



# Lifting the knapsack cover inequalities for the knapsack polytope

Adam N. Letchford<sup>a,\*</sup>, Georgia Souli<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Management Science, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YX, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup> STOR-i Centre for Doctoral Training, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YR, United Kingdom

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 20 March 2020

Received in revised form 13 July 2020

Accepted 14 July 2020

Available online 22 July 2020

### Keywords:

Knapsack problems

Lifted cover inequalities

Polyhedral combinatorics

Mixed-integer linear programming

## ABSTRACT

Valid inequalities for the knapsack polytope have proven to be very useful in exact algorithms for mixed-integer linear programming. In this paper, we focus on the *knapsack cover* inequalities, introduced in 2000 by Carr and co-authors. In general, these inequalities can be rather weak. To strengthen them, we use *lifting*. Since exact lifting can be time-consuming, we present two fast approximate lifting procedures. The first procedure is based on mixed-integer rounding, whereas the second uses superadditivity.

© 2020 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

A *knapsack constraint* is a linear constraint of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \leq b$ , where  $b$  and  $n$  are positive integers and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ . Any linear inequality involving binary variables can be converted into a knapsack constraint, by complementing variables with negative coefficients [23]. The polyhedron

$$\text{conv}\left\{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \leq b\right\}$$

is called a *knapsack polytope* [2]. Valid inequalities for knapsack polytopes have proven to be very useful in exact algorithms for mixed-integer linear programming (e.g., [4,8,12,13,15–17]).

There are many papers on valid inequalities for knapsack polytopes. Most of these focus on *lifted cover* inequalities (e.g., [2,3,8,12–14,16,18,23,26]), but there are a few papers on other families of inequalities. These include *weight* inequalities [22], *lifted pack* inequalities [1,16], *Chvátal–Gomory cuts* [17], *Fenchel cuts* [4], and the inequalities in [5], which are (somewhat confusingly) called *knapsack cover* inequalities. These last inequalities have received very little attention in the literature, and have not been analyzed from a polyhedral point of view.

We will see that, in general, knapsack cover inequalities can be rather weak. To strengthen them, we use *lifting* (see [2,21,23]). Since *exact* lifting can be time-consuming, we present two fast (and sequence-independent) approximate lifting procedures. The

first procedure, which runs in  $O(n)$  time, is based on a simple mixed-integer rounding argument (see [11,19,20]). The second procedure is stronger, but is a bit more complicated and runs in  $O(n \log n)$  time. It is based on the construction of a valid superadditive lifting function (see [13,25]). Our examples show that it is possible for both procedures to generate new facet-defining inequalities for the knapsack polytope.

The paper has a simple structure. The literature is reviewed in Section 2, the new lifting procedures are presented in Section 3, and some concluding remarks are made in Section 4. Throughout the paper, we let  $N$  denote  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

## 2. Literature review

For brevity, we review here only works of direct relevance. We recall cover inequalities in Section 2.1, knapsack cover inequalities in 2.2, lifting in Section 2.3, and mixed-integer rounding in Section 2.4.

### 2.1. Cover inequalities

A set  $C \subseteq N$  such that  $\sum_{i \in C} a_i > b$  is called a *cover*. If  $C$  is a cover, then the *cover inequality*  $\sum_{i \in C} x_i \leq |C| - 1$  is valid for the knapsack polytope [9]. A cover  $C$  is *minimal* if  $\sum_{i \in C \setminus \{k\}} a_i \leq b$  for all  $k \in C$ . The minimal cover inequalities dominate all others [2,23]. Although they are not guaranteed to define facets of the knapsack polytope, they can be strengthened to make them facet-defining (see Section 2.3).

### 2.2. Knapsack cover inequalities

Now consider a knapsack constraint of the form  $\sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \leq d$ , where  $d$  and  $n$  are positive integers and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ . Crowder

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [A.N.Letchford@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:A.N.Letchford@lancaster.ac.uk) (A.N. Letchford), [G.Souli@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:G.Souli@lancaster.ac.uk) (G. Souli).

et al. [8] noted that such a constraint can be strengthened simply by replacing each  $a_i$  with  $\min\{a_i, d\}$ . Carr et al. [5] generalised this as follows. Consider any  $S \subset N$ , possibly empty, such that  $\sum_{j \in S} a_j < d$ . The inequality

$$\sum_{i \in N \setminus S} a_i x_i \geq d - \sum_{j \in S} a_j$$

is trivially valid, and it can be strengthened to yield:

$$\sum_{i \in N \setminus S} \min\{a_i, d - \sum_{j \in S} a_j\} x_i \geq d - \sum_{j \in S} a_j. \quad (1)$$

Rather confusingly, Carr et al. call the inequalities (1) *knapsack cover inequalities*. We will therefore refer to them as KCIs. The standard cover inequalities, mentioned in the previous subsection, will be called CIs.

