

# A polyhedral study on chance constrained program with random right-hand side

Ming Zhao<sup>1</sup> · Kai Huang<sup>2</sup> · Bo Zeng<sup>3</sup>

Received: 29 April 2016 / Accepted: 15 December 2016 / Published online: 31 December 2016  
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg and Mathematical Optimization Society 2016

**Abstract** The essential structure of the mixed-integer programming formulation for chance-constrained program (CCP) is the intersection of multiple mixing sets with a 0–1 knapsack. To improve our computational capacity on CCP, an underlying substructure, the (single) mixing set with a 0–1 knapsack, has received substantial attentions recently. In this study, we consider a CCP problem with stochastic right-hand side under a finite discrete distribution. We first present a family of strong inequalities that subsumes known facet-defining ones for that single mixing set. Due to the flexibility of our generalized inequalities, we develop a new separation heuristic that has a complexity much less than existing one and guarantees generated cutting planes are facet-defining for the polyhedron of CCP. Then, we study lifting and superadditive lifting on knapsack cover inequalities, and provide an implementable procedure on deriving another family of strong inequalities for the single mixing set. Finally, different from the traditional approach that aggregates original constraints to investigate polyhedral implications due to their interactions, we propose a novel blending procedure

---

Bo Zeng is partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant CMMI-1235135. Kai Huang has been supported by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

---

✉ Bo Zeng  
bzeng@pitt.edu

Ming Zhao  
mzhao@bauer.uh.edu

Kai Huang  
khuang@mcmaster.ca

<sup>1</sup> University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA

<sup>2</sup> McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

<sup>3</sup> University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

ture that produces strong valid inequalities for CCP by integrating those derived from individual mixing sets. We show that, under certain conditions, they are the first type of facet-defining inequalities describing intersection of multiple mixing sets, and design an efficient separation heuristic for implementation. In the computational experiments, we perform a systematic study and illustrate the efficiency of the proposed inequalities on solving chance constrained static probabilistic lot-sizing problems.

**Keywords** Mixed-integer programming · Chance constraints · Mixing set · Blending · Knapsack · Lifting

**Mathematics Subject Classification** 90C11 · 90C15

## 1 Introduction

Chance constraints appear in optimization formulations of many important applications that model service levels, risk measures, or reliability requirements. When the randomness occurs only at the right-hand side vector, the chance-constrained program with joint probabilistic constraints (CCP) can be formulated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \\ & \mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{h}(\omega)\} \geq 1 - \tau \\ & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{Z}^{m_2}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{X}$  is a polyhedron,  $d$  and  $m$  are positive integers with  $m = m_1 + m_2$  for other two positive integers  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ ,  $\omega$  is an element of an underlying probability space  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{x}$  is an  $m$ -dimensional decision variable,  $\mathbf{A}$  is a  $d \times m$  matrix,  $\mathbf{h}(\omega)$  is a  $d$ -dimensional column random vector,  $\mathbf{c}$  is an  $m$ -dimensional cost vector, and  $\tau$  is a threshold probability with  $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$ . The major challenge in solving the CCP is that the feasible region may not be represented by a convex (or quasiconvex) function and is typically difficult to evaluate. For continuously distributed random variables, many researches focus on the identification of conditions under which the feasible set defined by the chance constraint is convex. Prékopa [33] shows that the feasible region can be represented by quasiconvex functions if  $\mathbf{h}$  is quasiconvex and  $\omega$  has a logconcave probability distribution. Henrion [16] and Henrion and Strugarek [18] show that a joint chance constraint in certain forms defines a convex set. Hanasusanto et al. [15] study the ambiguous joint chance constrained program and provide tight conditions when it is conic representable. Efficient methods for computing the gradients and the value of multivariate continuous distributions are proposed, see [17, 41, 42] for Gaussian, Student's and lognormal distributions. A widely applied approach is approximating the chance constraint with a more tractable function if the convexity of the feasible region is not verifiable. Many approximations have been proposed, e.g., the quadratic approximation [4], the conditional value-at-risk approximation [35], the Bernstein approximation [31] and Monte Carlo simulations [8, 20]. Luedtke et al. [29] propose

a sample approximation approach to substitute the underlying continuous distribution by a finite sample and reformulate it as a mixed-integer programming problem. Thus, algorithms based on cutting planes for mixed-integer reformulations are available in [22,28,29]. Recently, the cutting plan approach is extended to multi-stage chance-constrained programs and multivariate risk constraints, e.g., valid inequalities for the deterministic equivalent formulation in [48], strong feasibility and optimality cuts for decomposition algorithms in [27,28,45,47], and cuts generation for multivariate conditional value-at-risk or second-order stochastic dominance in [23]. For joint chance constraints with discrete distribution, a disjunctive programming reformulation for CCP is studied in [38] by using the concept of p-level efficient points (pLEPs) [32]. A bundle method for energy problem is proposed by [44] and combined with pLEPs for better performance [40]. Dentcheva et al. [9] use pLEPs to obtain various reformulations and derive valid bounds for the objective value. Beraldi and Ruszczyński [6] propose a branch-and-bound algorithm based on the enumeration of pLEPs, see also [36]. Lejeune and Noyan [25] generate pLEPs by solving a series of increasingly tighter outer approximations with several other algorithmic techniques. Lejeune [24] introduces Boolean reformulation framework, which is extended recently for nonlinear chance constraints [26]. Another study on nonlinear chance constraints is in [2] where optimality conditions are studied and approximation algorithms have been developed. Kogan and Lejeune [21] propose a Boolean method to solve CCP where the elements of the multirow random technology matrix follow a joint probability distribution. Many applications on the chance-constrained program are also studied in literature, such as probabilistic lot-sizing [6,48], health care [5,39], probabilistic set covering [7,37], hydro reservoir management [43] and logistic [10].

In this paper, we consider a mixed-integer programming (MIP) reformulation of chance-constrained program. Suppose  $\Omega$  has finitely many realizations, i.e.,  $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$  and  $\pi_i$  is the probability associated with  $\omega_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $h_{ri}$  be the  $r$ -th component of  $\mathbf{h}(\omega_i)$ . As described in [22,29], we can assume  $h_{ri} \geq 0$  without loss of generality. Throughout, we denote  $[i, j] \equiv \{r \in \mathbb{Z} : i \leq r \leq j\}$ . A deterministic equivalent formulation of the chance-constrained program is (see also [1,22,29])

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min \quad & \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Ax} \\
 & y_r \geq h_{ri}(1 - z_i) \quad \forall r \in [1, d], i \in [1, n] \tag{1} \\
 & \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau \\
 & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \times \mathbb{Z}^{m_2} \\
 & \mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d \tag{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_i = 0$  indicates that  $\mathbf{y} \geq h(\omega)$  is satisfied when  $\omega = \omega_i$  and  $z_i = 1$  otherwise. The constraints (1) and (2) define the key substructure of this MIP reformulation, i.e., the polyhedron of CCP

$$\mathcal{Q} = \left\{ (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d \times \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, y_r \geq h_{ri}(1 - z_i), r \in [1, d], i \in [1, n] \right\}.$$

For  $r \in [1, d]$ , we have a mixing set with 0–1 knapsack

$$\mathcal{Q}_r = \left\{ (y_r, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, y_r \geq h_{ri}(1 - z_i), i \in [1, n] \right\}.$$

By dropping the index  $r$ , we redefine the mixing set with 0–1 knapsack as

$$\mathcal{K} = \left\{ (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, y \geq h_i(1 - z_i), i \in [1, n] \right\}.$$

Importantly, the study of the polyhedron of CCP is fundamental for solving chance-constrained programs efficiently. Most literature focuses on its substructure the set  $\mathcal{K}$ . Since our contributions include studies on the set  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ , we give literature review on both sets in following subsections.

### 1.1 Mixing set with 0–1 knapsack

Observe that the set  $\mathcal{K}$  consists of a mixing set, introduced by Günlük and Pochet [14] on general integer variables. The mixing set was extensively studied in varying degrees of generality by many authors in [3, 13, 30, 34, 49, 50] and its convex hull can be described by the so-called star inequalities in [3].

Without loss of generality, we can assume  $h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \dots \geq h_n \geq 0$  in the set  $\mathcal{K}$ . As in [1, 22, 29], we introduce two parameters  $\nu$  and  $p$ . The parameter  $\nu$  is defined such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \pi_i \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\nu+1} \pi_i > \tau.$$

As noted by [29], we have  $y \geq h_{\nu+1}$  and the set  $\mathcal{K}$  can be strengthened as follows

$$\left\{ (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0, 1\}^{\nu} : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, y + (h_i - h_{\nu+1})z_i \geq h_i, i \in [1, \nu] \right\}. \tag{3}$$

Indeed, by using  $y + (h_i - h_{\nu+1})z_i \geq h_i$  in (3) to replace (1), we obtain a new formulation of CCP with a tighter LP relaxation and less constraints. Let  $\{(1), \langle 2 \rangle, \dots, \langle n \rangle\}$  be a permutation of set  $[1, n]$  with

$$\pi_{\langle 1 \rangle} \leq \pi_{\langle 2 \rangle} \leq \dots \leq \pi_{\langle n \rangle}.$$

The parameter  $p$  is defined such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \pi_{\langle i \rangle} \leq \tau \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \pi_{\langle i \rangle} > \tau.$$

Note that in the case of equal probabilities, i.e.,  $\pi_i = 1/n \forall i \in [1, n]$ , the knapsack constraint reduces to the following cardinality constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n z_i \leq p$$

and  $p = v$ . Luedtke et al. [29] applied the star inequality proposed in [3] to the *strengthened star inequality* (which is stated as Theorem 1 in [22])

$$y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} \geq h_{t_1} \quad \forall T = \{t_1, \dots, t_a\} \subseteq [1, v] \tag{4}$$

where  $t_1 < \dots < t_a$  and  $h_{t_{a+1}} = h_{v+1}$ , and showed that it is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$  when  $t_1 = 1$ . This result was generalized in [1] and [22] where more facet-defining inequalities were introduced for mixing set with either cardinality constraint or general knapsack. Luedtke et al. [29] and Küçükyavuz [22] also performed numerical studies for their proposed inequalities to evaluate the computational impact on solving lot-sizing based CCP instances.

### 1.2 Polyhedron of CCP

The polyhedron of CCP, i.e.,  $\mathcal{Q}$ , was initially studied in [22]. When the 0–1 knapsack in the set  $\mathcal{Q}$  is just a cardinality constraint, the author in [22] developed so-called TL inequalities and showed that they are facet-defining for both  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$ . We actually find that this result could be significantly generalized to any facet-defining inequalities as follows.

**Proposition 1** (i) *If an inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}_r$  for some  $r \in [1, d]$ , then the inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ ; moreover, (ii) if an inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\cap_{r \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{Q}_r$  for a set  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [1, d]$ , then the inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .*

*Proof* We omit the proof since it is the same as the last paragraph of the proof for Theorem 4 in [22]. □

Clearly, this proposition implies that the study of the single set  $\mathcal{K}$  (i.e., a single  $\mathcal{Q}_r$ ) provides a crucial polyhedral description to the set  $\mathcal{Q}$ . However, it can only bring us inequalities with at most one nonzero coefficient of  $y_r$  for some  $r \in [1, d]$ . As illustrated by a numerical example in [22], non-trivial inequalities for the polyhedron of CCP with  $d = 2$ , which are not obtainable from its single mixing subset  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  or  $\mathcal{Q}_2$ , can be obtained by studying an aggregation of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_2$ . Specifically, it involves selecting two scalars  $\beta_1, \beta_2$ , setting  $y = \beta_1 y_1 + \beta_2 y_2$ , and obtaining a new set

$$\mathcal{Q}' = \left\{ (y, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, y \geq (\beta_1 h_{1i} + \beta_2 h_{2i})(1 - z_i) \forall i \in [1, n] \right\}.$$

Then, all the results on the set  $\mathcal{K}$  can be readily applied to  $\mathcal{Q}'$ . Nevertheless, no analytical study has been done and the effectiveness of this combining approach is either theoretically or computationally unknown. For example, we do not know if this approach will derive any facet-defining inequalities of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

### 1.3 Main contributions and outline

Our main contributions are in both theory and computation, and presented in each of the following sections in details. Here we summarize our contributions as follows,

- In Sect. 2, we derive a new family of inequalities for the mixing set with general 0–1 knapsack, which subsumes all known facet-defining inequalities proposed in [1, 22, 29] as special cases. Due to the flexibility of our generalized inequalities, we are able to develop a new separation heuristic different from those in [1, 22], which has a much less complexity and is guaranteed to identify the strongest (i.e., facet-defining) cutting planes for the polyhedron of CCP.
- In Sect. 3, we present another large family of inequalities by performing lifting and superadditive lifting procedures on cover inequalities of 0–1 knapsack. Noting that all existing valid inequalities (including our results in Sect. 2) are based on star inequalities for the basic mixing set, our results are the first type of valid inequalities with a different structure. Unlike a characterization on parameters of valid inequalities derived in [1] for  $\mathcal{K}$ , our inequalities are explicit and constructive, which provide an implementable procedure to identify strong inequalities to strengthen the polyhedral description and to improve our solution capacity of CCP.
- In Sect. 4, we introduce a novel blending approach to study  $\mathcal{Q}$  such that, instead of combining original formulation, we are blending facet-defining inequalities of  $\mathcal{Q}_r$  for  $r \in [1, d]$ . Especially, we are able to show when the resulting inequalities are facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ . To the best of our knowledge, they are the first group of facet-defining inequalities capturing interactions among multiple mixing sets. We also develop a very effective separation heuristic that can find violated facet-defining blending inequalities.
- In Sect. 5, we fully test the *strengthened star inequality*, TL inequalities (as described in [22]) and our three families of inequalities. We show that our inequalities outperform other known inequalities in the literature and substantially improve a commercial solver's ability to solve large static probabilistic lot-sizing problems.

The last section concludes the paper.

## 2 Strong inequalities derived from mixing set

On the top of the classical mixing inequality, a family of strong inequalities was developed in [29] for the set  $\mathcal{K}$  when the knapsack constraint was replaced by a cardinality constraint. Then, Küçükyavuz [22] generalized that result for the cardinality constrained mixing set and extended those inequalities as valid ones for  $\mathcal{K}$ . Recently, Abdi et al. [1] provided a characterization of valid inequalities for  $\mathcal{K}$ , and explicitly developed a set of facet-defining inequalities for  $\mathcal{K}$  under some special conditions.

In the following, we present a large family of strong inequalities for  $\mathcal{K}$ , and derive sufficient conditions under which our proposed inequalities are facet-defining. In order to understand the connections to existing research on  $\mathcal{K}$ , we provide a detailed analysis and numerical examples to show that explicit strong inequalities or facet-defining inequalities developed in [1,22] are either dominated or subsumed by ours. Due to the flexibility of our inequalities, we can further present a separation heuristic which can identify potential facet-defining inequalities with a computational complexity less than those of [1,22].

**Theorem 1** For  $m \in [1, v]$  and  $q \in [0, p - m]$ , we define

- a set  $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_a\} \subseteq [1, m]$  with  $t_1 < \dots < t_a$ ;
- a set  $L$  with a permutation  $\Pi_L = \{l_1, \dots, l_q\}$ ;
- a sequence of integers  $s_j \in [0, v - m + 1]$  such that  $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_q \leq s_{q+1} = v - m + 1$ .

