

ARTICLE TEMPLATE

Discretization-Based Solution Approaches for the Circle Packing Problem

Rabia Taşpınar^a and Burak Kocuk^a

^aIndustrial Engineering Program, Sabancı University, Istanbul, Turkey 34956

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled January 2, 2024

ABSTRACT

The problem of packing a set of circles into the smallest surrounding container is considered. This problem arises in different application areas such as automobile, textile, food, and chemical industries. The so-called circle packing problem can be cast as a nonconvex quadratically constrained program, and is difficult to solve in general. An iterative solution approach based on a bisection-type algorithm on the radius of the larger circle is provided. The present algorithm discretizes the container into small cells and solves two different integer linear programming formulations proposed for a restricted and a relaxed version of the original problem. The present algorithm is enhanced with solution space reduction, bound tightening and variable elimination techniques. Then, a computational study is performed to evaluate the performance of the algorithm. The present algorithm is compared with BARON and Gurobi that solve the original nonlinear formulation and heuristic methods from literature, and obtain promising results.

KEYWORDS

global optimization; integer linear programming; circle packing; continuous location

1. Introduction

The circle packing problem (CPP) is concerned with packing a given number of different circles into a larger container, such as a square, a rectangle, or a circle, in such a way that circles do not overlap and each circle is entirely in the container. This well-known NP-Hard problem arises in different application areas including packing circular shaped objects into the smallest box (Castillo, Kampas, and Pintér 2008), some applications from nanotechnology, telecommunication, electrical, oil, automobile industries (Wang et al. 2002; Li and Sun 2009; Sugihara et al. 2004), forestry (Hifi and M'Hallah 2009), location analysis (Castillo and Sim 2010) and social distancing (Bortolote et al. 2022). Recent literature also focuses on the related problems including balanced circle packing problem (Romanova et al. 2022), proportional circle packing problem (Romanova et al. 2023) and circle bin packing problem (Yuan et al. 2022; Tole et al. 2023).

Different objectives are considered depending on the application setting in the literature, such as minimizing the area of the surrounding container, maximizing the number

This research is based on the first author's master thesis (Taşpınar 2021), and its four-page summary has appeared in the Proceedings of the 17th International Symposium on Operations Research in Slovenia.

CONTACT Burak Kocuk. Email: burakkocuk@sabanciuniv.edu

of circles packed into a fixed-size container (Galiev and Lisafina 2013), or maximizing the minimum distance between any two circles (Locatelli and Raber 2002). In this study, CPP with the objective of minimizing the radius of the surrounding circle is primarily considered although the present approach can be applied to other containers as well.

Here is the precise mathematical formulation of CPP: Denote the set of circles by \mathcal{C} , and the radius of circle $c \in \mathcal{C}$ by r_c . Assume that the center of the surrounding circle is located at the origin, and R is a decision variable denoting its radius. The center of circle c is represented by the decision variables (x_c, y_c) . Then, CPP can be modelled as the following nonconvex quadratically constrained program:

$$\min R \tag{1a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } (x_c - x_k)^2 + (y_c - y_k)^2 \geq (r_c + r_k)^2 \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c \neq k \tag{1b}$$

$$x_c^2 + y_c^2 \leq (R - r_c)^2 \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \tag{1c}$$

$$x_c \in \mathbb{R}, y_c \in \mathbb{R}, R \geq r_c \quad c \in \mathcal{C}. \tag{1d}$$

Under the stated feasibility rules of the problem, Figure 1a shows a feasible suboptimal solution for an instance of the problem consisting of three circles with radii 0.5, 1, 0.75 and 0.5 units where the surrounding container's radius is 2 units. Two possible infeasible configurations are also given: Figure 1b includes two overlapping circles violating constraint (1b); and Figure 1c is an example where a circle is not fully contained in the container, violating constraint (1c).




Figure 1.: Example feasible and infeasible placements of circles for CPP.

The vast majority of the CPP literature focuses on developing heuristic methods, which involve constructing a feasible packing of the circles, and then improving it with a search algorithm, see e.g., Huang et al. (2006); Francesco, Cerrone, and Cerulli (2014); Zeng et al. (2016); Torres-Escobar, Marmolejo-Saucedo, and Litvinchev (2020); Liu et al. (2024). Another stream of research focuses on nonlinear programming techniques to find high quality packings, see e.g., Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004); Huang and Ye (2011); He, Huang, and Yang (2015); Lai et al. (2022); Ikebe, Masuda, and Okuno (2023). However, none of the studies certify the optimality of the solutions obtained, which are only compared against the best-known results from the literature. Hence, the use of systematic global optimization approaches to solve CPP is lacking in the literature. The reason is that it is quite challenging to solve the nonlinear formulation (1) with global optimization solvers directly, as confirmed by the preliminary experiments.

In this article, an iterative solution approach based on a bisection-type algorithm considering the minimum radius objective is proposed, which converges to

a global optimal solution of CPP. The present solution procedure relies on discretizing the container into smaller cells, and iteratively solves two integer linear programming (ILP) formulations designed for restricted and relaxed versions of the original problem. This allows utilizing mature ILP solvers in order to certify lower and upper bounds for the optimal value of problem (1) efficiently. The closest works in the literature to the present article are Litvinchev and Ozuna (2014); Litvinchev, Infante, and Ozuna Espinosa (2015), which also use discretization but primarily work with LP relaxations enhanced with valid inequalities as opposed to the present ILP-based approach.

In the present approach, ILP formulations are constructed based on the discretization of the surrounding circle into smaller squares. The corner points of squares are the guiding points within the ILP formulations, and these points can be represented by utilizing a logarithmic number of binary decision variables in the grid size. Apart from the two ILP formulations developed for the restricted and relaxed versions of CPP, some sub-methods are proposed to start with a better lower bound within the proposed algorithm. Then, an algorithm based on continuous solution space is developed to shrink the solution space for locating the center of each circle iteratively. By using this algorithm, a portion of decision variables are eliminated without any further investigation by pre-processing. These enhancements significantly improve the performance of the present algorithm and help solve instances consistently faster than global solvers such as BARON and Gurobi. They also enable obtaining comparable or better feasible solutions compared to heuristic methods from the literature along with optimality guarantees.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, ILP formulations developed for the restricted and relaxed versions of the original problem (1) are introduced. In Section 3, the proposed discretization-based solution approach is presented as well as the algorithmic enhancements designed for this algorithm. Then, Section 4 contains a computational study analyzing the performance of the present algorithm and the proposed ILP formulations. Finally, the article is concluded in Section 5.

2. Integer Linear Programming Formulations

In this section, the ILP formulations developed for CPP are presented. It is assumed that the surrounding container is circular-shaped; however, the present approach can be applied to other containers, which can be outer-approximated by a rectangle, as well.

