We say that  $W'$  is a suffix of walk  $W = a_1, \dots, a_l$ , written  $W' \sqsubset W$ , if there is an  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , such that  $W' = a_i, \dots, a_l$ . A rooted tree  $T$  has a special node  $r \in V(T)$ . The depth  $d(v)$  of node  $v$  in  $T$  is the number of edges in the  $(r, v)$ -path in  $T$ . The depth of  $T$  is  $d(T) := \max\{d(v) : v \in V(T)\}$ . We say  $T$  contains an arc  $(u, v)$ , written  $(u, v) \in E(T)$ , if  $T$  contains an edge  $uv$ , such that  $d(u) < d(v)$ . For a given hop limit  $H \in \mathbb{N}^{\geq 0}$ , we call a rooted tree  $T$  with  $d(T) \leq H$  a *hop-constrained tree* (HT). Let  $C$  be an inequality in the form  $L \leq R$  with a linear expression  $L$  and a number  $R$ . By  $c(\text{var}, C)$ , we denote the coefficient of variable  $\text{var}$  in  $C$ , e.g.,  $c(y, x - 4y \leq 7) = -4$ . We denote by  $\nu_M$  the LP relaxation value of ILP  $M$ . Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two ILPs for problem  $P$ . In case  $P$  is a minimization (resp. maximization) problem, we call  $A$  stronger than  $B$ , if inequality  $\nu_A \geq \nu_B$  (resp.  $\nu_A \leq \nu_B$ ) holds for all  $P$  instances;  $A$  is strictly stronger than  $B$  if  $A$  is stronger than  $B$ , but  $B$  is not stronger than  $A$ , i.e., there is a  $P$  instance for which the inequality is strict.

### 3 Assignment and partial-ordering based models

The main idea of both models is similar: The solution of the hop-constrained Steiner tree problems is a hop-constrained subtree  $T$  of  $G$  with root  $r$  and depth  $d(T) \leq H$ . To describe the arcs of  $T$ , both models use two binary variables  $x_{u,v}, x_{v,u}$  for each edge  $uv \in E$ :  $x_{u,v} = 1$  if and only if  $(u, v) \in E(T)$ , and  $x_{v,u} = 1$  if and only if  $(v, u) \in E(T)$ . Both models compute a partial order  $\pi$  of nodes of  $T$  such that the position  $\pi(v)$  of any node  $v \in V(T)$  in this order satisfies  $d(v) \leq \pi(v) \leq H$ , and thus  $d(v)$  respects the hop-limit  $H$ . To describe the positions of nodes in  $\pi$ , the assignment model [29] for the STPRBH uses a binary variable  $y_{v,i}$  for each node  $v \in V$  and each position  $i \in \{0, \dots, H\}$ ;  $y_{v,i} = 1$  if and only if  $\pi(v) = i$ . The partial-ordering-based model [19] uses instead of the variables  $y$ , so-called *partial-ordering problem* (POP) variables, namely binary variables  $l$  (less than) and  $g$  (greater than). For each node  $v \in V$  and each position  $i$ ,  $l_{v,i} = 1$  if and only if  $\pi(v) < i$ , and  $g_{i,v} = 1$  if and only if  $\pi(v) > i$ . That is, if node  $v$  is at position  $i$ , then we have  $l_{v,i} = g_{i,v} = 0$ , i.e., the connection between the assignment and POP variables is:

$$y_{v,i} = 1 - (l_{v,i} + g_{i,v}) \quad \forall v \in V, i = 0, \dots, H. \quad (1)$$

We may assume that  $G$  is complete; otherwise, we can assign infinite costs to the missing edges. Via  $x, l, g$  variables, the partial-ordering based model (P-HT) for hop-constrained trees (HT) can be formulated similar to the STPRBH model [19]:

$$\text{(P-HT)} \quad l_{r,0} = g_{0,r} = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$l_{v,1} = g_{H,v} = 0 \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\} \quad (3)$$

$$l_{v,i} - l_{v,i+1} \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in V, i = 0, \dots, H-1 \quad (4)$$

$$g_{i,v} + l_{v,i+1} = 1 \quad \forall v \in V, i = 0, \dots, H-1 \quad (5)$$

$$l_{u,i} + g_{i,v} \geq x_{u,v} \quad \forall u \in V, v \in V \setminus \{u\}, i = 0, \dots, H \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v\}} x_{u,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in V \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v,w\}} x_{u,v} \geq x_{v,w} \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\}, w \in V \setminus \{v\} \quad (8)$$

$$x \in [0, 1]^{2|E|} \quad (9)$$

$$l, g \in [0, 1]^{H|V|} \quad (10)$$

Constraints (2) ensure that  $\pi(r) = 0$ , and (3) make sure that  $\pi(v) \in \{1, \dots, H\}$  for each  $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$ . If a node's position is less than  $i$ , it is also less than  $i+1$  by (4). Constraints (5) ensure that for each node  $v$ , either  $\pi(v) > i$  (i.e.  $g_{i,v} = 1$ ) or  $\pi(v) < i+1$  (i.e.  $l_{v,i+1} = 1$ ), and not both. The constraints (4) jointly with (5) enforce each node  $v$  to have exactly one position in  $\pi$  [19]. Recall that since  $G$  is complete, there

is a variable  $x_{uv}$  for each two distinct nodes  $u \neq v \in V$ . Constraints (6) ensure  $\pi(u) < \pi(v)$  for each arc  $(u, v) \in E(T)$  [19]. Each node has at most one incoming arc in  $T$ , which is ensured by (7). Constraints (8) express that each node  $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$  with an outgoing arc has also an incoming arc. The fact that  $\pi(u) < \pi(v)$  for each arc  $(u, v) \in E(T)$ , jointly with Constraints (7)–(9), ensure that  $T$  is a tree [19]. Moreover,  $d(T) \leq H$  by (2)–(6), i.e.,  $T$  is an HT. We denote the polytope of (P-HT) by  $\mathcal{P}$ :

$$\mathcal{P} := \{(x, l, g) : (x, l, g) \text{ satisfy (2) – (10)}\}. \quad (11)$$

Using the variables  $x, y$ , the assignment model (A-HT) for hop-constrained trees (HT) can be formulated similar to the STPRBH model [29]:

(A-HT) Constraints (7)–(9)

$$y_{r,0} = 1 \quad (12)$$

$$y_{r,i} = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, H \quad (13)$$

$$y_{v,0} = 0 \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\} \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^H y_{v,i} = 1 \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\} \quad (15)$$

$$y_{u,i} - y_{v,i+1} + x_{u,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall u \in V, v \in V \setminus \{u\}, i = 0, \dots, H-1 \quad (16)$$

$$y_{u,H} + x_{u,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall u \in V, v \in V \setminus \{u\} \quad (17)$$

$$y \in [0, 1]^{H|V|} \quad (18)$$

As both models use the same  $x$ -variables, (A-HT) also includes the constraints (7)–(9). Constraints (12) and (13) ensure  $\pi(r) = 0$ . Constraints (14) and (15) make sure that  $\pi(v) \in \{1, \dots, H\}$  for each  $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$ . Constraints (16) express that if  $x_{u,v} = 1$ , then  $\pi(v) = \pi(u) + 1$ . Constraints (17) make sure that if  $\pi(u) = H$ , then  $u$  has no outgoing arc  $(u, v)$  in  $T$ . From (16) and (17) follows that for each arc  $(u, v) \in T$ , we have  $\pi(u) < \pi(v)$ . Like in model (P-HT), the fact that  $\pi(u) < \pi(v)$  for each arc  $(u, v) \in E(T)$ , jointly with (7)–(9), guarantee that  $T$  is a tree. Moreover,  $d(T) \leq H$  by (12)–(18), i.e.,  $T$  is an HT. We denote the polytope of the assignment model (A-HT) by  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(x, y) : (x, y) \text{ satisfy (7) – (9), (12) – (18)}\} \quad (19)$$

The solution  $T$  of the HSTP is a HT that contains all terminals  $R \subseteq V$ , i.e.:

$$\sum_{u \in V \setminus \{v\}} x_{u,v} \geq 1 \quad \forall v \in R \setminus \{r\} \quad (20)$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$  denote the polytopes of the assignment and partial-ordering based LPs for the HSTP, respectively. Then we have:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}} = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ (19), } x \text{ satisfies (20)}\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} = \{(x, l, g) : (x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P} \text{ (11), } x \text{ satisfies (20)}\}.$$

The corresponding ILPs have the following form:

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{uv \in E} c_{u,v} (x_{u,v} + x_{v,u}) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}; x, y \text{ integral} \right\}, \quad (\text{A-HSTP})$$

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{uv \in E} c_{u,v} (x_{u,v} + x_{v,u}) : (x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}; x, l, g \text{ integral} \right\}. \quad (\text{P-HSTP})$$

## 4 Polyhedral comparison

### 4.1 Direct comparison of polytopes $\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$ and $\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$

To compare (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) directly, we can replace, for example, in (A-HSTP)  $y$  variables by  $l, g$  via (1), and then test if the resulted constraints imply (“ $\Rightarrow$ ”) constraints of (P-HSTP) or vice versa (“ $\Leftarrow$ ”). However, the examples below that handle the transformations of polytopes of (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) onto the same variable space, namely

$$\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}} \text{ to } \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{HSTP}} := \{(x, l, g) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}} \text{ and } y, l, g \text{ satisfy (1)}\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} \text{ to } \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{HSTP}} := \{(x, y) : (x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} \text{ and } y, l, g \text{ satisfy (1)}\},$$

show that  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{HSTP}} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{HSTP}} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} \neq \emptyset$ , so neither “ $\Rightarrow$ ” nor “ $\Leftarrow$ ” holds.



■ **Figure 1** Complete graph  $G$  and feasible solutions (a) for (P-HSTP) and (b) for (A-HSTP)

► **Example 1** ( $\mathcal{P}_A^{\text{HSTP}} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}} \neq \emptyset$ ). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a complete graph,  $V = R = \{r, a, b, c\}$ , and  $H = 2$ . Let  $\pi^A$  and  $\pi^P$  be the partial orders constructed by (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP), respectively. Recall that for an arc  $(u, v) \in T$ ,  $\pi^A$  satisfies  $\pi^A(v) = \pi^A(u) + 1$ , while  $\pi^P$  meets  $\pi^P(v) \geq \pi^P(u) + 1$ , e.g.,  $\pi^P(v) = \pi^P(u) + 2$  is possible, too. Using this observation, we construct feasible solution  $(x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$  as in Figure 1a: The  $x$  values are all zero, except  $x_{r,a} = x_{r,b} = x_{r,c} = 1$ . Moreover,  $\pi^P(r) = 0$  and  $\pi^P(a) = \pi^P(b) = \pi^P(c) = 2$ , i.e.,  $(g_{0,r}, g_{1,r}, g_{2,r}) = (0, 0, 0)$ , and  $(g_{0,v}, g_{1,v}, g_{2,v}) = (1, 1, 0)$  for  $v \in \{a, b, c\}$ . For clarity, we do not write  $l$  values, since they can be derived from (5). Via (1), we transform  $(x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$  to  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}_A^{\text{HSTP}}$ , which violates (16):  $y_{r,0} - y_{a,1} + x_{r,a} = (1 - (l_{r,0} + g_{0,r})) - (1 - (l_{a,1} + g_{1,a})) + x_{r,a} = (1 - (0 + 0)) - (1 - (0 + 1)) + 1 = 2 \not\leq 1$ . Thus  $(x, y) \notin \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$ .