### 2.3. Lifting

We now recall the basics of *lifting* [21,24], focusing on 0–1 linear programs (0–1 LPs). Let  $P \subset [0, 1]^n$  be the convex hull of feasible solutions to a 0–1 LP, let  $S$  be a proper subset of  $N$ , and let  $P(S)$  be the face of  $P$  obtained by setting  $x_i$  to 0 for all  $i \in S$ . Suppose we know that  $\dim(P(S)) = \dim(P) - |S|$ , and that the inequality

$$\sum_{i \in N \setminus S} \alpha_i x_i \leq \beta$$

defines a facet of  $P(S)$ . Then, there exists at least one inequality of the form

$$\sum_{i \in N \setminus S} \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{i \in S} \gamma_i x_i \leq \beta,$$

that defines a facet of  $P$ . (In particular, any minimal cover inequality can be strengthened to make it facet-defining for the knapsack polytope.)

The process of computing the  $\gamma_i$  is called *lifting*. Lifting is usually done *sequentially*, i.e., one variable at a time. To compute each lifting coefficient, one has to solve an auxiliary 0–1 LP, which may be time-consuming. Fortunately, fast exact and approximate algorithms are available for sequentially lifting CIs [2,3,8,12,16,23,26]. For other kinds of inequalities, Wolsey [24] suggests solving the LP relaxations of the auxiliary 0–1 LPs.

There can sometimes exist facet-defining lifted inequalities that cannot be obtained by sequential lifting [23]. To obtain such inequalities, one must lift several variables *simultaneously*. Unfortunately, simultaneous lifting is very complicated, even for CIs [3,14]. Wolsey [25] devised an elegant way to perform simultaneous lifting *approximately*, based on superadditive functions. This approach, sometimes called *sequence-independent* lifting, has been used to good effect in, e.g., [1,13,18]. However, the resulting inequality is not guaranteed to define a facet of  $P$ . For brevity, we omit the details.

### 2.4. Mixed-integer rounding

Finally, we recall some results from cutting-plane theory. Let  $P \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$  be a polyhedron, and suppose that the inequality  $\alpha^T x \leq \beta$ , with  $\beta \notin \mathbb{Z}$ , is valid for  $P$ . It is well known that the inequality  $\sum_{i \in N} \lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor x_i \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor$  is satisfied by all integer points in  $P$  [7,10]. Less well known is that one can derive a stronger inequality as follows [11,20]. Given a real number  $r$ , let  $\phi(r)$  denote  $r - \lfloor r \rfloor$ , the so-called *fractional part* of  $r$ . Also define the following (continuous and non-decreasing) function

$$F_\beta(r) = \begin{cases} \lfloor r \rfloor, & \text{if } \phi(r) \leq \phi(\beta) \\ \lfloor r \rfloor + \frac{\phi(r) - \phi(\beta)}{1 - \phi(\beta)}, & \text{if } \phi(r) > \phi(\beta). \end{cases}$$

The strengthened inequality takes the form:

$$\sum_{i \in N} F_\beta(\alpha_i) x_i \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor.$$

We follow [19,20] in calling these inequalities *mixed-integer rounding* (MIR) inequalities.

### 3. Lifting knapsack cover inequalities

In this section, we show how to strengthen the KCIs by lifting. In Section 3.1, we present some simple results and examples to motivate our study. In Section 3.2, we define lifted KCIs formally and give examples. In Sections 3.3 and 3.4, we present our sequence-independent lifting procedures.