Recall the nonconvex quadratically constrained program (1). In an optimal solution of the this formulation, the centers of circles can be located into anywhere in \mathbb{R}^2 space. However, this problem is hard to solve in the continuous space by using the global solvers BARON and Gurobi. Hence, the continuous solution space is discretized into smaller squares to design the algorithm. This discretization scheme is accompanied by a restricted and a relaxed version under the assumption that a candidate radius for the surrounding circle is given as R . In the restricted version, the corners of each cell are considered as candidate points to locate the centers of circles. If feasible, this solution will give a feasible solution for CPP, and an upper bound of at most R for problem (1). In the relaxed version, the centers of circles to be located are allowed to be at any point in a cell. In this version, any pair of circles are allowed to overlap in a well-defined and limited manner so that the resulting model gives a systematic way to construct a relaxation for CPP. If infeasible, the relaxed model will certify a lower

bound of R for problem (1). The details of each formulation are given in the following subsections.

2.1. *Restricted Version*

The main features of the formulation can be motivated with the running example from Figure 1. First, divide the smallest square containing the candidate surrounding circle with radius $R = 1.8$ into square-shaped cells as in Figure 2a. By using the candidate points, subsets of the bullets in Figure 2a, it is possible to come up with a restricted formulation, which models all constraints of the original problem with the following property: If the restriction has a feasible solution, then this solution is also feasible for the original problem. In Figures 2b and 2c, the circles are tried to be packed into a surrounding circle with radius $R = 1.8$ units. The cell sizes in these figures are 0.3 and 0.1 units, respectively. Depending on the granularity of the discretization, it may not be possible to find any feasible configuration for a given radius for the surrounding circle, as in Figure 2b. On the other hand, a finer grid with smaller cells can enable finding a feasible solution for the original problem, as exemplified in Figure 2c.




Figure 2.: Example discretizations of the circle and example placements of circles.

This modeling framework is formalized as follows: Divide the smallest square containing the candidate surrounding circle with radius R into small square-shaped cells whose side length is δ where $\theta\delta = R$ for some positive integer θ . The corners of these cells are “guiding points” used in these constructions. It is assumed that the diagonal size of each cell is smaller than the radius of the smallest circle, i.e., $\delta\sqrt{2} < \min\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$. If a corner of any cell is out of the surrounding circle, this point is eliminated from the set of candidate points since the size of each cell is smaller than each circle.

Define the set \mathcal{I} to represent the x -coordinates (respectively, y -coordinates) of the corners of the cells, where $|\mathcal{I}| = 2\theta + 1$ such that $\mathcal{I} = \{0, 1, \dots, 2\theta\}$. The surrounding circle’s center is assumed to be at the origin of the coordinate system, which is represented by (θ, θ) . Hence, the coordinates of the candidate point represented by (i, j) are given with $((i - \theta)\delta, (j - \theta)\delta)$. Then, there is a total of $(2\theta + 1)^2$ guiding points within the surrounding circle with radius R , and a subset of these points are candidate points to locate the center of circle $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

A direct approach to represent candidate points would be to define a pair of binary variables for each such point. In this case, the number of binary variables grows linearly in the grid size, which does not scale well for large problem instances (see, (Taşpınar 2021), for preliminary experiments). Instead, a logarithmic number of binary decision variables in the grid size are defined to locate the center of each circle, which is an idea inspired from Vielma, Ahmed, and Nemhauser (2010a,b). For this purpose, a new

parameter $\Theta := \lceil \log_2(2\theta) \rceil$ is introduced and two vectors of binary decision variables are defined: $\alpha_c \in \{0, 1\}^\Theta$ and $\beta_c \in \{0, 1\}^\Theta$. These binary column vectors correspond to the corner point of cell on x -axis (y -axis) in base 2, where the center of circle c is located. Another decision variable $\psi_{i,j,c}$ is also defined to ensure that circle c is totally included in the containing circle by stating that the circle's center should be located from the set $\mathcal{L}_c := \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}^2 : ((\theta - i)\delta)^2 + ((\theta - j)\delta)^2 \leq (R - r_c)^2\}$.

To ensure the feasibility for the original problem, overlapping of two circles should be banned. Hence, the candidate points to place the centers of distinct circles c and k should be far enough. In order to guarantee this, the pairs of the minimum required number of cells on x and y axes between the centers of the circles c and k are considered to avoid overlapping of these circles. For this purpose, the following set is defined:

$$\mathcal{N}_{c,k} = \left\{ (u_1, u_2) : u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{I}, u_1, u_2 \geq 0, (u_1 \delta)^2 + (u_2 \delta)^2 \geq (r_c + r_k)^2, \right. \\ \left. (u_1 \delta - \delta)^2 + (u_2 \delta)^2 < (r_c + r_k)^2, (u_1 \delta)^2 + (u_2 \delta - \delta)^2 < (r_c + r_k)^2 \right\}.$$

Before introducing the corresponding formulation, one more binary variable is needed: $\pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k}$. With the help of $\pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k}$ and the set $\mathcal{N}_{c,k}$, it is possible to ensure that any two circles are non-overlapping by stating the sum of all such variables is equal to 1 for each pair of distinct circles c and k , and the decision variable $\pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k}$ can be assigned one if the centers of circles c, k are located at two points which have at least u_1 cells on x -axis, and u_2 cells on y -axis between them, i.e., $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{c,k}$. Finally, the following formulation is obtained:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(t-1)} (\alpha_{c,t} - \alpha_{k,t}) \geq \sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{c,k}} u_1 \pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (2a)$$

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(v-1)} (\beta_{c,v} - \beta_{k,v}) \geq \sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{c,k}} u_2 \pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{c,k}} \pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} = 1 \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(t-1)} \alpha_{c,t} \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} : \exists j, (i, j) \in \mathcal{L}_c} i \psi_{i, j, c} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2d)$$

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(v-1)} \beta_{c,v} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I} : \exists i, (i, j) \in \mathcal{L}_c} j \psi_{i, j, c} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2e)$$

$$\sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{L}_c} \psi_{i, j, c} = 1 \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2f)$$

$$\alpha_c, \beta_c \in \{0, 1\}^\Theta \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2g)$$

$$\pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C}, (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{N}_{c,k} \quad (2h)$$

$$\psi_{i, j, c} \in \{0, 1\} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} (i, j) \in \mathcal{L}_c. \quad (2i)$$

In this model, Constraints (2a)-(2c) satisfy the non-overlapping feasibility rule, and Constraints (2d)-(2f) ensure that each circle is fully contained by the surrounding circle. Finally, Constraints (2g)-(2i) are the domain restrictions for the decision variables.

2.2. Relaxed Version

In Section 2.1, if a circle is assigned to a candidate point, it means that the center of corresponding circle is located exactly at the corresponding candidate point. In this section, assigning a circle to a candidate point is interpreted differently. In particular, assigning a circle to a candidate point means locating its center to a point included by the region represented with this point. To be more precise, the region represented with a candidate point is the cell whose lower-left corner point is the corresponding candidate point. The relaxed version will cover all feasible solutions of the original problem as well as a subset of infeasible solutions; however, the subset of allowed infeasible solutions is limited. For example, locating two circles to two candidate regions is forbidden if even the farthest distance between these two regions is less than the sum of the radii of the corresponding circles.