In constructing the next example, we use Theorem 2, which states that the partial-ordering model implies the following constraints: From any directed walk with  $H$  arcs that does not start at  $r$ , at most  $H - 1$  arcs can be selected. The next example shows that these constraints do not hold for the assignment model.

► **Theorem 2.** Let  $(x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}(11)$ , let  $v_1, \dots, v_{H+1}$  be a walk with  $H$  arcs and  $v_1 \neq r$ . Then:

$$\sum_{i=1}^H x_{v_i, v_{i+1}} \leq H - 1. \quad (21)$$

**Proof.** Adding up constraints (6) for the arcs  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  with  $1 \leq i \leq H$  gives  $\sum_{i=1}^H x_{v_i, v_{i+1}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^H (l_{v_i, i} + g_{i, v_{i+1}}) = l_{v_1, 1} + \sum_{i=1}^{H-1} (g_{i, v_{i+1}} + l_{v_{i+1}, i+1}) + g_{H, v_{H+1}}$ . Since  $l_{v_1, 1} = 0$  for  $v_1 \neq r$  by (2),  $g_{i, v_{i+1}} + l_{v_{i+1}, i+1} = 1$  by (5),  $g_{H, v_{H+1}} = 0$  by (3), we have  $\sum_{i=1}^H x_{v_i, v_{i+1}} \leq 0 + \sum_{i=1}^{H-1} 1 + 0 = H - 1$ . ◀

► **Example 3** ( $\mathcal{A}_P^{\text{HSTP}} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} \neq \emptyset$ ). Suppose we have the same HSTP instance as in Example 1. Consider the feasible solution  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$  (Fig. 1b), where:


$$\begin{aligned} (x_{a,b}, x_{b,c}, x_{c,a}, x_{b,a}, x_{a,c}, x_{c,b}) &= (2/3, 2/3, 2/3, 1/3, 1/3, 1/3), \\ (y_{r,0}, y_{r,1}, y_{r,2}) &= (1, 0, 0), \\ (y_{v,0}, y_{v,1}, y_{v,2}) &= (0, 2/3, 1/3) \end{aligned} \quad v \in V \setminus \{r\}, \quad (22)$$

and the remaining  $x$  values are zero. Via (1), we transform  $(x, y)$  to  $(x, l, g) \in \mathcal{A}_P^{\text{HSTP}}$ . The arcs  $(a, b)$ ,  $(b, c)$  build a walk with  $H = 2$  arcs and  $a \neq r$ . As  $x_{a,b} + x_{b,c} = \frac{4}{3} \not\leq 1 = H - 1$ ,  $x$  violates (21), so  $(x, l, g) \notin \mathcal{P}$  by Theorem 2. The claim follows from  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ .

## 4.2 Comparison by the projection onto the $x$ variable space

We observe that (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) have the same objective function, which depends only on  $x$  variables. We call a constraint an  $x$ -space constraint if it contains only the  $x$  variables. Let  $\mathcal{Q}_X$  denote the projection of polytope  $\mathcal{Q}$  onto the  $x$  variable space. To show that (P-HSTP) is stronger than (A-HSTP), it suffices to prove  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{HSTP}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^{\text{HSTP}}$  (Figure 2). To this end, we first show that the hop-constrained tree polytopes  $\mathcal{A}$  (19) and  $\mathcal{P}$  (11) satisfy  $\mathcal{P}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X$ . To get the projection  $\mathcal{A}_X$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we first eliminate some  $y$  variables using (12)–(15) and then eliminate the remaining  $y$  variables via Fourier-Motzkin elimination (FME) [27]. We illustrate the FME by eliminating the variable  $x_1$  in the following simple problem. The problem consists of two types of constraints  $P$  and  $N$ ;  $P$  contains the variable  $x_1$  with the positive sign, while  $N$  with the negative sign:

$$\begin{aligned} P : & \quad a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \dots + a_n x_n + a_{n+1} \leq 0, \\ N : & \quad -b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \dots + b_n x_n + b_{n+1} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$



■ **Figure 2** Polytopes  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$  and their projections onto the  $x$  variable space

Note that  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are positive numbers. Multiplying  $P$  by  $b_1$  and  $N$  by  $a_1$  yields  $(b_2x_2 + \dots + b_nx_n + b_{n+1}) \cdot a_1 \leq a_1b_1x_1 \leq -(a_2x_2 + \dots + a_nx_n + a_{n+1}) \cdot b_1$ . Thus  $x_1$  can be eliminated, and the constraints  $P$  and  $N$  can be replaced by the constraint  $P \cdot b_1 + N \cdot a_1$ , i.e.,  $(a_2x_2 + \dots + a_nx_n + a_{n+1}) \cdot b_1 + (b_2x_2 + \dots + b_nx_n + b_{n+1}) \cdot a_1 \leq 0$ . If we have  $k$  constraints of type  $P$  and  $k'$  constraints of type  $N$ , then we combine each constraint of type  $P$  with each constraint of type  $N$ , so we get  $k \cdot k'$  new constraints.

► **Remark 4.** If all coefficients in constraints of a problem are integral, then applying the FME on the problem produces new constraints, which are a weighted sum of constraints of input problem such that the weights are nonnegative integers.

We first fix all  $y$  variables corresponding to  $r$  via equations (12), (13). For each remaining node  $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$ , we eliminate  $y_{v,0}$  using (14) and  $y_{v,1}$  using (15):

$$y_{v,1} = 1 - (y_{v,2} + \dots + y_{v,H}) \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\}. \quad (23)$$

Concerning (16) and (17), there are three cases w.r.t. an edge  $uv \in E$ : In case  $r = u$ , setting (12) and (23) to (16) for  $i = 0$  yields the following set of constraints, which is denoted by  $S_0$ :

$$S_0 : \quad (y_{v,2} + \dots + y_{v,H}) + x_{r,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\}.$$

Setting (13) to (16) for  $i = 1, \dots, H-1$  gives  $-y_{v,i+1} + x_{r,v} \leq 1$ , which is redundant as it is implied by  $-y_{v,i+1} \leq 0$  and  $x_{r,v} \leq 1$ . Constraints (17) have the form  $x_{r,v} \leq 1$ , too.

In case  $r \notin \{u, v\}$ , (16) are redundant for  $i = 0$ , since setting (14) to (16) gives  $-y_{v,1} + x_{u,v} \leq 1$ , which is implied by  $-y_{v,1} \leq 0$  and  $x_{u,v} \leq 1$ . Setting (23) to (16) for  $i = 1$  gives the set  $S_1$ :

$$S_1 : \quad -(y_{u,2} + \dots + y_{u,H}) - y_{v,2} + x_{u,v} \leq 0 \quad \forall uv \in E, r \notin \{u, v\}.$$

Inequalities (16) for  $i \in \{2, \dots, H-1\}$  remain unchanged and are denoted by  $S_i$ . The constraints (17) also remain unchanged and are denoted by  $S_H$ .

$$S_i : \quad y_{u,i} - y_{v,i+1} + x_{u,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall uv \in E, r \notin \{u, v\}, i = 2, \dots, H-1.$$

$$S_H : \quad y_{u,H} + x_{u,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall uv \in E, r \notin \{u, v\}.$$

In case  $r = v$ , for  $i = 0$ , setting (13) and (14) to (16) implies  $x_{u,r} \leq 1$ . Setting (13) to (16) and (17) for  $i \in \{1, \dots, H\}$  gives  $y_{u,i} + x_{u,r} \leq 1$ . We replace  $y_{u,i} + x_{u,r} \leq 1$  by stronger constraints

$$x_{u,r} \leq 0 \quad \forall u \in V \setminus \{r\}, \quad (24)$$

and denote the resulting polytope by  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . Concerning (18), notice that  $y_{v,i} \leq 1$  is redundant as it is implied by  $y_{v,i} \geq 0$  and (15). Setting (23) to  $y_{v,1} \geq 0$  for each  $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$  yields  $\sum_{j=2}^H y_{v,j} \leq 1$ , which is implied by constraints  $S_0$ . For  $i \geq 2$ , we rewrite constraints  $y_{v,i} \geq 0$ :


$$-y_{v,i} \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\}, i \in \{2, \dots, H\}. \quad (25)$$

The polytope  $\mathcal{A}^*$  strengthened by (24) has the form

$$\mathcal{A}^* = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \text{ satisfy } S_0, \dots, S_H, (7) - (9), (24), (25)\}. \quad (26)$$

► **Remark 5.** Set  $S_0$  contains exactly one constraint with variable  $x_{r,v}$  for each neighbor  $v$  of  $r$ , while  $S_i$  with  $i \geq 1$  has two constraints for each  $uv \in E$  with  $r \notin \{u, v\}$ , one for arc  $(u, v)$ , one for  $(v, u)$ . By  $S_i^{(u,v)}$ , we denote the  $S_i$  constraint for arc  $(u, v)$ . Note that if  $i = 0$ , then  $u = r$  and  $v \neq r$ , otherwise  $u \neq r \neq v$ .





■ **Figure 3** Example walks  $W_1(a, c, t)$ ,  $W_2(b, e, c, t)$ ,  $W_3(r, t)$  have the same end  $t$ , such that for each  $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , there is a node  $v$  with  $|\delta_{W_i}^-(v) \cup \delta_{W_j}^-(v)| \geq 2$ , e.g.,  $\delta_{W_1}^-(c) \cup \delta_{W_2}^-(c) = \{(a, c), (e, c)\}$ .

