

Branch and Cut for Partitioning a Graph into a Cycle of Clusters

Leon Eifler¹[0000-0003-0245-9344], Jakob Witzig^{1,2}[0000-0003-2698-0767], and
Ambros Gleixner^{1,3}[0000-0003-0391-5903]

¹ Zuse Institute Berlin, Takustr. 7, 14195 Berlin, Germany eifler@zib.de

² SAP SE, Dietmar-Hopp-Allee 17, 69190 Walldorf, Germany jakob.witzig@sap.com

³ HTW Berlin, 10313 Berlin, Germany gleixner@htw-berlin.de

Abstract. In this paper we study formulations and algorithms for the cycle clustering problem, a partitioning problem over the vertex set of a directed graph with nonnegative arc weights that is used to identify cyclic behavior in simulation data generated from nonreversible Markov state models. Here, in addition to partitioning the vertices into a set of coherent clusters, the resulting clusters must be ordered into a cycle such as to maximize the total net flow in the forward direction of the cycle. We provide a problem-specific binary programming formulation and compare it to a formulation based on the reformulation-linearization technique (RLT). We present theoretical results on the polytope associated with our custom formulation and develop primal heuristics and separation routines for both formulations. In computational experiments on simulation data from biology we find that branch and cut based on the problem-specific formulation outperforms the one based on RLT.

Keywords: Branch and cut · cycle clustering · graph partitioning · valid inequalities · primal heuristics.

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with solving a curious combination of a graph partitioning problem with a cyclic ordering problem called *cycle clustering*. This combinatorial optimization problem was introduced in [16] to analyze simulation data from nonreversible stochastic processes, in particular Markov state models, where standard methods using spectral information are not easily applicable. One typical example for such processes are catalytic cycles in biochemistry, where a set of chemical reactions transforms educts to products in the presence of a catalyst.

Generally, we are given a complete undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$, edge set $E = \binom{V}{2}$, weights $q_{i,j} \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in V$, and a pre-specified number of clusters $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is essential to the problem that q is not assumed to be symmetric, i.e., we may have $q_{i,j} \neq q_{j,i}$. We refer to directed edges (i, j) also as arcs and let $A = \{(i, j) \in V \times V : i \neq j\}$. Our goal is then to partition V into an ordered set of clusters C_1, \dots, C_m such as to maximize an objective function based on the following definition.

Definition 1. Let $Q \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$ and $S, T \subseteq V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be two disjoint sets of vertices, then we define the net flow from S to T as

$$f(S, T) := \sum_{i \in S, j \in T} q_{i,j}^- \text{ with } q_{i,j}^- := q_{i,j} - q_{j,i},$$

and the coherence of S as

$$g(S) := \sum_{i,j \in S} q_{i,j} = \sum_{i,j \in S, i \leq j} q_{i,j}^+ \text{ with } q_{i,j}^+ := \begin{cases} q_{i,i}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ q_{i,j} + q_{j,i}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given a scaling parameter α with $0 < \alpha < 1$, we want to compute a partitioning C_1, \dots, C_m of V that maximizes the combined objective function

$$\alpha \sum_{t=1}^m f(C_t, C_{t+1}) + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{t=1}^m g(C_t), \quad (1)$$

where we use the cyclic notation $C_{m+1} = C_1, C_{m+2} = C_2, \dots$, when indexing clusters in order to improve readability. W.l.o.g. we assume in the following that $q_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i \in V$, since nonzero values only add a constant offset to (1).

In the application domain, the vertices may correspond to Markov states and $Q = (q_{i,j})_{i,j \in V}$ then constitutes the transition matrix of the unconditional probabilities that a transition from state i to state j is observed during the simulation. In this case, the coherence of a set of states gives the probability that a transition takes place inside this set, hence the second component of (1) aims to separate states that rarely interact with each other and cluster states into so-called metastabilities. The (forward) flow $\sum_{i \in S, j \in T} q_{i,j}$ between two disjoint sets of states S and T corresponds to the probability of observing a transition from S to T . Hence, the first component of (1) aims at arranging clusters into a cycle such that the probability of observing a transition from one cluster to the next minus the probability of observing a transition in the backwards direction is maximized. With α close to one, finding near-optimal cycle clusterings can be used to detect whether there exists such cyclic behavior in simulation data. For details on the motivation and interpretation of cycle clustering, we refer to [16].