If  $L \subseteq [m + s_1 + 1, n]$  with  $l_j \geq m + \min\{1 + s_j, s_{j+1}\}$  and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} > \tau \quad \forall j \in [1, q]$$

where  $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\}$  is a permutation of  $L$  with  $\pi_{k_1} \geq \dots \geq \pi_{k_q}$ , we have the following inequality

$$y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \geq h_{t_1} \tag{5}$$

that is valid for  $\mathcal{K}$ , where  $t_{a+1} = m + s_1$  and

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} h_{m+s_1} - h_{m+s_2} & j = 1 \\ \max \left\{ \delta_{j-1}, h_{m+s_1} - h_{m+s_{j+1}} - \sum_{i \in [1, j-1] \text{ and } l_i \geq m + \min\{1+s_j, s_{j+1}\}} \delta_i \right\} & j \in [2, q]. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

*Proof* It is clear that if  $y \geq h_{t_1}$ , the inequality (5) is trivially satisfied. If  $y \geq h_{t_i}$  for some  $i = 2, \dots, a + 1$  and  $y < h_{t_j}$  for all  $j \in [1, i - 1]$ , then we must have  $z_{t_j} = 1$  for all  $j \in [1, i - 1]$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} &\geq h_{t_i} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}}) \\ &= h_{t_1} \geq h_{t_1} - \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \end{aligned}$$

and inequality (5) is satisfied when  $y \geq h_{t_{a+1}} = h_{m+s_1}$ . Therefore, we assume that  $y < h_{m+s_1}$ , which implies  $z_{t_j} = 1 \forall j = 1, \dots, a$  and

$$\sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} = h_{t_1} - h_{m+s_1}$$

in the rest of proof.

If  $q = 0$ , we have  $m + s_1 = m + v - m + 1 = v + 1$ . Such case is trivial because  $y \geq h_{v+1}$  and the resulting inequality is the strengthened star inequality. It is sufficient to consider  $q \geq 1$ . Because  $y \geq h_{v+1}$  and  $s_{q+1} = v - m + 1$ , we must have  $h_{m+s_{i'}} > y \geq h_{m+s_{i'+1}}$  for some  $i' = 1, \dots, q$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $s_{i'+1} \geq s_{i'} + 1$ , i.e.,  $m + \min\{1 + s_{i'}, s_{i'+1}\} = m + 1 + s_{i'}$ . Thus,  $z_j = 1$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, m + s_{i'}$ , which implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}} \pi_i + \sum_{i=m+s_{i'}+1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau \tag{7}$$

from the knapsack inequality, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j (1 - z_{l_j}) &= \sum_{j \in [1, q] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j (1 - z_{l_j}) \\ &= \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j (1 - z_{l_j}) + \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j (1 - z_{l_j}) \\ &= \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j + \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j - \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j z_{l_j} - \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j z_{l_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The first equality holds because  $z_j = 1 \forall j \in [1, m + s_{i'}]$ . The second equality holds because

$$l_j \geq \begin{cases} m + s_j + 1 \geq m + s_{i'} + 1, \\ m + s_{j+1} \geq m + s_{i'+1} \geq m + s_{i'} + 1 \end{cases} \quad \forall j \in [i' + 1, q].$$

Next, we show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q z_{l_j} \leq q - i' \tag{9}$$



by introducing a contradiction. Suppose  $\sum_{j=1}^q z_{l_j} \geq q - i' + 1$ . We have

$$\tau \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}} \pi_i + \sum_{i=m+s_{i'}+1}^n \pi_i z_i \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}} \pi_i + \sum_{j \in [1, q] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \pi_{l_j} z_{l_j} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}} \pi_i + \sum_{j=i'}^q \pi_{l_j} z_{l_j} + \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \pi_{l_j} z_{l_j} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}} \pi_i + \sum_{j=i'}^q \pi_{k_j} > \tau \tag{12}$$

where inequality (10) is just (7). Inequality (11) holds because

$$l_j \geq \begin{cases} m + s_j + 1 \geq m + s_{i'} + 1, \\ m + s_{j+1} \geq m + s_{i'+1} \geq m + s_{i'} + 1 \end{cases} \quad \forall j \in [i', q].$$

Inequality (12) holds because  $\sum_{j=1}^q z_{l_j} \geq q - i' + 1$  and  $\pi_{k_1} \geq \dots \geq \pi_{k_q}$ .

Given the contradiction introduced by (10)–(12), we have that (9) holds. Note that  $\delta_1 \leq \dots \leq \delta_{q+1}$  is monotonic. With (9), we get

$$\sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j \geq \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j z_{l_j} + \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j z_{l_j}.$$

Then from (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j (1 - z_{l_j}) &= \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j + \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j - \sum_{j=i'+1}^q \delta_j z_{l_j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j z_{l_j} \\ &\geq \sum_{j \in [1, i'] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j \\ &\geq \delta_{i'} + \sum_{j \in [1, i'-1] \text{ and } l_j \geq m+s_{i'}+1} \delta_j \geq h_{m+s_1} - h_{m+s_{i'+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because of the definition of  $\delta_{i'}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \\
 & \geq h_{m+s_{i'+1}} + h_{t_1} - h_{m+s_1} + h_{m+s_1} - h_{m+s_{i'+1}} \geq h_{t_1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we give necessary condition that (5) is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Proposition 2** *If (5) is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$ , then we have  $t_1 = 1$  and*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} \leq \tau \quad \forall j \in [1, q] \text{ with } s_j \geq 1. \tag{13}$$

*Proof* Note that the inequality (5) is uniquely determined by a triple  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$ . We will denote (5) as the triple  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  in the proof. First, we will prove the necessary condition that  $t_1 = 1$ . Given a  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  with  $t_1 > 1$ . We can have  $(T', \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  with  $T' = T \cup \{1\}$ , i.e.,

$$y + (h_1 - h_{t_1})z_1 + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \geq h_1$$

which implies

$$(h_1 - h_{t_1})(z_1 - 1) + y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \geq h_{t_1}.$$

As  $(h_1 - h_{t_1})(z_1 - 1) \leq 0$ , The  $(T', \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  is at least as strong as the  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  inequality.

Suppose the condition (13) does not hold for a  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  with coefficient  $\delta_j \forall j \in [1, q]$  and  $i' \in [1, q]$  is the first index that the condition (13) does not hold. Thus, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'}-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=i'}^q \pi_{k_i} > \tau \quad \text{but} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_{i'-1}-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=i'}^q \pi_{k_i} \leq \tau$$

which implies that  $s_{i'-1} < s_{i'}$ . We can define a triple  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s}')$  such that  $s'_j = s_j \forall j \in [1, q] - \{i\}$  and  $s'_{i'} = s_{i'} - 1$ . Note that  $\mathbf{s}'$  is still a monotonic sequence as  $\mathbf{s}$ . It is clear that we have  $\delta'_j \leq \delta_j \forall j \in [1, q]$  where  $\delta'_j$  is the coefficient for  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s}')$ . So  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s}')$  inequality is at least as strong as the  $(T, \Pi_L, \mathbf{s})$  inequality. □

In Theorem 1, we have parameter  $q \in [0, p - m]$ . It is obvious that inequality (5) becomes the strengthened star inequality when  $q = 0$ . Next, when  $q = p - m$ , we show that Theorem 1 improves Theorem 6 in [22].

**Corollary 1** Let  $q = p - m$  and  $s_j = \min\{j, v - m + 1\} \forall j \in [1, q]$ , we have valid inequalities

$$y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-m} \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \geq h_{t_1} \tag{14}$$

where

$$\delta_j = \begin{cases} h_{m+1} - h_{m+\min\{v-m+1,2\}} & j = 1 \\ \max \left\{ \delta_{j-1}, h_{m+1} - h_{m+\min\{v-m+1, j+1\}} - \sum_{i \in [1, j-1] \text{ and } l_i \geq m+1+\min\{v-m+1, j\}} \delta_i \right\} & j \in [2, q]. \end{cases}$$

*Proof* Because the definition of  $p$  in Sect. 1 implies that the summation of any  $p + 1$  many  $\pi_i$ 's for  $i \in [1, n]$  is strictly greater than  $\tau$ , we have the following result for any permutation  $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\}$  of  $L$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} \geq \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{m+j} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^{p-m} \pi_{k_i} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{m+(v-m+1)} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^{p-m} \pi_{k_i} \end{cases} > \tau \quad \forall j \in [1, q].$$

Apparently  $s_1 = \min\{1, v - m + 1\} = 1$  since  $m \in [1, v]$ . Therefore, the expected result follows. □

*Remark 1* (i) Corollary 1 is equivalent to Theorem 3 in [22] when the knapsack constraint is reduced to a cardinality constraint. In such case, we have  $p = v$  and  $s_j = \min\{j, p - m + 1\} = j \forall j \in [1, p - m]$ .

(ii) Corollary 1 improves Theorem 6 in [22], which is the main result in [22] for general  $\mathcal{K}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{i \in [1, j - 1] : l_i \geq m + 1 + \min\{v - m + 1, j\}\} \\ & \supseteq \{i \in [1, j - 1] : l_i \geq m + 1 + j\} \end{aligned}$$

and  $\delta_j$ s are all positive. Hence, inequality (14) is at least as strong as the one in [22].

(iii) We note that the choice of  $s_j$  in Corollary 1 does not need to satisfy (13). If it is the case, (14) could be dominated by (5), which is demonstrated in an example adopted from [22].

*Example 1* (Example 1 in [22]) Let  $h = (40, 38, 34, 31, 26, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)$  for  $n = 10$ , and  $\pi_1 = \dots = \pi_4 = \tau/4$  and  $\pi_5 = \dots = \pi_{10} = \tau/6$  with  $\tau = 0.5$ . It is easy to check that  $v = 4$  and  $p = 6$ . As showed in [22], inequality (14) with  $m = 1, t_1 = 1$  and  $\Pi_L = \{4, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$  gives

$$y + (h_1 - h_2)z_1 + (h_2 - h_3)(1 - z_4) + (h_2 - h_3)(1 - z_6) + (h_2 - h_5 - \delta_2)(1 - z_7) + (h_2 - h_5 - \delta_2)(1 - z_8) + (h_2 - h_5 - \delta_2)(1 - z_9) \geq h_1$$

or specifically,

$$y + 2z_1 + 4(1 - z_4) + 4(1 - z_6) + 8(1 - z_7) + 8(1 - z_8) + 8(1 - z_9) \geq 40 \tag{15}$$

where  $\delta_2 = h_2 - h_3$  is the coefficient for term  $(1 - z_6)$ . This inequality, nevertheless, is not facet-defining as it is dominated by

$$y + (h_1 - h_2)z_1 + (h_2 - h_3)(1 - z_4) + (h_2 - h_3)(1 - z_7) + (h_2 - h_5 - \delta_2)(1 - z_8) \geq h_1 \tag{16}$$

or specifically,

$$y + 2z_1 + 4(1 - z_4) + 4(1 - z_7) + 8(1 - z_8) \geq 40$$

which is valid and facet-defining. According to Theorem 1, inequality (16) can be generated by letting  $m = 1, \Pi_L = \{4, 7, 8\}$  with  $q = 3$ . So  $\{k_1, k_2, k_3\} = \{4, 7, 8\}$  as well since  $\pi_4 \geq \pi_7 \geq \pi_8$ . It is easy to see that we can choose  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (1, 2, 3)$  because, for  $j \in [1, q] = [1, 3]$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{4}\tau + \frac{1}{4}\tau + \frac{2}{6}\tau = \frac{13}{12}\tau & \text{when } j = 1 \\ \frac{3}{4}\tau + \frac{2}{6}\tau = \frac{13}{12}\tau & \text{when } j = 2 \\ \tau + \frac{1}{6}\tau = \frac{7}{6}\tau & \text{when } j = 3 \end{cases} > \tau.$$

Because of Proposition 2, we make the following assumption to have stronger inequalities (5).

**Assumption 1** In Theorem 1, we always choose  $s_j \forall j \in [1, q + 1]$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} \leq \tau \quad \forall j \in [1, q].$$

Next, we provide sufficient conditions that guarantee (5) to be facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Theorem 2** The inequality (5) is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$  if  $t_1 = 1, \pi_{l_1} \geq \dots \geq \pi_{l_q}$ , and

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \pi_{l_i} + \pi_j \leq \tau \quad \forall j \notin T \cup L. \tag{17}$$

*Proof* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4 in [22]. However, since our inequality (5) is more general, we give a self-contained proof. First, let  $y^0 = h_1$ , vector  $\mathbf{z}^0$  with  $\mathbf{z}_j^0 = 1$  if  $j \in L$  and  $\mathbf{z}_j^0 = 0$  otherwise. Next, for each  $j \notin (T \cup L)$ , we have point  $(y^j, \mathbf{z}^j) = (y^0, \mathbf{z}^0 + e_j)$ , where  $e_j$  is an  $n$  dimensional unit vector with  $j$ th component equal to 1. The point is feasible because of (17).

For each  $j \in [1, a]$ , let  $y^{t_j} = h_{t_{j+1}}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_i^{t_j} = 1$  if  $i \in [1, t_{j+1} - 1] \cup L$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i^{t_j} = 0$  otherwise. The point is feasible because of the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t_{j+1}-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=1}^q \pi_{l_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_1-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i=1}^q \pi_{l_i} \leq \tau.$$

For  $j \in [1, q]$ , first we let  $y^{l_1} = h_{m+s_2}$  and

$$\mathbf{z}_i^{l_j} = 1 \forall i \in [1, m + s_2 - 1] \cup \{l_2, \dots, l_{q+1}\} \text{ and } \mathbf{z}_i^{l_j} = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

The point is feasible because of Assumption 1. Then, for  $j \in [2, q + 1]$ , if

$$\delta_j = h_{m+s_1} - h_{m+s_j} - \sum_{i \in [1, j-1] \text{ and } l_i \geq m+1+s_j} \delta_i,$$

let  $y^{l_j} = h_{m+s_{j+1}}$  and

$$\mathbf{z}_i^{l_j} = 1 \forall i \in [1, m + s_{j+1} - 1] \cup \{l_{j+1}, \dots, l_{q+1}\} \text{ and } \mathbf{z}_i^{l_j} = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

If  $\delta_j = \delta_{j-1}$ , we let

$$(y^{l_j}, \mathbf{z}^{l_j}) = (y^{l_{j-1}}, \mathbf{z}^{l_{j-1}} + e_{l_{j-1}} - e_{l_j}).$$

Note that  $\pi_{l_j} \geq \pi_{l_{j-1}}$ . In either case, the point is feasible because of Assumption 1. These  $n + 1$  points on the face defined by inequality (5) are affinely independent.  $\square$

In the following, we consider an implementation strategy of this type of strong inequalities in our numerical study.

**Corollary 2** *When  $|L| = 1$ , the inequality (5) in Theorem 1 is facet-defining if  $t_1 = 1$ , and*

$$\pi_{l_1} + \pi_j \leq \tau \quad \forall j \in [1, n] \setminus \{l_1\}.$$

Next we will provide a separation algorithm for implementing Corollary 2.

**Separation Heuristic** We always set  $t_1 = 1$ . Let  $z^*$  be a fraction solution and we keep an ordered list of the elements in  $\{i \in [v + 1, n] : z_i^* = 1, \pi_i + \pi_j \leq \tau, \forall j \in [1, n] \setminus \{i\}\}$ , denoted as  $\Omega$ , in decreasing order of  $\pi_i$ . We choose the first element in the list to be in the set  $L$ , i.e.,  $L = \{l_1\}$  where  $l_1 = \arg \max_i \{\pi_i : i \in \Omega\}$ . We let

$$m + s_1 = \min \left\{ j : \sum_{i=1}^j \pi_i + \pi_{l_1} > \tau, j \in [1, v] \right\}$$

which can be found in  $O(v)$ . Then, the best choice of the set  $T$  in the inequality (5) can be found by solving a shortest path problem from the source 1 to the sink  $m + s_1$  on a directed acyclic graph with vertices  $\{1, \dots, m + s_1\}$ , edges  $(i, j)$ ,  $1 \leq i < j \leq m + s_1$ , and associated cost of  $(h_i - h_j)z_i^*$  (see also Sect. 3.1 in [22]) and the complexity is  $O(v^2)$ . The coefficient  $\delta_1 = h_{m+s_1} - h_{v+1}$ . Note that  $z_{l_1}^* = 1$  and shortest path algorithm is used to find the best choice of the set  $T$ . Therefore, our separation algorithm can find the most violated inequality in the form of Corollary 2, which is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ , in  $O(v^2)$ .

Note that the separation algorithm in [22] is  $O(p^4)$  without guarantee of finding facet-defining inequalities of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Abdi et al. [1] mentioned that the same separation algorithm can be applied in their case without providing computational evaluation.