We remind the reader that there is one KCI (1) for every  $S \subseteq N$  satisfying  $\sum_{j \in S} a_j < d$ . Throughout this section, we let  $d^-$  denote  $d - \sum_{j \in S} a_j$ , and we sometimes refer to the sets  $L = \{i \in N \setminus S : a_i > d^-\}$  and  $R = N \setminus (S \cup L)$ . (The idea here is that  $L$  contains indices with “large”  $a_i$  value, and  $R$  contains the “remaining” indices.) With this notation, the KCIs can be written in the simpler form

$$\sum_{i \in R} a_i x_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq d^-. \quad (2)$$

We let  $e$  denote the all-ones vector of length  $n$ . We also frequently refer to the following two polytopes:

$$P^\geq = \text{conv}\{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : a^T x \geq d\}$$

$$P^\leq = \text{conv}\{\bar{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n : a^T \bar{x} \leq e^T a - d\}.$$

Note that these polytopes are congruent, via the trivial mapping  $\bar{x}_i = 1 - x_i$  for  $i \in N$ .

#### 3.1. Motivation

In some preliminary experiments with the software package PORTA [6], we found that KCIs usually (though not always) define low-dimensional faces of  $P^\geq$ . A partial explanation is given by the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 1.** *If  $\sum_{j \in R} a_j < d^-$ , then the KCI (2) is equivalent to or dominated by the inequality  $\sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq 1$ . Note that this inequality is equivalent to a CI for  $P^\leq$ .*

**Proof.** By the definition of  $d^-$ , the stated condition can be written as  $\sum_{j \in R \cup S} a_j < d$ . Under this condition, the inequality  $\sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq 1$  is valid for  $P^\geq$ . Writing this as  $d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq d^-$ , we see that it is at least as strong as the KCI. Writing it as  $\sum_{i \in L} \bar{x}_i \leq |L| - 1$  instead, we see that it is equivalent to a CI for  $P^\leq$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *If  $\sum_{j \in R} a_j \geq d^-$ , but  $\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{i\}} a_j < d^-$  for all  $i \in R$ , then the KCI (2) is dominated by the inequalities  $\sum_{j \in L \cup \{i\}} x_j \geq 1$  ( $i \in R$ ). Note that these inequalities are equivalent to CIs for  $P^\leq$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose the stated conditions hold. If  $x_i = 0$  for all  $i \in L$ , then we must set  $x_i$  to 1 for all  $i \in R$ . Thus, the following inequalities are valid for  $P^\geq$ :

$$\sum_{j \in L \cup \{i\}} x_j \geq 1 \quad (i \in R). \quad (3)$$

Writing these inequalities in the form  $\sum_{j \in L \cup \{i\}} \bar{x}_j \leq |L|$ , we see that they are equivalent to CIs for  $P^\leq$ . Now, for each  $i \in R$ , multiply the inequality (3) by  $a_i d^- / \sum_{j \in R} a_j$ , and sum the resulting  $|R|$  inequalities together, to yield:

$$\frac{d^-}{\sum_{j \in R} a_j} \sum_{i \in R} a_i x_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq d^-.$$

Since  $\sum_{j \in R} a_j \geq d^-$  by assumption, this last inequality is at least as strong as the KCI.  $\square$

When the conditions in Lemmas 1 and 2 do not hold, the KCI may or may not define a facet of  $P^\geq$ . This is shown in the following example.

**Example 1.** Let  $n = d = 7$  and  $a = (1, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 7)^T$ . Taking  $S = \{1\}$  yields the KCI  $2(x_2 + x_3 + x_4) + 4(x_5 + x_6) + 6x_7 \geq 6$ . We have  $R = \{2, \dots, 6\}$  and  $\sum_{i \in R} a_i = 14$ , so Lemmas 1 and 2 do not apply. One can check (either by hand or with the help of a package like PORTA) that this KCI defines a facet of  $P^\geq$ . On the other hand, if we take  $S = \{2\}$ , we get the KCI  $x_1 + 2(x_3 + x_4) + 4(x_5 + x_6) + 5x_7 \geq 5$ . We have  $R = \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and  $\sum_{i \in R} a_i = 13$ , so, again, the lemmas do not apply. Yet, this KCI does not define a facet, since every extreme point of  $P^\geq$  that satisfies it at equality also satisfies  $x_1 + x_7 = 1$ .  $\square$

### 3.2. Lifted KCIs

We propose to lift KCIs, regardless of whether or not Lemma 1 or Lemma 2 applies. The idea is as follows. The KCI (2) is equivalent to the following valid inequality for  $P^\leq$ :

$$\sum_{i \in R} a_i \bar{x}_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} \bar{x}_i \leq \sum_{i \in R} a_i + d^- (|L| - 1).$$