Since the solution of cycle clustering problems to global optimality has proven to be challenging, we have developed a problem-specific branch-and-cut algorithm that is the focus of this paper. Our contributions are as follows. In Sec. 2, we first present two binary programming formulations for cycle clustering and give basic results on the underlying polytopes. In Sec. 3, we provide the basis for a branch-and-cut algorithm by introducing three classes of valid inequalities and discuss suitable separation algorithms for them; we show that the computationally most useful class of extended subtour and path inequalities can be separated in polynomial time. In Sec. 4, we describe four primal heuristics that aim at quickly constructing near-optimal solutions before or during branch and cut: a greedy construction heuristic, an LP-based rounding heuristic, a Lin-Kernighan [10] style improvement heuristic, and a sub-MIP heuristic based on

sparsification of the arc set. We conclude the paper with Sec. 5, where we evaluate and compare the effectiveness of the primal and dual techniques numerically on simulation data that are generated to exhibit cyclic structures.

2 Formulations

We start with a straightforward formulation as a quadratic binary program. Let $\mathcal{K} := \{1, \dots, m\}$ denote the index set of clusters. For each vertex $i \in V$ and cluster C_s , $s \in \mathcal{K}$, we introduce a binary variable $x_{i,s}$ with

$$x_{i,s} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \text{vertex } i \text{ is assigned to cluster } C_s.$$

Then a first, nonlinear formulation for the cycle clustering problem is

$$\max \quad \alpha \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} q_{i,j}^- x_{i,s} x_{j,s+1} + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} q_{i,j}^+ x_{i,s} x_{j,s} \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} x_{i,s} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in V, \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in V} x_{i,s} \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (2c)$$

$$x_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in V, s \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (2d)$$

Again, note that we use the cyclic notation $x_{i,m+1} = x_{i,1}$ for convenience. The two parts of the objective function correspond to net flow and coherence, respectively. Constraints (2b) ensure that each vertex is assigned to exactly one cluster, while constraints (2c) ensure that no cluster is empty.

Following Padberg [14], this binary quadratic program could be linearized by introducing a binary variable and linearization constraints for each bilinear term, also called McCormick inequalities [13]. A more compact linearization proposed by Liberti [11] and refined by Mallach [12] exploits the set partitioning constraints (2b). Instead of McCormick inequalities, it relies on the reformulation-linearization technique (RLT) [2]. Each of equations in (2b) is multiplied by $x_{j,t}$ for all $j \in V$, $t \in \mathcal{K}$, and the bilinear terms $x_{i,s} x_{j,t}$ are replaced by newly introduced linearization variables $w_{i,j}^{s,t}$. This gives the mixed-binary program (RLT)

$$\max \quad \alpha \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} q_{i,j}^- w_{i,j}^{s,s+1} + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} q_{i,j}^+ w_{i,j}^{s,s}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (2b), (2c),$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} w_{i,j}^{s,t} = x_{j,t} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in V, t \in \mathcal{K},$$

$$x_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in V, s \in \mathcal{K},$$

$$w_{i,j}^{s,t} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in A, s, t \in \mathcal{K},$$

where, by symmetry arguments, we can use the same variable for $w_{i,j}^{s,s} = w_{j,i}^{s,s}$.

Our second, problem-specific formulation exploits the fact that we only need to distinguish three cases for each edge $\{i, j\} \in E$ in order to model its contribution to the objective function. Either i and j are in the same cluster, in consecutive clusters, or more than one cluster apart. We capture this by introducing binary variables $y_{i,j}$ with

$$y_{i,j} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \text{vertices } i \text{ and } j \text{ are in the same cluster}$$

for all edges $\{i, j\} \in E$, $i < j$, and

$$z_{i,j} = 1 \Leftrightarrow \text{vertex } i \text{ is one cluster before } j \text{ along the cycle}$$

for all arcs $(i, j) \in A$. We will use the shorthand $y_{i,j} = y_{j,i}$ if $i > j$. With these variables, we obtain the significantly more compact binary program (CC)