As mentioned, a set of facet-defining inequalities for  $\mathcal{K}$  was developed in Theorem 14 of [1]. In the following, we analyze the connection between those facet-defining inequalities and results in Theorems 1 and 2. In particular, we show that they are subsumed as special cases of (5).

**Corollary 3** *Let  $M$  be a positive integer,  $a_i = M\pi_i \forall i \in [1, n]$  and  $\mu = M\tau$ . The inequality (5) in Theorem 1 is valid for  $\mathcal{K}$  if*

- $a_i = 1 \forall i \in L$  and  $q = \mu - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  is an integer;
- $s_1 = 1$  and  $m + s_j = m(j - 1) + 1 \forall j \in [2, q]$ ;
- $l_j > m(j) \forall j \in [1, q]$

where  $m(j) = \max \left\{ k : j \geq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \right\}$ . The inequality is facet-defining if  $t_1 = 1$  and  $a_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \forall j \in [1, n] \setminus L$ .

It is not difficult to verify that Corollary 3 is equivalent to Theorem 14 in [1]. So, before providing a proof to this result, we make a few remarks on the applicability of Corollary 3 (equivalently, Theorem 14 of [1]).

*Remark 2* (i) The condition that  $a_i = 1 \forall i \in L$  requires that  $\pi_i \forall i \in L$  are equal, which is a very special case of the knapsack constraint of  $\mathcal{K}$ . For example, Corollary 3 cannot explain (15) (derived in [22]) or (16) because  $\pi_4 \neq \pi_6$ . Note however that Corollary 1 or Theorem 6 in [22] is able to generate explicit valid inequalities for a general  $\mathcal{K}$ . Hence, different from the understanding made in [1], we cannot conclude that Corollary 3 subsumes Corollary 1 or Theorem 6 in [22].

(ii) The condition that  $q = \mu - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  is an integer is very restrictive. Actually, Corollary 3 cannot describe any inequalities in Example 1 with  $m = 1$ . Since we need to have  $a_i = 1 \forall i \in L$ , we have either  $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, 4\}$  with  $M = 8$  or  $L \subseteq \{5, \dots, 10\}$  with  $M = 12$ . If  $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, 4\}$ ,  $q = M(\tau - \pi_1) = 3$ . So, we must have  $L = \{2, 3, 4\}$ . However,  $l_j > m(j) = j + 1$  implies that the choice of  $L$  is not viable. If  $L \subseteq \{5, \dots, 10\}$ ,  $q = M(\tau - \pi_1) = 4.5$ , which is not an integer. So, there is no valid  $L$  satisfying those conditions.

(iii) Corollary 3 could fail to provide any inequalities other than *strengthened star inequalities*. Consider an example with  $n = 8$ ,  $\pi_1 = \dots = \pi_3 = \tau/3$ , and  $\pi_4 = \dots = \pi_8 = \tau/5$  where  $\tau = 0.5$ . Since we need to have  $a_i = 1 \forall i \in L$ , we have either  $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, 3\}$  with  $M = 6$  or  $L \subseteq \{4, \dots, 8\}$  with  $M = 10$ .

Suppose  $m < v = 3$ . To have that  $q = \mu - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$  is an integer, we can only set  $L \subseteq \{1, \dots, 3\}$  with  $M = 6$ . If  $m = 1$  or  $2$ , it is easy to check that  $m(j) = j + m$ , which implies that a viable choice of  $L$  with  $l_j > m(j)$  does not exist. So,  $m = v$ , i.e., the only set of inequalities Corollary 3 implies is the *strengthened star inequalities*.

- (iv) Comparing to Corollary 3, we mention that Theorem 1 has no such limitations but includes it as a special case. Therefore, Theorem 1 generalizes one of the main theorems in [1]. Note also that Corollary 3 does not imply Corollary 2 because  $q = \frac{1}{\pi_{l_1}}(\tau - \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i)$  might not be an integer.

*Proof* Note that  $\forall j \in [1, q], l_j > m(j)$  implies  $l_j \geq m + s_{j+1}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} s_j &= m(j - 1) - m + 1 = \arg \max_s \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m+s} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \leq j - 1 \right\} + 1 \\ &= \arg \min_s \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m+s} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i > j - 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $j \in [1, q]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} \pi_i + \sum_{i=j}^q \pi_{k_i} &= \frac{1}{M} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} a_i + \sum_{i=j}^q a_{k_i} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} a_i + q - j + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m+s_j} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i + \mu - j + 1 \right) \\ &> \frac{1}{M} (M\tau) > \tau \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where (18) holds because  $a_i = 1 \forall i \in L$ . By Theorem 1, the inequality (1) is valid for  $\mathcal{K}$ . We have

$$\mu = q + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i = \sum_{i \in L} a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \geq \sum_{i \in L} a_i + a_j \quad \forall j \in [1, n]/L, \tag{19}$$

$$\Rightarrow \tau \geq \sum_{i \in L} \pi_i + \pi_j \quad \forall j \in [1, n] \setminus L, \tag{20}$$

$$\Rightarrow \tau \geq \sum_{i \in L} \pi_i + \pi_j \quad \forall j \in [1, n] \setminus (T \cup L), \tag{21}$$

where (20) is obtained from dividing (19) by  $M$ . Note that Corollary 3 follows Theorem 1 by imposing more restricted requirements on parameters other than  $T$ . Actually,

according to Theorem 1, set  $T$  is an arbitrary subset of  $[1, m]$ . Since  $j \in [1, n] \setminus (T \cup L)$  implies  $j \in [1, n] \setminus L$  obviously, we have (21), i.e., (17), holds. Thus, Theorem 2 implies that (5) is facet-defining.  $\square$

### 3 Strong inequalities derived from lifting

In Sect. 2, although a large number facet-defining inequalities subsuming those identified in [1, 22, 29] are proposed for  $\mathcal{K}$ , they are not sufficient to define its convex hull. For instance, we observe that the following inequalities are facet-defining for the set in Example 1, which, nevertheless, cannot be derived based on Theorem 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{3}z_1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_7 + z_8 + z_9 &\leq 4 + \frac{1}{3}(y - 40) + \frac{8}{3}(1 - z_{10}) \\
 \frac{1}{3}z_1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_7 + z_9 &\leq 4 + \frac{1}{3}(y - 40) + \frac{8}{3}(1 - z_{10}) \\
 \frac{1}{3}z_1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_6 + z_7 + z_8 + z_9 &\leq 4 + \frac{1}{3}(y - 40) + \frac{8}{3}(1 - z_5).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{22}$$

Indeed, as pointed out by Abdi and Fukasawa [1], set  $\mathcal{K}$  has abundant polyhedral structure and many of its valid inequalities are related to 0–1 knapsack polyhedron. They further presented a characterization of all valid inequalities of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Yet, from our understanding, such result does not have explicit representation for implementation, unless a general purpose solver is called for separation. To advance our understanding on  $\mathcal{K}$  as well as our solution capacity for chance-constrained problem, we directly make use of the cover inequality of 0–1 knapsack polyhedron and develop lifting techniques with consideration of mixing inequalities to derive valid inequalities. As demonstrated at the end of this section, inequalities in (22) can be simply obtained using this approach. We mention that, the family of inequalities obtained through this approach is, to the best of our knowledge, the first type that has a different structure from those of all star inequality based ones, including those in [1, 22, 29], as well as ours presented in Sect. 2.

For  $m \in [1, v]$ , let  $N_0 = [1, m - 1]$  and  $N_1 = \{l_1, \dots, l_q\} \subseteq [v + 2, n]$  with cardinality  $q$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i + \sum_{i \in N_1} \pi_i \leq \tau \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \pi_i + \sum_{i \in N_1} \pi_i > \tau.
 \tag{23}$$

We consider a restricted 0–1 knapsack polytope  $\mathcal{S}(N_0, N_1)$ , where

$$\mathcal{S}(N_0, N_1) = \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau, z_i = 0 \ \forall i \in N_0 \text{ and } z_i = 1 \ \forall i \in N_1 \right\}.$$



Let  $\tau' = \tau - \sum_{i \in N_1} \pi_i$ . Then, for set  $\hat{N} = [1, n] \setminus (N_0 \cup N_1)$ , we assume that a cover  $\mathbb{C}$  is available with respect to  $\tau'$  and a lifted cover inequality (LCI) is derived as the following

$$\sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 \tag{24}$$

with  $\alpha_i > 0 \forall i \in E \subseteq \hat{N}$  and  $\alpha_i = 0 \forall i \in \hat{N} \setminus E$ .

We then define the following function with set  $W \subseteq E$  and scalar  $\beta \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i$ .

$$\begin{aligned} G(W, \beta) = \max & \sum_{i \in W} \alpha_i z_i \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i \in W} \pi_i z_i \leq \tau' - \beta, \quad z_i \in \{0, 1\} \forall i \in W. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $G$  is well defined because of (23). Note that the lifting function of (24) can be defined as  $|\mathbb{C}| - 1 - G(E, \beta)$ . Let  $\bar{\rho} = G\left(E, \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \pi_i\right) - G\left(E \setminus \{m\}, \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i\right) - \alpha_m$ , which is nonnegative noting that an optimal solution of  $G\left(E \setminus \{m\}, \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i\right)$ , together with  $z_m = 1$ , is just feasible to  $G\left(E, \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \pi_i\right)$ .

**Theorem 3** *Let  $m \in [1, v]$  and  $N_1 \subseteq [v + 2, n]$ . Suppose a superadditive function  $\Phi(\beta)$  exists and  $0 \leq \Phi(\beta) \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 - G(E, \beta)$ . If  $h_m > h_{m+1}$  and  $0 \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ , then the inequality*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (y - h_1) \tag{25}$$

is valid for the set  $\mathcal{K}(N_1) = \mathcal{K} \cap \{z \in \{0, 1\}^n : z_i = 1 \forall i \in N_1\}$ , where

$$\phi_i = \Phi(\pi_i) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (h_{i+1} - h_i) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m - 1. \tag{26}$$

*Proof* By the definition of  $\mathcal{K}(N_1)$ , we can fix  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in N_1$  for the rest of proof. Note that  $y \geq h_{m+1}$  in the set  $\mathcal{K}(N_1)$ , because of condition (23). Next, we consider all three situations based on the value of  $y$ .

First, if  $y \geq h_1$ , we assume that  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in Q \subseteq [1, m - 1]$  and  $z_i = 0 \forall i \in [1, m - 1] \setminus Q$  for a set  $Q$ . Then the knapsack constraint in  $\mathcal{K}(N_1)$  becomes

$$\sum_{i \in E} \pi_i z_i \leq \tau' - \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i &\leq \sum_{i \in Q} \Phi(\pi_i) + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \\ &\leq \Phi\left(\sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq \Phi\left(\sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) + G\left(E, \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 \\ &\leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(y - h_1) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because  $\phi_i \leq \Phi(\pi_i)$ .

Second, if  $h_{t-1} > y \geq h_t$  for some  $t = 2, \dots, m$ . We must have  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in [1, t - 1]$ , and also assume that  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in Q \subseteq [t, m - 1]$  and  $z_i = 0 \forall i \in [1, m - 1] \setminus Q$  for a set  $Q$ . Then the knapsack constraint in  $\mathcal{K}(N_1)$  becomes

$$\sum_{i \in E} \pi_i z_i \leq \tau' - \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i - \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i$$

and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \phi_i + \sum_{i=t}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \Phi(\pi_i) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(h_t - h_1) + \sum_{i \in Q} \Phi(\pi_i) + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \\ &\leq \Phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(h_t - h_1) + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \\ &\leq \Phi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(h_t - h_1) + G\left(E, \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i + \sum_{i \in Q} \pi_i\right) \\ &\leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(y - h_1). \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise,  $h_m > y \geq h_{m+1}$  and  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in [1, m]$ . So, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i + \alpha_m + \sum_{i \in E \setminus \{m\}} \alpha_i z_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Phi(\pi_i) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(h_m - h_1) + \alpha_m + \sum_{i \in E \setminus \{m\}} \alpha_i z_i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \Phi \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \pi_i \right) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (h_{m+1} - h_1) + \rho + \alpha_m + \sum_{i \in E \setminus \{m\}} \alpha_i z_i \\
 &\leq \Phi \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \pi_i \right) + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (h_{m+1} - h_1) + G \left( E, \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \pi_i \right) \\
 &\leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (h_{m+1} - h_1) \\
 &\leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (y - h_1) \tag{27}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (27) holds because of the definition of  $G$ .

With analysis on all three cases, it can be seen that the inequality (25) is valid for the set  $\mathcal{K}(N_1)$ . □

*Remark 3* (i) LCI in (24) can be easily obtained through the sequential lifting algorithm in [46]. Note that  $\alpha_i$  are positive integers for  $i \in E$ , and  $G(E, \beta)$  (also the lifting function  $|\mathbb{C}| - 1 - G(E, \beta)$ ) will be a staircase function [11]. Then, a dynamic program algorithm can be used to analytically describe the lifting function, whose superadditive approximation  $\Phi(\beta)$  can be constructed using the approximation method developed in [12].

(ii) To support our example at the end of this section and to make this paper self-contained, we next provide a valid superadditive approximation for the lifting function  $|\mathbb{C}| - 1 - G(E, \beta)$ . Our intention here is for demonstration, rather than deriving the strongest but complicated ones, i.e., maximal and non-dominated approximations, which certainly is a future research direction. Assume step lengths of lifting function are  $p_0, \dots, p_{|\mathbb{C}|-1}$ . We sort them from large to small to obtain a permutation  $(p_{a_0}, \dots, p_{a_{|\mathbb{C}|-1}})$ . Then, by [12], the following function is a valid superadditive approximation.

$$\Phi(\beta) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq \beta < p_{a_0} \\ \mathfrak{h} & \text{if } \sum_{k=0}^{\mathfrak{h}-1} p_{a_k} \leq \beta < \sum_{k=0}^{\mathfrak{h}} p_{a_k}, \mathfrak{h} = 1, \dots, |\mathbb{C}| - 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that when  $\bar{\rho} = \rho = 0$ , (25) reduces to an LCI of 0–1 knapsack set  $\mathcal{S}(\emptyset, N_1)$ . Then performing exact lifting with respect to variables fixed at 1 provides us a valid inequality for both  $\mathcal{S}(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  and  $\mathcal{K}$ . It actually corresponds the observation made in [1] that facet-defining inequalities of  $\mathcal{S}(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  are also facet-defining for  $\mathcal{K}$ . To study more interesting interactions between mixing set and 0–1 knapsack set, we next limit ourselves to the case that  $\rho > 0$  in Theorem 3 and investigate lifting (25) sequentially with respect to variables  $z_i \forall i \in N_1$  in the order of  $\{l_1, \dots, l_q\}$ . Suppose we already have lifting coefficients for  $z_{l_1}, \dots, z_{l_{r-1}}$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (y - h_1) + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} (1 - z_{l_j}) \tag{28}$$

is valid for the set  $\mathcal{K} \cap \{\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n : z_i = 1 \forall i \in \{l_r, \dots, l_q\}\}$ , and we are lifting inequality (28) with respect to variable  $z_{l_r}$ . By denoting the lifting coefficient as  $\delta_{l_r}$ , we have

**Proposition 3** *The lifting coefficient  $\delta_{l_r}$  can be defined as*

$$\delta_{l_r} = \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} h_1 - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} - (|\mathbb{C}| - 1) + \max_{t \in [1, \eta_r + 1]} \left\{ \Delta_{t,r} - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} h_t \right\} \tag{29}$$

where

$$\eta_r = \max \left\{ j : \sum_{i=1}^j \pi_i \leq \tau' + \sum_{i=1}^r \pi_{l_i} \right\}$$

and  $\Delta_{t,r}$  for  $t \in [1, \eta_r + 1]$  are arbitrary scalars satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{t,r} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i + \max_{i \in E \cup \{t, m-1\}} \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} z_{l_j} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &\sum_{i \in [t, n] - N_1} \pi_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \pi_{l_j} z_{l_j} \leq \tau' + \sum_{j=1}^r \pi_{l_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i \\ &z_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in [t, n] \setminus \{l_r, \dots, l_q\}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

*Proof* To prove that  $\delta_{l_r}$  is a valid coefficient by lifting from (28), it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (y - h_1) + \sum_{j=1}^r \delta_{l_j} (1 - z_{l_j}) \tag{31}$$

is valid for the set  $\mathcal{K} \cap \{\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n : z_i = 1 \forall i \in \{l_{r+1}, \dots, l_q\} \text{ and } z_{l_r} = 0\} \triangleq \mathcal{K}'$ . Distinct from most literature, our lifting procedure involves a continuous variable  $y$ , which requires special treatments. Based on the definition of  $\eta_r$ , we know that  $y \geq h_{\eta_r}$ . Since  $z_{l_r} = 0$  in  $\mathcal{K}'$ , from (31), we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{l_r} &\geq \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}', y \geq h_{\eta_r}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i - (|\mathbb{C}| - 1) \\ &\quad - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} (y - h_1) - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} (1 - z_{l_j}) \\ &= \max_{t \in [1, \eta_r]} \max_{\substack{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}' \\ h_{t-1} > y \geq h_t}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i - (|\mathbb{C}| - 1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(y - h_1) - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j}(1 - z_{l_j}) \\
 = & \max_{t \in [1, \eta_r]} \max_{\substack{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}' \\ h_{t-1} > y \geq h_t}} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in E \cup [t, m-1]} \alpha_i z_i - (|\mathcal{C}| - 1) \\
 & - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(y - h_1) - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j}(1 - z_{l_j}) \tag{32}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we denote  $h_0$  as  $+\infty$  for simplicity and (32) holds because  $h_{t-1} > y \geq h_t$  implies  $z_j = 1 \forall j \in [1, t - 1]$  ( $[1, t - 1] = \emptyset$  when  $t = 1$ ). Recall that we set  $\alpha_i = 0 \forall i \in \hat{N} - E$ .