It is now apparent that we may be able to lift the variables in  $S$ , to obtain a valid inequality for  $P^\leq$  of the form:

$$\sum_{i \in R} a_i \bar{x}_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} \bar{x}_i + \sum_{i \in S} \gamma_i \bar{x}_i \leq \sum_{i \in R} a_i + d^- (|L| - 1).$$

The corresponding valid inequality for  $P^\geq$  takes the form:

$$\sum_{i \in R} a_i x_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq d^- + \sum_{i \in S} \gamma_i (1 - x_i). \quad (4)$$

We call (4) a *lifted knapsack cover inequality* or LKCI. In general, LKCI's are not guaranteed to define facets of  $P^\geq$ . On the other hand, the following example shows that LKCI's can define non-trivial facets even when Lemma 1 applies.

**Example 2.** Let  $n = 5$ ,  $d = 8$  and  $a = (2, 2, 2, 5, 5)^T$ . Taking  $S = \{1, 2\}$  yields the KCI  $2x_3 + 4(x_4 + x_5) \geq 4$ . We have  $R = \{3\}$  and  $\sum_{i \in R} a_i = 2 < d^- = 4$ . Thus, Lemma 1 applies. One can check however that the LKCI  $2x_3 + 4(x_4 + x_5) \geq 4 + 2(1 - x_1) + 2(1 - x_2)$  is valid and facet-defining for  $P^\leq$ . Moreover, if we write the LKCI in the form  $\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2 + \bar{x}_3 + 2(\bar{x}_4 + \bar{x}_5) \leq 3$ , we see that it is not equivalent to a lifted CI.  $\square$

Now recall that lifting can be done sequentially or simultaneously. If one wishes to lift a KCI sequentially, one must solve an auxiliary knapsack problem (KP) to compute each lifting coefficient [21,24]. This is likely to be too time-consuming to be useful in practical computation. Following Wolsey [25], one could compute approximate lifting coefficients sequentially, by solving the continuous relaxations of the KPs. We prefer however to use sequence-independent lifting, as described in the following two subsections.

### 3.3. Lifting via mixed-integer rounding

It turns out that one can lift KCIs using mixed-integer rounding. This can be done in four steps, as follows.

1. Write the constraint  $a^T x \geq d$  in the form

$$\sum_{i \in S} a_i \bar{x}_i - \sum_{i \in N \setminus S} a_i x_i \leq -d^-. \quad (5)$$

2. Let  $a^+ = \max_{i \in N \setminus S} \{a_i\}$ , and assume that  $a^+ > d^-$  (since, if not, the KCI is redundant.) Divide (5) by  $a^+$  to obtain

$$\sum_{i \in S} \left( \frac{a_i}{a^+} \right) \bar{x}_i + \sum_{i \in N \setminus S} \left( \frac{-a_i}{a^+} \right) x_i \leq -\frac{d^-}{a^+}.$$

3. We now set  $-d^-/a^+$  to  $\beta$ , and apply mixed-integer rounding to get

$$\sum_{i \in S} F_\beta(a_i/a^+) \bar{x}_i + \sum_{i \in N \setminus S} F_\beta(-a_i/a^+) x_i \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor.$$

We can simplify this inequality, as follows. Since  $a^+ > d^-$ , we have  $\lfloor \beta \rfloor = -1$  and  $\phi(\beta) = 1 - d^-/a^+$ . For  $i \in R$ , we have that  $a_i \leq a^+$  (by the definition of  $a^+$ ) and  $a_i \leq d^-$  (by the definition of  $R$ ). Hence,  $\phi(-a_i/a^+) = 1 - a_i/a^+ \geq \phi(\beta)$  and  $F_\beta(-a_i/a^+) = -a_i/d^-$ . For  $i \in L$ , we have that  $a_i \leq a^+$  (by the definition of  $a^+$ ) and  $a_i > d^-$  (by the definition of  $L$ ). Hence,  $\phi(-a_i/a^+) = 1 - a_i/a^+ < \phi(\beta)$  and  $F_\beta(-a_i/a^+) = \lfloor -a_i/a^+ \rfloor = -1$ . So, we get

$$\sum_{i \in S} F_\beta(a_i/a^+) \bar{x}_i - \sum_{i \in R} \frac{a_i}{d^-} x_i - \sum_{i \in L} x_i \leq -1.$$

4. Multiplying the MIR inequality by  $d^-$  and re-arranging, we obtain:

$$\sum_{i \in R} a_i x_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \geq d^- + d^- \sum_{i \in S} F_\beta(a_i/a^+) (1 - x_i). \quad (6)$$

This is the desired LKCI.