► **Lemma 6.** Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a set of walks that end in the same node  $t$ , such that for each two  $W \neq W' \in \mathcal{W}$ , there is a node  $v$  with  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$  (Fig. 3). Then (7) and (9) imply:

$$\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} x(W) \leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}| + 1. \quad (27)$$

**Proof.** We show it by induction on  $|\mathcal{W}|$ . For  $|\mathcal{W}| = 1$ , constraint (27) has the form  $x(W) \leq \ell_W - 1 + 1 = \ell_W$ , which is implied by (9). For  $|\mathcal{W}| \geq 2$ , there are two cases: In the first case, there is a walk  $W' := a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathcal{W}$  that contains a node  $v$  with  $|\delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$ . By the induction hypothesis, (7) and (9) imply:

$$\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W} \setminus W'} x(W) \leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W} \setminus W'} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W} \setminus W'| + 1 = \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W} \setminus W'} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}| + 2. \quad (28)$$

Let  $a_j \neq a_k \in \delta_{W'}^-(v)$ . We have  $\sum_{i \in \{j, k\}} x_{a_i} \leq 1$  by (7) and  $\sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{j, k\}} x_{a_i} \leq m - 2$  by (9). Thus  $x(W') = \sum_{i \in \{j, k\}} x_{a_i} + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{j, k\}} x_{a_i} \leq m - 1 = \ell_{W'} - 1$  is implied by (7) and (9). Adding  $x(W') \leq \ell_{W'} - 1$  and (28) proves the claim.

In the second case, for any walk  $W := v_0, a_1, v_1, \dots, a_{\ell_W}, v_{\ell_W} \in \mathcal{W}$  and any  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell_W\}$ , we have  $|\delta_W^-(v_i)| \leq 1$ , i.e.,  $\delta_W^-(v_i) = \{a_i\}$ . Then:

$$x(W) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_W} x_{a_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_W} x(\delta_W^-(v_i)). \quad (29)$$

Consider the set  $\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t) := \bigcup_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \delta_W^-(t)$ . If  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t)| = 1$ , i.e., all walks in  $\mathcal{W}$  end in the same arc, then we traverse the walks backward till we find a node  $t'$  with  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t')| \geq 2$ : We initialize  $t' := t$ . While  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t')| = 1$ , say  $\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t') = \{w, t'\}$ , we set  $t' := w$ . This way, we get a node  $t'$  with  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t')| \geq 2$ , since for each two  $W \neq W' \in \mathcal{W}$ , there is a node  $v$  with  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$ . Let  $\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t') = \{(w_1, t'), \dots, (w_k, t')\}$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Constraints (7) imply:

$$x(\delta_{\mathcal{W}}^-(t')) = \sum_{i=1}^k x_{w_i, t'} \leq 1. \quad (30)$$

Let  $\mathcal{W}_i \subset \mathcal{W}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  be the set of walks that contain the walk  $w_i, t', \dots, t$  as a suffix. Then  $\delta_{\mathcal{W}_i}^-(t') = \{(w_i, t')\}$ . Thus  $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(\delta_W^-(t')) = |\mathcal{W}_i| \cdot x_{w_i, t'}$ . Let  $l$  be the length of walk  $t', \dots, t$ , and let  $W := (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell_W}) \in \mathcal{W}_i$ . Then  $t' = v_{\ell_W - l}$ . From (29) follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(W) &= \sum_{W := (v_0, \dots, v_{\ell_W}) \in \mathcal{W}_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_W} x(\delta_W^-(v_j)) \\ &= \sum_{W := (v_0, \dots, v_{\ell_W}) \in \mathcal{W}_i} \left( x(\delta_W^-(t')) + \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, \ell_W\} \setminus \{\ell_W - l\}} x(\delta_W^-(v_j)) \right) \\ &= |\mathcal{W}_i| \cdot x_{w_i, t'} + \sum_{W := (v_0, \dots, v_{\ell_W}) \in \mathcal{W}_i} \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, \ell_W\} \setminus \{\ell_W - l\}} x(\delta_W^-(v_j)). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since  $|\mathcal{W}_i| < |\mathcal{W}|$ , by the induction hypothesis, (7) and (9) imply:

$$\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(W) \leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}_i| + 1. \quad (32)$$

Constraints (7) affect  $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(W)$  if and only if there is a node  $w$  with  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}_i}^-(w)| \geq 2$ , i.e., there are two distinct arcs  $a, a' \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}_i}^-(w)$ , as then  $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(W)$  includes the summands  $x_a, x_{a'}$ , such that  $x_a + x_{a'} \leq 1$  by (7). From  $|\delta_{\mathcal{W}_i}^-(t')| = |\{(w_i, t')\}| = 1$  follows  $w \neq t'$ . The variables corresponding to arcs  $\delta_{\mathcal{W}_i}^-(w)$  with  $w \neq t'$  are in the second summand of (31). That is, constraints (7) affect only the second summand of (31), while (9) affect both summands of (31). Particularly, (9) imply for the first summand that  $|\mathcal{W}_i| \cdot x_{w_i, t'} \leq |\mathcal{W}_i|$ . Then (7) and (9) imply (32), if and only if (7) and (9) imply for the second summand

of (31) that:

$$\sum_{W:=(v_0,\dots,v_{\ell_W}) \in \mathcal{W}_i} \sum_{j \in \{1,\dots,\ell_W\} \setminus \{\ell_W-l\}} x(\delta_W^-(v_j)) \leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}_i| + 1 - |\mathcal{W}_i|. \quad (33)$$

It follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} x(W) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} x(W) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left( |\mathcal{W}_i| \cdot x_{w_i,t'} + \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}_i| + 1 - |\mathcal{W}_i| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}_i| + x_{w_i,t'} \right) \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}| + 1, \quad (36)$$

where (34) follows from (31) and (33). The reason for (35) is that  $|\mathcal{W}_i| \cdot x_{w_i,t'} - (|\mathcal{W}_i| - 1) = x_{w_i,t'} + (x_{w_i,t'} - 1)(|\mathcal{W}_i| - 1) \leq x_{w_i,t'}$  as  $x_{w_i,t'} \leq 1$  and  $|\mathcal{W}_i| \geq 1$ . Inequality (36) follows from  $\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}_i} \ell_W = \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \ell_W$  and (30). ◀

► **Theorem 7.** *Hop-constrained tree polytopes  $\mathcal{A}$  (19) and  $\mathcal{P}$  (11) satisfy  $\mathcal{P}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X$ .*

**Proof.** Polytopes  $\mathcal{A}$  (19) and  $\mathcal{A}^*$  (26) satisfy  $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_X^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X$ . So it is enough to show  $\mathcal{P}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^*$ .  $\mathcal{A}^*$  constraints (7)–(9) also hold for  $\mathcal{P}_X$ , by definition of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Moreover, adding  $\mathcal{P}$  constraints  $-g_{0,r} = 0$  (2),  $-l_{u,1} = 0$  (3),  $-l_{u,0} + l_{u,1} \geq 0$  (4), and  $l_{u,0} + g_{0,r} \geq x_{u,r}$  (6) gives  $x_{u,r} \leq 0$  (24), so (24) hold for  $\mathcal{P}_X$ , too. So we consider only the  $x$ -space constraints  $X$ , generated by applying the FME on the remaining  $\mathcal{A}^*$  constraints  $S_0, \dots, S_H$  and (25).

In case  $H = 1$ , the set (25) is empty as it is defined for  $H \geq 2$ , while  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 : & \quad x_{r,v} \leq 1 & \quad \forall v \in V \setminus \{r\}, \\ S_1 : & \quad x_{u,v} \leq 0 & \quad \forall uv \in E, r \notin \{u, v\}. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{P}_X$  constraints (9) imply  $S_0$ . By Theorem 2,  $\mathcal{P}_X$  constraints (21) imply  $S_1$ , since the arc  $(u, v)$  with  $r \notin \{u, v\}$  is a directed walk  $u, v$  with  $H = 1$  arc such that  $u \neq r$ . Thus  $\mathcal{P}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^*$ .

Otherwise,  $H \geq 2$ . By Remark 4,  $X$  is a weighted sum of some constraints selected from sets  $S_0, \dots, S_H$  and (25), where the weights are nonnegative integers. We can interpret an integral weight  $w$  of a constraint  $C$  as meaning that constraint  $C$  is selected  $w$  time. Thus,  $X$  can be shown as unweighted sum  $C_1 + \dots + C_l$  of some not necessarily distinct constraints  $C_1, \dots, C_l$  selected from sets  $S_0, \dots, S_H$  and (25). Moreover, since in the constraints  $C_1, \dots, C_l$ , all coefficients are integral, this is true for  $X$ , too. Let  $s_i$  be the number of the selected  $S_i$  constraints, and let  $s := (s_0 + \dots + s_H)$ . Since  $X$  does not contain any  $y$  variable, it has the form:

$$X : \quad x_{a_1} + \dots + x_{a_s} \leq s - s_1, \quad (37)$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_s$  are some not necessarily distinct arcs. Let  $J := \{1, \dots, s\}$  and let  $J_0, \dots, J_H$  be the partition of  $J$  such that  $j \in J_i$  if  $x_{a_j}$  is originated from  $S_i^{a_j}$  with  $0 \leq i \leq H$ ; in this case, we write  $S(j) = S_i^{a_j}$ . We show that there is a partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $J$ , such that (7), (9), and (21) imply:

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{a_i} \leq |I \setminus J_1| \quad \text{for all } I \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (38)$$

It follows then  $\mathcal{P}_X$  constraints (7), (9), and (21) imply  $X$  (37), as

$$x_{a_1} + \dots + x_{a_s} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{i \in I} x_{a_i} \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |I \setminus J_1| = \left( \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |I| \right) - |J_1| = s - s_1,$$

and thus  $\mathcal{P}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^*$ . We construct  $\mathcal{I}$  (38) such that it contains three types of sets:

**Type 1:** Each set  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_H\}$  of the first type has exactly  $H$  elements such that  $|I \cap J_1| = 1$  and  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_H}$  build a walk with  $H$  arcs that does not start at  $r$  (Fig. 4a). From (21) follows  $\sum_{i \in I} x_{a_i} \leq H - 1 = |I \setminus J_1|$ . Thus  $I$  satisfies (38).

**Type 2:** Let  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}$  be a set of the second type. The arcs  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_m}$  build  $|I \cap J_1| + 1$  walks  $\mathcal{W} := \{W_1, \dots, W_{|I \cap J_1|+1}\}$  that end in the same node such that each two  $W \neq W' \in \mathcal{W}$  have a common node  $v$  with  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$ . By Lemma 6, constraints (7) and (9) imply  $\sum_{i \in I} x_{a_i} = \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} x(W) \leq \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} \ell_W \right) - |\mathcal{W}| + 1 = |I| - |I \cap J_1| = |I \setminus J_1|$ . Hence  $I$  fulfills (38).