Apparently, (32) holds if we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_{l_r} \geq & \max_{t \in [1, \eta_r]} \max_{\substack{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}' \\ h_{t-1} > y \geq h_t}} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in E \cup [t, m-1]} \alpha_i z_i - (|\mathcal{C}| - 1) \\
 & - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(h_t - h_1) - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j}(1 - z_{l_j}) \tag{33}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 = & \max_{t \in [1, \eta_r]} \left[ \left( \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}'} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in E \cup [t, m-1]} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} z_{l_j} \right) - \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} h_t \right] \\
 & + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}} h_1 - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} - (|\mathcal{C}| - 1) \tag{34}
 \end{aligned}$$

where (33) implies (32) because of  $y \geq h_t$ . Thus the continuous variable  $y$  is dropped from the lifting procedure in (34).

To show that the definition of  $\delta_{l_r}$  in (29) satisfies (34), we only need to demonstrate that

$$\Delta_{t,r} \geq \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}'} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in E \cup [t, m-1]} \alpha_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \delta_{l_j} z_{l_j} \tag{35}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{K}'$  (similar to  $\mathcal{K}$ ) includes only a knapsack inequality, which becomes

$$\sum_{i \in [t, n] - N_1} \pi_i z_i + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \pi_{l_j} z_{l_j} \leq \tau' + \sum_{j=1}^r \pi_{l_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \pi_i$$

with  $z_i \in \{0, 1\} \forall i \in [t, n] \setminus \{l_r, \dots, l_q\}$  in  $\mathcal{K}'$  since  $z_i \forall i \in \{l_{r+1}, \dots, l_q\}$  are fixed to 1 and recall that  $z_j = 1 \forall j \in [1, t - 1]$ . Thus, (35) is equivalent to (30) and the definition of  $\delta_{l_r}$  in (29) is valid. □

Therefore, by summarizing Theorem 3 together with Proposition 3, we get

**Theorem 4** *If  $h_m > h_{m+1}$ , then, for any  $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ , the inequality*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \phi_i z_i + \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i z_i \leq |\mathbb{C}| - 1 + \frac{\rho}{h_m - h_{m+1}}(y - h_1) + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_{l_j}(1 - z_{l_j}) \quad (36)$$

is valid for  $\mathcal{K}$ , where  $\phi_i \forall i \in N_0$  are defined in (26) and  $\delta_i \forall i \in N_1$  are given by lifting procedure in (29).

*Remark 4* Given that knapsack cover inequalities have been intensively implemented in commercial solvers, we point it out that they can be readily strengthened by Theorem 4. Although the computation of (29) is a little bit involved, we can address this issue by computing LP relaxations of (30) with a simple greedy algorithm.

*Example 1* (cont.) We suppose general probabilities as shown previously, where  $\nu = 4$ . Let  $m = 3$ ,  $N_0 = \{1, 2\}$  and  $N_1 = \{10\}$ . Note that the condition (23) holds. So, we have set  $\mathcal{S}(N_0, N_1)$  that includes a knapsack as follows,

$$\frac{\tau}{4}z_3 + \frac{\tau}{4}z_4 + \frac{\tau}{6}z_5 + \frac{\tau}{6}z_6 + \frac{\tau}{6}z_7 + \frac{\tau}{6}z_8 + \frac{\tau}{6}z_9 \leq \tau - \frac{\tau}{6}.$$

The set  $\{3, 4, 5, 6, 8\}$  gives a minimal cover for this 0–1 knapsack and we have the minimal cover inequality

$$z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_8 \leq 4.$$

By lifting the cover inequality with respect to variable  $z_9$ , we have

$$z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_8 + z_9 \leq 4.$$

For its lifting function, we note that all step lengths are  $\frac{\tau}{6}$ . According to the superadditive function presented in Remark 3, that lifting function is naturally superadditive. Therefore, Theorem 3 gives the following inequality

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{h_3 - h_4}(h_2 - h_1)\right) z_1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{h_3 - h_4}(h_3 - h_2)\right) z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_8 + z_9 \leq 4 + \frac{1}{h_3 - h_4}(y - h_1),$$

or specifically

$$\frac{1}{3}z_1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_8 + z_9 \leq 4 + \frac{1}{3}(y - h_1), \quad (37)$$

which is valid for the set  $\mathcal{K} \cap \{\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^{10} : z_{10} = 1\}$ . Then, by lifting inequality (37) with respect to  $z_{10}$ , we get

$$\Delta_{t1} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } t = 1 \\ 1 & \text{when } t = 2 \\ 1 & \text{when } t = 3 \\ 1 & \text{when } t = 4 \\ \frac{8}{3} & \text{when } t = 5. \end{cases}$$

So  $\delta_1 = 8/3$  and we have the valid inequality

$$\frac{1}{3}z_1 - \frac{1}{3}z_2 + z_3 + z_4 + z_5 + z_6 + z_8 + z_9 \leq 4 + \frac{1}{3}(y - 40) + \frac{8}{3}(1 - z_{10})$$

for  $\mathcal{K}$ , which is the first inequality in the list (22). Similar procedures can produce other inequalities in the list.

**Implementation** Because we cannot access the cover inequality generating procedure in commercial solvers, we added (36) into the initial formulation in our numerical study. Specifically, we let  $N_1 = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $m = v$ , cover  $\mathbb{C}$  be obtained by Algorithm 1 in the following and  $E$  be an extended cover of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $\alpha_i = 1 \forall i \in E$ , the value of  $\bar{\rho}$  can be obtained easily and we set  $\rho = \bar{\rho}$ . Then the inequalities (36) can be derived from Theorem 3 for  $Q_r \forall r \in [1, d]$ . Overall, we could include up to  $d$  lifting inequalities into the initial formulation.

---

**Algorithm 1** Find cover  $\mathbb{C}$

---

- 1: Sort  $\pi_i \forall i \in 1, \dots, n$  such that  $\pi_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq \pi_{(n)}$
  - 2:  $\mathbb{C} \leftarrow \emptyset$
  - 3: **for**  $j = 1$  to  $n$  **do**
  - 4:   **if**  $\langle j \rangle \geq v$  **then**
  - 5:      $\mathbb{C} \leftarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\langle j \rangle\}$
  - 6:   **if**  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{C}} \pi_i > \tau$  **then break**
  - 7: **for**  $j = 1$  to  $|\mathbb{C}|$  **do**
  - 8:   **if**  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{C} - \{j\}} \pi_i > \tau$  **then**
  - 9:      $\mathbb{C} \leftarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{j\}$
  - 10:   **else**
  - 11:     **break**
- 

## 4 Intersection of multiple mixing sets with knapsack

Up to now, we focus on deriving strong valid inequalities for a single mixing set with a 0–1 knapsack constraint, i.e.,  $\mathcal{K}$ , which, according to Proposition 1, are crucial to understand the polyhedron  $\mathcal{Q}$  of CCP. It is clear that such types of inequalities are not sufficient to describe  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Hence, in this section, we investigate the intersection of

multiple mixing sets with knapsack constraint by developing valid inequalities that explicitly capture their interactions, i.e., valid inequalities with nonzero coefficients of multiple  $y_r$ s, where  $r \in [1, d]$ .

Given existing algebraic derivations of valid inequalities for  $\mathcal{K}$ , one direct approach to study  $\mathcal{Q}$  is to aggregate multiple mixing sets (with assigned weights) into a single mixing set and derive valid inequalities from that aggregation, which definitely are valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Using a numerical example, [22] illustrated that such strategy could lead to a new valid inequality that cannot be obtained from each individual mixing set. Nevertheless, observing that there is no systematical study on this approach, it remains unknown that: (1) how to select appropriate weights to generate a significant aggregation carrying rich interactive information among mixing sets; and (2) what is the strength of inequalities obtained from that aggregation with respect to  $\mathcal{Q}$ . In this section, instead of aggregating original constraints, we propose a novel blending procedure that allows us to aggregate derived strong inequalities from individual mixing sets into a strong one for the polyhedron  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Moreover, a set of sufficient conditions is derived, which ensures the resulting *blending inequality* is facet-defining. It is worth mentioning that it is the first type of facet-defining inequalities for the intersection of multiple mixing sets.

Apparently, in the study of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , it is not valid to assume  $h_{r1} \geq \dots \geq h_{rn}$  for all  $r \in [1, d]$  without loss of generality. So, we keep subscript  $r$  and for each  $r \in [1, d]$ , we define a 1 – 1 mapping  $\langle \cdot \rangle_r$  on  $[1, n]$  such that

$$h_{r\langle 1 \rangle_r} \geq h_{r\langle 2 \rangle_r} \geq \dots \geq h_{r\langle n \rangle_r}.$$

We also use the notation that  $\langle X \rangle_r = \{ \langle i \rangle_r : \forall i \in X \}$  for any set  $X \subseteq [1, n]$ . For each  $\mathcal{Q}_r$ , we define  $v_r$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{v_r} \pi_{\langle i \rangle_r} \leq \tau \text{ but } \sum_{i=1}^{v_r+1} \pi_{\langle i \rangle_r} > \tau.$$

Note that the value  $p$  is independent of index  $r$ , since it is based on the monotonic order of all  $\pi_i$ 's.

**Definition 1** Given  $\theta \in [1, n]$ , for each  $r \in [1, d]$ , let  $m_r \in [1, v_r]$  and  $q_r \in [0, p - m_r]$ , we define

- a set  $T_r = \{t_{r1}, t_{r2}, \dots, t_{ra_r}\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m_r\}$  with  $t_{r1} < t_{r2} < \dots < t_{ra_r}$ ;
- a set  $L_r$  with a permutation  $\Pi_{L_r} = \{l_{r1}, l_{r2}, \dots, l_{rq_r}\}$  and  $l_{r1} = \theta$ ;
- a sequence of integers  $s_{rj} \in [0, v_r - m_r + 1] \forall j \in [1, q_r + 1]$  such that
  - $L_r \subseteq \{m_r + s_{r1} + 1, \dots, n\}$  with  $l_{rj} \geq m_r + \min\{s_{rj} + 1, s_{r,j+1}\}$ ;
  - $0 \leq s_{r1} \leq \dots \leq s_{rq_r+1} = v_r - m_r + 1$ ; and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_r+s_{rj}} \pi_{\langle i \rangle_r} + \sum_{i=j}^{q_r} \pi_{\langle k_{ri} \rangle_r} > \tau \forall j \tag{38}$$

where  $\{k_{r1}, \dots, k_{rq_r}\}$  is a permutation of set  $L_r$  with  $\pi_{\langle k_{r1} \rangle_r} \geq \dots \geq \pi_{\langle k_{rq_r} \rangle_r}$ ;



- an expression

$$\mathcal{I}_r = y_r + \sum_{j=1}^{a_r} (h_{r\langle t_{rj} \rangle_r} - h_{r\langle t_{r,j+1} \rangle_r}) z_{\langle t_{rj} \rangle_r} + \sum_{j=1}^{q_r} \delta_{rj} (1 - z_{\langle l_{rj} \rangle_r})$$

where

$$\delta_{rj} = \begin{cases} h_{r\langle m_r+s_{r1} \rangle_r} - h_{r\langle m_r+s_{r2} \rangle_r} & j = 1 \\ \max \left\{ \delta_{r,j-1}, h_{r\langle m_r+s_{r1} \rangle_r} - h_{r\langle m_r+s_{r,j+1} \rangle_r} - \sum_{i:i < j \text{ and } l_{ri} \geq m_r + \min\{1+s_{rj}, s_{r,j+1}\}} \delta_{ri} \right\} & j \in [2, q_r]. \end{cases}$$

When the sets  $\langle L_r \rangle_r \setminus \{\theta\} \forall r \in [1, d]$  are mutually disjoint, we define the *blending inequality* as

$$\sum_{r \in [1, d]} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} \mathcal{I}_r - (1 - z_\theta) \geq \sum_{r \in [1, d]} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} h_{r\langle t_{r1} \rangle_r}. \tag{39}$$

Next, we give a necessary condition that the *blending inequality* is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**Theorem 5** *The blending inequality is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$  if*

$$\sum_{i \in \bigcup_{r \in [1, d]} \langle [1, m_r + s_{r1}] \rangle_r} \pi_i > \tau. \tag{40}$$

*Proof* Consider a single mixing set  $\mathcal{Q}_r$  for a given  $r \in [1, d]$ . We can assume  $\langle i \rangle_r = i \forall i \in [1, n]$  without loss of generality. Thus, the next inequality is exactly the inequality (5) for  $\mathcal{Q}_r$

$$\mathcal{I}_r \geq h_{r\langle t_{r1} \rangle_r}. \tag{41}$$

Since  $\mathcal{Q}_r \supseteq \mathcal{Q}$ , the inequality (41) is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Next, we show that for some  $u \in [1, d]$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_u - \delta_{u1}(1 - z_\theta) \geq h_{u\langle t_{u1} \rangle_u}$  is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}_u$ .

Because of the condition (40), we claim that there exists some  $u \in [1, d]$  such that  $y_u \geq h_{u, m_u + s_{u1}}$ . Suppose the claim is not true. Then we have  $y_r < h_{r, m_r + s_{r1}}$  for all  $r \in [1, d]$ . It implies that  $z_i = 1 \forall i \in \langle [1, m_r + s_{r1}] \rangle_r, r \in [1, d]$ , which violates the knapsack constraint because of (40).