$$\max \alpha \sum_{(i,j) \in A} q_{i,j}^- z_{i,j} + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} q_{i,j}^+ y_{i,j} \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (2b), (2c),$$

$$y_{i,j} + z_{i,j} + z_{j,i} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } \{i, j\} \in E, \quad (3b)$$

$$x_{i,s} + x_{j,s} - y_{i,j} + z_{i,j} - x_{j,s+1} - x_{i,s-1} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in A, s \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (3c)$$

$$x_{i,s} + x_{j,s+1} - z_{i,j} + y_{i,j} - x_{j,s} - x_{i,s+1} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in A, s \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (3d)$$

$$x_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in V, s \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (3e)$$

$$y_{i,j}, z_{i,j}, z_{j,i} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } \{i, j\} \in E, i < j. \quad (3f)$$

Again, the first sum in the objective function expresses the total net flow between consecutive clusters, while the second sum expresses the coherence within all clusters. Constraints (3b) ensure that two vertices cannot both be in the same cluster and in consecutive clusters. Constraints (3c) and (3d) are best explained by examining several weaker constraints first. For $(i, j) \in A$, $s \in \mathcal{K}$, consider

$$x_{i,s} + x_{j,s} - y_{i,j} \leq 1, \quad (4a)$$

$$x_{i,s} + z_{i,j} - x_{j,s+1} \leq 1, \quad (4b)$$

$$x_{j,s} + z_{i,j} - x_{i,s-1} \leq 1. \quad (4c)$$

The reasoning behind (4a) is that if i and j are in the same cluster, then $y_{i,j}$ has to be equal to one. If i is in some cluster s and $z_{i,j} = 1$, then (4b) forces j to be in the next cluster $s + 1$. Analogously, if j is in cluster s and $z_{i,j} = 1$, then (4c) ensures that i is in the cluster preceding s . All of these three cases are covered by (3c), since $y_{i,j}$ and $z_{i,j}$ are binary and at most one of the two can be nonzero at the same time. Constraints (3d), in the same way, cover the functionality of the weaker constraints

$$x_{i,s} + x_{j,s+1} - z_{i,j} \leq 1,$$

$$x_{i,s} + y_{i,j} - x_{j,s} \leq 1,$$

$$x_{j,s+1} + y_{i,j} - x_{i,s+1} \leq 1.$$

Since (3c) and (3d) are defined for all $(i, j) \in A$ and $s \in \mathcal{K}$, the following implications hold:

- If i and j are in the same cluster, then $y_{i,j} = 1$ due to (3c).
- If i and j are in consecutive clusters, then $z_{i,j} = 1$ due to (3d).
- If $y_{i,j} = 1$, there exists $s \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $x_{i,s} = x_{j,s} = 1$ due to (3d).
- If $z_{i,j} = 1$, there exists $s \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $x_{i,s} = x_{j,s+1} = 1$ due to (3c).

To compare both formulations (RLT) and (CC), we first note that one can transform any feasible solution of (RLT) into a feasible solution of (CC) and vice versa, since the assignment of the x -variables in both cases uniquely implies the assignment of the remaining linearization variables. Moreover, it holds for all $(i, j) \in A$, $s \in \mathcal{K}$ that $y_{i,j} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} w_{i,j}^{s,s}$ and $z_{i,j} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{K}} w_{i,j}^{s,s+1}$, hence also any valid inequality for (CC) can be transformed into a valid inequality for (RLT).

Second, we observe that the LP relaxations of both formulations yield the same dual bound at the root node. For both formulations an LP-optimal solution is induced by assigning $x_{i,s} = 1/m$ for all $i \in V$, $s \in \mathcal{K}$.

Regarding size, (RLT) has roughly $0.5m^2$ times as many variables as (CC), whereas (CC) has about twice the number of constraints. Note that in practice we can exploit in both formulations that linearization variables for pairs of vertices $i, j \in V$ are only needed if $q_{i,j} + q_{j,i} > 0$.