Figure 4 (a) A set of the first type  $\{j_1, \dots, j_H\}$  and (b) a set of the second type  $\{j_1, \dots, j_6\}$

**Algorithm 1** Construction of the partition  $\mathcal{I}$

---

```

1  $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \{\}$ 
2  $J^{used} \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3 /* Phase 1: Search for the first type of sets in  $\mathcal{I}$  */
4 foreach  $j_1 \in J_1$  do
5   if there is  $\{j_1, \dots, j_H\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{used}$  such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_H) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_H$ , and  $(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_H})$  is a walk then
6      $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \mathcal{I} \cup \{\{j_1, \dots, j_H\}\}$  /*  $\{j_1, \dots, j_H\}$  is a set of the first type */
7      $J^{used} \leftarrow J^{used} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_H\}$ 
8 /* Phase 2: Search for the second type of sets in  $\mathcal{I}$  */
9  $J^* \leftarrow J^{used}$ 
10 foreach  $j_0 \in J_0$  do
11    $I_{j_0} \leftarrow \{j_0\}$ 
12    $Y_{j_0} \leftarrow \{\}$ 
13   for  $k = 1, \dots, |J_1 \setminus J^*|$  do
14     Find a  $j_0 \in J_0$  and a set  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{used}$  of minimum cardinality with  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  such that
15      $(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l})$  is a walk,  $\text{head}(a_{j_0}) = \text{head}(a_{j_l})$  and  $y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1} \notin Y_{j_0}$ .
16      $I_{j_0} \leftarrow I_{j_0} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ 
17      $J^{used} \leftarrow J^{used} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ 
18      $Y_{j_0} \leftarrow Y_{j_0} \cup \{y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1}\}$ 
19     for  $i = 2, \dots, H-l$  do
20       if  $y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+i} \notin Y_{j_0}$  and there is  $\{j'_1, \dots, j'_i\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{used}$  with  $(j'_1, \dots, j'_i) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_{l+i-1}$  and
21        $(a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_i}) = (a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l})$  then
22          $J^{used} \leftarrow J^{used} \cup \{j'_1, \dots, j'_i\}$ 
23          $Y_{j_0} \leftarrow Y_{j_0} \cup \{y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+i}\}$ 
24 foreach  $j_0 \in J_0$  do
25   if  $|I_{j_0} \cap J_1| > 0$  then
26      $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \mathcal{I} \cup \{I_{j_0}\}$  /*  $I_{j_0}$  is a set of the second type */
27 /* Phase 3: The remaining set  $J \setminus \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I$  is the only set of the third type. */
28  $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \mathcal{I} \cup \{J \setminus \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I\}$ 

```

---


Figure 4b illustrates an example for the second type of sets, namely the set  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_6\}$  with  $I \cap J_1 = \{j_1, j_3\}$ . The arcs  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_6}$  build  $|I \cap J_1| + 1 = 3$  walks  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_1, W_2, W_3\}$  (solid, dashed and dotted) that end in the same node, and each two walks  $W \neq W' \in \mathcal{W}$  have a common node  $v$  with at least two distinct incoming arcs, i.e.,  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$ . By Lemma 6, constraints (7) and (9) imply  $x_{a_{j_1}} + \dots + x_{a_{j_6}} \leq |I| - |\mathcal{W}| + 1 = 6 - 3 + 1 = |I| - (|I \cap J_1| + 1) + 1 = |I \setminus J_1|$ .

**Type 3:** There is only one set  $I$  of the last type, which does not contains any element from  $J_1$ , i.e.,  $I \setminus J_1 = I$ . By (9),  $\sum_{i \in I} x_{a_i} \leq |I| = |I \setminus J_1|$ , so  $I$  fulfills (38).

To construct  $\mathcal{I}$  we use Algorithm 1. The algorithm initialize  $\mathcal{I}$  on line 1 as an empty set-family. To ensure that the sets in  $\mathcal{I}$  are disjoint, we manage the set  $J^{used}$  of used elements and choose the elements from the remaining set  $J \setminus J^{used}$ . The set  $J^{used}$  is initially empty (line 2).

The algorithm has three phases, one phase for each set type. The first phase (lines 3-6) searches for the first type of sets. The loop spanning lines 3-6 checks on line 4 for each  $j \in J_1$  if there is a set  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_H\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{used}$  such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_H) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_H$  and  $W := a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_H}$  is a walk. If yes, we add  $I$  to  $\mathcal{I}$  (line 5) as  $I$  is a set of the first type. The reason is the following: We have  $I \cap J_1 = \{j_1\}$ , so  $|I \cap J_1| = 1$ . Moreover, as  $j_1 \in J_1$ ,  $x_{a_{j_1}}$  is originated from  $S_1$ . Then, by Remark 5,  $a_{j_1}$  is not incident to  $r$ . Thus  $W$  is a walk with  $H$  arcs that does not start at  $r$  (Fig. 4a). Line 6 updates the set  $J^{used}$ .

The second phase (lines 7-22) searches for the second type of sets. Consider the set  $J^* = J^{used}$  (line 7) of used elements in the first phase. As no  $j_1 \in J_1 \setminus J^*$  meets the conditions in line 4, there is no subset of  $J \setminus J^*$  that is a first type set. We divide the remaining elements of  $J_1 \setminus J^*$  between the second type of



■ **Figure 5** The arcs corresponding to  $j_0 \in J_0$ , to  $j_1, j_2, j_3$  found on line 12, and to  $j'_1, j'_2, j'_3$  found on line 17

sets. We construct these sets such that each of them has a unique element  $j_0$  from set  $J_0$  and at least one element from  $J_1$ . The loop spanning lines 8-10 creates for each  $j_0 \in J_0$ , a set  $I_{j_0}$ , which initially has exactly one unique element from  $J_0$ , namely  $j_0$  (line 9). The loop spanning lines 11-19 extends some of the sets  $I_{j_0}$  to the sets of the second type, which are then added to  $\mathcal{I}$  by the loop spanning lines 20-22.

For each  $j_1 \in J_1 \setminus J^*$ , the loop spanning lines 11-19 finds on line 12 a set  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{used}$  of minimum cardinality and a  $j_0 \in J_0$  such that  $W := a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  and  $W' := a_{j_0}$  are two walks with a common node  $t := \text{head}(a_{j_0}) = \text{head}(a_{j_l})$ . The node  $t$  has two distinct incoming arcs, i.e.,  $|\delta_W^-(t) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(t)| \geq 2$  (Fig. 5). The reason is as follows: Both  $a_{j_0}$  and  $a_{j_l}$  have the same head node  $t$ . As  $j_0 \in J_0$  and  $j_l \in J_1$ ,  $x_{a_{j_0}}$  and  $x_{a_{j_l}}$  are originated from  $S_0$  and  $S_l$  with  $l \neq 0$ , respectively. By Remark 5,  $a_{j_0}$  is incident to  $r$ , whereas  $a_{j_l}$  is not. Thus  $a_{j_0}$  and  $a_{j_l}$  have different tails. It follows that each found set  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  and element  $j_0$  on line 12 give a set of the second type, namely  $\{j_0\} \cup I = \{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ . The lines 13 and 14 extend  $I_{j_0}$  and  $J^{used}$  by  $I$ .

The meaning of condition  $y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1} \notin Y_{j_0}$  is as follows: Recall that each  $j \in J_i$  with  $i \in \{0, \dots, H\}$  identifies the unique constraint  $S(j) = S_i^{a_j}$ . As  $j_0 \in J_0$  and  $j_l \in J_l$ , we have  $S(j_0) = S_0^{a_{j_0}}$  and  $S(j_l) = S_l^{a_{j_l}}$ . By definitions of  $S_0^{a_{j_0}}$  and  $S_l^{a_{j_l}}$ , the coefficient of variable  $y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1}$  is 1 in constraint  $S_0^{a_{j_0}}$  and -1 in  $S_l^{a_{j_l}}$ , i.e.,  $c(y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1}, S_0^{a_{j_0}}) = 1$  and  $c(y_{\text{head}(a_{j_l}), l+1}, S_l^{a_{j_l}}) = -1$ . From  $\text{head}(a_{j_0}) = \text{head}(a_{j_l})$  follows  $c(y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1}, S(j_0) + S(j_l)) = 0$ . We add variable  $y_{\text{head}(a_{j_0}), l+1}$  to set  $Y_{j_0}$  in the sense that this variable is eliminated via constraint  $S(j_0)$ .

Suppose that by the end of loop 11,  $I_{j_0}$  is extended by more than one set, say  $I_1, \dots, I_m$ , i.e.,  $I_{j_0} = \{j_0\} \cup I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_m$ . We have seen that for each  $I \in I_1, \dots, I_m$ , set  $\{j_0\} \cup I$  is a set of the second type. To make sure that it is also true for  $I_{j_0} = \{j_0\} \cup I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_m$ , we must also ensure for each two  $I \neq I' \in \{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$  that  $I \cup I'$  is a set of the second type. To guarantee this, the loop on line 16 finds the sets  $\{j'_1, \dots, j'_l\}$  such that the walks  $W := a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  and  $W' = a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_l}$  are the same (Fig. 5) and thus have no common node  $v$  with  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$ . Hence the set  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \cup \{j'_1, \dots, j'_l\}$  is not of the second type. So we add  $j'_1, \dots, j'_l$  to  $J^{used}$  on line 18 to prevent them from becoming part of  $I_{j_0}$ .

Phase 3 (line 23) adds the remaining set  $J \setminus \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I$  to  $\mathcal{I}$  as the only set of the third type.

We now show the correctness of Algorithm 1, i.e., the algorithm constructs a set-family  $\mathcal{I}$  such that

- (1)  $\mathcal{I}$  is a partition of  $J$ .
- (2) Each set in  $\mathcal{I}$  belongs to one of the three type of the sets.

(1) To this end, we show that  $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I = J$  such that each two distinct sets  $I \neq I' \in \mathcal{I}$  satisfy  $I \cap I' = \{\}$ . Since any element in  $\mathcal{I}$  is a subset of  $J$ , we have  $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I \subseteq J$ . On the other hand, Phase 3 (line 23) ensures that for each element  $j \in J$ , there is a set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  with  $j \in I$ , so  $J \subseteq \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I$  and thus  $\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I = J$ . The algorithm manages the set  $J^{used}$  of used elements in  $J \setminus J_0$ . As soon as an element is selected from  $J \setminus J_0$ , it is added into the set  $J^{used}$  and into at most one set of partition  $\mathcal{I}$ . The next element is selected from set  $J \setminus J^{used}$ . So each element of  $J \setminus J_0$  is included at most one set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ . The elements of  $J_0$  are contained only in the sets of the second and third types. There is no element  $j_0 \in J_0$  and no two sets  $I \neq I'$  of the second or third type such that  $j_0 \in I$  and  $j_0 \in I'$ . Thus each element of  $J$  is included at most one set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ . Hence each two distinct sets  $I \neq I' \in \mathcal{I}$  satisfy  $I \cap I' = \{\}$ .