The following example shows that the above MIR procedure can yield non-trivial facet-defining LKCI's.

**Example 3.** Let  $n = 7$ ,  $d = 17$  and  $a = (3, 3, 3, 4, 7, 7, 7)^T$ . Taking  $S = \{4, 5\}$  yields the KCI  $3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 6(x_6 + x_7) \geq 6$ . We have  $d^- = 6$  and  $a^+ = 7$ , which gives  $\beta = -6/7$ . We have  $F_\beta(a_4/a^+) = F_{1/7}(4/7) = 1/2$  and  $F_\beta(a_5/a^+) = F_{1/7}(1) = 1$ . The resulting LKCI is therefore  $3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 6(x_6 + x_7) \geq 6 + 3(1 - x_4) + 6(1 - x_5)$ . One can check (either by hand or with the help of a package like PORTA) that this LKCI defines a facet of  $P^\geq$ . Moreover, if we write the LKCI in the form  $\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2 + \bar{x}_3 + \bar{x}_4 + 2(\bar{x}_5 + \bar{x}_6 + \bar{x}_7) \leq 5$ , we see that it is not equivalent to a lifted CI.  $\square$

For the purpose of what follows, we will find it helpful to express the lifting coefficients in the LKCI (6) in a more explicit form.

**Proposition 1.** For any  $r \geq 0$ , let  $f(r)$  denote  $d^- F_\beta(r/a^+)$ . We have


$$f(r) = \begin{cases} d^- \lfloor r/a^+ \rfloor & \text{if } r \bmod a^+ \leq a^+ - d^- \\ d^- \lceil r/a^+ \rceil - a^+ + r \bmod a^+ & \text{if } r \bmod a^+ > a^+ - d^- \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Write  $r$  as  $ka^+ + \epsilon$ , where  $k = \lfloor r/a^+ \rfloor$  and  $\epsilon = r \bmod a^+$ . If  $\epsilon \leq a^+ - d^-$ , we have  $\phi(r/a^+) = \epsilon/a^+ \leq 1 - d^-/a^+ = \phi(\beta)$ , and therefore

$$F_\beta(r/a^+) = k.$$

On the other hand, if  $\epsilon > a^+ - d^-$ , we have  $\phi(r/a^+) > \phi(\beta)$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} F_\beta(r/a^+) &= k + \frac{\phi(r/a^+) - (1 - d^-/a^+)}{d^-/a^+} \\ &= k + \frac{a^+ \phi(r/a^+) - a^+ + d^-}{d^-} \\ &= k + 1 - \frac{a^+ - \epsilon}{d^-}. \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 1. The exact lifting function  $g(r)$  for Example 4.

We have established that:

$$F_\beta\left(\frac{r}{a^+}\right) = \begin{cases} \lfloor r/a^+ \rfloor & \text{if } r \bmod a^+ \leq a^+ - d^- \\ \lceil r/a^+ \rceil - \frac{a^+ - d^-}{d^-} & \text{if } r \bmod a^+ > a^+ - d^-. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying by  $d^-$  yields the result.  $\square$

We remark that the MIR function  $F_\beta$  is superadditive for any  $\beta$  (see [20]). Thus, the function  $f$  is superadditive for any  $d^-$  and  $a^+$ .

### 3.4. Lifting via superadditivity

Consider again the LKCI (4), and suppose that we wish to lift  $x_k$  first, for some  $k \in S$ . Let  $r$  denote  $a_k$ . Following [21,24], we can compute the largest possible value of  $\gamma_k$  by computing

$$z(r) = \min \sum_{i \in R} a_i x_i + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \quad (7)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{i \in L \cup R} a_i x_i \geq d^- + r \quad (8)$$

$$x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in L \cup R), \quad (9)$$

and then setting  $\gamma_k$  to  $z(r) - d^-$ . The function  $g(r) = z(r) - d^-$  is called the *exact lifting function*. Note that the domain of  $g$  is  $[0, \sum_{j \in L \cup R} a_j - d^-]$  since, if  $r$  exceeds  $\sum_{j \in L \cup R} a_j - d^-$ , the above 0–1 LP becomes infeasible.