For the following section, define the *cycle clustering polytope* CCP as the convex hull of all feasible incidence vectors of (CC), i.e.,

$$CCP := \text{conv}(\{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{nm+1.5|A|} : (2b-2c), (3b-3f)\})$$

One can show that the dimension of CCP is $(m-1)n + |A|$ if $m = 3$ and $(m-1)n + 1.5|A|$ if $4 \leq m \leq n-2$. Furthermore, the lower bound constraints $x_{i,s} \geq 0$, $y_{i,j} \geq 0$, and $z_{i,j} \geq 0$ define facets of CCP , whereas the upper bound constraints $x_{i,s} \leq 1$, $y_{i,j} \leq 1$, and $z_{i,j} \leq 1$ do not. For $m \geq 4$, one can show that also the model inequalities (3c) and (3d) define facets of CCP .

3 Valid Inequalities

As explained in Sec. 2, any valid inequality for (CC) can be transformed to a valid inequality for (RLT). Hence, the following valid inequalities for the cycle clustering polytope CCP apply equally to (RLT). The formal proofs that some of the inequalities are facet-defining follow standard patterns and are left for an extended version of the paper due to space limitations.

In this section we use the notation $\kappa(i) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ to denote the (index of the) cluster that a vertex $i \in V$ is assigned to.

3.1 Triangle Inequalities

First, consider the special case of exactly three clusters $m = 3$ and three vertices $i, j, k \in V$. If j is in the successor cluster of $\kappa(i)$, and k is in the successor cluster of $\kappa(j)$, then also i has to be in the successor cluster of $\kappa(k)$. This is expressed by the valid inequality

$$z_{i,j} + z_{j,k} - z_{k,i} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i, j), (j, k), (k, i) \in A.$$

Now assume $m \geq 4$. The next inequality builds only on y -variables and can be found in the graph partitioning literature, e.g., [5,8]. If i and j , and j and k are in the same cluster, then also i and k must be in the same cluster, i.e., we have

$$y_{i,j} + y_{j,k} - y_{i,k} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i,j), (j,k), (k,i) \in A. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, if i and j are in the same cluster, and k is in the successor of $\kappa(i)$, then k also has to be in the successor of $\kappa(j)$. This gives the valid inequality

$$y_{i,j} + z_{i,k} - z_{j,k} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i,j), (j,k), (k,i) \in A, \quad (6)$$

and if we choose k to be in the predecessor of $\kappa(i)$, then we obtain

$$y_{i,j} + z_{k,i} - z_{k,j} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i,j), (j,k), (k,i) \in A. \quad (7)$$

With these observations, one can prove the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let $m \geq 4$ and $i, j, k \in V$ with $(i,j), (j,k), (i,k) \in A$, then*

$$y_{i,j} + y_{j,k} - y_{i,k} + \frac{1}{2}(z_{i,j} + z_{j,i} + z_{j,k} + z_{k,j} - z_{i,k} - z_{k,i}) \leq 1 \quad (8)$$

is a valid, facet-defining inequality for CCP.

The final set of triangle inequalities is derived from the following observations. If vertex i is in the predecessor of $\kappa(j)$ as well as in the predecessor of $\kappa(k)$, then j and k must be assigned to the same cluster. This gives the valid inequality

$$z_{i,j} + z_{i,k} - y_{j,k} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i,j), (i,k), (j,k) \in A. \quad (9)$$

Conversely, if i is in the successor of $\kappa(j)$ as well as in the successor of $\kappa(k)$, then j and k must be assigned to the same cluster, i.e., we have

$$z_{j,i} + z_{k,i} - y_{j,k} \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } (i,j), (i,k), (j,k) \in A. \quad (10)$$

In the special case that $m = 4$ we can prove that the stronger inequality

$$z_{i,j} + z_{i,k} - 2y_{j,k} - (z_{j,k} + z_{k,j} + z_{j,i} + z_{k,i}) \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

must hold. The reason is that if j is assigned to the successor of $\kappa(i)$, but k is not assigned to the successor of $\kappa(i)$, then k has to be in one of the other three clusters. In each of those three cases, one of the variables $z_{j,k}, z_{k,j}, z_{k,i}$ has to be set to one: If k is in the same cluster as i , then $z_{k,j}$ has to be one; if k is in the predecessor of $\kappa(i)$, then $z_{k,i}$ has to be one; if k is in the successor of $\kappa(j)$, then $z_{j,k}$ has to be one. The same argument holds if $z_{i,k}$ is one, but $z_{i,j}$ is not. Regarding the strength of the above triangle inequalities, we can show the following.