(2) To this end, we show that each element of  $J_1$  is in a set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  of the first or second type. There is only one set of the third type, which does not contain any element of  $J_1$ . The first phase finds for each  $j_1 \in J_1 \cap J^*$  a set of the first type, such that after this phase, no  $j_1 \in J_1 \setminus J^*$  meets the conditions in line

4, and thus no subset of  $J \setminus J^*$  is a set of the first type. So we need to show that the second phase finds a set of the second type for each element in  $J_1 \setminus J^*$ . More precisely, we show the following:

**(2a)** The second phase finds for each element  $j_1 \in J_1 \setminus J^*$  a set  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  and an element  $j_0 \in J_0$  that meet the conditions of line 12.

**(2b)** Let  $I_1, \dots, I_m$  be the sets that are joined to  $I_{j_0}$  on line 13, i.e.,  $I_{j_0} = \{j_0\} \cup I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_m$ . Then for each two  $I \neq I' \subseteq I_{j_0}$ , set  $I \cup I'$  is a set of the second type.

**(2a)** To show this, we need some facts about the coefficients  $c(y_{v,i}, C)$  of the variables  $y_{v,i}$  in some crucial constraints  $C$ . Let  $J^{(0)} := J^*$  (line 7) and let  $J^{(k)} \subseteq J$  with  $k \geq 1$  be the set of elements added to  $J^{used}$  at iteration  $k$  of the loop spanning lines 11–19, and let  $J^{(\leq k)} := \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq k} J^{(i)}$ .

Let  $j_1 \in J_1$  and let  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_H\} \subseteq J^{(0)}$  be a set found in the first phase on line 4. Due to the condition in line 4, we have  $(j_1, \dots, j_H) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_H$ . Recall that as  $j_i \in J_i$ , we have  $S(j_i) = S_i^{a_{j_i}}$ , so  $(S(j_1), \dots, S(j_H)) = (S_1^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_H^{a_{j_H}})$ . Since  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_H}$  is a walk, the sum of constraints  $S_1^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_H^{a_{j_H}}$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{j \in I} S(j)$  has the following form:

$$\sum_{j \in I} S(j) : \quad \left( - \sum_{i=2}^H y_{\text{tail}(a_{j_1}), i} \right) + (x_{a_{j_1}} + \dots + x_{a_{j_H}}) \leq H - 1.$$

Hence for any  $y$  variable  $y_{v,i}$ , we have  $c(y_{v,i}, \sum_{j \in I} S(j)) \leq 0$ . As this holds for any set  $I \subseteq J^{(0)}$  that is found on line 4, it follows:

$$c(y_{v,i}, \sum_{j \in J^{(0)}} S(j)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } y \text{ variable } y_{v,i}. \quad (39)$$

Next we study the coefficient of  $y_{v,i}$  in the constraint  $\sum_{j \in J^{(k)}} S(j)$  for a  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $j_1 \in J_1$  and let  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  with  $l < H$  and  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  be the set joined to  $J^{(k)}$  on line 14. The constraints corresponding to  $(j_1, \dots, j_l)$  are  $(S(j_1), \dots, S(j_l))$ . From  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  follows  $(S(j_1), \dots, S(j_l)) = (S_1^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_l^{a_{j_l}})$ , i.e., the constraints  $\sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)$  and  $S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}}$  are the same. Let  $q := \text{tail}(a_{j_1})$  and  $t := \text{head}(a_{j_l})$  (Fig. 5). The constraint  $S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}}$  with  $l < H$  and a walk  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  has the form:

$$S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}} : \quad \left( - \sum_{h=2}^H y_{q,h} \right) + (x_{a_{j_1}} + \dots + x_{a_{j_l}}) - y_{t,l+1} \leq l - 1.$$

Thus we have:

$$c(y_{q,h}, \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) = c(y_{q,h}, S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}}) \leq -1 \quad \text{for any } h \geq 2. \quad (40)$$

$$c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) = c(y_{v,h}, S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}}) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } y \text{ variable } y_{v,h} \quad (41)$$

$$c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) = c(y_{t,l+1}, S_1^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_l^{a_{j_l}}) \leq -1. \quad (42)$$

Let  $\{j'_1, \dots, j'_l\} \subseteq J$  with  $(j'_1, \dots, j'_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_{i+l-1}$  and  $2 \leq i \leq H-l$  and  $(a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_l}) = (a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l})$  be a set joined to  $J^{(k)}$  on line 18. From  $(j'_1, \dots, j'_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_{i+l-1}$  follows  $(S(j'_1), \dots, S(j'_l)) = (S_i^{a_{j'_1}}, \dots, S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j'_l}})$ . Since  $(a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_l}) = (a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l})$ , we have  $(S_i^{a_{j'_1}}, \dots, S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j'_l}}) = (S_i^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})$ , so  $(S(j'_1), \dots, S(j'_l)) = (S_i^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})$ . Thus the constraints  $\sum_{j \in \{j'_1, \dots, j'_l\}} S(j)$  and  $S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}$  are the same. The constraint  $S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}$  with  $2 \leq i \leq H-l$  and a walk  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  has the form:

$$S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}} : \quad y_{q,i} + (x_{a_{j_1}} + \dots + x_{a_{j_l}}) - y_{t,l+i} \leq l.$$

Thus, for  $2 \leq i \leq H-l$ , we have

$$c(y_{q,i}, S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}) = 1 \quad (43)$$

$$c(y_{v,h}, S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } y \text{ variable } y_{v,h} \text{ except } y_{q,i} \quad (44)$$

$$c(y_{t,l+i}, S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}) \leq -1. \quad (45)$$

Let  $I \subseteq \{2, \dots, H-l\}$  such that for each  $i \in I$  at iteration  $i$  of the loop spanning lines 16–19 the elements  $(j'_1, \dots, j'_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_{i+l-1}$  are joined to  $J^{(k)}$  on line 18. Note that  $(S_1^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_l^{a_{j_l}})$  can be written as  $(S_i^{a_{j_1}}, \dots, S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})$  where  $i = 1$ . Thus  $\sum_{j \in J^{(k)}} S(j)$  is the same constraint as  $\sum_{i \in \{1\} \cup I} (S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})$ . Facts (40) and (43) imply  $c(y_{q,i}, \sum_{i \in \{1\} \cup I} (S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})) \leq 0$  for any  $2 \leq i \leq H-l$ . Particularly, (40)–(45) imply that  $c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{i \in \{1\} \cup I} (S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})) \leq 0$  for any  $y$  variable  $y_{v,h}$ . It follows:

$$c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{j \in J^{(k)}} S(j)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } k \geq 1 \text{ and for any } y \text{ variable } y_{v,h}.$$

This fact, together with (39), implies that:

$$c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{j \in J^{(k)}} S(j)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0 \text{ and for any } y \text{ variable } y_{v,h}. \quad (46)$$

Particularly, by (42) and (45),  $c(y_{t,l+i}, S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}}) \leq -1$  holds for any  $i \geq 1$ . Then we have  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{i \in \{1\} \cup I} (S_i^{a_{j_1}} + \dots + S_{i+l-1}^{a_{j_l}})) \leq -1$ . It follows that:

$$c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(k)}} S(j)) \leq -1 \quad \text{for any } k \geq 1. \quad (47)$$

Using these facts about the coefficients of the  $y$  variables we show (2a). Suppose, for contradiction,  $k$  is the first iteration of the loop spanning lines 11–19, at which there is no  $j_0 \in J_0$  and  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  that meet the conditions of line 12. Recall that after the first phase, there is no set of the first type, i.e., there is no  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \in J \setminus J^*$  with  $l = H$  (but with  $l \leq H-1$ ), such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  and  $(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l})$  is a walk. Consider the subset  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \subseteq J \setminus J^{(\leq k-1)}$  such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$ , and  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  is a walk, and there is no  $j_{l+1} \in J_{l+1} \setminus J^{(\leq k-1)}$  with  $\text{head}(a_{j_l}) = \text{tail}(a_{j_{l+1}})$ . Let  $t := \text{head}(a_{j_l})$ . We have  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) \leq -1$  by (42) and  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)}} S(j)) \leq 0$  by (46). It follows  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) \leq -1$ . Assume

$$c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)}} S(j)) = -z_1 \quad z_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (48)$$

$$c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}} S(j)) = -z_2 \quad z_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad z_2 > z_1. \quad (49)$$


Recall that  $X$  is a unweighted sum  $C_1 + \dots + C_l$  of not necessarily distinct constraints  $C_1, \dots, C_l$  selected from sets  $S_0, \dots, S_H$  and (25). By definitions of  $C_i$  with  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ , we have  $c(y_{v,h}, C_i) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  for each  $y$ -variable  $y_{v,h}$ . Since  $X$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^l C_i$  is an  $x$ -space constraint, we have  $c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{i=1}^l C_i) = 0$ . It follows that if there is  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  with  $c(y_{v,h}, C_i) = -1$ , then there is  $i' \in \{1, \dots, l\} \setminus \{i\}$  with  $c(y_{v,h}, C_{i'}) = 1$ . Since  $y_{v,h}$  occurs with a positive sign only in  $S_0^a$  with  $\text{head}(a) = v$  and in  $S_h^{a'}$  with  $\text{tail}(a') = v$ , we have  $C_{i'} \in \{S_0^a : \text{head}(a) = v\} \cup \{S_h^{a'} : \text{tail}(a') = v\}$ , i.e.,  $C_{i'} \in S_0 \cup S_h$ . Particularly, if there is  $I \subset \{1, \dots, l\}$ , such that  $c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{i \in I} C_i) = -z$  for a  $z > 0$ , then there is  $I' \subset \{1, \dots, l\} \setminus I$  such that  $c(y_{v,h}, \sum_{i' \in I'} C_{i'}) = z$ , where  $C_{i'} \in S_0 \cup S_h$  for each  $i' \in I'$ . Thus, as there is  $I := J^{(\leq k-1)} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  such that  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in I} S(j)) = -z_2$  by (49), there is also  $I' \subseteq J \setminus I$  with  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in I'} S(j)) \geq z_2$ , where  $S(j) \in \{S_0^a : \text{head}(a) = t\} \cup \{S_{l+1}^a : \text{tail}(a) = t\}$  for each  $j \in I'$ . From  $S(j) \in S_0 \cup S_{l+1}$  follows  $I' \in J_0 \cup J_{l+1}$ . Moreover,  $I' \subseteq J \setminus I$  implies  $I' \in (J_0 \setminus I) \cup (J_{l+1} \setminus I)$ . In other words, to eliminate  $y_{t,l+1}$  there must be a  $j_0 \in J_0 \setminus I = J_0$  with  $\text{head}(a_{j_0}) = t$ , or  $j_{l+1} \in J_{l+1} \setminus I$  with  $\text{tail}(a_{j_{l+1}}) = t$ . By construction of  $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  there is no such  $j_{l+1}$ . It follows that

$$c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J_0} S(j)) \geq z_2, \quad (50)$$

i.e., there is a  $j_0 \in J_0$  with  $\text{head}(a_{j_0}) = t = \text{head}(a_{j_l})$ .