As an example, look at the candidate regions given in Figure 3a. If locating the largest circle to the candidate region at the middle and the second largest circle to the candidate region at the rightmost is considered, then an infeasible configuration is obtained for the proposed relaxed version since the farthest distance of these regions (1.58 units) is smaller than the sum of their radii (1.75 units). However, if the candidate region containing the largest circle's center is changed to the candidate region at the leftmost, then it will be feasible for the relaxed version since the farthest distance between the corresponding regions (1.8 units) is greater than the sum of their radii. This example shows that the relaxed version will be able to prevent some (but not all) infeasible configurations.




Figure 3.: Example placements of circles for the relaxed version.

To introduce the relaxed formulation, two sets of binary decision variables, $\gamma_c \in \{0,1\}^\Theta$ and $\omega_c \in \{0,1\}^\Theta$, are defined which respectively denote the x -axis and y -axis coordinate of the left-lower corner point of the cell in base 2 where the center of circle c is contained. Another variable $\eta_{i,j,c}$ is also defined to ensure that circle c is fully contained by the surrounding circle if there is at least one point of the cell whose left-lower point is contained in the set $\mathcal{S}_c := \{i, j \in \mathcal{I} : (i - \theta)^2 + (j - \theta)^2 \leq (\frac{R-r_c}{\delta})^2 \text{ or } (i - \theta + 1)^2 + (j - \theta + 1)^2 \leq (\frac{R-r_c}{\delta})^2\}$.

By using a similar idea with the restricted version, another set $\mathcal{O}_{c,k}$ is defined for the pairs of circles c, k similar to $\mathcal{N}_{c,k}$. The set $\mathcal{O}_{c,k}$ includes the pairs of the minimum required number of cells where the farthest distance of the cells between the centers of circles c, k are bigger than the sum of their radii. This set is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}_{c,k} = \left\{ (u_1, u_2) : u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\theta\}, u_1, u_2 \geq 0, (u_1 + 1)^2 + (u_2 + 1)^2 \geq ((r_c + r_k)/\delta)^2 \right. \\ \left. (u_1\delta)^2 + ((u_2 + 1)\delta)^2 < (r_c + r_k)^2, ((u_1 + 1)\delta)^2 + (u_2\delta)^2 < (r_c + r_k)^2 \right\}.$$

The defined set $\mathcal{O}_{c,k}$ consists of the minimum number of required cells to locate the

circles without overlapping at least if circles c and k are located to the farthest points of corresponding two cells. In other words, the set $\mathcal{O}_{c,k}$ includes the pairs (u_1, u_2) such that the diagonal of the rectangle with side lengths $(u_1 + 1)$ and $(u_2 + 1)$ is larger than $(r_c + r_k)/\delta$. Similarly, there are no other rectangles with diagonal length larger than $(r_c + r_k)/\delta$ which is totally included by this rectangle. Also, if centers of circles $c, k \in \mathcal{C}$ are included by two cells whose farthest distance is at least u_1 cells on x -axis and u_2 cells on y -axis, the corresponding proposed variable $\Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k}$ will be one. With the help of the sets $\mathcal{O}_{c,k}$ and the variables $\Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k}$, the obvious infeasible solutions of CPP are eliminated. The corresponding formulation is as follows:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(t-1)} (\gamma_{c,t} - \gamma_{k,t}) \geq \sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_{c,k}} u_1 \Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (3a)$$

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(v-1)} (\omega_{c,v} - \omega_{k,v}) \geq \sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_{c,k}} u_2 \Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (3b)$$

$$\sum_{(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_{c,k}} \Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} = 1 \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C} : c < k \quad (3c)$$

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(t-1)} \gamma_{c,t} \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_c} i \eta_{i,j,c} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (3d)$$

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\Theta} 2^{(v-1)} \omega_{c,v} \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_c} j \eta_{i,j,c} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (3e)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_c} \eta_{i,j,c} = 1 \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (3f)$$

$$\gamma_c, \omega_c \in \{0, 1\}^{\Theta} \quad c \in \mathcal{C} \quad (3g)$$

$$\Pi_{u_1, u_2, c, k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad c, k \in \mathcal{C}, (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_{c,k} \quad (3h)$$

$$\eta_{i,j,c} \in \{0, 1\} \quad c \in \mathcal{C}, (i, j) \in \mathcal{S}_c. \quad (3i)$$

In this model, Constraints (3a)-(3c) satisfy the non-overlapping feasibility condition partially while allowing some intersections. Constraints (3d)-(3f) ensure that there is at least one point of the corresponding cell for locating the circle's center such that it is fully contained by the surrounding circle. Finally, (3g)-(3i) are domain restrictions for the decision variables.

3. Solution Methods and Enhancements

In this section, the solution methods designed for CPP are presented. A bisection-type solution algorithm is introduced which iteratively considers different candidate radius values for the surrounding circle. The present solution algorithm solves the restricted and relaxed formulations alternately by using the discretized circle while utilizing the ILP models in Section 2. Then, several algorithmic enhancements are presented, which significantly improve the success of the proposed solution approach.

3.1. Discretized-Space Circle Packer Algorithm

In this subsection, the details of the solution procedure, named as the Discretized-Space Circle Packer Algorithm (DCPACK), are given. This algorithm depends on updating the upper and lower bounds of the radius of the surrounding circle until they are close enough. To initialize these bounds, it is proceeded as follows: If a surrounding circle in which all circles can be packed is known, then its radius gives an upper bound. Otherwise, the upper bound is trivially selected as the sum of the radii of all circles. Similarly, if a surrounding circle into which there is no feasible placement of packing all circles is known, then its radius gives a lower bound for the optimal solution; otherwise, the lower bound is initialized as the sum of the radii of the largest two circles.

Algorithm 1 DCPACK Algorithm.

Require: $\mathcal{C}; r_c, \forall c \in \mathcal{C}; U; L; \delta; \varepsilon$.

Ensure: $(x_c, y_c), \forall c \in \mathcal{C}; U; L$.

- 1: $R \leftarrow \frac{U+L}{2}$
 - 2: Divide the container with radius R into square cells with length δ .
 - 3: Solve the restriction model (2) using an MILP solver.
 - 4: **if** the restriction model is feasible **then**
 - 5: $U \leftarrow R$. Go to Step 11.
 - 6: Solve the relaxation model (3) using an MILP solver.
 - 7: **if** the relaxation model is infeasible **then**
 - 8: $L \leftarrow R$. Go to Step 11.
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: $\delta \leftarrow \frac{\delta}{2}$. Go to Step 2.
 - 11: **if** $U - L > \varepsilon U$ **then**
 - 12: Go to Step 1.
 - 13: **else**
 - 14: STOP!
-

Algorithm 1 aims to progressively improve the upper and lower bounds for the radius of the surrounding circle and terminates when the ε -optimality is proven, which is defined as follows: Suppose there is a feasible configuration for which the radius of the container is U and it is proven that there does not exist any feasible configuration when the radius of the container is at most L . Then, U is called an ε -optimal solution for the radius of the container if condition $U - L > \varepsilon U$ holds.