Theorem 2. *Let $i, j, k \in V$ with $(i,j), (j,k), (i,k) \in A$. If $m = 4$, then (11) is facet-defining for CCP. If $m > 4$, then (9) and (10) are facet-defining for CCP.*

All types of triangle inequalities can be separated at once by complete enumeration in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time.

3.2 Partition Inequalities

The following generalization of the triangle inequalities (9) is inspired by [8].

Theorem 3. *Let $S, T \subseteq V$ with $S \cap T = \emptyset$. The partition inequality*

$$\sum_{i \in S, j \in T} z_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j \in S, i < j} y_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j \in T, i < j} y_{i,j} \leq \min\{|S|, |T|\} \quad (12)$$

is valid for CCP. If $m > 4$ and $|S| - |T| = \pm 1$, it is facet-defining.

These inequalities can be separated heuristically by deriving S, T from almost violated triangle inequalities. To limit the computational effort, we only create partition inequalities with $|S| + |T| \leq 5$ in our implementation.

3.3 Subtour and Path Inequalities

Since we consider a fixed number of clusters, if (i, j) is an arc between two clusters, then there must be exactly $m - 1$ further arcs along the cycle before vertex i is reached again. Formally, let $K = \{(i_1, i_2), (i_2, i_3), \dots, (i_{\ell-1}, i_\ell), (i_\ell, i_1)\} \subseteq E$ be any cycle of length $1 < |K| < m$, then the *subtour (elimination) inequality*

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in K} z_{i,j} \leq |K| - 1 \quad (13)$$

is valid for CCP. This inequality can be extended by adding variables for arcs inside a cluster. Let $U \subset K$ be any strict subset of K , then the *extended subtour (elimination) inequality*

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in K} z_{i,j} + \sum_{(i,j) \in U} y_{i,j} \leq |K| - 1 \quad (14)$$

is valid for CCP, because in any cycle the number of forward transitions must be a multiple of the number of clusters m . The inequality (14) is stronger than (13) in the sense that it defines a higher-dimensional face of CCP. Figure 1 illustrates an extended subtour inequality. While extended subtour inequalities must not define facets, they prove effective in practice and can be separated efficiently.

Theorem 4. *Extended subtour inequalities can be separated in polynomial time.*

Proof. Let (x, y, z) be a given LP solution. By rotational symmetry, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $U = K \setminus \{(i_1, i_2)\}$. For a fixed start node i_1 , define weights

$$c_{i,j} := \begin{cases} z_{i,j}, & \text{if } i = i_1, \\ z_{i,j} + y_{i,j}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for all $(i, j) \in A$, and let $A' = \{(i, j) \in A : c_{i,j} > 0\}$. Then violated extended subtour inequalities correspond to cycles in the directed graph $D = (V, A')$ with length $\ell < m$ and weight greater than $\ell - 1$.

Hence, (14) can be separated by computing, for each start node, maximum weight walks between all pairs of nodes for $\ell = 2, \dots, m - 1$. Since $c_{i,j} \geq 0$, this is possible in $\mathcal{O}(n^3 m)$ time by dynamic programming.




Fig. 1. Illustration of an extended subtour inequality (left) and a path inequality (right) in a 5-cluster problem. Not all of the displayed variables can be set to one.

Similarly, let $P = \{(i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_{m-1}, i_m)\}$ be a path from i_1 to $i_m \neq i_1$ of length $m - 1$, and let $U \subset P$. Then the *path inequality*

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in P} z_{i,j} + \sum_{(i,j) \in U} y_{i,j} + y_{i_1, i_m} \leq m - 1 \quad (15)$$

is valid for *CCP*, for the following reason. Suppose $\sum_{(i,j) \in P} z_{i,j} + \sum_{(i,j) \in U} y_{i,j}$ equals $m - 1$, then there are between one and $m - 1$ forward transitions from i_1 to i_m . Therefore, i_1 and i_m cannot be in the same cluster and y_{i_1, i_m} has to be zero. These inequalities can be separated in the same way as the extended subtour inequalities. Figure 1 gives an example of a path inequality.