As the last condition, line 12 requires a  $j_0$ , such that  $y_{t,l+1} \notin Y_{j_0}$ . If there is such  $j_0$  at iteration  $k$ , then we are done, so suppose not. Then  $|\{j_0 \in J_0 : y_{t,l+1} \in Y_{j_0}\}| = c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J_0} S(j))$  before iteration  $k$ . From (50) follows that  $|\{j_0 \in J_0 : y_{t,l+1} \in Y_{j_0}\}| \geq z_2$  before iteration  $k$ . Consider an iteration  $k'$  of the loop spanning lines 11–19. The algorithm adds  $y_{t,l+1}$  to a  $Y_{j_0}$  on line 15 or on line 19. In case of line 15 the algorithm also adds on line 14 the elements  $j_1, \dots, j_l$  to  $J^{(k')}$  such that  $(j_1, \dots, j_l) \in J_1 \times \dots \times J_l$  and  $a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  build a walk with  $l \leq H-1$  arcs and  $\text{head}(a_{j_l}) = t$ . In case of line 19 the algorithm also adds on line 18 the elements  $j_i, \dots, j_l$  with  $i \geq 2$  to  $J^{(k')}$  such that  $(j_i, \dots, j_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_l$  and  $a_{j_i}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  build a walk with  $l \leq H-1$  arcs and  $\text{head}(a_{j_l}) = t$ . It follows that if the algorithm adds  $y_{t,l+1}$  to a  $Y_{j_0}$  then it also adds the elements  $j_i, \dots, j_l$  with  $i \geq 1$  to  $J^{(k')}$  such that  $(j_i, \dots, j_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_l$  and  $a_{j_i}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  build a walk with  $l \leq H-1$  arcs and  $\text{head}(a_{j_l}) = t$ . Then  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(k')}} S(j)) \leq -1$  by (47). It follows  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)}} S(j)) \leq -|\{j_0 \in J_0 : y_{t,l+1} \in Y_{j_0}\}| \leq -z_2 < -z_1$ . It contradicts  $c(y_{t,l+1}, \sum_{j \in J^{(\leq k-1)}} S(j)) = -z_1$ .

(2b) Let  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \in \{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$ . By line 12,  $W := a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  and  $W' := a_{j_0}$  are two walks with a common node  $t := \text{head}(a_{j_0}) = \text{head}(a_{j_l})$ . The node  $t$  have two distinct incoming arcs, i.e.,  $|\delta_W^-(t) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(t)| \geq 2$  (Fig. 5). The reason is as follows: Both  $a_{j_0}$  and  $a_{j_l}$  have the same head node  $t$ . As  $j_0 \in J_0$  and  $j_l \in J_l$  with  $l \neq 0$ ,  $x_{a_{j_0}}$  and  $x_{a_{j_l}}$  are originated from  $S_0$  and  $S_l$ , respectively. By Remark 5,  $a_{j_0}$  is incident to  $r$ , whereas  $a_{j_l}$  with  $l \neq 0$  is not. Thus  $a_{j_0}$  and  $a_{j_l}$  have different tails. It follows that for



■ **Figure 6** The walk  $W = a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, a_{j_3}, a_{j_4}$  and a suffix  $W' = a_{j'_1}, a_{j'_2}, a_{j'_3}$  of  $W$ .

each  $I \in I_1, \dots, I_m$  the union of the sets  $\{j_0\}$  and  $I$  is a set of the second type.

We now need only to prove for each two  $I \neq I' \in \{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$  that  $I \cup I'$  is a set of the second type. Suppose, for contradiction,  $I \cup I'$  is not a set of second type. Let  $I := \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  and  $I' := \{j'_1, \dots, j'_q\}$ . By line 12,  $W := a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  and  $W' := a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_q}$  are two walks with a same end node  $t := \text{head}(a_{j_0})$ , i.e.,  $\text{head}(a_{j_l}) = \text{head}(a_{j'_q}) = t$ . Since  $I \cup I'$  is not a set of the second type,  $W$  and  $W'$  does not have any common node  $v$  with two distinct incoming arcs, i.e., with  $|\delta_W^-(v) \cup \delta_{W'}^-(v)| \geq 2$  (Fig. 6). Then  $W$  is a suffix of  $W'$  or vice versa, i.e.,  $W \sqsubset W'$  or  $W' \sqsubset W$ . Assume that  $I$  and  $I'$  are added to  $I_{j_0}$  at iterations  $k$  and  $k' < k$  of the loop spanning lines 11–19, respectively. By the condition of line 12, the second phase finds a set of minimum cardinality first, so we have  $|I'| \leq |I|$ . It follows that  $\ell_{W'} \leq \ell_W$  and thus  $W' \sqsubset W$ . Then there is an  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  such that  $a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_q} = a_{j_i}, \dots, a_{j_l}$ . Since  $I = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  is added to  $I_{j_0}$  at iteration  $k$ , by the condition of line 12, at the start of iteration  $k$ , we have  $y_{t,l+1} \notin Y_{j_0}$ . Then this is true for the iteration  $k' < k$ , too.

There are two cases: If  $\ell_{W'} = \ell_W$ , then  $a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_q} = a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_l}$ , i.e.,  $i = 1$ . Then at iteration  $k' < k$ , in line 15,  $y_{t,l+1}$  is added to  $Y_{j_0}$ , so after iteration  $k'$ , thus at the start of iteration  $k > k'$ , we have  $y_{t,l+1} \in Y_{j_0}$ , a contradiction.

Otherwise  $\ell_{W'} < \ell_W$ . Then  $a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_q} = a_{j_i}, \dots, a_{j_l}$  with  $i \geq 2$ . Recall that  $I \subseteq J^{(k)} \subseteq J \setminus J^{(\leq k-1)}$ , while  $I' \subseteq J^{(k')} \subseteq J \setminus J^{(\leq k'-1)}$ . Since  $k' < k$ , we have  $J \setminus J^{(\leq k-1)} \subseteq J \setminus J^{(\leq k'-1)}$ , and thus  $I \subseteq J \setminus J^{(\leq k'-1)}$ . Then the subset  $\{j_i, \dots, j_l\}$  of  $I = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$  is a subset of  $J \setminus J^{(\leq k'-1)}$ , too. Thus  $\{j_i, \dots, j_l\}$  was present in iteration  $k'$  as  $I' = \{j'_1, \dots, j'_q\}$  was. Then  $\{j_i, \dots, j_l\}$  would satisfy at iteration  $k' < k$  of loop 11, at iteration  $i$  of loop 16, the conditions in line 17, i.e.,  $(j_i, \dots, j_l) \in J_i \times \dots \times J_l$  and  $a_{j_i}, \dots, a_{j_l} = a_{j'_1}, \dots, a_{j'_q}$ . Then the variable  $y_{t,l+1}$  would be added to  $Y_{j_0}$  at iteration  $k' < k$ , in line 19, so after iteration  $k'$ , thus at the start of iteration  $k > k'$ ,  $y_{t,l+1} \in Y_{j_0}$ , a contradiction. ◀

#### 4.2.1 Results for the HSTP

► **Theorem 8.** *For the HSTP, the partial-ordering model is strictly stronger than the assignment model.*

**Proof.** From definitions of  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{HSTP}}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{HSTP}}$  follows  $\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{HSTP}} = \mathcal{A}_X \cap \{x: x \text{ meets (20)}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{HSTP}} = \mathcal{P}_X \cap \{x: x \text{ meets (20)}\}$ . Theorem 7 implies  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{HSTP}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^{\text{HSTP}}$ . Let  $(x^*, l^*, g^*)$  be an optimal solution, with objective value  $\nu^*$ , of the LP relaxation of (P-HSTP). From  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{HSTP}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^{\text{HSTP}}$  follows  $x^* \in \mathcal{A}_X^{\text{HSTP}}$ . Then, since both models have the same objective function, which depends only on  $x$  variables, the LP relaxation of (A-HSTP) also has a feasible solution (e.g.,  $x^*$ ) whose objective value is not greater than  $\nu^*$ . Hence  $\nu_{\text{P-HSTP}} \geq \nu_{\text{A-HSTP}}$  holds for all HSTP instances, so (P-HSTP) is stronger than (A-HSTP). Moreover, the computations (Sec. 5) have detected the HSTP instances for which the inequality is strict, so (A-HSTP) is not stronger than (P-HSTP). ◀

#### 4.2.2 Results for the HMSTP

► **Theorem 9.** *For the HMSTP, the partial-ordering model is strictly stronger than the assignment model.*

**Proof.** The HMSTP is a special case of the HSTP with  $R = V$ . Hence the assignment and partial-ordering based models for the HMSTP also take the form (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP), respectively. In Theorem 8, we have shown that  $\nu_{\text{P-HSTP}} \geq \nu_{\text{A-HSTP}}$ . Moreover, there are the HMSTP instances (Section 5) for which the inequality is strict. ◀

#### 4.2.3 Results for the STPRBH

The solution  $T$  of the STPRBH is a HT, such that  $\sum_{e \in E(T)} c_e \leq B$ , formulated [19] as:

$$\sum_{uv \in E} c_{u,v}(x_{u,v} + x_{v,u}) \leq B. \quad (51)$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{STPRBH}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{STPRBH}}$  denote the polytopes of the assignment and partial-ordering based LPs for the STPRBH, respectively. Then we have:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\text{STPRBH}} = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ (19)}; x \text{ satisfies (51)}\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}^{\text{STPRBH}} = \{(x, l, g) : (x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P} \text{ (11)}; x \text{ satisfies (51)}\}.$$

The goal of the STPRBH is to maximize  $\rho_r + \sum_{uv \in E} (x_{u,v} \rho_v + x_{v,u} \rho_u)$  [19], i.e., its objective function also depends only on  $x$  variables:

$$\max \left\{ \rho_r + \sum_{uv \in E} (x_{u,v} \rho_v + x_{v,u} \rho_u) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{STPRBH}}; x, y \text{ integral} \right\} \quad (\text{A-STPRBH})$$

$$\max \left\{ \rho_r + \sum_{uv \in E} (x_{u,v} \rho_v + x_{v,u} \rho_u) : (x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{STPRBH}}; x, l, g \text{ integr.} \right\} \quad (\text{P-STPRBH})$$

► **Theorem 10.** *For the STPRBH, the partial-ordering model is strictly stronger than the assignment model.*

**Proof.** From definitions of  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{STPRBH}}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{STPRBH}}$  follows  $\mathcal{A}_X^{\text{STPRBH}} = \mathcal{A}_X \cap \{x : x \text{ satisfies (51)}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{STPRBH}} = \mathcal{P}_X \cap \{x : x \text{ satisfies (51)}\}$ . Theorem 7 implies  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\text{STPRBH}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X^{\text{STPRBH}}$ . Analogous to Theorem 8, we can show that  $\nu_{\text{P-STPRBH}} \leq \nu_{\text{A-STPRBH}}$  holds for all STPRBH instances. Moreover, there are the STPRBH instances for which the inequality is strict [19]. ◀


Theorem 7 allows us to summarize the polyhedral results as follows:

► **Corollary 11.** *For the problems whose solution is a hop-constrained tree, a rooted tree that has bounded depth, the partial-ordering model is stronger than the assignment model if both models have the same objective function and constraints (i.e., depending only on common  $x$ -variables), except the hop-constrained tree constraints, namely  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{A}$  (19) and  $(x, l, g) \in \mathcal{P}$  (11).* ◀

## 5 Computational comparison


The assignment and partial-ordering models give (up to our knowledge) the best two state-of-the-art formulations [19, 29] for the STPRBH. Both models solve almost all 414 DIMACS instances [1] with up to 500 nodes and 12 500 edges, whereas previous models left 86 unsolved. A computational comparison of the two models for the STPRBH, using the DIMACS instances, have already been done in [19] and shows that the partial-ordering model outperforms the assignment model; it has better LP relaxation values and solves more instances. So our new experimental study concerns only the HSTP and HMSTP. To speed up algorithms for these problems, computational studies in the literature use problem-specific strengthening constraints and utilize reduction techniques that can eliminate up to 69% of the edges [2]. Since our experiments aim only to compare the two models, we did not use reduction techniques or strengthening constraints.