It follows from the main result in [25] that, if  $g$  is superadditive, then we can use it to lift all variables in  $S$  simultaneously. Unfortunately,  $g$  is not superadditive in general. This is demonstrated in the following example.



**Example 4.** Let  $n = 7$ ,  $a = (3, 3, 3, 7, 8, 9, 17)$ ,  $d = 23$  and  $S = \{7\}$ . The reduced knapsack constraint is  $3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3x_3 + 7x_4 + 8x_5 + 9x_6 \geq 6$ . We have  $d^- = 6$  and  $a^+ = 9$ . The KCI is  $3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 6(x_4 + x_5 + x_6) \geq 6$ . The function  $g$  is shown in Fig. 1. To see that  $g$  is not superadditive, note that, for example,  $g(14) = 9 < 2g(7) = 12$ .  $\square$

Following the approach in [13,25], we are led to search for *superadditive valid lifting functions*, i.e., superadditive functions that do not exceed  $g$ . As, we remarked in Section 3.3, the MIR lifting function, called  $f$ , is such a function. Fig. 2 shows the function  $f$  for Example 4. Note that  $f$  is piecewise-linear, and each “piece” has a slope equal to either 0 or 1.

We now introduce a third lifting function, called  $h$ , which we will show to be superadditive and intermediate between  $f$  and  $g$ . Let  $h(r) = \tilde{z}(r) - d^-$ , where

$$\tilde{z}(r) = \min y + d^- \sum_{i \in L} x_i \quad (10)$$

$$\text{s.t. } y + \sum_{i \in L} a_i x_i \geq d^- + r \quad (11)$$

Fig. 2. The lifting function  $f(r)$  for Example 4.Fig. 3. The lifting function  $h(r)$  for Example 4.

$$x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in L) \quad (12)$$

$$y \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

Note that, due to the continuous variable  $y$ ,  $\tilde{z}(r)$  is feasible for all non-negative values of  $r$ . Hence, the domain of  $h$  is the whole of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . In the following proposition, we give an explicit formula for  $h$ .

**Proposition 2.** For  $k = 1, \dots, |L|$ , let  $S(k)$  be the sum of the  $k$  largest  $a_j$  values over the members of  $L$ . We trivially set  $S(0) = 0$ . Then, we can write  $h(r)$  as follows

$$h(r) = \begin{cases} kd^-, & \text{if } S(k) \leq r < S(k+1) - d^- \\ & \text{for } k \in \{0, \dots, |L| - 1\} \\ r - (S(k) - d^-), & \text{if } S(k) - d^- \leq r < S(k) \\ & \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, |L| - 1\}. \\ r - (S(|L|) - d^-), & \text{if } r \geq S(|L|) - d^-. \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Consider the mixed 0–1 knapsack problem (10)–(13). Observe that every time that we set a variable  $x_i$  to 1, we incur a cost  $d^-$ . This increases the LHS of the constraint (11) by  $a_i$ , which is greater than  $d^-$  by the definition of  $L$ . Hence, to find the optimal solution, it makes sense to keep switching on binary variables in decreasing order of  $a_i$  as long as the constraint (11) is violated. The continuous variable  $y$  will only take a positive value if the remaining violation of the constraint (11) is so “small” that it is not worth switching on an additional binary variable.  $\square$

To aid the reader, we show the lifting function  $h$  for Example 4.

**Example 4 (cont.).** Recall that  $d^- = 6$  and  $L = \{4, 5, 6\}$ . Moreover,  $S(0) = 0$ ,  $S(1) = 9$ ,  $S(2) = 17$  and  $S(3) = 24$ . Using these, one can compute the function  $h$ , which is shown in Fig. 3.  $\square$

Note that, like  $f$ ,  $h$  is piecewise-linear, and each “piece” has a slope equal to either 0 or 1. In the following proposition, we prove that  $h$  is intermediate between  $f$  and  $g$ .



**Proposition 3.** For all  $r \in [0, \sum_{j \in LUR} a_j - d^-]$ , we have  $f(r) \leq h(r) \leq g(r)$ .

**Proof.** We will first prove that  $h(r) \leq g(r)$ . Given that  $g(r) = z(r) - d^-$  and  $h(r) = \tilde{z}(r) - d^-$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\tilde{z}(r) \leq z(r)$ . To see why this inequality holds, note that the mixed 0–1 knapsack problem (10)–(13) is a relaxation of the integer program (7)–(9), obtained by replacing the binary variables  $x_i$  for  $i \in R$  with a single continuous variable  $y$ .