4 Primal Heuristics

The heuristics presented in this section exploit the fact that an integer solution for (RLT) and (CC) is determined completely by the assignment of x -variables. We present three start heuristics and one improvement heuristic.

Greedy. This heuristic constructs a feasible solution by iteratively assigning vertices to clusters in a greedy fashion. First, one vertex is assigned to each cluster, such that (2c) is satisfied. Second, we repeatedly compute for all unassigned vertices and each of the m clusters the updated objective value (in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time), and choose the vertex-cluster assignment with largest improvement. In our implementation, the algorithm is called once as a start heuristic. It runs in $\mathcal{O}(n^2m)$ time and always generates a feasible solution since it ensures that each cluster contains at least one vertex and that all vertices are assigned.

Sparsify. For this sub-MIP heuristic, we remove 97% of the edges with smallest weight $q_{i,j} + q_{j,i}$ and call the branch-and-cut solver on the reduced instance with a node limit of one, i.e., we only process the root node in order to limit its effort.

Rounding. This heuristic assumes a fractional LP solution and rounds the x -variables. For each vertex $i \in V$, it selects a cluster $s^* \in \mathcal{K}$ with largest x_{i,s^*}

and fixes it to one; all other $x_{i,s}$, $s \neq s^*$, are fixed to zero. If $\arg \max_{s^* \in \mathcal{K}} x_{i,s^*}$ is not unique, we choose the smallest cluster. For each vertex, m clusters have to be considered, hence the heuristic runs in $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ time. If no cluster remains empty, the heuristic terminates with a feasible solution.

Exchange. This heuristic assumes an integer feasible solution and applies a series of exchange steps, where each time one vertex is transferred to a different cluster. It is inspired by the famous Lin-Kernighan graph partitioning heuristic [10]. Each vertex is reassigned once. We repeatedly compute for all unprocessed vertices and each of the $m - 1$ alternative clusters the updated objective value (in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time), and choose the swap with largest improvement, even if it is negative. We track the solution quality and return the clustering with best objective value.

The algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}(n^3m)$ time and is applied to each new incumbent. It can be executed repeatedly, with the solution of the previous run as the input, until no more improvement is found. In this case, it can be useful to continue from a significantly different solution. To this end, half of the vertices are selected randomly from each cluster and moved to the next cluster. In our implementation, we apply at most 5 perturbations.

5 Computational Experiments

We implemented both formulations (RLT) and (CC) within the branch-and-cut framework SCIP [7] and added the separation routines and primal heuristics described above. Except for the problem-specific changes, we used default settings for all test runs. The time limit was set to 7200 seconds, with only one job running per node at a time on a compute cluster of 2.7 GHz Intel Xeon E5-2670 v2 CPUs with 64 GB main memory each.

We consider 65 instances over graphs with 20 to 250 vertices that were created from four different types of simulations of non-reversible Markov state models such as to exhibit between 3 and 15 clusters. In the objective function, net flow and coherence are weighted 1 : 0.001, i.e., $\alpha = 1/1.001$. The first 40 instances stem from a model of artificial catalytic cycles, simulated using a hybrid Monte-Carlo method [4] as described in [16], with 3, 4, and 6 minima; for each of those, transition matrices over graphs with 20, 30, 50, and 100 vertices were created. For 12 instances we used repressilator simulations [6], a very prominent example of a synthetic genetic regulatory network; these instances feature 40, 80, and 200 vertices and between 3 and 6 clusters. Another 8 instances were created from simulations of the Hindmarsh-Rose model [9], which is used to study neuronal activity in the human heart; these instances feature 50 and 250 vertices with 3, 5, 7, and 9 clusters each. The final set of 5 instances stems from the dynamics of an Amyloid- β peptide [15] over 220 vertices, with 3 to 15 clusters.