To solve the models, we used the Gurobi 6.5.1 single-threadedly on the Intel Xeon E5-2640 2.60GHz system running Ubuntu 18.04. We performed our tests on the benchmark instances used in the literature (e.g. [2, 16]) for the HMSTP, namely Euclidean (TC, TE) and random (TR) complete graphs with 21, 41, 61, 81 nodes and up to 3240 edges. For simplicity, they are referred to as 20, 40, 60, 80. The last node in set  $V = \{1, \dots, |V|\}$  is used as the root, i.e.,  $r = |V|$ . Based on each of these HMSTP instances, we also created an HSTP instance with  $R \neq V$ , namely  $R = \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{|V|}{2} \rfloor\} \cup \{r\}$ , i.e., the first  $\lfloor \frac{|V|}{2} \rfloor$  nodes and the root  $r = |V|$  are terminals. We tested nine hop parameters  $H = 2, \dots, 10$ . Recall that the




■ **Figure 7** (a) Number of instances with strict inequality  $\nu_{\text{P-HSTP}} > \nu_{\text{A-HSTP}}$  depending on  $H$ ; (b) Average LP gaps of (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) over 216 instances depending on  $(|V|, H)$





**Figure 8** Number of the unsolved (a) HMSTP, (b) HSTP instances depending on  $(|V|, H)$



**Figure 9** Average run times of (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) for the (a) HMSTP, (b) HSTP instances depending on  $(|V|, H)$ ; (c) Comparison of the two models with Akgün-Tansel model [2]

HMSTP instances are HSTP instances with  $R = V$ , so we get for each of the TC, TE, TR graphs and each  $H = 2, \dots, 10$ , two HSTP instances, one with  $R = V$  and one with  $R \neq V$ ; this leads to a total of 216 instances.

The evaluations (for detailed numbers, see the appendix) of LP relaxations show that the inequality  $\nu_{\text{P-HSTP}} \geq \nu_{\text{A-HSTP}}$  holds for all 216 instances. Figure 7a shows for each  $H = 2, \dots, 10$  the number of instances for which the inequality is strict, i.e., the LP relaxation value of (P-HSTP) is greater than that of (A-HSTP). The strict inequality holds mostly for small hop limits, e.g., for 23 of 24 instances with  $H = 2$  but only for 2 of 24 instances with  $H = 10$ . It is also interesting to compare the LP gaps of the two models, i.e., the gap between optimal integer value  $Opt$  and the LP relaxation value. If  $Opt$  could not be computed, we used the value  $\overline{Opt}$  of the best integer solution found by the two models. Figure 7b shows the average LP gaps of the two models over 216 instances depending on  $(|V|, H)$ , where the LP gap of model  $M$  is given by  $\frac{Opt - \nu_M}{Opt}$ . The figure indicates that the gaps become larger as the number  $|V|$  of nodes increases and the hop limit  $H$  decreases. Moreover, (P-HSTP) has smaller gaps than (A-HSTP) for small hop limits, where the small hop limits significantly affect the objective value.

To compute the optimal integer values, we ran (A-HSTP) and (P-HSTP) with a time limit of 10 hours. Figure 8 shows the number of unsolved HMSTP (Fig. 8a) and HSTP (Fig. 8b) instances, while Figure 9 shows the average run times in seconds for the HMSTP (Fig. 9a) and HSTP (Fig. 9b) instances in dependency of  $(|V|, H)$ . Model (A-HSTP) solves 100 instances within a few seconds and needs several minutes for 37 instances and hours for 13 instances. It misses solving the remaining 66 instances. Model (P-HSTP) outperforms (A-HSTP) and solves 156 instances within a few seconds and needs some minutes for 27 instances and hours for 7 instances. The model solves 40 instances more than (A-HSTP). We also compared the two models with another node-oriented state-of-the-art model suggested by Akgün-Tansel [2], based on MTZ constraints. Computational results, taken from [2], involve nine TC, TE, TR graphs with up to 60 nodes, 1830 edges, and hop limits 3–5 for the HMSTP. The comparison of average run times of the three models (Fig. 9c), depending on  $(|V|, H)$ , shows that the partial-ordering model outperforms the other two.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we provided polyhedral results for two node-originated models, called assignment and partial-ordering based models for the hop-constrained Steiner tree problems HSTP, HMSTP, and STPRBH. We showed that the partial-ordering model is strictly stronger than the assignment model for these problems. Corollary 11 summarizes these polyhedral results for the problems whose solution is a hop-constrained tree, i.e., a rooted tree with bounded depth. Moreover, in Theorem 2, we showed that the partial-ordering based model implies an exponential-sized set of hop-constrained path constraints, which does not hold

for the assignment model. Furthermore, the computational results in the literature and this work show for the problems HSTP, HMSTP, and STPRBH that the partial-ordering based model outperforms the assignment model in practice, too; it has a smaller LP gap and solves more instances.

---

## References

---

- 1 DIMACS: 11th DIMACS implementation challenge in collaboration with ICERM: Steiner tree problems, 2014. URL: <http://dimacs11.zib.de/downloads.html>.
- 2 İ. Akgün and B. Ç. Tansel. New formulations of the hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem via miller-tucker-zemlin constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 212(2):263–276, 2011.
- 3 A. Balakrishnan and K. Altinkemer. Using a hop-constrained model to generate alternative communication network design. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, 4(2):192–205, 1992.
- 4 A.M. Costa, J.-F. Cordeau, and G. Laporte. Fast heuristics for the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 190(1):68 – 78, 2008.
- 5 A.M. Costa, J.-F. Cordeau, and G. Laporte. Models and branch-and-cut algorithms for the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop constraints. *Networks*, 53:141–159, 03 2009.
- 6 G. Dahl. The 2-hop spanning tree problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 23:21–26, 1998.
- 7 G. Dahl, L. Gouveia, and C. Requejo. On formulations and methods for the hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem. In *Handbook of Optimization in Telecommunications*, pages 493–515. Springer, 2006.
- 8 M. Fernandes, L. Gouveia, and S. Voß. Determining hop-constrained spanning trees with repetitive heuristics. *Journal of Telecommunications and Information Technology*, pages 16–22, 2007.
- 9 Z.H. Fu and J.K. Hao. Breakout local search for the Steiner tree problem with revenue, budget and hop constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 232(1):209–220, 2014.
- 10 Z.H. Fu and J.K. Hao. Dynamic programming driven memetic search for the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget, and hop constraints. *INFORMS J. on Computing*, 27(2):221–237, May 2015.
- 11 M.R. Garey, R.L. Graham, and D.S. Johnson. The complexity of computing Steiner minimal trees. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 32(4):835–859, 1977.
- 12 L. Gouveia. Using the miller-tucker-zemlin constraints to formulate a minimal spanning tree problem with hop constraints. *Computers & Operations Research*, 22(9):959 – 970, 1995.
- 13 L. Gouveia. Multicommodity flow models for spanning trees with hop constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 95(1):178–190, November 1996.
- 14 L. Gouveia. Using variable redefinition for computing lower bounds for minimum spanning and steiner trees with hop constraints. *INFORMS J. on Computing*, 10(2):180–188, May 1998.
- 15 L. Gouveia, A. Paías, and D. Sharma. Restricted dynamic programming based neighborhoods for the hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 17:23–37, 2011.
- 16 L. Gouveia and C. Requejo. A new lagrangean relaxation approach for the hop-constrained minimum spanning tree problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 132:539–552, 2001.
- 17 L. Gouveia, L. Simonetti, and E. Uchoa. Modeling hop-constrained and diameter-constrained minimum spanning tree problems as steiner tree problems over layered graphs. *Mathematical Programming*, 128:123–148, 2011.
- 18 F. K. Hwang and D. S. Richards. Steiner tree problems. *Networks*, 22(1):55–89, 1992.
- 19 A. Jabrayilov and P. Mutzel. A new integer linear program for the steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop constraints. In *Proceedings of the Meeting on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX 2019)*, pages 107–116. SIAM, 2019.
- 20 H. Kerivin and A. R. Mahjoub. Design of survivable networks: A survey. *Networks: An International Journal*, 46(1):1–21, 2005.
- 21 J. B. Kruskal. On the Shortest Spanning Subtree of a Graph and the Traveling Salesman Problem. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 7, 1956.
- 22 S.B. Layeb, I. Hajri, and M. Haouari. Solving the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop constraints to optimality. *5th International Conference on Modeling, Simulation and Applied Optimization (ICMSAO)*, pages 1–4, 2013.
- 23 P. Manyem and M. Stallmann. Some approximation results in multicasting. Technical report, USA, 1996.
- 24 C. E. Miller, A. W. Tucker, and R. A. Zemlin. Integer programming formulation of traveling salesman problems. *J. ACM*, 7(4):326–329, October 1960.
- 25 M. S. R. Monteiro, D. B. M. M. Fontes, and F. A. C. C. Fontes. Hop-constrained tree-shaped networks. In *Examining Robustness and Vulnerability of Networked Systems*, volume 37, pages 192–208. IOS, 2014.
- 26 R. C. Prim. Shortest connection networks and some generalizations. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 36(6):1389–1401, 1957.