Then, for that particular  $u$ , we assume  $y_u \geq h_{u, m_u + s_{u1}}$ . Because we are considering single mixing set, without loss of generality, we can assume  $\langle i \rangle_u = i \forall i \in [1, n]$  and write the inequality  $\mathcal{I}_u - \delta_{u1}(1 - z_\theta) \geq h_{u\langle t_{u1} \rangle_u}$  explicitly as follows,

$$y_u + \sum_{j=1}^{a_u} (h_{u\langle t_{uj} \rangle_u} - h_{u\langle t_{u,j+1} \rangle_u}) z_{\langle t_{uj} \rangle_u} + \sum_{j=2}^{q_u} \delta_{uj} (1 - z_{\langle l_{uj} \rangle_u}) \geq h_{u\langle t_{u1} \rangle_u}.$$

To simplify the notation, we can drop subscript  $u$  and have inequality

$$y + \sum_{j=1}^a (h_{t_j} - h_{t_{j+1}})z_{t_j} + \sum_{j=2}^q \delta_j(1 - z_{l_j}) \geq h_{t_1}.$$

Because of the assumption that  $y_u \geq h_{u, m_u + s_{u1}}$ , we need to show that the above inequality is valid when  $y \geq h_{m+s_1}$ , which is already proved in the first paragraph of the proof for Theorem 1. Now, we have  $\mathcal{I}_u - \delta_{u1}(1 - z_\theta) \geq h_{u\langle t_{u1} \rangle_u}$  is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}_u$ , i.e., valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

Together with (41) for any  $r \in [1, d] \setminus \{u\}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r \in [1, d]} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} \mathcal{I}_r - (1 - z_\theta) &= \sum_{r \in [1, d] - \{u\}} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} \mathcal{I}_r + \frac{1}{\delta_{u1}} \mathcal{I}_u - (1 - z_\theta) \\ &\geq \sum_{r \in [1, d] - \{u\}} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} h_{r t_{r1}} + \frac{1}{\delta_{u1}} h_{u t_{u1}} = \sum_{r \in [1, d]} \frac{1}{\delta_{r1}} h_{r t_{r1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the blending inequality is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$ . □

When all the scenarios have equal probabilities, the condition that the *blending inequality* is valid follows immediately after Theorem 5.

**Corollary 4** *Suppose all the scenarios have equal probabilities, then the blending inequality is valid for  $\mathcal{Q}$  if*

$$\left| \bigcup_{r \in [1, d]} \langle [1, m_r + 1] \rangle_r \right| > p. \tag{42}$$

In the next theorem, we show that the *blending inequality* is facet-defining under certain conditions.

**Theorem 6** *Suppose all scenarios have equal probabilities,  $d = 2$  and (42) is satisfied. The blending inequality is facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$  if,  $\forall r \in \{1, 2\}$ , the sets  $\langle T_r \rangle_r, \langle L_r \rangle_r \setminus \{\theta\}$  are mutually disjoint,  $t_{r1} = 1$  and we have*

1.  $\langle 1 \rangle_1 \notin \langle [1, m_2] \rangle_2 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2, \langle 1 \rangle_2 \notin \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_1 \rangle_1$ ;
2.  $\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \setminus \{\theta\} \subsetneq \langle [1, m_2] \rangle_2, \langle L_2 \rangle_2 \setminus \{\theta\} \subsetneq \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1$ .

*Proof* To show that the blending inequality is facet-defining for  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{Q})$ , we give  $n + 2$  affinely independent points. The idea is that we can always set  $y_r = h_{r\langle 1 \rangle_r}$  and enumerate extreme points as in the proof of Theorem 2 for  $y_{\bar{r}}$  because of condition 1.

First, we let  $y_1^0 = h_{1\langle 1 \rangle_1}, y_2^0 = h_{2\langle 1 \rangle_2}$ , and  $\mathbf{z}^0_j = 1$  if  $j \in \langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2$ . Note that

$$\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2 \subsetneq \langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1 \cup \{\theta\} = \langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1. \tag{43}$$

So,  $|\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2| \leq |\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1| = p$  and the point is feasible.

Next, for each  $j \notin \langle T_1 \cup L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle T_2 \cup L_2 \rangle_2$ , we consider the point  $(\mathbf{y}^j, \mathbf{z}^j) = (\mathbf{y}^0, \mathbf{z}^0 + e_j)$ . For each  $t_{1j} \in \{t_{11}, \dots, t_{1a_1}\}$ , we let  $y_2^{t_{2j}} = h_{2\langle 1 \rangle_2}$ ,  $y_1^{t_{1j}} = h_{1\langle 1, j+1 \rangle_1}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_i^{t_{1j}} = 1$  if  $i \in \langle [1, t_{1, j+1} - 1] \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2$  and 0 otherwise. The point is feasible because (43) implies

$$|\langle [1, t_{1, j+1} - 1] \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2| \leq |\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cup \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1| = p.$$

Due to the symmetry, we have similar way to get points for each  $t_{2j} \in \{t_{21}, \dots, t_{2a_2}\}$  by letting  $y_1^{t_{1j}} = h_{1\langle 1 \rangle_1}$ .

Let  $y_1^{l_{11}} = h_{1\langle 1 \rangle_1}$ ,  $y_2^{l_{21}} = h_{m_2+2}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_i^{l_{21}} = 1$  if  $i \in \langle [1, m_2 + 1] \rangle_2$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i^{l_{21}} = 1$  for  $i > 1$ , and 0 otherwise. The point is feasible because of condition 2. For each  $j \in [2, p - m_2]$  if  $\delta_{2j} = \delta_{2, j-1}$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{y}^{l_{2j}}, \mathbf{z}^{l_{2j}}) = (\mathbf{y}^{l_{2, j-1}}, \mathbf{z}^{l_{2, j-1}} + e_{l_{2, j-1}} - e_{l_{2j}}),$$

otherwise we have that  $y_1^{l_{1j}} = h_{1\langle 1 \rangle_1}$ ,  $y_2^{l_{2j}} = h_{m_2+1+j}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_i^{l_{2j}} = 1$  if  $i \in \langle [1, m + j] \rangle_2$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i^{l_{2j}} = 1$  for  $i > j$ , and 0 otherwise. Thus, we get points for each  $l_{2j} \in \{l_{21}, \dots, l_{2, p-m_2}\}$ . Due to the symmetry, we can also get points for each  $l_{1j} \in \{l_{11}, \dots, l_{1, p-m_1}\}$ .

Note that  $\langle T_1 \rangle_1, \langle T_2 \rangle_1, \langle L_1 \rangle_1, \langle L_2 \rangle_2$  are mutually disjoint except  $\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \cap \langle L_2 \rangle_2 = \{\theta\}$ . So, we get totally  $n + 2$  points on the face defined by blending inequality and they are affinely independent. □

We next give a numerical example to illustrate Theorem 6.

*Example 2* Let  $n = 6$  and  $p = 3$ . Suppose we have equal probabilities for all scenarios and

$$(h_{11}, \dots, h_{16}) = (28, 25, 15, 8, 5, 3) \text{ and } (h_{21}, \dots, h_{26}) = (2, 5, 6, 8, 17, 10)$$

The inequality (5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 + 3z_1 + 10(1 - z_3) + 17(1 - z_6) &\geq 28 \text{ is valid for } \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ with } m_1 = 1 \\ y_2 + 9z_5 + 2(1 - z_3) &\geq 17 \text{ is valid for } \mathcal{Q}_2 \text{ with } m_2 = 2 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\theta = 3$ . We have

- $\langle 1 \rangle_1 = 1 \notin \{5, 6\} \cup \{3\} = \langle [1, m_2] \rangle_2 \cup \langle L_2 \rangle_2$ ;
- $\langle 1 \rangle_2 = 5 \notin \{1\} \cup \{3, 6\} = \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1 \cup \langle L_1 \rangle_1$ ;
- $\langle L_1 \rangle_1 \setminus \{\theta\} = \{3, 6\} \setminus \{3\} \subseteq \{5, 6\} = \langle [1, m_2] \rangle_2$ ;
- $\langle L_2 \rangle_2 \setminus \{\theta\} = \{3\} \setminus \{3\} \subseteq \{1\} = \langle [1, m_1] \rangle_1$ .

Thus, the conditions in Theorem 6 are satisfied and we have a blending inequality

$$y_1 + 5y_2 + 3z_1 + 45z_5 + 10(1 - z_3) + 17(1 - z_6) \geq 113$$

which is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

Next, we give a special case of Theorem 6 and show how to use it as our separation algorithm.

**Corollary 5** *Suppose all scenarios have equal probabilities and  $d = 2$ . If  $L_1 = L_2 = \{\theta\}$  for some  $\theta \in [1, n]$ , then the blending inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$  if following conditions hold*

- $\theta \in \langle [p + 1, n] \rangle_1 \cap \langle [p + 1, n] \rangle_2$ ;
- $\langle T_1 \rangle_1 \cap \langle T_2 \rangle_2 = \emptyset$ ;
- $\langle 1 \rangle_1 \notin \langle [1, p] \rangle_2 \cup \{\theta\}$ ; and
- $\langle 1 \rangle_2 \notin \langle [1, p] \rangle_1 \cup \{\theta\}$ .

*Proof* Because  $\langle 1 \rangle_1 \notin \langle [1, p] \rangle_2 \cup \{\theta\}$ , condition (42) holds, which implies that the blending inequality is valid. It is easy to check that all conditions in Theorem 6 are satisfied. Therefore, the blending inequality is valid and facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .  $\square$

**Separation Heuristic** First, we collect a set  $R$  consisting of pairs  $(r_1, r_2)$  where  $r_1 \neq r_2 \in [1, d]$ ,  $\langle 1 \rangle_{r_1} \notin \langle [1, p] \rangle_{r_2}$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle_{r_2} \notin \langle [1, p] \rangle_{r_1}$ . Suppose  $z^*$  is a fraction solution. For each pair  $(r_1, r_2) \in R$ , let  $\theta = \arg \max_i \{\pi_i : z_i^* = 1, i \in \langle [p + 1, n] \rangle_{r_1} \cap \langle [p + 1, n] \rangle_{r_2}\}$ . Next, we find the set  $T_1$  by solving a shortest path problem from the source  $\langle 1 \rangle_{r_1}$  to the sink  $\langle p - 1 \rangle_{r_1}$  on a directed acyclic graph with vertices  $\langle \{1, \dots, p - 1\} \rangle_{r_1}$ , edges  $\langle (i)_{r_1}, (j)_{r_1} \rangle, 1 \leq i < j \leq p - 1$  and associated cost of  $(h_{(i)_{r_1}} - h_{(j)_{r_1}})z_{(i)_{r_1}}^*$ . Finally, the set  $T_2$  is obtained by solving another shortest path problem from the source  $\langle 1 \rangle_{r_2}$  to the sink  $\langle p - 1 \rangle_{r_2}$  on a directed acyclic graph with vertices  $\langle \{1, \dots, p - 1\} \rangle_{r_2} \setminus \langle T_1 \rangle_{r_1}$ , edges  $\langle (i)_{r_2}, (j)_{r_2} \rangle, 1 \leq i < j \leq p - 1$  but  $\langle i \rangle_{r_2}, \langle j \rangle_{r_2} \notin \langle T \rangle_{r_1}$ , and associated cost of  $(h_{(i)_{r_2}} - h_{(j)_{r_2}})z_{(i)_{r_2}}^*$ . Following Corollary 5, all violated inequalities found by this separation algorithm are facet-defining for  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

At the end of this section, we adopt an example from [22] to show that our blending inequalities are stronger than those generated from a single mixing set, which is obtained by combining original formulation.

*Example 3* (Example 2 in [22]) We have the chance-constrained program

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & x_1 + x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P \left\{ \begin{aligned} 2x_1 - x_2 &\geq \omega_1 \\ x_1 + 2x_2 &\geq \omega_2 \end{aligned} \right\} \geq 0.6 = 1 - \tau \\ & x_1, x_2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  are dependent random variables with joint probability density function given in Table 1. The optimal solution is  $(x, y) = (0.55, 0.35, 0.75, 1.25)$  with objective value 0.9.

**Table 1** Joint probability mass function of  $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2)$

Scenario	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$\omega_1$	0.75	0.5	0.5	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0
$\omega_2$	1.25	1.5	1.25	1.75	1.5	1.25	2	1.5	1.25
Probability	0.2	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.3	0.04	0.04	0.1

For this example, we have  $\tau = 0.4, d = 2, p = 6, \nu_1 = 3$  and  $\nu_2 = 5$ . Let  $y_1 = 2x_1 - x_2$  and  $y_2 = x_1 + 2x_2$ . Then the mixing set reformulation is

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_1 + 0.75z_1 &\geq 0.75 & y_2 + 2.00z_7 &\geq 2.00 \\
 y_1 + 0.50z_2 &\geq 0.50 & y_2 + 1.75z_4 &\geq 1.75 \\
 y_1 + 0.50z_3 &\geq 0.50 & y_2 + 1.50z_2 &\geq 1.50 \\
 y_1 + 0.25z_4 &\geq 0.25 & y_2 + 1.50z_5 &\geq 1.50 \\
 y_1 + 0.25z_5 &\geq 0.25 & y_2 + 1.50z_8 &\geq 1.50 \\
 y_1 + 0.25z_6 &\geq 0.25 & y_2 + 1.25z_1 &\geq 1.25 \\
 &\vdots & &\vdots \\
 &\sum_{i=1}^9 \pi_i z_i &\leq 0.4 &= \tau
 \end{aligned}$$

and the tighter formulation (3) in [29] is

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_1 + 0.50z_1 &\geq 0.75 & y_2 + 0.75z_7 &\geq 2.00 \\
 y_1 + 0.25z_2 &\geq 0.50 & y_2 + 0.50z_4 &\geq 1.75 \\
 y_1 + 0.25z_3 &\geq 0.50 & y_2 + 0.25z_2 &\geq 1.50 \\
 y_1 &\geq 0.25 & y_2 + 0.25z_5 &\geq 1.50 \\
 & & y_2 + 0.25z_8 &\geq 1.50 \\
 &\vdots & y_2 &\geq 1.25 \\
 & & &\vdots \\
 &\sum_{i=1}^9 \pi_i z_i &\leq 0.4 &= \tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

The initial linear programming (LP) relaxation solution by using tight formulation (3) is

$$(x, y) = (0.49, 0.38, 0.60, 1.25).$$

In [22], the author proposed 3 inequalities in the form of (14), which were generated for  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ , respectively. Then the author combined two mixing sets with  $y_1$  and  $y_2$

(with equal weights), and derived a valid inequality  $y_1 + y_2 \geq 2$  from that aggregation. Augmented with those inequalities, the updated LP relaxation has a solution with optimal  $(x, y)$ .

For this example, based on our previously presented theorems, we are able to develop several new facet-defining inequalities. First, we have facet-defining inequality

$$y_2 + 0.25z_2 + 0.25z_4 + 0.25z_7 \geq 2 \quad (44)$$

which is a *strengthened star inequality* in [29] and also a special case of inequality (5). Then, we have another facet-defining inequality

$$z_2 + z_4 + z_6 \leq 2 + 4(y_1 - 0.75) + (1 - z_7) \quad (45)$$

which is derived from lifting by fixing  $z_7 = 1$  and letting  $m = 2$ . Note that, with these choices, we have a minimal cover inequality

$$z_2 + z_4 + z_6 \leq 2.$$

From Theorem 3, we can easily calculate  $\rho = 1$  and  $\Phi(\pi_1) = \Phi(0.2) = 1$ . So we have

$$z_2 + z_4 + z_6 \leq 2 + 4(y_1 - 0.75)$$

which is valid when  $z_7 = 1$ . By performing lifting procedure on variable  $z_7$ , we can derive inequality (45). Indeed, by summing (44) and  $0.25 \times (45)$ , we have a valid inequality  $y_1 + y_2 \geq 2 + 0.25z_6$ . Because it dominates the inequality  $y_1 + y_2 \geq 2$ , the latter one clearly is not facet-defining. Instead, the *blending inequality* proposed in this section gives a facet-defining inequality

$$y_1 + y_2 + 0.25z_1 + 0.5z_7 + 0.25(1 - z_9) \geq 2.75 \quad (46)$$

by blending following two inequalities as in (39)

$$y_1 + 0.25z_1 + 0.25(1 - z_9) \geq 0.75 \quad (47)$$

$$y_2 + 0.5z_7 + 0.25(1 - z_9) \geq 2 \quad (48)$$

where (47) and (48) are facet-defining inequalities for two individual mixing sets respectively, and can be derived by (5).

## 5 Computational study

In order to investigate the computational advantages of the proposed strong inequalities, we implement them as cutting planes within professional solver CPLEX's

branch-and-bound process, i.e., an implementation of of branch-and-cut (B&C) algorithm. In particular, the CALLABLE libraries of CPLEX 12.6.1 are called for adding user defined cuts and a single thread with traditional branch-and-bound search method is adopted. All tests are subject to 3600 CPU seconds time limit. If no optimal solution is obtained within the time limit, then the optimality gap will be reported. Because it is often the case that a very large number of user defined cuts will be generated, we activate the purging option (which is the default option as well) in CPLEX to allow ineffective ones to be removed by CPLEX. The complete computational study is carried out on the Texas Tech High Performance Computing Center’s node based system, where each node contains two Westmere 2.8 GHz 6-core processors with 24 GB main memory [19].