We will now prove that  $h(r) \geq f(r)$ . Recall that  $f$  and  $h$  are piecewise-linear. For the function  $h$ , the  $k$ th “piece” with slope 0 has length  $\ell_k^h = S(k+1) - S(k) - d^-$ . For the function  $f$ , the  $k$ th piece with slope 0 has length  $\ell_k^f = a^+ - d^-$ . By the definitions of  $S$  and  $a^+$ , we have  $\ell_k^h \leq \ell_k^f$ . Hence,  $h(r) \geq f(r)$  for all  $r \in [0, \sum_{j \in LUR} a_j - d^-]$ . (The reader may find it helpful to compare Figs. 2 and 3.)  $\square$

In the following proposition, we prove that  $h$  is superadditive, which immediately implies that we can use  $h$  for simultaneous lifting.

**Proposition 4.** The function  $h$  is superadditive in its domain.

**Proof.** We will prove that  $h$  is superadditive by contradiction. Suppose that  $h$  is not superadditive. Then, there are values  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  such that  $h(r_1 + r_2) < h(r_1) + h(r_2)$ . Recall that each “piece” of the function has a slope of either 0 or 1. We will call the points where  $h$  is non-differentiable “breakpoints”, and the points where  $h$  is differentiable “interior” points.

Suppose that  $r_1$  is either an interior point where the slope is 0, or a breakpoint where the slope on the left of  $r_1$  is 0 and the slope on the right is 1. Then, there exists a small  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $h(r_1 - \epsilon) = h(r_1)$ . We therefore have  $h(r_1 - \epsilon) + h(r_2) = h(r_1) + h(r_2) > h(r_1 + r_2) \geq h(r_1 + r_2 - \epsilon)$ . This means that  $r_1 - \epsilon$  and  $r_2$  also form a counter-example. So, we can assume w.l.o.g. that  $r_1$  is neither an interior point with slope 0 nor a breakpoint where the slope on the left is 0.

Now, suppose that  $r_1$  is an interior point with slope 1. Then, there exists a small  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $h(r_1 + \epsilon) = h(r_1) + \epsilon$ . We therefore have  $h(r_1 + \epsilon) + h(r_2) = h(r_1) + h(r_2) + \epsilon > h(r_1 + r_2) + \epsilon \geq h(r_1 + r_2 + \epsilon)$ . This means that  $r_1 + \epsilon$  and  $r_2$  also form a counter-example. So, we can assume w.l.o.g. that  $r_1$  is a breakpoint where the slope on the left is 1 and the slope on the right is 0.

The same argument enables us to assume that  $r_2$  is also a breakpoint of the same type. Hence, to complete the proof, we have to show superadditivity for the case where both  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are breakpoints of that type. Note these points are such that there exist positive integers  $k_1, k_2$  such that  $r_1 = S(k_1)$  and  $r_2 = S(k_2)$ . So,  $r_1 + r_2 = S(k_1) + S(k_2) \geq S(k_1 + k_2)$  by the definition of  $S$ . The function  $h$  is increasing. So,  $h(r_1 + r_2) \geq h(S(k_1 + k_2))$ . By the definition of  $h$ , we have that  $h(r_1) = h(S(k_1)) = k_1 d$ ,  $h(r_2) = h(S(k_2)) = k_2 d$  and  $h(S(k_1 + k_2)) = (k_1 + k_2) d^-$ . This implies that  $h(r_1 + r_2) \geq h(r_1) + h(r_2)$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

We now revisit Example 4 to demonstrate the LKCI that we get using  $f$  and  $h$ .

**Example 4 (cont.).** Recall that  $d^- = 6$  and  $L = \{4, 5, 6\}$ . Using the MIR lifting function, we get the LKCI  $3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 6(x_4 + x_5 + x_6) \geq 6 + 11(1 - x_7)$ . Using the lifting function  $h$ , we get the stronger LKCI  $3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 6(x_4 + x_5 + x_6) \geq 6 + 12(1 - x_7)$ . One can check (either by hand or with the help of a package like PORTA) that the latter is facet-defining. Note that this inequality is not equivalent to a lifted cover inequality.  $\square$

## 4. Concluding remarks

We have introduced two lifting procedures for knapsack cover inequalities. Our examples show that it is possible for these lifting procedures to yield non-trivial facet-defining inequalities. An interesting extension to our work would be the design and implementation of efficient separation heuristics for LKCI. It would also be interesting to compare LKCI with lifted cover inequalities.