First, the surrounding circle's radius is initialized as the average of the initial upper and lower bounds at Step 1. Then, the given surrounding circle is divided into smaller squares with side length δ at Step 2 and the restricted formulation (2) is solved. If this problem gives a feasible configuration, the corresponding radius value gives an upper bound for the minimum value of the surrounding circle's radius. Then, the upper bound is updated at Step 5, and the gap between the bounds are is checked at Step 11. If the bounds are close enough, then Algorithm 1 terminates with an ε -optimal solution. Otherwise, Algorithm 1 proceeds with Step 1 with an updated upper bound.

On the other hand, if the restricted model is infeasible, the relaxed formulation (3) is solved. If the relaxed model is also infeasible for the given radius of the surrounding circle, it means that there is no feasible configuration of the given circles into this surrounding circle. Hence, the lower bound for the original problem is updated at Step 8 and it is checked whether the updated lower and upper bounds are close enough or not. If they are close enough, the algorithm stops. Otherwise, Algorithm 1 proceeds

with Step 1 with an updated lower bound.

If a given radius value for the surrounding circle is feasible in the relaxation model which is infeasible in the restriction model, then there is no clear conclusion. In that case, the side length of the cells is halved to get a finer discretization at Step 10 and the algorithm proceeds with the new discretization.

Now, the convergence of Algorithm 1 is discussed. The algorithm will set the value of R at most $\lceil \log_2(1/\varepsilon) \rceil$ many times in Step 1, a property inherited from the bisection method. As long as the algorithm executes Step 10 finitely many times, the finite convergence to an ε -optimal solution can be shown. The only complication may arise when L and U are not close enough, but the current iterate R is arbitrarily close to the global optimal value. In this case, the restriction model (2) will be infeasible and the relaxation model (3) will be feasible, and the algorithm might have to refine the grid arbitrarily many times in Step 10. Although this behavior has not been observed in the computational experiments, this occurrence can be prevented by additional measures. For example, if the algorithm is stuck at Step 10 for a predetermined number of iterations, then the current iterate R can be perturbed slightly and the algorithm can continue with Step 2.

3.2. Algorithmic Enhancements

In this subsection, the details of improvements proposed for Algorithm 1 are given. In Section 3.2.1, the details of Algorithm 2, which decreases the number of decision variables by decreasing the solution space for each circle, are presented. In Section 3.2.2, the methods for obtaining initial lower and upper bounds for the radius of the surrounding circle are described used in Algorithm 1. Then, other improvements are given in Section 3.2.3. Throughout this subsection, the circles are assumed to be ordered with respect to their radii, that is, $r_c \geq r_k$ for $c < k$.

3.2.1. Solution Space Reductions

In this part, the aim is to reduce the feasible region of CPP using geometric arguments. For example, without loss of generality, it is possible to place the center of the first circle to the first quadrant, and the center of the second circle to the half space defined by $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y - x \geq 0\}$ by adding the constraints $x_1 \geq 0, y_1 \geq 0, y_2 \geq x_2$. This helps eliminating some symmetric solutions of the problem.

In fact, more restrictions can be inferred by considering the packing and non-overlapping constraints. To start with, it is possible to use the fact that the distance from a point to the boundary of the surrounding circle should be at least the radius of the circle to be located for placing at this point; and the maximum distance from the point to the boundary should be at least two times of the radius of the reference circle (the largest circle for other circles, and the second largest circle for the largest circle) plus the radius of the corresponding circle by considering the non-overlapping constraint. Moreover, the obtained regions can be further reduced by eliminating the points where there is no feasible point to locate the other circle's center due to the non-overlapping constraint. These resulting regions are the smallest feasible regions for these circles within this procedure. Then, by using the reduced regions for the largest two circles, the feasible regions for locating centers of other circles are reduced by performing an iterative algorithm. The steps of this approach is given in Algorithm 2

An example is given in Figure 4 to illustrate the solution space reduction idea.

Suppose that in a given instance, two circles have radii 6 and 7 units, and the task is to identify the regions their centers can be located to a container of radius 13.6 units. In Figure 4a, the dashed and undashed regions show the reduced regions to place the largest and the second largest circles, respectively. Then, the improved version of the reduced regions are given in Figure 4b. These reduced regions given in Figure 4b will be combined with the knowledge that any two circles cannot overlap. Then, the corresponding regions can be decreased by eliminating the points where there is no feasible point to locate the other circle's center. After this elimination step, feasible regions given in Figure 4c are obtained for the largest two circles. These resulting regions are the minimum possible feasible regions for these circles within this procedure.




Figure 4.: An example of solution space reductions.

Algorithm 2 Feasible Region Identification Algorithm.

Require: \mathcal{C} ; r_c , $\forall c \in \mathcal{C}$; \mathcal{S}_1 ; \mathcal{S}_2 ; R , k .

Ensure: True or False.

- 1: **for** $\{p_c = (x_c, y_c) : \|(p_c, p_l)\|_2 \geq (r_c + r_l), \|p_c\|_2 \leq R - r_c\}$ where the center of circle at order c is located where $c < k$ **do**
 - 2: $\mathcal{G} = \{p_k = (x_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (R - r_k) \geq \|p_k\|_2 \geq \max\{0, 2r_1 + r_k - R\}$
 - 3: $\mathcal{F} = \{p_k = (x_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \forall c \in \mathcal{C}, \|(p_k, p_c)\|_2 \geq r_c + r_k\} \cap \mathcal{G}$
 - 4: **if** $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ **then**
 - 5: return FALSE.
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: return TRUE.
-

It is easy to see that if Algorithm 2 results in False for any k , there is no feasible configuration of circles in the given surrounding circle; otherwise, there is at least one feasible placement. By using the resulting reduced regions obtained by Algorithm 2, it is possible to eliminate the decision variables corresponding to the candidate points which are not included by the resulting regions for each circle.

3.2.2. Initializing Lower and Upper Bounds

An obvious but potentially weak upper bound can be obtained as the sum of all radii of the circles, that is, $\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} r_c$. To obtain better upper bound values, it is possible to use the best-known upper bounds from Circle Packing Contest of Al Zimmermann's Programming Contests and Packomania website with the algorithm given in Huang et al. (2006).

Below, four methods to initialize the lower bound (LB) in Algorithm 1 will be

discussed. Many of these methods exploit the geometric properties of the problem whereas the last one solves an auxiliary optimization problem to compute the bound.