- 27 A. Schrijver. *Theory of linear and integer programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- 28 M. Sinnl. Branch-and-price for the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop constraints. *Master's thesis, Vienna University of Technology*, 2011.
- 29 M. Sinnl and I. Ljubić. A node-based layered graph approach for the Steiner tree problem with revenues, budget and hop-constraints. *Math. Program. Comput.*, 8(4):461–490, 2016.
- 30 S. Voß. The steiner tree problem with hop constraints. *Annals OR*, 86:321–345, 1999.
- 31 P. Winter. Steiner problem in networks: a survey. *Networks*, 17(2):129–167, 1987.
- 32 K. Woolston and S. Albin. The design of centralized networks with reliability and availability constraints. *Computers & Operations Research*, 15(3):207–217, 1988.

## **A Computational results of the assignment and partial-ordering based models**

Table 1 shows the results of the assignment model (A-HSTP) and partial-ordering based model (P-HSTP) for the HMSTP and HSTP (with  $R \neq V$ ) instances. The first two columns show the evaluated graphs and hop limits. The next six columns, namely columns 3–8, show the results for the 108 HMSTP instances, while the last six columns show the relevant results for the 108 HSTP (with  $R \neq V$ ) instances. Columns 3-5 show the following results omitted by (A-HSTP): Column 3 contains corresponding LP relaxation values. If the optimal integer value of an instance is found, then Column 4 contains this value; otherwise, it includes an interval  $[lb - ub]$ , where  $lb$  and  $ub$  are the lower and upper bounds omitted by IP solver within the time limits of 10 hours. Column 5 includes the times required to find the optimal integer values. Similarly, columns 6-8 show the relevant results omitted by (P-HSTP).

# 23:18 On the hop-constrained Steiner tree problems

		HMSTP instances ( $R = V$ )						HSTP instances ( $R \neq V$ )					
Graph	H	(A-HSTP)			(P-HSTP)			(A-HSTP)			(P-HSTP)		
		LP	IP	Time[s]	LP	IP	Time[s]	LP	IP	Time[s]	LP	IP	Time[s]
TC20	2	311.33	384	0	318.0	384	0	207.36	249	0	209.78	249	0
	3	305.5	340	2	307.0	340	0	207.06	227	0	207.19	227	0
	4	302.75	318	0	304.0	318	0	207.0	219	0	207.0	219	0
	5	302.0	312	0	302.86	312	0	207.0	219	0	207.0	219	0
	6	302.0	302	0	302.0	302	0	207.0	219	0	207.0	219	0
	7	302.0	302	0	302.0	302	0	207.0	219	0	207.0	219	0
	8	302.0	302	0	302.0	302	0	207.0	219	1	207.0	219	0
	9	302.0	302	0	302.0	302	0	207.0	219	0	207.0	219	0
	10	302.0	302	0	302.0	302	0	207.0	219	1	207.0	219	0
	TC40	2	472.67	747	0	479.0	747	0	284.0	431	0	286.74	431
3		472.0	609	733	472.4	609	2	283.0	345	93	283.0	345	1
4		472.0	548	1005	472.0	548	5	281.5	317	5	281.5	317	1
5		472.0	522	8563	472.0	522	6	281.5	313	6	281.5	313	1
6		472.0	498	89	472.0	498	4	281.5	310	9	281.5	310	2
7		472.0	490	78	472.0	490	2	281.5	306	17	281.5	306	2
8		472.0	488	33	472.0	488	2	281.5	302	11	281.5	302	1
9		472.0	484	19	472.0	484	1	281.5	300	6	281.5	300	1
10		472.0	482	34	472.0	482	2	281.5	300	10	281.5	300	1
TC60		2	665.33	1083	1	678.27	1083	0	417.06	635	1	426.48	635
	3	658.67	[821-866]	36000	661.87	866	13	408.99	528	4983	411.51	528	26
	4	658.4	[733-785]	36000	659.0	781	71	407.99	487	19940	408.73	487	28
	5	658.27	[711-734]	36000	658.8	734	40	407.67	458	1235	407.93	458	49
	6	658.19	[692-718]	36000	658.67	712	56	407.13	440	195	407.13	440	6
	7	658.0	692	30317	658.31	692	15	406.73	432	36	406.73	432	5
	8	658.0	[670-682]	36000	658.0	682	9	406.73	432	19	406.73	432	6
	9	658.0	676	1209	658.0	676	5	406.73	432	110	406.73	432	13
	10	658.0	672	44	658.0	672	4	406.73	432	43	406.73	432	7
	TC80	2	820.08	1305	1	832.67	1305	0	492.84	785	3	498.89	785
3		816.0	[958-1083]	36000	816.57	1072	312	488.62	[593-646]	36000	490.8	643	161
4		816.0	[856-990]	36000	816.0	981	9055	487.34	[547-605]	36000	488.59	587	451
5		816.0	[842-926]	36000	816.0	922	16566	487.05	[536-564]	36000	487.54	560	487
6		816.0	[828-912]	36000	816.0	884	3493	486.8	[523-544]	36000	487.0	544	455
7		816.0	[829-872]	36000	816.0	862	1685	486.4	[520-528]	36000	486.5	528	139
8		816.0	[825-846]	36000	816.0	846	264	486.0	518	3425	486.0	518	91
9		816.0	[821-838]	36000	816.0	838	40	486.0	512	129	486.0	512	30
10		816.0	[820-834]	36000	816.0	834	40	486.0	510	201	486.0	510	18
TE20		2	287.14	561	0	292.83	561	0	197.0	362	0	199.3	362
	3	284.0	449	71	284.0	449	1	196.0	290	43	196.0	290	1
	4	284.0	385	972	284.0	385	7	196.0	268	35	196.0	268	3
	5	284.0	366	1250	284.0	366	16	196.0	247	15	196.0	247	1
	6	284.0	355	780	284.0	355	36	196.0	239	14	196.0	239	2
	7	284.0	344	714	284.0	344	25	196.0	236	6	196.0	236	2
	8	284.0	336	80	284.0	336	9	196.0	236	9	196.0	236	2
	9	284.0	332	391	284.0	332	11	196.0	236	13	196.0	236	3
	10	284.0	330	160	284.0	330	7	196.0	236	40	196.0	236	4
	TE40	2	488.47	915	0	498.4	915	0	282.14	561	0	288.17	561
3		481.13	708	12070	484.67	708	25	279.0	449	35030	279.0	449	113
4		480.64	[542-630]	36000	481.83	627	176	279.0	[364-385]	36000	279.0	385	500
5		480.29	[533-595]	36000	481.17	590	859	279.0	[338-366]	36000	279.0	366	1098
6		480.0	[511-572]	36000	480.44	565	675	279.0	[335-358]	36000	279.0	355	1164
7		480.0	[506-550]	36000	480.0	544	3095	279.0	[325-345]	36000	279.0	344	860
8		480.0	[503-536]	36000	480.0	536	5060	279.0	[334-336]	36000	279.0	336	1490
9		480.0	[503-529]	36000	480.0	528	1031	279.0	332	10858	279.0	332	2116
10		480.0	[502-520]	36000	480.0	520	2376	279.0	[325-330]	36000	279.0	330	391
TE60		2	970.4	2108	1	987.67	2108	0	635.93	1348	1	641.58	1348
	3	955.39	[1224-1550]	36000	961.81	1525	483	633.9	[782-1011]	36000	635.77	1004	3279
	4	951.22	[1037-1351]	36000	953.67	1336	18680	633.3	[735-907]	36000	634.65	[846-901]	36000
	5	950.0	[1010-1233]	36000	951.08	[1202-1226]	36000	632.63	[720-842]	36000	633.4	[785-835]	36000
	6	950.0	[993-1159]	36000	950.0	[1096-1154]	36000	632.4	[710-816]	36000	632.4	[751-802]	36000
	7	950.0	[979-1126]	36000	950.0	[1046-1107]	36000	632.4	[700-801]	36000	632.4	[738-784]	36000
	8	950.0	[978-1105]	36000	950.0	[1026-1072]	36000	632.4	[700-774]	36000	632.4	[738-760]	36000
	9	950.0	[978-1076]	36000	950.0	[1012-1053]	36000	632.4	[706-748]	36000	632.4	745	32059
	10	950.0	[981-1101]	36000	950.0	[1008-1036]	36000	632.4	[703-731]	36000	632.4	731	7471
	TE80	2	1090.6	2547	1	1104.0	2547	1	717.56	1600	3	726.26	1600
3		1077.53	[1327-1868]	36000	1086.39	1806	19575	714.37	[857-1219]	36000	717.08	[1084-1172]	36000
4		1074.23	[1195-1637]	36000	1079.0	[1476-1573]	36000	713.0	[793-1079]	36000	714.14	[885-1051]	36000
5		1072.53	[1144-1487]	36000	1075.3	[1322-1455]	36000	713.0	[768-1011]	36000	713.0	[843-964]	36000
6		1072.0	[1134-1402]	36000	1072.73	[1241-1348]	36000	713.0	[762-979]	36000	713.0	[807-932]	36000
7		1072.0	[1124-1335]	36000	1072.0	[1201-1310]	36000	713.0	[766-922]	36000	713.0	[796-897]	36000
8		1072.0	[1118-1345]	36000	1072.0	[1171-1274]	36000	713.0	[771-916]	36000	713.0	[783-873]	36000
9		1072.0	[1121-1334]	36000	1072.0	[1159-1242]	36000	713.0	[761-866]	36000	713.0	[786-835]	36000
10		1072.0	[1109-1314]	36000	1072.0	[1150-1226]	36000	713.0	[770-876]	36000	713.0	[775-824]	36000
TR20		2	145.5	227	0	157.33	227	0	103.0	110	0	103.0	110
	3	138.67	168	0	140.0	168	0	102.58	110	0	102.67	110	0
	4	137.0	146	0	138.14	146	0	102.5	110	0	102.5	110	0
	5	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	6	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	7	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	8	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	9	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	10	137.0	137	0	137.0	137	0	102.0	102	0	102.0	102	0
	TR40	2	132.85	296	0	139.42	296	0	71.5	155	0	75.93	155
3		127.18	176	186	129.0	176	0	68.62	99	15	69.42	99	1
4		126.33	149	100	127.06	149	0	68.2	85	17	68.58	85	1
5		126.12	139	38	126.5	139	1	68.0	75	1	68.2	75	0
6		126.0	130	2	126.0	130	0	68.0	70	1	68.0	70	0
7		126.0	127	1	126.0	127	0	68.0	69	1	68.0	69	0
8		126.0	127	2	126.0	127	0	68.0	69	1	68.0	69	0
9		126.0	127	2	126.0	127	1	68.0	69	1	68.0	69	0
10		126.0	127	2	126.0	127	0	68.0	69	1	68.0	69	0
TR60		2	145.96	452	1	155.25	452	0	93.54	268	1	98.5	268
	3	139.13	[228-256]	36000	142.17	256	7	90.7	[144-153]	36000	92.6	153	9
	4	137.65	[166-193]	360									