Our numerical study data sets (available at [51]) consist of a set of difficult and large instances of the static probabilistic lot-sizing (SPLS) model as described in [48] with  $d$  periods,  $n$  scenarios and service level  $1 - \tau$ . Let  $x_t$  be the decision variable of ordering quantity in period  $t$ ,  $I_{it}$  be the inventory level at the end of period  $t$  under scenario  $i$ , and  $w_t$  be binary variables to indicate order setup. The *natural* deterministic equivalent of SPLS model is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max \quad & \sum_{t=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i (c_t x_t + h_{it} I_{it} + g_t w_t) \\
 \text{s.t.} \quad & y_t = \sum_{j=1}^t x_j && t \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\
 & y_t \geq D_{it}(1 - z_i) && t \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\
 & I_{it} \geq y_t - D_{it} && t \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\
 & 0 \leq x_t \leq M_t w_t && t \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\
 & \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i z_i \leq \tau \\
 & I_{i,t} \geq 0, z_i, w_t \in \{0, 1\} && t \in \{1, \dots, d\}, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $D_{it}$  is the cumulative demand until period  $t$  under scenario  $i$ ,  $c_t$  and  $g_t$  are the variable and fixed costs of ordering,  $h_{it}$  is the variable holding cost in period  $t$  under scenario  $i$ , and  $M_t$  is the order capacity in period  $t$ . As mentioned in Sect. 1, this natural formulation can be easily strengthened by using (3), which has a tighter LP relaxation and less constraints. Hence, the reformulation (3) is applied on those instances to build our testing platform for both CPLEX and B&C algorithms.

We assume that the demands are i.i.d. across periods. In any time period, the demand follows a normal distribution with mean 100 and standard deviation 40, i.e., Normal(100, 40), and we set demand to 0 if a negative number is generated (denoted as Normal<sup>+</sup>(100,40)). Then, the cumulative demand  $D_{i1}$  is generated from Normal<sup>+</sup>(100,40), and  $D_{it}$  is generated by adding an i.i.d. random number from Normal<sup>+</sup>(100,40) to  $D_{i,t-1} \forall t \in [2, d]$ . The variable production costs are generated from a uniform distribution between 1 and 5 and inventory holding costs are gener-

ated from an uniform distribution between 1 and 2. The fixed costs follow a discrete uniform distribution between 900 and 1000. We set the order capacity  $M_t = 500$ .

### 5.1 Computational results of instances with general probabilities

To generate instances with scenarios of general probabilities, we first assign every scenario a random number from a discrete uniform distribution between 1 and 99, and then normalize those numbers by dividing their total summation to obtain probabilities for all scenarios. By varying values of  $d$ ,  $n$  and  $\tau$ , 45 instances with different sizes are produced. Those random instances are tested by our implementations of the following computing methods. Observing that adding cuts at every node of branch-and-bound tree is rather ineffective, our implementations mainly focus on cut generation at the root node.

- **CPX** indicates the default CPLEX with traditional B&C in single thread mode;
- **Mix** indicates a B&C algorithm by adding *strengthened star inequalities* [3,29] at every node of branch-and-bound tree;
- **MixR** indicates a B&C algorithm by adding *strengthened star inequalities* [3,29] at the root node only;
- **TL** indicates a B&C algorithm by adding TL inequalities (using the separation algorithm described in [22]) at every node of the B&C tree;
- **TLR** indicates a B&C algorithm by adding TL inequalities (using the separation algorithm described in [22]) at the root node only;
- **LF** indicates applying the algorithm MixR on an updated formulation with lifting cover inequalities (see Sect. 3 for implementation details);
- **GMixR** indicates a B&C algorithm by adding new inequalities (5) (using the separation algorithm presented in Sect. 2) at the root node only.

The detailed computational results of each algorithm are presented in two tables, i.e., Tables 5 and 6, due to space limitation. To evaluate the overall performance of those algorithms and gain a general understanding, a summary is presented in Table 2, where we report the number of instances solved to the optimality (column Solved), the number of unsolved instances (column Unsolved), the average gap before termination among unsolved instances (column Avg. Gap (Unsolved)), and the average number of user defined cuts added before termination but after CPLEX purging (column Avg. Cuts). Given that B&C algorithms have different behaviors and almost all of them (excluding TL) are actually able to solve instances that are solved by CPLEX, we benchmark their performances against CPLEX on those instances to have a fair comparison basis. Hence, in Table 2, we also report algorithms' data on those instances, specifically, the average CPU seconds (column Avg. Time (CPX Solved)), the ratio of the average CPU seconds between CPLEX and a B&C algorithm (column  $\frac{\text{CPX Time}}{\text{B\&C Time}}$ ), the average number of nodes explored (column Avg. Nodes (CPX Solved)), and the ratio of the average number of nodes explored between CPLEX and a B&C algorithm (column  $\frac{\text{CPX Nodes}}{\text{B\&C Nodes}}$ ).

Based on Table 2, a few non-trivial observations can be made. First, as mentioned, adding cuts at every node of the whole branch-and-bound tree is not an effective



**Table 2** Summarized results of computing lot-sizing instances with general probabilities

	Solved	Unsolved	Avg. Gap	Avg. Cuts (CPX Solved)	Avg. Time (CPX Solved)	CPX Time B&C Time	Avg. Nodes (CPX Solved)	CPX Nodes B&C Nodes
<b>CPX</b>	22	23	1.66	0.0	1068.4	1.0	80,961.1	1.0
<b>Mix</b>	34	11	2.14	10,968.5	864.7	1.2	89,57.4	9.0
<b>MixR</b>	38	7	1.60	219.0	578.9	1.8	30,071.8	2.7
<b>TL</b>	6	39	5.42	27,509.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TLR</b>	22	23	1.90	33.8	1465.6	0.7	80,944.1	1.0
<b>LF</b>	39	6	1.58	212.6	434.8	2.5	22,999.1	3.5
<b>GMixR</b>	40	5	1.12	216.2	325.3	3.3	19,473.7	4.2

strategy. As demonstrated in **Mix** and **TL**, an extremely large number of cuts are generated, which drastically increase the complexity of SPLS formulation. Such situation is especially severe in **TL**. Note that SPLS only has  $d + 1$  non-sparse constraints, i.e., the first set of constraints and the 0–1 knapsack. Nevertheless, the average number of generated TL inequalities, which are non-sparse, is almost twenty-seven thousands. Comparing to the performances of their two corresponding variants, i.e., **MixR** and **TLR**, we can clearly see the benefits of adding cuts in a less frequent fashion.

Second, among all implemented computing methods, our **GMixR** and **LF** provide the most significant computational improvements and perform much better than CPLEX. Note that only 22 of 45 instances can be solved to optimality by CPLEX, while **LF** and **GMixR** can solve 39 and 40 instances, respectively. In addition, **GMixR** and **LF**, on instances solved by CPLEX, have the best computation speed (are faster by 2.5 and 3.3 times, respectively) with the smaller numbers of branch-and-bound nodes (roughly 28 and 24% of CPLEX nodes, respectively). Also, for those that cannot be solved to optimality, the average gaps before termination in **GMixR** and **LF** are the least ones. For the efficacy of **GMixR**, we believe that it is mainly due to the fact that the separation algorithm based on Corollary 2 leads to facet-defining cuts for the polyhedron of CCP. As the *strengthened star inequalities* are also facet-defining cuts for the polyhedron of CCP, results of **GMixR** and **MixR** show that they are all practically useful and the former has more computationally advantages. For **LF**, we think the lifted inequalities largely capture the non-trivial interactions between mixing set and the 0–1 knapsack. Their strong performance suggests that a more sophisticated separation algorithm is worth further exploring.

Third, although TL inequalities are theoretically valid and strong, they are less effective than the *strengthened star inequalities* in computation. One explanation is that, as shown in Corollary 1 and Example 1, TL inequalities are usually weak for CCP instances with general probabilities. Another interesting observation is that **TL** has much more user defined cuts than **Mix**, while the root node implementation variant **TLR** has much less cuts than the corresponding **MixR**. One possibility is that we allow CPLEX to purge user defined cuts if they are deemed weak, CPLEX may decide to purge a high proportion of TL cuts and start branching very soon.

## 5.2 Computational results of instances with equal probabilities

In Sect. 4, we develop a new technique to blend strong inequalities (5) derived from individual mixing sets into a strong one for CCP. In particular, we show that blending inequality could be facet-defining when scenarios have equal probabilities. In order to computationally evaluate this new type of inequalities, we generate 45 instances with equal probabilities (by simply setting scenario probabilities as  $\frac{1}{n}$ ) and compute them by the following computing methods.

- **CPX** indicates the default CPLEX with transitional branch-and-bound in single thread mode;
- **Mix** indicates a branch-and-cut algorithm by adding *strengthened star inequalities* at every node of branch-and-bound tree;

- **Mix100** indicates a branch-and-cut algorithm by adding *strengthened star inequalities* at every 100 nodes of branch-and-bound tree;
- **BL** indicates a branch-and-cut algorithm by adding *blending inequalities* at the root node and *strengthened star inequalities* at every 100 nodes of the branch-and-bound tree.

The **Mix100** is implemented due to the observation made from Table 2 that adding cuts at every node of the whole branch-and-bound tree is not effective. With some preliminary tests, we find that adding *strengthened star inequalities* at every 100 nodes of branch-and-bound tree gives the best result in general. Then, on top of the **Mix100**, we develop **BL** algorithm by adding blending inequalities at the root node. Similar to the organization of Sect. 5.1, the detailed computational results are presented in Table 7 and a summary is presented in Table 3.

Based on the performances of CPLEX and **Mix** in Tables 2 and 3, we first note that the instances with equal probabilities are not necessarily easier than the instances with general probabilities. It is different from the observation made in [29], but reasonable since  $p \geq v$  (or  $p \geq v_r \forall r \in [1, d]$ ) and hence the instances with equal probabilities usually have much larger problem size in the reformulation (3).

Regarding the effectiveness of B&C methods, we observe that **BL** completely dominates other algorithms by optimally computing almost all instances (44 out of 45 instances) and demonstrating much fast computational speed (as  $4.5 \times$  CPLEX). We believe that such strong performance shows that the generated blending cuts, which capture the interactive information among mixing sets and are facet-defining for CCP, have a great computational advantage over existing strong inequalities derived from single mixing sets. The ratio of the average number of nodes between CPLEX and **BL** supports our understanding. Note that **BL** generally has 13% less user defined cuts than **Mix100** while it explores 23% less nodes in the branch-and-bound trees than **Mix100**.

## 6 Conclusion and future research

In this paper, we study the polyhedral structure of chance-constrained program with stochastic right-hand side, which is computationally very challenging. We develop three families of strong inequalities from different perspectives. Following the tradition that considers a single mixing set with a 0–1 knapsack, our first family of inequalities of that set dominates or subsumes all explicit inequalities described in [1, 22, 29]. Our second family of inequalities builds a direct link between a single mixing set and 0–1 knapsack through lifting and superadditive lifting with respect to cover inequality. In order to analyzing the interactions among multiple mixing sets, we design a novel technique to integrate facet-defining inequalities derived from individual mixing sets, which leads to our third family of inequalities, i.e., *blending inequalities*. Finally, we implement all three families of strong inequalities and test them on random instances of static probabilistic lot-sizing problem. Through benchmarking with a professional MIP solver and existing cutting plane methods, we observe significant computational improvements can be achieved by all those proposed inequalities, especially by the newly developed *blending inequalities*.

**Table 3** Summarized results of computing lot-sizing instances with equal probabilities

	Solved	Unsolved	Avg. Gap	Avg. Gap (Unsolved) (%)	Avg. Cuts (CPX Solved)	Avg. Time (CPX Solved)	CPX Time B&C Time	Avg. Nodes (CPX Solved)	CPX Nodes B&C Nodes
<b>CPX</b>	23	22	1.87		0.0	1705.5	1.0	109,190.3	1
<b>Mix</b>	33	12	2.67		12,142.5	958.9	1.8	10,297.0	10.6
<b>Mix100</b>	37	8	1.72		2273.9	597.0	2.9	13,522.4	8.1
<b>BL</b>	44	1	0.60		1960.1	381.4	4.5	10,503.3	10.4

There are three directions, we believe, that deserve further studies. The first one is to develop more general and effective separation algorithms. Note that cutting planes generated in our current numerical study is just a small proportion of our first family of strong inequalities. So, more powerful separation algorithms will allow us to make good use of that large family of strong inequalities. Another one is to develop stronger superadditive lifting functions and better lifting techniques. For example, our current superadditive approximation scheme is adopted from existing research, which probably is not the best one. A deeper study on the lifting function should help us develop tighter valid approximations for stronger cutting planes. Finally, given the outstanding computational performance of *blending inequalities*, this technique should be fully investigated and we will extend it for other similar models.

### Appendix 1: Notations

Table 4 presents our key notations, their definitions and the first usage place. Note that many notations are reused in Sect. 4 (especially in Definition 1) with an additional subscript  $r$  because we extend our results in Sect. 2 to multiple mixing sets.

**Table 4** Key notations used in this paper

Type	Notation	Definition	Introduced in
Parameters	$n$	Number of scenarios (dimension of $\mathbf{z}$ variable)	Sect. 1
	$d$	Dimension of $\mathbf{y}$ variable (number of periods in lot-sizing model)	Sect. 1
	$h_{ri}, h_i$	Right hand side of chance constraints with $r \in [1, d], i \in [1, n]$	Sect. 1
	$m$	Dimension of $\mathbf{x}$ variable	Sect. 1
	$\tau$	The threshold probability for chance constraint	Sect. 1
	$\omega_i$	A scenario in a set of finitely many realizations with $i \in [1, n]$	Sect. 1
	$\pi_i$	The probability associated with $\omega_i$	Sect. 1
	$v$	$\sum_{i=1}^v \pi_i \leq \tau$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{v+1} \pi_i > \tau$ with $h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \dots \geq h_n$	Sect. 1
	$p$	$\sum_{i=1}^p \pi_{(i)} \leq \tau$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p+1} \pi_{(i)} > \tau$ where $\{(1), (2), \dots, (n)\}$ is a permutation of the set $[1, n]$ with $\pi_{(1)} \leq \pi_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \pi_{(n)}$ . Note $p = v$ in the case of equal probabilities	Sect. 1
	$m$	An arbitrary scalar in $[1, v]$	Theorems 1 and 3
	$a$	Cardinality of set $T$	Theorem 1
	$q$	Cardinality of set $L$	Theorem 1

**Table 4** continued

Type	Notation	Definition	Introduced in
	$\delta_*$	Coefficient of the term $(1 - z_*)$ for proposed inequalities	Theorems 1 and 3
	$M, a_i, \mu, m$	Only used in Corollary 3 to match notations in Theorem 14 in [1]	Corollary 3
	$\rho$	A scalar related to lifting coefficient	Theorem 3
	$\bar{\rho}$	A upper bound of obtaining feasible $\rho$	Sect. 3
	$\alpha_i$	Coefficients of an arbitrary lifted cover inequality for $i \in E$	Sect. 3
	$\tau'$	$= \tau - \sum_{i \in N_1} \pi_i$ updated threshold probability after $z$ variables fixed	Sect. 3
Polyhedron	$\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{Q}_r$	A mixing set with 0–10–1 knapsack	Sect. 1
	$\mathcal{Q}$	Polyhedron of CCP	Sect. 1
	$\mathcal{S}(N_0, N_1)$	Projected set for lifting procedure	Sect. 3
	$\mathcal{K}(N_1)$	Projected set for lifting procedure	Theorem 3
Index sets	$T$	$= \{t_1, \dots, t_a\} \subseteq [1, m]$	Theorem 1
	$L$	$\subseteq [1, n] \setminus T$	Theorem 1
	$\{s_1, \dots, s_{q+1}\}$	A sequence of integers such that $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_q \leq s_{q+1} = v - m + 1$	Theorem 1
	$\Pi_L$	$= \{l_1, \dots, l_q\}$ , an arbitrary permutation of set $L$ with $l_j \geq m + \min\{1 + s_j, s_{j+1}\}$	Theorem 1
	$\{k_1, \dots, k_q\}$	A permutation of set $L$ based on probability $\pi_{k_i}$	Theorem 1
	$N_0, N_1$	The set of $\mathbf{z}$ variables fixed at 0 or 1 respectively	Sect. 3
	$\hat{N}$	$= [1, n] \setminus (N_0 \cup N_1)$	Sect. 3
	$\mathbb{C}$	Cover	Sect. 3
	$E$	Variables $z_i \forall i \in E$ have nonzero coefficient in a lifted cover inequality	Sect. 3
Lifting functions	$G(W, \beta)$	Where $W \subseteq E$ and $\beta \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i$	Sect. 3
	$\Phi(\beta)$	For lifting coefficients $\phi_i$	Theorem 3

## Appendix 2: Computational tables for instances with general probabilities

The column  $d \times n \times \tau$  indicates that the instance has  $d$  periods and  $n$  scenarios with service level  $1 - \tau$ . For a given combination of  $d, n, \tau$ , we solve 5 instances. In all tables, we compare the percentage of root node gap (column **%RootGap**), the number of branch-and-cut tree nodes explored (column **Nodes**), and CPU time in second on solving the instance to the optimality (column **Time (%Endgap)**). We indicate the instance that could not be solved within one hour with  $T(gap)$ , where  $gap$ , in parenthesis, is the percentage gap between the best lower bound and the best integer solution found in the search tree when the time limit is reached. We also report the number of user cuts added (column **Cuts**) after purging. Due to the page size restriction, we partition the results into two tables as in Tables 5 and 6.