- LB1: An obvious lower bound for the radius of the surrounding circle is the sum of the radii of the largest two circles, that is, $r_1 + r_2$.
- LB2: Since the sum of the areas of all circles gives a lower bound for the area of the surrounding circle, another lower bound for the radius of the surrounding circle can be obtained as $\sqrt{\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} r_c^2}$.
- LB3: Algorithm 2 can be performed iteratively to calculate another lower bound for the radius of the surrounding circle.
- LB4: Placing circles on the plane, even in tangent positions, inevitably creates idle regions that cannot contain any other circle. The main idea in this lower bound calculation is to quantify the area of idle regions between circle triples and the circles adjacent to the surrounding circle. This approach is summarized below and the reader is referred to Taşpınar (2021) for details.

To start with, define a set denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}$, where 0 is the index of the surrounding circle. In order to investigate the idle regions, it is convenient to think of a configuration of circles as a graph such that each circle denotes a node, and there is an edge between any two circles if their centers can be connected by a line without intersecting another circle. As an illustration, consider Figure 5. Observe that there are three adjacent circles in Figure 5a and they are all tangent to one another. In general, it is possible to compute the idle area between such triplet of circles C , K and L , denoted by $\Delta_{C,K,L}$, as follows:

$$\sqrt{(r_C + r_K + r_L)r_C r_K r_L} - \sum_{\substack{(c,k,l) \in \{(C,K,L), \\ (K,C,L), (L,C,K)\}}} \frac{r_c^2 \cos^{-1} \left(\frac{r_c(r_c+r_k+r_l)-r_k r_l}{(r_c+r_l)(r_c+r_k)} \right)}{2}.$$

It can also happen that the circles are not tangent to each other, or form cycles with length more than three as in Figure 5b. In these cases, it is possible to underestimate the idle area as the sum of the idles areas of the consecutive triples as if they are adjacent to one another.




Figure 5.: The idle region between adjacent circles.

There are other possible configurations as illustrated in Figure 6. As in Figure 6a, if one of the circles in the triplet is the surrounding circle, then the idle area calculation changes and involves an upper bound on the radius of the container. Figure 6b presents a case in which some idle regions are double counted. If circle k is the circle between the circles c , l and the surrounding circle, then the double counted area is computed as $\rho_{c,k,l} := \Delta_{0,c,k} + \Delta_{0,k,l} + \Delta_{c,k,l} + \pi r_k^2$.




Figure 6.: The idle region between adjacent circles and the surrounding circle.

It is now explained how to use an integer programming formulation to calculate a lower bound for the idle area in the optimal packing. In addition to the idle area parameters $\Delta_{c,k,l}$ and $\rho_{c,k,l}$ as explained above, also define parameters $\underline{\kappa}_c$ and $\bar{\kappa}_c$, which respectively give the minimum and maximum number of triples circle c can have as neighbors. These parameters can be easily computed as a function of the radius r_c . Two binary variables $d_{c,k,l}$ and $f_{c,k,l}$ are defined for $c, k, l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ with $c < k < l$. If the circles c , k , and l are adjacent to each other, then $d_{c,k,l}$ takes value 1. If circles c , k and l are adjacent to the surrounding circle (i.e., $d_{c,k,l} = 1$, $d_{0,c,k} = 1$, $d_{0,k,l} = 1$, $d_{0,c,l} = 1$), then the binary variable $f_{c,k,l}$ takes value 1. The resulting integer linear program is given as below:

$$\min \sum_{c,k,l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}: c < k < l} (\Delta_{c,k,l} d_{c,k,l} - \rho_{c,k,l} f_{c,k,l}) \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \underline{\kappa}_c \leq \sum_{k,l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} d_{c,k,l} + \sum_{k,l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} d_{k,c,l} + \sum_{k,l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} d_{k,l,c} \leq \bar{\kappa}_c \quad c \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4b)$$

$$f_{c,k,l} \leq d_{c,k,l} \quad c, k, l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4c)$$

$$f_{c,k,l} \leq d_{0,c,k}, \quad f_{c,k,l} \leq d_{0,k,l}, \quad f_{c,k,l} \leq d_{0,c,l} \quad c, k, l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4d)$$

$$f_{c,k,l} \geq d_{c,k,l} + d_{0,c,k} + d_{0,k,l} + d_{0,c,l} - 3 \quad c, k, l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}} \quad (4e)$$

$$d_{c,k,l}, f_{c,k,l} \in \{0, 1\} \quad c, k, l \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}. \quad (4f)$$

In the above formulation, objective function (4a) minimizes a lower bound on the total idle area created by circle triplets. Constraint (4b) ensures that circle c has at least $\underline{\kappa}_c$ and at most $\bar{\kappa}_c$ many circles as its neighbors. Constraints (4c)-(4e) assign the value of the decision variable $f_{c,k,l}$ according to the values of the decision variables $d_{c,k,l}$, $d_{0,c,k}$, $d_{0,k,l}$ and $d_{0,c,l}$. In particular, $f_{c,k,l}$ takes value one if and only if $d_{c,k,l}$, $d_{0,c,k}$, $d_{0,k,l}$ and $d_{0,c,l}$ are all assigned to one. Finally, Constraint (4f) are domain restrictions for the decision variables. The sum of the optimal value of problem (4) and the sum of the areas of all circles gives a lower bound for the area of the surrounding circle, from which a lower bound for the radius of the surrounding circle can be computed.

3.2.3. Other Improvements

In addition to the previous enhancements, a set of procedures handled during the branching process are also introduced. First of all, the decision variables are prioritized according to the radius of the corresponding circle. The variables corresponding larger circles have the larger priorities. This is implemented by Gurobi solver's branching priority functionality.

In a typical node of a branch-and-bound tree, some binary variables are assigned a value of one. In the case of CPP, this means that a number of circles are assigned to certain candidate points or cells, and some circles are currently unassigned. During the branching process, it is possible to encounter situations in which a subset of unassigned circles cannot be located due to insufficient space left. For example, this can happen if there is not enough area to locate some of the unassigned circles, or there is not enough candidate points to place all the unassigned circles. As listed below, these cases are identified during the execution of an MILP solve, and cuts are added or branch-and-bound nodes are eliminated through Gurobi solver’s user cut and callback functionalities to handle such situations efficiently:

- The idle regions between the assigned circles where none of the unassigned circles can be placed are identified. The candidate points or cells in such regions are eliminated.
- The remaining idle area is calculated and it is compared with the sum of the areas of the unassigned circles with the minimum idle area between them to be packed. A branch-and-bound node is eliminated in two cases: i) if the remaining area is less than the sum of the areas of the unassigned circles, or ii) if the distance between the farthest available candidate points is less than the sum of the radii of the two largest unassigned circles.
- Situations in which the assignment of an unassigned circle to a particular cell creates overlapping with the already assigned circles are also identified. Then, such cases are prevented with the help of conditional constraints.