## Acknowledgment

The second author gratefully acknowledges financial support from the EPSRC through the STOR-i Centre for Doctoral Training under grant EP/L015692/1.

## References

- [1] A. Atamtürk, Cover and pack inequalities for (mixed) integer programming, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 139 (2005) 21–38.
- [2] E. Balas, Facets of the knapsack polytope, *Math. Program.* 8 (1975) 146–164.
- [3] E. Balas, E. Zemel, Facets of the knapsack polytope from minimal covers, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 34 (1978) 119–148.
- [4] E.A. Boyd, Generating fenchel cutting planes for knapsack polyhedra, *SIAM J. Optim.* 3 (1993) 734–750.
- [5] R.D. Carr, L.K. Fleischer, V.J. Leung, C.A. Phillips, Strengthening integrality gaps for capacitated network design and covering problems, in: *Proceedings of SODA XI*, SIAM, New York, NY, 2000, pp. 106–115.
- [6] T. Christof, A. Loebl, PORTA (polyhedron representation transformation algorithm), Software package, available for download at <http://comopt.ifi.uni-heidelberg.de/software/PORTA/>.
- [7] V. Chvátal, Edmonds polytopes and a hierarchy of combinatorial problems, *Discrete Math.* 4 (1973) 305–337.
- [8] H. Crowder, E. Johnson, M. Padberg, Solving large-scale 0–1 linear programming programs, *Oper. Res.* 31 (1983) 803–834.
- [9] F. Glover, Unit-Coefficient Inequalities for Zero-One Programming, *Management Science Report* 73–7, University of Colorado, 1973.
- [10] R.E. Gomory, Outline of an algorithm for integer solutions to linear programs, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 64 (1958) 275–278.
- [11] R.E. Gomory, An Algorithm for the Mixed Integer Problem, Technical Report RAND-P-1885, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1960.
- [12] Z. Gu, G.L. Nemhauser, M.W.P. Savelsbergh, Lifted cover inequalities for 0–1 integer programs: computation, *INFORMS J. Comput.* 10 (1998) 427–437.
- [13] Z. Gu, G.L. Nemhauser, M.W.P. Savelsbergh, Sequence-independent lifting in mixed integer programming, *J. Comb. Optim.* 4 (2000) 109–129.
- [14] D. Hartvigsen, E. Zemel, The complexity of lifted inequalities for the knapsack problem, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 39 (1992) 113–123.
- [15] K.L. Hoffman, M.W. Padberg, Improving LP-representations of zero-one linear programs for branch-and-cut, *ORSA J. Comput.* 3 (1991) 121–134.
- [16] K. Kaparis, A.N. Letchford, Separation algorithms for 0–1 knapsack polytopes, *Math. Program.* 124 (2010) 69–91.
- [17] K.S. Lee, Separation heuristic for the rank-1 Chvátal-Gomory inequalities for the binary knapsack problem, *J. Korean Inst. Ind. Eng.* 38 (2012) 74–79.
- [18] A.N. Letchford, G. Souli, On lifted cover inequalities: a new lifting procedure with unusual properties, *Oper. Res. Lett.* 47 (2019) 83–87.
- [19] H. March, L.A. Wolsey, Aggregation and mixed integer rounding to solve MILPs, *Oper. Res.* 49 (2001) 363–371.
- [20] G.L. Nemhauser, L.A. Wolsey, A recursive procedure to generate all cuts for 0–1 mixed integer programs, *Math. Program.* 46 (1990) 379–390.
- [21] M.W. Padberg, A note on zero-one programming, *Oper. Res.* 23 (1975) 833–837.
- [22] R. Weismantel, On the 0–1 knapsack polytope, *Math. Program.* 77 (1997) 49–68.
- [23] L.A. Wolsey, Faces for a linear inequality in 0–1 variables, *Math. Program.* 8 (1975) 165–178.
- [24] L.A. Wolsey, Facets and strong valid inequalities for integer programs, *Oper. Res.* 24 (1976) 367–372.
- [25] L.A. Wolsey, Valid inequalities and superadditivity for 0–1 integer programs, *Math. Oper. Res.* 2 (1977) 66–77.
- [26] E. Zemel, Easily computable facets of the knapsack polytope, *Math. Oper. Res.* 14 (1989) 760–765.