**Table 5** Static probabilistic lot-sizing problem with general probabilities (cuts on every node)

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap				Nodes				Time (%Endgap)				Cuts					
	CPX		Mix		TL		Mix		CPX		Mix		TL		Mix		TL	
	CPX	Mix	TL	Mix	CPX	Mix	TL	Mix	CPX	Mix	TL	Mix	TL	Mix	TL	Mix	TL	
$30 \times 300 \times 0.2$	12.89	12.97	11.90	1472	42,667	1885	493	323	493	323	T(5.87)	9566	44,235					
	12.64	12.91	11.67	2635	42,295	13,914	573	619	573	619	T(4.41)	14,758	40,042					
	13.52	14.79	15.58	6537	129,237	8803	2446	1253	2446	1253	T(5.42)	13,104	40,881					
	13.28	10.67	13.74	3265	108,929	5103	1433	915	1433	915	T(5.56)	15,950	40,929					
$30 \times 300 \times 0.25$	10.06	13.30	13.26	1295	20,672	6153	226	233	226	233	T(3.44)	7926	39,937					
	16.58	16.52	16.61	4494	119,828	27,855	2022	1663	2022	1663	T(4.26)	18,743	29,973					
	17.60	15.33	16.72	5101	165,600	6022	T(0.47)	2027	T(0.47)	2027	T(6.5)	22,006	28,915					
	12.74	16.04	14.70	4788	144,137	5261	2253	2880	2253	2880	T(5.82)	28,180	36,505					
$30 \times 400 \times 0.2$	12.21	13.65	11.52	7554	82,373	2808	930	1385	930	1385	T(6.23)	12,317	41,126					
	14.06	13.79	13.41	3040	63,613	1899	1191	1129	1191	1129	T(6.85)	15,587	42,442					
	12.47	12.58	11.06	3404	116,158	3589	1765	928	1765	928	T(4.59)	13,472	29,113					
	20.90	17.32	15.06	3246	164,404	2371	T(0.66)	1343	T(0.66)	1343	T(8.44)	16,116	43,727					
$30 \times 400 \times 0.25$	14.74	13.27	13.30	3197	213,110	11,140	T(0.85)	1326	T(0.85)	1326	T(5.81)	18,949	35,557					
	10.15	9.33	11.02	1744	164,548	2327	1831	634	1831	634	T(5.26)	12,995	38,621					
	12.02	13.18	14.24	2584	100,968	198	1345	1097	1345	1097	T(6.74)	19,420	37,002					
	13.77	13.51	13.66	1375	136,077	1887	T(0.57)	852	T(0.57)	852	T(5.9)	12,759	39,507					
$40 \times 400 \times 0.1$	11.80	14.03	14.85	3050	91,600	1337	T(0.61)	T(2.39)	T(0.61)	T(2.39)	T(7.5)	27,890	36,893					
	11.43	12.03	11.79	2588	117,300	1003	T(1.41)	T(2.31)	T(1.41)	T(2.31)	T(6.19)	26,575	31,546					
	15.73	21.15	16.12	3379	82,502	2985	T(3.08)	2153	T(3.08)	2153	T(8.06)	17,688	42,711					
	19.55	19.11	16.42	2846	103,810	2000	T(2.51)	T(2.15)	T(2.51)	T(2.15)	T(8.83)	27,901	39,520					
$40 \times 400 \times 0.1$	17.66	13.96	9.33	6172	81,267	23,300	1206	507	1206	507	T(2.7)	7591	31,354					
	9.74	10.71	8.56	3625	36,124	45,453	472	267	472	267	T(1.8)	5988	28,524					
	12.17	11.92	11.09	10,969	81,150	57,600	855	794	855	794	T(0.97)	8106	16,858					

**Table 5** continued

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap			Nodes			Time (%Endgap)			Cuts	
	CPX	Mix	TL	CPX	Mix	zTL	CPX	Mix	TL	Mix	TL
$40 \times 400 \times 0.15$	10.40	13.70	13.09	40,383	11,830	23,322	501	837	T(2.11)	7169	34,188
	12.49	10.52	14.96	40,123	4625	23,565	518	275	962	6594	6093
	14.68	16.66	11.77	87,227	8766	21,167	T(1.76)	1474	T(3.68)	12,091	26,988
	16.19	19.15	13.87	131,435	8222	44,299	T(1.83)	1584	T(3.63)	14,904	24,704
	12.35	13.51	11.50	118,690	17,492	21,604	T(1.23)	2761	T(4.67)	17,575	32,079
	14.83	17.15	15.56	100,350	13,919	9946	T(1.42)	2184	T(5.46)	14,086	27,822
$40 \times 500 \times 0.1$	12.49	21.96	14.87	93,400	17,402	10,298	T(2.26)	T(1.57)	T(6.38)	16,683	38,790
	15.33	11.31	14.86	150,900	19,504	11,399	T(0.34)	T(0.86)	T(4.2)	16,296	31,822
	12.64	9.91	12.76	115,200	15,580	10,953	T(1.41)	T(1.29)	T(5.7)	22,261	39,487
	13.25	16.15	13.31	137,300	8474	21,125	T(0.74)	1531	T(3.59)	15,160	32,950
	13.07	13.02	10.23	157,900	14,466	10,593	T(1.96)	T(1.28)	T(4.71)	20,375	32,937
	19.03	14.00	12.18	153,900	29,846	25,474	T(1.06)	3510	T(3.67)	14,761	29,732
$40 \times 500 \times 0.15$	18.00	18.14	19.68	84,737	5080	2884	T(2.75)	T(2.38)	T(6.86)	20,350	38,996
	16.94	14.32	13.41	82,100	5427	2950	T(2.43)	T(2.29)	T(6.78)	23,158	33,970
	17.29	14.91	12.49	90,885	6665	6490	T(2.75)	T(2.08)	T(6.85)	22,109	36,647
	11.97	15.87	15.12	76,884	6575	2900	T(4.45)	T(4.98)	T(8.73)	23,662	37,875
	11.57	11.93	14.56	114,678	12,517	2434	T(1.58)	3570	T(7.15)	17,821	37,627
	8.76	9.01	16.5	117,935	42,897	134,256	1048	1031	3014	5643	2767
$50 \times 500 \times 0.05$	9.64	9.91	10.67	89,165	27,431	100,910	876	730	1769	5392	2173
	9.35	9.78	8.42	87,896	24,922	52,688	783	833	1687	4352	5890
	13.81	7.21	8.86	33,591	8999	36,866	323	224	1280	3401	7592
	8.7	7.38	7.74	38,084	12,780	32,574	414	467	1396	5052	8952



**Table 6** Static probabilistic lot-sizing problem with general probabilities (cuts on root node)

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap		Nodes						Time (%Endgap)						Cuts				
	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR
$30 \times 300 \times 0.2$	12.89	12.97	11.9	14.33	11.19	42,667	14,036	33,440	13,404	7960	493	224	696	203	119	209	101	213	212
	12.64	12.91	11.67	12.37	15.39	42,295	18,938	58,888	15,575	14,206	573	389	899	299	241	250	25	176	198
	13.52	14.79	15.58	12.92	14.03	129,237	30,655	110,865	21,694	18,130	2446	708	1843	459	374	273	47	299	269
	13.28	10.67	13.74	10.98	15.07	108,929	22,701	81,320	23,294	21,661	1433	584	1997	494	340	274	29	256	265
	10.06	13.3	13.26	10.7	12.55	20,672	9149	22,667	8700	7645	226	172	311	171	94	172	36	186	158
$30 \times 300 \times 0.25$	16.58	16.52	16.61	16.04	15.75	119,828	35,109	136,123	19,645	21,179	2022	811	2759	596	473	303	2	264	317
	17.6	15.33	16.72	15.99	16.86	165,600	37,590	92,900	30,974	35,583	T(0.47)	1532	T(0.61)	1135	850	329	94	297	328
	12.74	16.04	18.54	13.12	11.73	144,137	25,706	108,042	26,458	18,875	2253	759	2010	710	492	346	87	342	309
	12.21	13.65	11.52	11.89	13.87	82,373	39,008	86,022	25,600	19,794	930	1085	1569	629	392	224	43	232	281
	14.06	13.79	13.41	14.87	12.4	63,613	18,399	108,476	12,197	11,501	1191	540	2230	523	343	262	63	266	296
$30 \times 400 \times 0.2$	12.47	12.58	11.06	12.21	12.19	116,158	34,109	139,224	33,693	26,111	1765	628	2092	513	360	298	107	273	299
	20.9	17.32	15.06	23.61	14.46	164,404	30,017	85,300	27,841	21,779	T(0.66)	984	T(1.23)	768	679	391	36	369	428
	14.74	13.27	13.3	11.95	14.14	213,110	75,576	202,768	37,938	36,273	T(0.85)	1807	T(0.57)	1325	946	379	27	415	505
	10.15	9.33	11.02	9.4	9.01	164,548	33,891	100,680	21,500	21,447	1831	584	1622	347	337	249	33	253	229
	12.02	13.18	14.24	16.43	15.39	100,968	23,354	139,159	23,597	16,037	1345	739	3249	633	519	362	91	311	358
$30 \times 400 \times 0.25$	13.77	13.51	14.27	13.56	15.27	136,077	51,254	95,178	15,051	29,366	T(0.57)	1876	T(1.41)	557	1016	425	46	398	433
	11.8	14.03	14.38	14.39	15.51	91,600	37,872	61,381	34,696	28,585	T(0.61)	2447	T(2.56)	1879	1517	349	136	405	442
	11.43	12.03	11.79	13.04	11.81	117,300	70,938	88,109	60,147	40,863	T(1.41)	2258	T(1.41)	1937	945	352	152	350	422
	15.73	21.15	20.17	11.64	19.2	82,502	44,552	109,623	35,863	31,453	T(3.08)	2752	T(1.78)	2052	1361	447	40	444	514
	19.55	19.11	21.81	14.38	14.77	103,810	42,420	83,890	34,127	52,048	T(2.51)	3201	T(1.9)	1665	2212	508	70	483	541
$40 \times 400 \times 0.1$	17.66	13.96	9.33	10.75	9.91	81,267	21,202	43,391	27,634	18,298	1206	523	1029	863	346	200	3	221	227
	9.74	10.71	8.56	9.22	7.88	36,124	13,419	46,115	10,341	10,713	472	310	837	201	175	198	7	193	194
	12.17	11.92	11.09	10.75	10.72	81,150	33,767	101,033	25,414	14,718	855	580	1591	415	235	141	9	152	143

Table 6 continued

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap			Nodes						Time (%Endgap)						Cuts			
	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	CPX	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR	MixR	TLR	LF	GMixR
$40 \times 400 \times 0.15$	10.4	13.7	13.09	9.89	20.85	40,383	32,891	35,208	15,660	20,757	501	700	599	255	465	223	15	197	191
	12.49	10.52	14.96	12.31	13.83	40,123	18,086	23,734	13,530	14,034	518	330	344	202	205	107	9	99	95
	16.19	19.15	13.87	13.32	13.08	87,227	42,816	81,100	52,020	32,366	T(1.76)	1628	T(1.45)	1691	947	266	49	291	314
$40 \times 500 \times 0.1$	12.35	13.51	11.5	11.27	13.67	118,690	57,456	108,000	27,582	43,054	T(1.23)	2331	T(1.66)	1162	1595	336	7	327	322
	14.83	17.15	14.83	16.27	16.12	100,350	35,132	72,951	37,760	36,241	T(1.42)	1409	T(1.51)	2116	1816	307	85	309	379
	12.49	21.96	14.87	12.94	15.21	93,400	57,887	86,360	56,502	68,337	T(2.26)	T(1.03)	T(2.75)	T(1.11)	T(0.68)	429	20	382	485
$40 \times 500 \times 0.1$	15.33	11.31	14.86	12.42	12.71	150,900	87,120	75,095	75,619	66,276	T(0.34)	2152	T(1.78)	1848	1404	208	36	201	217
	12.64	9.91	12.76	14.09	16.5	115,200	60,753	96,827	79,870	48,108	T(1.41)	3190	T(1.75)	3418	1670	280	24	283	282
	13.25	16.15	13.31	17.42	12.58	137,300	30,928	90,777	25,329	18,469	T(0.74)	1372	T(0.81)	931	675	312	25	306	312
$40 \times 500 \times 0.15$	13.07	13.02	10.23	13.89	13.43	157,900	99,400	94,981	57,914	63,710	T(1.96)	T(0.3)	T(1.22)	1713	1708	308	38	318	307
	19.03	14	12.18	12.55	11.88	153,900	73,357	104,783	83,749	66,947	T(1.06)	3438	T(1.61)	2115	1793	251	16	224	255
	18.14	19.68	15.6	20.31	20.31	84,737	37,963	54,111	33,575	43,560	T(2.75)	T(2.04)	T(2.76)	T(2.03)	T(0.46)	313	72	337	355
$50 \times 500 \times 0.05$	16.94	14.32	13.41	11.58	13.77	82,100	37,417	50,971	38,153	42,195	T(2.43)	T(1.37)	T(2.75)	T(0.99)	T(0.92)	369	79	321	407
	17.29	14.91	12.39	11.95	15.29	90,885	42,507	56,673	43,859	37,639	T(2.75)	T(2.17)	T(2.87)	T(0.99)	T(1.33)	460	57	461	514
	11.97	15.87	15.12	17.78	17.67	76,884	39,392	57,300	41,900	47,504	T(4.45)	T(4.19)	T(4.44)	T(3.25)	T(2.24)	386	57	391	467
$50 \times 500 \times 0.05$	11.57	11.93	14.56	14.95	12.46	114,678	63,772	74,900	55,924	83,968	T(1.58)	T(0.11)	T(2.86)	T(1.13)	2982	383	58	411	340
	8.76	9.01	16.5	17.79	12.62	117,935	55,809	180,978	61,247	39,738	1048	669	2893	585	379	139	2	137	121
	9.64	9.91	10.67	11.27	11.9	89,165	91,086	98,540	42,856	33,870	876	1053	1472	583	402	134	13	150	128
$50 \times 500 \times 0.05$	9.35	9.78	8.42	11.2	12.74	87,896	53,415	50,235	26,869	41,640	783	910	881	411	498	185	17	188	199
	13.81	7.21	8.86	7.29	8.53	33,591	16,850	48,690	19,531	11,863	323	184	782	216	145	149	2	153	153
	8.7	7.38	7.74	9.32	6.55	38,084	19,999	27,939	17,541	18,245	414	253	538	258	222	119	3	117	114