4. Computational Study

In this section, the present algorithm is evaluated on a series of benchmark instances from Packomania (2020), the Circle Packing Contest of Al Zimmermann’s Programming Contests from Zimmermann (2005), and equal circle instances from Huang and Ye (2011). The instances from the Circle Packing Contest are denoted with “*Zimm – n*”, which represents an instance with n -circles where $5 \leq n \leq 20$ (Zimmermann 2005), and n equal circle instances from Huang and Ye (2011) are denoted with “*Eq – n*”.

Before analyzing the performance of the algorithm, the problem (1) is solved with Baron and Gurobi to show the effectiveness of the global solvers in Subsection 4.1. Then, the performance of the discretization-based solution approach is given in Subsection 4.2. The present algorithm for the equal circle case is compared with a heuristic method proposed in Huang and Ye (2011) in Subsection 4.3. Then, the present solution procedure is compared with another heuristic designed for a rectangular-shaped container from Stoyan and Yas’kov (2004) in Subsection 4.4. The optimality gap is set as 1% for Baron and Gurobi as well as Algorithm 1.

4.1. Performance Analysis of Global Solvers

In this subsection, four instances from (Zimmermann 2005) are used to analyze the performance of global solvers for two versions of formulation (1). For the basic version, no knowledge is shared with the global solvers in terms of solution space reductions from Section 3.2.1 or lower and upper bounds from Section 3.2.2 whereas stronger lower and upper bounds are used for the improved version. These formulations are

implemented in Python, and solved by solvers Baron and Gurobi with a time limit of 30 minutes. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1.: Results obtained by the global solvers (TLE: time limit exceeded).

Ins.	Baron						Gurobi					
	Basic Version			Improved Version			Basic Version			Improved Version		
	Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)	GAP (%)
<i>Zimm</i> – 5	9.001	1.26	0.01	9.001	0.01	0.00	9.001	0.50	0.99	9.034	0.72	0.36
<i>Zimm</i> – 6	11.057	12.83	0.01	11.109	0.27	0.46	11.057	17.31	0.52	11.062	1.28	0.04
<i>Zimm</i> – 7	13.462	TLE	3.43	13.462	TLE	2.28	13.463	TLE	3.44	13.462	TLE	2.28
<i>Zimm</i> – 8	16.222	TLE	7.53	16.222	TLE	5.85	16.384	TLE	8.45	16.437	TLE	7.08

It is observed that the global solvers cannot solve problem (1) even for the 7-circle instance for both versions. In the improved version, the given lower bounds are not improved during the solution times by the solvers, but the global solvers can detect and improve upper bounds for problem (1). It is deduced that CPP is quite challenging to solve with the help of the global solvers even for the small-sized instances.

4.2. Performance Analysis of the Discretization-Based Approach

In this subsection, the performance of Algorithm 1 and the effects of the enhancements given in Section 3.2 are investigated. In Table 2, the results obtained by Algorithm 1 are given for two different versions: the basic version without any enhancements and the enhanced version with all the enhancements proposed in Section 3.2. As seen in Table 2, the enhancements improve Algorithm 1’s performance, and they decrease the total solution time significantly.

Table 2.: Performance analysis of the enhancements introduced for Algorithm 1.

Instance	Basic Version			Enhanced Version			
	Upper Bound	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)
<i>Zimm</i> – 5	9.002	2.07	0.02	9.001	0.04	0.06	0.76
<i>Zimm</i> – 6	11.139	9.25	0.73	11.071	0.17	0.24	0.13
<i>Zimm</i> – 7	13.471	17.72	0.82	13.467	0.86	1.07	0.64
<i>Zimm</i> – 8	16.321	28.20	0.99	16.224	1.59	2.57	0.81

The individual effect of each enhancement is also analyzed. For this purpose, four versions of Algorithm 1 are tested in which all enhancements from Section 3.2 are implemented similar to Enhanced Version, except for one enhancement left out each time. In particular, Version 1 is the one without any lower bound improvement from Section 3.2.2, Version 2 is the one without any upper bound improvement from Section 3.2.2, Version 3 is the one without any solution space reductions from Section 3.2.1, and Version 4 is the one without any cuts added during the branching process from Section 3.2.3. The results are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3.: Effects of the qualities of starting lower and upper bounds for Algorithm 1.

Instance	Version 1				Version 2			
	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)
<i>Zimm</i> – 5	9.002	0.01	1.43	0.02	9.006	0.03	2.12	0.07
<i>Zimm</i> – 6	11.140	0.04	6.63	0.86	11.084	0.14	5.73	0.43
<i>Zimm</i> – 7	13.469	0.15	13.56	0.89	13.470	0.68	11.41	0.80
<i>Zimm</i> – 8	16.273	0.41	21.32	0.88	16.269	1.11	18.83	0.83

Initializing lower and upper bounds is an important factor in Algorithm 1 according to Table 3. The pre-processing time required for initializing the bounds is less than the necessary time spent in Algorithm 1 without the pre-processing methods. Hence, the methods for initializing the upper and lower bounds are effective since the solution times do not decrease much compared to the Basic Version.

Table 4.: Effects of other enhancements one by one introduced for Algorithm 1.

Instance	Version 3				Version 4			
	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)
<i>Zimm</i> – 5	9.001	0.03	0.06	0.86	9.001	0.04	0.07	0.55
<i>Zimm</i> – 6	11.091	0.15	0.26	0.36	11.087	0.17	0.28	0.25
<i>Zimm</i> – 7	13.466	0.81	1.04	0.70	13.468	0.84	1.13	0.59
<i>Zimm</i> – 8	16.224	1.53	6.48	0.69	16.224	1.56	2.91	0.86

According to Table 4, one can say that the solution space reductions and adding cuts during the branching have a positive effect in the reduction of the total solution time compared to the Basic Version. However, they are less influential compared to the lower and bound enhancement methods.

Other than observing the effect of the sub-methods designed for enhancing the performance of Algorithm 1 one by one, the efficiency of the algorithm used for initializing the upper bound is also explored if the best-known value from the literature are not fed into the algorithm. As a result, the instances are solved by only using the upper bound initialization algorithm from Huang et al. (2006), and these results are compared with the results obtained by initializing the upper bounds as equal to the best-known values in Table 5. Algorithm 1 terminates after 120 minutes of processing. As seen in Table 5, Algorithm 1 performs good enough without knowing the best-known values by using the upper bound initialization algorithm stated in Section 3.2.3. Although it may not have found the best-known radii for some instances, the general performance of Algorithm 1 is not effected conspicuously.

Table 5.: Effect of using best-known values within Algorithm 1.