We first compare the performance of (RLT) and (CC), both with and without problem-specific separation. In all cases, the problem-specific heuristics were enabled, since they apply equally to both models. Table 1 reports aggregated results, using shifted geometric means as defined in [1] with a shift of 10 seconds for time, 100 nodes for the size of the search tree, and 1000 for the primal and

Table 1. Performance of formulations CC and RLT with and without problem-specific separation: number of solved instances, shifted geometric means of solving time, number of branch-and-bound nodes, primal and dual integral, and arithmetic mean of final gap. Subset “1-solved” contains all instances that could be solved to optimality by at least one setting. Problem-specific heuristics are enabled, hence the lines “CC” and “CC+sepa” over all instances match the last two lines in Tab. 2.

Instances	setting	solved	time [s]	nodes	gap [%]	primal int.	dual int.
All (65)	RLT	29	1184.1	182.0	72.3	2540.7	47568.0
	RLT+sepa	28	1377.9	35.3	69.1	2552.5	39205.7
	CC	24	1550.9	676.4	35.9	1161.7	81561.4
	CC+sepa	31	755.3	125.0	25.2	1077.5	34755.5
1-solved (34)	RLT	29	221.8	206.1	3.2	622.9	6305.5
	RLT+sepa	28	299.0	45.6	2.1	692.4	4037.6
	CC	24	376.8	1425.2	5.3	245.2	10445.9
	CC+sepa	31	89.0	137.6	0.7	221.4	1311.3

dual integrals. The primal integral [3] is a useful metric to quantify how quickly good primal solutions are found and improved during the course of the solving process. The dual integral is defined analogously and can give insight into how quickly good dual bounds are established. It is computed using the difference between the current dual bound and the best known primal solution. The gap at primal bound p and dual bound d is computed as $(d - p) / \min\{p + \epsilon, d + \epsilon\}$ for $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ and can exceed 100% [1].

While plain (CC) solves less instances than both variants of (RLT), we observe that (CC) with separation clearly outperforms all other settings overall. (CC) with separation solves 7 more instances than plain (CC) and reduces solving time by 51.3% and the number of nodes by 81.5%. By contrast, for (RLT) we observe that separation negatively impacts overall performance. While it reduces the number of nodes significantly by a similar factor than in (CC), the addition of cutting planes slows down the speed of LP solving and overall node processing time. This may be explained by the fact that (RLT) contains many more variables than constraints. The above analysis is confirmed on the subset “1-solved” of instances, where all instances not solved by any setting are excluded.

In order to quantify the performance impact of individual solving techniques, we continued to use (CC) as a baseline with all cutting planes and primal heuristics deactivated. In Tab. 2 we report the performance when a single separator is enabled, when all separators are enabled simultaneously, and similarly for the four primal heuristics. Here we can observe that each separation routine individually improves performance. Subtour separation seems to be the most useful single separator, reducing the solving time by 40.4% and the number of nodes by 67.1%. All separators combined deliver the best results, with 4 more instances solved, a speedup of 45%, and a reduction in the number of nodes by 81.7%. However, the final gap still remains large because on hard instances that time out, good primal solutions cannot be found by the LP solutions alone.

Table 2. Performance impact of separation routines and primal heuristics over all 65 instances with formulation CC: on the number of solved instances, on the shifted geometric means of solving time, number of branch-and-bound nodes, primal and dual integral, and on the arithmetic mean of the final gap.

Setting	solved	time [s]	nodes	gap [%]	primal int.	dual int.
Default	27	1592.6	1240.6	7439.0	62250.3	76759.2
+triangle only	29	1147.4	639.0	7231.0	42281.0	48884.2
+partition only	27	1372.0	593.4	7652.5	58147.5	60835.6
+subtour only	30	949.9	408.1	4906.8	45601.8	45380.6
+all sepas	31	876.0	227.0	5050.1	40796.6	38811.6
Default	27	1592.6	1240.6	7439.0	62250.3	76759.2
+greedy only	25	1741.3	1084.3	1356.1	49072.8	72946.5
+sparsify only	23	1763.2	1109.6	113.5	47536.5	75186.5
+rounding only	27	1376.4	937.4	1724.3	34584.9	50266.7
+exchange only	28	1305.2	684.4	35.0	1252.5	73321.3
+all heurs	24	1550.9	676.4	35.9	1161.7	81561.4
All sepas+all heurs	31	755.3	125.0	25.2	1077.5	34755.5