**Table 7** Static probabilistic lot-sizing problem with equal probabilities

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap			Nodes			Time (%Endgap)			Cuts					
	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	Mix	Mix100	BL
	$30 \times 300 \times 0.2$	12.34	11.51	11.51	9.31	33,621	695	2452	1325	362	87	86	58	4619	1125
	12.56	12.06	12.06	11.99	65,932	2402	4255	3172	827	506	230	122	10,080	1944	1143
	17.89	17.5	17.5	25.35	77,859	2101	5990	4101	871	679	475	221	13,875	2212	1853
	14.09	18.03	18.03	18.2	81,532	4023	4998	3666	1012	977	315	203	14,790	2425	1368
	13.05	14.1	14.1	13.39	66,282	3917	3998	3611	1352	976	253	183	15,927	1871	1927
$30 \times 300 \times 0.25$	15.09	13.5	13.5	12.27	118,859	3656	8230	5549	T(1.51)	1527	849	494	17,157	3519	2406
	15.76	16.12	16.12	13.16	117,627	2294	4242	3275	1498	1222	409	291	17,088	2353	2454
	17.86	17.3	17.3	17.04	89,386	2695	4986	2194	1402	1232	423	216	18,575	2694	2209
	15.52	16.1	16.1	14.73	76,442	2368	4815	3819	965	1111	552	325	17,440	2199	1922
	13.84	15.12	15.12	24.63	148,971	2676	3820	3782	3048	1320	360	306	16,643	2617	2934
$30 \times 400 \times 0.2$	13.98	14.06	14.06	12.41	182,865	3364	5507	4768	T(0.16)	1928	723	491	21,185	3897	2689
	16.1	15.09	15.09	16.61	218,740	7589	23,316	10,360	T(2.06)	T(1.35)	3591	1423	23,274	7014	4759
	12.43	14.22	14.22	18.49	108,940	5447	5969	4062	2259	2718	780	472	24,391	3657	2997
	13.74	21.5	21.5	17.33	176,128	4237	6513	4045	2629	T(1.54)	920	460	27,310	4085	3195
	15.63	15.64	15.64	14.07	137,539	5980	10,183	5688	T(0.39)	2820	1069	752	17,202	3377	3179
	18.09	17.99	17.99	15.39	109,445	1949	4874	4263	T(1.93)	T(3.73)	1384	818	25,542	4631	3393
$30 \times 400 \times 0.25$	22.75	21.64	21.64	16.83	119,700	1419	7371	7158	T(1.9)	T(4.73)	T(1.6)	2195	31,299	9066	6467
	18.72	16.69	16.69	20.68	61,919	1553	10,228	6130	T(2.67)	T(4.88)	T(1.1)	1907	31,162	7961	4884
	13.42	13.43	13.43	19.66	140,255	3757	9424	5700	T(0.6)	T(0.26)	1546	1005	22,064	4784	5163
	18.77	14.27	14.27	20.49	122,025	2855	13,764	14,914	T(3.16)	T(5.43)	T(1.82)	3492	26,825	8435	6270
$40 \times 400 \times 0.1$	14.49	12.98	12.98	14.05	63,612	6857	10,716	7443	791	616	561	349	9113	2412	1862
	13.68	9.25	9.25	8.94	139,619	10,274	10,846	9650	2266	589	464	321	7054	1405	1653

Table 7 continued

$d \times n \times \tau$	%RootGap			Nodes			Time (%Endgap)			Cuts					
	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	CPX	Mix	Mix100	BL	Mix	Mix100	BL
$40 \times 400 \times 0.15$	13.1	13.21	13.21	11.72	242,727	18,461	30,759	27,243	2626	1302	1216	789	9255	2267	1917
	8.56	11.8	11.8	11.09	66,765	7759	8434	6500	1072	432	325	185	6753	1379	1149
	11.97	9.41	9.41	11.11	53,415	7130	10,553	8610	735	593	455	297	9973	1724	1817
	11.22	9.06	9.06	11.55	88,000	8165	14,667	11,080	T(1.93)	2089	1646	1166	16,865	4272	3569
	13.06	12.57	12.57	12.57	146,900	9410	11,368	10,312	T(0.88)	1199	1150	919	8988	2664	1908
	10.01	10.94	10.94	11.42	75,643	4491	6838	4542	T(0.7)	760	724	429	10,359	2169	1892
$40 \times 500 \times 0.1$	16.42	14.05	14.05	14.08	98,085	9604	14,618	9392	T(1.67)	2552	2062	1023	17,229	4401	3430
	13.27	15.17	15.17	12.59	137,367	3023	8870	5542	3571	401	790	365	6583	2299	1337
	10.84	11.92	11.92	9.94	68,922	4309	8625	6944	1241	435	572	441	8271	1956	2235
	12.1	16.97	16.97	16.18	123,100	25,255	33,523	25,734	T(2.46)	3548	3123	1837	15,494	4916	4236
	17.32	16.39	16.39	14.21	103,300	18,722	21,244	14,675	T(1.5)	2128	1464	889	12,094	3456	3052
	11.97	12.05	12.05	13.38	162,388	5486	10,629	7743	3516	992	760	458	12,954	2715	2399
$40 \times 500 \times 0.15$	11.1	15.58	15.58	13.93	158,352	11,341	15,501	11,404	3408	1324	1076	762	11,444	3349	3031
	13.7	11.13	11.13	13.53	59,100	4686	15,395	175,73	T(3.3)	T(2.51)	T(0.77)	3370	26,263	6646	5161
	11.01	15.68	15.68	13.6	85,159	8200	15,618	14,867	T(2.16)	3380	T(1.49)	3256	20,233	6277	6142
	14.78	13.54	13.54	14.05	86,000	4148	11,774	12,999	T(4.26)	T(1.81)	T(2.71)	3322	23,851	8537	6815
	14.84	12.68	12.68	14.47	61,500	4830	13,565	13,311	T(2.85)	T(2.38)	T(2.5)	2212	25,767	8242	6360
	16.12	14.41	14.41	14.28	74,055	4759	14,081	15,076	T(3.57)	T(2.65)	T(1.83)	T(0.6)	25,001	7574	7107
$50 \times 500 \times 0.05$	9.32	8.81	8.81	8.87	258,300	52,328	78,169	68,635	T(0.62)	1546	1513	1298	7570	2570	2802
	6.56	8.87	8.87	7.22	96,793	52,032	63,185	43,864	808	1298	1028	553	4159	1505	1410
	11.94	8.64	8.64	10.5	156,259	23,492	35,908	27,037	1645	690	599	431	5209	1679	1391
	10.31	10.26	10.26	7.0	122,437	53,810	44,951	42,543	1322	1595	1083	965	7772	2427	2110
	8.01	11.16	11.16	13.54	298,400	91,452	144,381	132,669	T(0.89)	T(0.80)	3501	2612	8300	2807	3110

### Appendix 3: Computational tables for instances with equal probabilities

We keep the same table format as in “Appendix 1”. For a given combination of  $d, n, \tau$ , we solve 5 instances. Results are presented in Table 7.

### References

1. Abdi, A., Fukasawa, R.: On the mixing set with a knapsack constraint. *Math. Program.* **157**(1), 191–217 (2016)
2. Adam, L., Branda, M.: Nonlinear chance constrained problems: optimality conditions, regularization and solvers. *J. Optim. Theor. Appl.* **170**(2), 419–436 (2016)
3. Atamtürk, A., Nemhauser, G.L., Savelsbergh, M.W.P.: The mixed vertex packing problem. *Math. Program.* **89**(1), 35–53 (2000)
4. Ben-Tal, A., Nemirovski, A.: Robust solutions of linear programming problems contaminated with uncertain data. *Math. Program.* **88**(3), 411–424 (2000)
5. Beraldi, P., Bruni, M.E., Conforti, D.: Designing robust emergency medical service via stochastic programming. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **158**(1), 183–193 (2004)
6. Beraldi, P., Ruszczyński, A.: A branch and bound method for stochastic integer programs under probabilistic constraints. *Optim. Methods Softw.* **17**(3), 359–382 (2002)
7. Beraldi, P., Ruszczyński, A.: The probabilistic set covering problem. *Oper. Res.* **50**(6), 956–967 (2002)
8. Campi, M.C., Garatti, S.: A sampling-and-discarding approach to chance-constrained optimization: feasibility and optimality. *J. Optim. Theory App.* **148**(2), 257–280 (2011)
9. Dentcheva, D., Prékopa, A., Ruszczyński, A.: Concavity and efficient points of discrete distributions in probabilistic programming. *Math. Program.* **89**(1), 55–77 (2000)
10. Ehmke, J.F., Campbell, A.M., Urban, T.L.: Ensuring service levels in routing problems with time windows and stochastic travel times. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **240**(2), 539–550 (2015)
11. Gu, Z., Nemhauser, G.L., Savelsbergh, M.W.: Lifted cover inequalities for 0–1 integer programs: computation. *INFORMS J. Comp.* **10**(4), 427–437 (1998)
12. Gu, Z., Nemhauser, G.L., Savelsbergh, M.W.: Sequence independent lifting in mixed integer programming. *J. Comb. Optim.* **4**(1), 109–129 (2000)
13. Guan, Y., Ahmed, S., Nemhauser, G.L.: Sequential pairing of mixed integer inequalities. *Discrete Optim.* **4**(1), 21–39 (2007)
14. Günlük, O., Pochet, Y.: *Math. Program.* **90**(3), 429–457 (2001)
15. Hanasusanto, G.A., Roitch, V., Kuhn, D., Wiesemann, W.: Ambiguous joint chance constraints under mean and dispersion information. *Oper. Res.* **62**(6), 1358–1376 (2016)
16. Henrion, R.: Structural properties of linear probabilistic constraints. *Optimization* **56**(4), 425–440 (2007)
17. Henrion, R., Möller, A.: A gradient formula for linear chance constraints under Gaussian distribution. *Math. Oper. Res.* **37**(3), 475–488 (2012)
18. Henrion, R., Strugarek, C.: Convexity of chance constraints with independent random variables. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **41**(2), 263–276 (2008)
19. High Performance Computing Center. <http://www.hpcc.ttu.edu/>. Accessed April 2016
20. Hong, L.J., Yang, Y., Zhang, L.: Sequential convex approximations to joint chance constrained programs: a Monte Carlo approach. *Oper. Res.* **59**(3), 617–630 (2011)
21. Kogan, A., Lejeune, M.: Threshold boolean form for joint probabilistic constraints with random technology matrix. *Math. Program.* **147**(1–2), 391–427 (2014)
22. Küçükyavuz, S.: On mixing sets arising in chance-constrained programming. *Math. Program.* **132**(1), 31–56 (2012)
23. Küçükyavuz, S., Noyan, N.: Cut generation for optimization problems with multivariate risk constraints. *Math. Program.* **159**(1), 165–199 (2016)
24. Lejeune, M.A.: Pattern-based modeling and solution of probabilistically constrained optimization problems. *Oper. Res.* **60**(6), 1356–1372 (2012)
25. Lejeune, M., Noyan, N.: Mathematical programming approaches for generating  $p$ -efficient points. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **207**(2), 590–600 (2010)

26. Lejeune, M.A., Margot, F.: Solving chance-constrained optimization problems with stochastic quadratic inequalities. *Oper. Res.* **64**(4), 939–957 (2016)
27. Liu, X., Küçükyavuz, S., Luedtke, J.: Decomposition algorithms for two-stage chance-constrained programs. *Math. Program.* **157**(1), 219–243 (2016)
28. Luedtke, J.: A branch-and-cut decomposition algorithm for solving chance-constrained mathematical programs with finite support. *Math. Program.* **146**(1), 219–244 (2014)
29. Luedtke, J., Ahmed, S., Nemhauser, G.: An integer programming approach for linear programs with probabilistic constraints. *Math. Program.* **122**(2), 247–272 (2010)
30. Miller, A.J., Wolsey, L.A.: Tight formulations for some simple mixed integer programs and convex objective integer programs. *Math. Program.* **98**(1), 73–88 (2003)
31. Nemirovski, A., Shapiro, A.: Convex approximations of chance constrained programs. *SIAM J. Optim.* **17**(4), 969–996 (2006)
32. Prékopa, A.: Dual method for the solution of a one-stage stochastic programming problem with random RHS obeying a discrete probability distribution. *Z. Oper. Res.* **34**(6), 441–461 (1990)
33. Prékopa, A.: Probabilistic programming. In: Ruszczyński, A., Shapiro, A. (eds.) *Stochastic Programming, Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, vol. 10, pp. 267–351. Elsevier, Amsterdam (2003)
34. Qiu, F., Shabbir, A., Dey, S.D., Wolsey, L.A.: Covering linear programming with violations. *INFORMS J. Comp.* **26**(3), 531–546 (2014)
35. Rockafellar, R.T., Uryasev, S.: Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *J. Risk* **2**(3), 21–41 (2000)
36. Ruszczyński, A.: Probabilistic programming with discrete distributions and precedence constrained knapsack polyhedra. *Math. Program.* **93**(2), 195–215 (2002)
37. Saxena, A., Goyal, V., Lejeune, M.A.: MIP reformulations of the probabilistic set covering problem. *Math. Program.* **121**(1), 1–31 (2010)
38. Sen, S.: Relaxations for probabilistically constrained programs with discrete random variables. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **11**(2), 81–86 (1992)
39. Tanner, N.W., Ntaimo, L.: IIS branch-and-cut for joint chance-constrained stochastic programs and application to optimal vaccine allocation. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **207**(1), 290–296 (2010)
40. van Ackooij, W., Berge, V., De Oliveira, W., Sagastizabal, C.: Probabilistic optimization via approximate p-efficient points and bundle methods. *Comput. Oper. Res.* **77**, 177–193 (2017)
41. van Ackooij, W., Henrion, R.: Gradient formulae for nonlinear probabilistic constraints with Gaussian and Gaussian-like distributions. *SIAM J. Optim.* **24**, 1864–1889 (2014)
42. van Ackooij, W., Henrion, R., Miller, A., Zorghi, R.: On joint probabilistic constraints with Gaussian coefficient matrix. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **39**(2), 99–102 (2011)
43. van Ackooij, W., Henrion, R., Möller, A., Zorghi, R.: Joint chance constrained programming for hydro reservoir management. *Optim. Eng.* **15**(2), 509–531 (2014)
44. van Ackooij, W., Sagastizabal, C.: Constrained bundle methods for upper inexact oracles with application to joint chance constrained energy problems. *SIAM J. Optim.* **24**(2), 733–765 (2014)
45. Wang, J., Shen, S.: Risk and energy consumption tradeoffs in cloud computing service via stochastic optimization models. In: *Proceedings of the 5th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC 2012)*. Chicago, Illinois (2012)
46. Zemel, E.: Easily computable facets of the knapsack polytope. *Math. Oper. Res.* **14**(4), 760–764 (1989)
47. Zeng, B., An, Y., Kuznia, L.: Chance constrained mixed integer program: Bilinear and linear formulations, and Benders decomposition. *Optimization Online* (2014). [arXiv:1403.7875v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7875v2)
48. Zhang, M., Küçükyavuz, S., Goel, S.: A branch-and-cut method for dynamic decision making under joint chance constraints. *Manag. Sci.* **60**(5), 1317–1333 (2014)
49. Zhao, M., de Farias Jr, I.R.: The mixing-MIR set with divisible capacities. *Math. Program.* **115**(1), 73–103 (2008)
50. Zhao, M., de Farias Jr, I.R.: A note on the continuous mixing set. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **36**(6), 726–733 (2008)
51. Zhao, M., Huang, K., Zeng, B.: Test instances of—a polyhedral study on chance constrained program with random right-hand side. [www.pitt.edu/~bzeng/](http://www.pitt.edu/~bzeng/)