Instance	Upper Bound Initialization Algorithm				Best-known Values			
	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Pre-processing Time (m)	Total Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)
<i>Zimm</i> – 12	28.371	3.72	14.43	0.59	28.371	2.71	12.92	0.57
<i>Zimm</i> – 13	31.546	4.90	20.43	0.99	31.545	3.91	17.26	0.96
<i>Zimm</i> – 14	35.096	6.04	37.05	0.43	35.096	5.41	36.43	0.37
<i>Zimm</i> – 15	38.839	7.88	54.26	0.92	38.838	6.40	48.13	0.90
<i>Zimm</i> – 16	42.457	9.94	63.56	0.85	42.457	8.51	61.30	0.84
<i>Zimm</i> – 17	46.291	12.93	73.59	0.68	46.291	10.71	68.73	0.68
<i>Zimm</i> – 18	50.129	15.07	99.26	0.83	50.120	12.87	90.36	0.46
<i>Zimm</i> – 19	54.240	19.98	111.51	0.93	54.240	17.19	108.09	0.93
<i>Zimm</i> – 20	58.401	24.91	TLE	1.97	58.401	21.63	TLE	1.97

According to Table 5, one can also say that Algorithm 1 can solve problems up to 19 circles within 120 minutes time limit whether or not the best-known is assumed to be given. In addition, the solution quality can be increased by solving the problem containing 20 circles with a longer time limit. Since the present algorithm is a global optimization method, the solution quality is guaranteed, especially for such a problem for which a tight lower bound is hard to verify. Therefore, it is possible to say that the proposed solution approach is quite successful as a global optimization method for CPP.

4.3. Comparison with an Algorithm Designed for Equal Circle Case

In this subsection, the results for the equal circle instances are given. For the packing of n -equal circles into a larger circle problem, a tailored algorithm is proposed by Huang and Ye (2011), and the present approach is compared against their algorithm. It can be noted that the proposed algorithm in Huang and Ye (2011) combines a local-search procedure and an improvement heuristic. The comparison of Algorithm 1 with the algorithm introduced in Huang and Ye (2011) is given in Table 6. The upper bounds are obtained by the upper bound initialization algorithm of Huang et al. (2006).

Table 6.: Results obtained by Algorithm 1 and algorithm in Huang and Ye (2011).

No.	Algorithm 1			Algorithm in Huang and Ye (2011)	
	Upper Bound	Sol. Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Sol. Time (m)
<i>Eq</i> – 20	5.122	4.17	0.64	5.122	4.23
<i>Eq</i> – 25	5.753	6.34	0.91	5.753	4.14
<i>Eq</i> – 30	6.198	9.43	0.62	6.198	5.72
<i>Eq</i> – 35	6.696	12.08	0.97	6.697	7.76
<i>Eq</i> – 40	7.123	14.42	0.89	7.124	10.59

Algorithm 1 presents an upper and a lower bound for the radius of the surrounding circle. Hence, it is ensured that the obtained circle is at most 1% away from the optimal-sized circle in which all circles are packed. However, the algorithm introduced in Huang & Ye (2011) only compares the obtained solutions with the best-known values given in Packomania (2020). Although this algorithm proposed by Huang & Ye (2011) solves the instances in shorter times, the increase in the solution time is not

crucial. It is noted that their algorithm is tailored for equal circle case whereas the present algorithm is generic.

It can be also observed that Algorithm 1 can solve the equal circle problem for the instances with a larger number of circles as well as the solution times are shorter than the unequal circle problem. This observation is likely a result of the tighter initial lower bounds. Since the minimum idle regions between the circles do not change according to different configurations of circles for the equal circle case, the obtained lower bounds are tighter for the equal circle packing problem.

4.4. Comparison with an Algorithm Tailored for a Rectangular Container

In this subsection, the present algorithm is compared with another algorithm proposed by Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004) in which the surrounding container is a rectangular strip. To handle this issue, the feasible region definitions in Algorithm 2 are changed within the surrounding container and the definitions of the sets $\mathcal{L}_c, \mathcal{S}_c$.

During the modification process, the guiding points are included by the rectangular strip whose width is known. To ensure that a corresponding circle is totally included by the surrounding rectangle, guiding points are included by a rectangular ring whose outer boundary is r_c units away from the boundary for circle c . In this problem, the aim is to find the minimum length of the strip. In addition, the idle regions between the circles and the surrounding container should be updated accordingly. For that, the idle region is equal to the region between the tangent passing through both circles. The reduced regions are calculated according to the shape of the container. For the two largest circles, the first circle's center is located at the right upper part of the rectangle, and the second circle's center is located on the upper part of the diagonal connecting the right upper and left lower corner points of the rectangle. The set definitions within Algorithm 2 are accordingly changed. With these changes above, Algorithm 1 is compared with the algorithm proposed in Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004). During the comparisons, the initial upper bounds are obtained by the algorithm introduced in Huang et al. (2006) which is also updated to pack the circles into a rectangular strip.

Table 7.: Results obtained by Algorithm 1 and the algorithm in Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004).

No.	Strip Size (units)	Algorithm 1			Algorithm in Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004)	
		Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)	GAP (%)	Upper Bound	Solution Time (m)
SY1	9.5	17.291	47.35	0.91	17.461	34.14
SY2	8.5	14.375	23.07	0.37	15.604	8.11
SY2 - 1	9.0	13.572	24.16	0.12	13.653	7.64
SY2 - 2	9.5	12.758	19.83	0.76	12.547	6.01
SY2 - 3	11.0	11.163	20.49	0.85	11.214	6.69
SY3	9.0	14.321	31.29	0.82	15.171	18.09
SY3 - 1	8.5	15.904	36.40	0.77	16.463	17.26
SY3 - 2	9.5	13.691	34.05	0.94	13.713	13.52
SY3 - 3	11.0	11.564	29.52	0.37	11.827	16.52

According to the results given in Table 7, the algorithm in Stoyan and Yas'kov

(2004) performs worse in terms of the solution quality, and the optimality gap is unknown for these solutions. Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004) state that the proposed algorithm depends on the initialization procedure, and the initial solution affects the solution quality of the algorithm. Also, their algorithm requires an initial solution with all corresponding coordinates for the circles; however, Algorithm 1 requires an upper bound and a lower bound for the strip size during the initialization procedure which can be assigned as the sum of the radii of the circles and zero, respectively. Although the initial upper and lower bounds are not well-defined, the performance of Algorithm 1 is not affected adversely since it is a bisection-type algorithm and remove the half of the possible values at each iteration. However, when comparing the algorithms in terms of the solution times, one can say that the proposed procedure requires more time to solve the instances. This is a somewhat expected result since the strength of Algorithm 1 is in guaranteeing the solution quality whereas Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004) do not propose any optimality gap during the solution procedure. In addition, for many of the instances, the present approach is able to find better upper bounds than the algorithm in Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004).