Among the primal heuristics, the exchange heuristic proves to be the most important single technique. While also the other heuristics all reduce the primal integral and the final gap, only the exchange heuristic increases the number of solved instances (by one instance) and yields the smallest final gap of 35.0%. Still, applying all heuristics together gives the best results. The main benefit of the greedy and sparsify heuristics is to run once in order to provide the exchange heuristic with starting solutions to improve upon. The best performance in all metrics is obtained when all separators and heuristics are active.

To conclude, we observed the best out-of-the-box performance using an RLT formulation including improvements from [11,12]. However, this formulation did not profit from problem-specific separation due to an increased cost in solving the LP relaxations. In turn, our problem-specific formulation responded very well to the separation routines, and we observed that all solving techniques complement each other in improving performance. Still, only 52.3% of the instances could be solved to proven optimality, which underlines the importance of the primal heuristics when applying cycle clustering to real-world data. In this respect, we found that repeated application of a Lin-Kernighan style exchange heuristic with random perturbations was highly successful in improving initial solutions provided by simple construction heuristics.

Acknowledgments. We wish to thank Konstantin Fackeldey, Andreas Grever, and Marcus Weber for supplying us with simulation data for our experiments. This work has been supported by the Research Campus MODAL funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF grants 05M14ZAM, 05M20ZBM).

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. Achterberg, T.: Constraint Integer Programming. Ph.D. thesis (2007), <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn:nbn:de:0297-zib-11129>
2. Adams, W.P., Sherali, H.D.: A reformulation-linearization technique for solving discrete and continuous nonconvex problems (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4388-3>
3. Berthold, T.: Measuring the impact of primal heuristics. *OR Letters* **41**(6), 611–614 (2013). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2013.08.007>
4. Brooks, S., Gelman, A., Jones, G., Meng, X.L.: *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*. CRC press (2011)
5. Chopra, S., Rao, M.R.: The partition problem. *Math. Prog.* **59**(1), 87–115 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01581239>
6. Elowitz, M.B., Leibler, S.: A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators. *Nature* **403**(6767), 335–338 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002125>
7. Gleixner, A., Bastubbe, M., Eifler, L., et al.: The SCIP Optimization Suite 6.0. ZIB-Report 18-26 (2018), <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0297-zib-69361>
8. Grötschel, M., Wakabayashi, Y.: Facets of the clique partitioning polytope. *Math. Prog.* **47**(1), 367–387 (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580870>
9. Hindmarsh, J.L., Rose, R.: A model of neuronal bursting using three coupled first order differential equations. *Proceedings of the Royal society of London B. Biological sciences* **221**(1222), 87–102 (1984). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1984.0024>
10. Kernighan, B.W., Lin, S.: An efficient heuristic procedure for partitioning graphs. *Bell System Technical Journal* **49**(2), 291–307 (1970). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1970.tb01770.x>
11. Liberti, L.: Compact linearization for binary quadratic problems. *4OR* **5**(3), 231–245 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10288-006-0015-3>
12. Mallach, S.: Compact linearization for binary quadratic problems subject to assignment constraints. *4OR* **16**(3), 295–309 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10288-017-0364-0>
13. McCormick, G.P.: Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part I – Convex underestimating problems. *Math. Prog.* **10**(1), 147–175 (1976). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580665>
14. Padberg, M.: The boolean quadric polytope: Some characteristics, facets and relatives. *Math. Prog.* **45**(1), 139–172 (1989). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01589101>
15. Reuter, B., Weber, M., Fackeldey, K., et al.: Generalized Markov state modeling method for nonequilibrium biomolecular dynamics: Exemplified on Amyloid β conformational dynamics driven by an oscillating electric field. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **14**(7), 3579–3594 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.8b00079>
16. Witzig, J., Beckenbach, I., Eifler, L., et al.: Mixed-integer programming for cycle detection in nonreversible Markov processes. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* **16**(1), 248–265 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1091162>