5. Conclusion

In this article, the circle packing problem with the objective of minimizing the radius of a circular container is studied. This nonconvex problem arises in many different settings and quite challenging to solve in general. Since global solvers perform poorly, a discretization-based solution approach is designed to solve the problem to global optimality. The present solution approach iterates between a restricted and a relaxed version of the problem, which are both formulated as integer linear programming models, and terminate once the upper and lower bounds are within the user specified tolerance. This algorithm is enhanced using feasible region reduction, bound tightening and variable elimination strategies, and tested with a variety of instances from literature. The computational experiments show that the proposed approach is orders-of-magnitude faster than the global solvers. Moreover, the proposed generic approach is competitive against heuristics tailored for specific cases, which cannot provide any optimality guarantee. As a future work, real-life instances such as the 162-circle instance arising in the automobile industry (Sugihara et al. 2004) can be solved.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey under grant number 120M345.

Data Availability Statement

The input data of this study is collected from the references Packomania (2020), Zimmermann (2005), Huang and Ye (2011) and Stoyan and Yas'kov (2004).

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Bortolete, J. C., L. F. Bueno, R. Butkeraites, A. A. Chaves, G. Collaço, M. Magueta, F. J. R. Pelogia, et al. 2022. “A support tool for planning classrooms considering social distancing between students.” *Computational and Applied Mathematics* 41: 1–23.
- Castillo, I., F. J. Kampas, and J. D. Pintér. 2008. “Solving circle packing problems by global optimization: Numerical results and industrial applications.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 191 (3): 786 – 802.
- Castillo, I., and T. Sim. 2010. “A spring-embedding approach for the facility layout problem.” *JORS* 61: 1063.
- Francesco, C., C. Cerrone, and R. Cerulli. 2014. “A Tabu Search Approach for the Circle Packing Problem.” In *Proceedings of the 2014 17th International Conference on Network-Based Information Systems*, NBIS '14, USA, 165–171. IEEE Computer Society.
- Galiev, S. I., and M. S. Lisafina. 2013. “Linear models for the approximate solution of the problem of packing equal circles into a given domain.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 230 (3): 505 – 514.
- He, K., M. Huang, and C. Yang. 2015. “An action-space-based global optimization algorithm for packing circles into a square container.” *Computers & Operations Research* 58: 67 – 74.
- Hifi, M., and R. M’Hallah. 2009. “A Literature Review on Circle and Sphere Packing Problems: Models and Methodologies.” *Adv. Operations Research* 2009: 150624:1–150624:22.
- Huang, W., and T. Ye. 2011. “Global optimization method for finding dense packings of equal circles in a circle.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 210 (3): 474 – 481.
- Huang, W. Q., Y. Li, C. M. Li, and R. C. Xu. 2006. “New Heuristics for Packing Unequal Circles into a Circular Container.” *Comput. Oper. Res.* 33 (8): 2125–2142.
- Ikebe, Y., S. Masuda, and T. Okuno. 2023. “Mixed-integer DC programming based algorithms for the circular packing problem.” *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan* 66 (3): 153–175.
- Lai, X., J.-K. Hao, D. Yue, Z. Lü, and Z.-H. Fu. 2022. “Iterated dynamic thresholding search for packing equal circles into a circular container.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 299 (1): 137–153.
- Li, W., and T. Sun. 2009. “Silica artificial opal incorporated with silver nanoparticles.” *Materials Chemistry and Physics* 116.
- Litvinchev, I., L. Infante, and E. Ozuna Espinosa. 2015. “Packing circular-like objects in a rectangular container.” *Journal of Computer and Systems Sciences International* 54: 259–267.
- Litvinchev, I., and E.L. Ozuna. 2014. “Approximate Packing Circles in a Rectangular Container: Valid Inequalities and Nesting.” *Journal of Applied Research and Technology* 12 (4): 716 – 723.
- Liu, J., K. Zhang, X. Yan, and Q. Zhang. 2024. “A configuration space evolutionary algorithm with local minimizer for weighted circles packing problem.” *Expert Systems with Applications* 238: 121768.
- Locatelli, M., and U. Raber. 2002. “Packing Equal Circles in a Square: A Deterministic Global Optimization Approach.” *Discrete Appl. Math.* 122 (1-3): 139–166.
- Packomania. 2020. “Packomania website.” <http://www.packomania.com/>. Accessed: 2021-01-30.
- Romanova, T., O. Pankratov, I. Litvinchev, P. Stetsyuk, O. Lykhovyd, J. A. Marmolejo-Saucedo, and P. Vasant. 2022. “Balanced circular packing problems with distance constraints.” *Computation* 10 (7): 113.
- Romanova, T. E., P. I. Stetsyuk, A. Fischer, and G. M. Yaskov. 2023. “Proportional Packing of Circles in a Circular Container.” *Cybernetics and Systems Analysis* 59 (1): 82–89.
- Stoyan, Y. G., and G. Yas’kov. 2004. “A mathematical model and a solution method for the problem of placing various-sized circles into a strip.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 156 (3): 590 – 600.
- Sugihara, K., M. Sawai, H. Sano, D. Kim, and D. Kim. 2004. “Disk packing for the estimation of the size of a wire bundle.” *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 21:

- 259–278.
- Taşpınar, R. 2021. “Discretization based solution approaches for the circle packing problem.” Master’s thesis, Sabancı University.
- Tole, K., R. Moqa, J. Zheng, and K. He. 2023. “A Simulated Annealing approach for the Circle Bin Packing Problem with Rectangular Items.” *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 176: 109004.
- Torres-Escobar, R., J. A. Marmolejo-Saucedo, and I. Litvinchev. 2020. “Binary monkey algorithm for approximate packing non-congruent circles in a rectangular container.” *Wireless Networks* 26: 4743–4752.
- Vielma, J. P., S. Ahmed, and G. Nemhauser. 2010a. “Mixed-Integer Models for Nonseparable Piecewise-Linear Optimization: Unifying Framework and Extensions.” *Operations Research* 58: 303–315.
- Vielma, J. P., S. Ahmed, and G. Nemhauser. 2010b. “A Note on “A Superior Representation Method for Piecewise Linear Functions”.” *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 22 (3): 493–497.
- Wang, H., W. Huang, Q. Zhang, and D. Xu. 2002. “An improved algorithm for the packing of unequal circles within a larger containing circle.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 141 (2): 440 – 453.
- Yuan, Y., K. Tole, F. Ni, K. He, Z. Xiong, and J. Liu. 2022. “Adaptive simulated annealing with greedy search for the circle bin packing problem.” *Computers & Operations Research* 144: 105826.
- Zeng, Z., X. Yu, K. He, W. Huang, and Z. Fu. 2016. “Iterated Tabu Search and Variable Neighborhood Descent for packing unequal circles into a circular container.” *European Journal of Operational Research* 250 (2): 615 – 627.
- Zimmermann, A. 2005. “Al Zimmermann’s Programming Contests.” <http://www.recmath.org/contest/CirclePacking/>. Accessed: 2021-01-30.