

The Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions

Elena Fernández¹, Ivana Ljubić², and Nicolás Zerega¹

¹*Department of Statistics and Operations Research, Universidad de Cádiz, Puerto Real, Spain*

²*Department of Information Systems, Decision Sciences and Statistics, ESSEC Business School, France*

Abstract

We address a new prize-collecting problem of routing commodities in a given network with hub and non-hub nodes, in which the service of the non-hub nodes will be outsourced to third-party carriers. The problem is modeled as a Stackelberg game: there is a major firm (leader) that decides to serve a subset of commodities. The leader aims to outsource first and third legs of transportation services to smaller carriers (who act as followers) by allocating at most one carrier to each non-hub node. The carriers try to maximize their own profits, which are influenced by the leader's offers. The goal of the leader is to determine the optimal outsourcing fees, along with the allocation of carriers to the non-hub nodes, so that the profit from the routed commodities is maximized. The optimal response of the followers must be taken into account, as the followers might refuse to serve some legs in case they are negative or do not maximize their profit. We also study two alternative settings: one in which the outsourcing fees are fixed, and the other one in which the carriers accept any offer, as long as the resulting profit is non-negative. We prove that the set of possible outsourcing fees can be discretized and formulate the problem as a single-level mixed-integer nonlinear program. For all considered problem variants, we prove NP-hardness and propose and computationally investigate several MIP formulations. We study the computational scalability of these MIP formulations and analyze solutions obtained by varying the reservation prices of the carriers. Finally, by comparing the introduced problem variants, we derive some interesting managerial insights.

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the outsourcing of various practices. This trend has been particularly prominent in the logistics and freight transportation sectors, where it encompasses activities like last-mile delivery and full integration with external operators, including 3-PL logistics partners [Dimitriou, 2021]. Similarly, the airline industry has also experienced outsourcing in processes such as check-in, luggage management, and even cabin crew [Commission et al., 2019], among others. Notably, there are cases in which flights are outsourced to third-party airlines, by taking advantage of the existing transfer system in major airports [Commission et al., 2021]. The outsourcing of these processes offers several advantages, including enhanced flexibility and a reduced dependency on hiring and training specialized staff.

Given the increasing prevalence of this trend, it is crucial to study and model this type of situations to gain a better understanding of how the outsourcing decisions contribute to the overall net profit of a major firm when it faces such a process. It is equally important to consider the viewpoint of carriers (who will perform the outsourced tasks) as they too aim to optimize their own net profits.

The objective of this research is to introduce a novel prize-collecting multi-commodity flow problem for the transportation of demand between different origins and destinations (commodities) when a major firm, referred to as the leader, already possesses a backbone network induced by a set of major hubs and chooses to outsource the service for the demands coming from or going to the remaining non-hub locations using third-party companies (carriers) in order to maximize its overall profit. The incoming trips, from a non-hub to a hub node are referred to as first legs, and the outgoing trips, from a hub to a non-hub node, as third legs.

The whole process can be seen as a Stackelberg game with a single-leader and multiple independent followers. The leader has to make tactical decisions regarding the outsourcing of the services, namely:

- how to allocate carriers to non-hub nodes, and
- what should be the outsourcing fees for routing commodities through hub nodes.

Once they receive the offer and allocation provided by the leader, carriers decide which commodities they accept to serve, taking into account their reservation prices. We assume that the leader has perfect information regarding the carriers' reservation prices, and hence, by anticipating the optimal response of the followers, the leader also decides which commodities will ultimately be served and how the routing of served commodities will be done through the hub network. We call this problem the *Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions* (MCFOD).

Our Contribution: We initially model the MCFOD as a bilevel Mixed Integer Non-Linear Program (MINLP). We consider an additional *fixed* setting, in which the outsourcing fees are fixed (e.g., by some external authorities) and cannot be modified. We also study two *relaxed* problems, in which the followers are more flexible, and are willing to accept any offer that meets their reservation price (so any offer resulting in a non-negative profit will be accepted). That way, we obtain three additional problem variants, denoted by MCFOD_F , $r\text{MCFOD}$ and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$, respectively. We prove that all introduced variants are NP-hard.

Leveraging the inherent properties associated with the independency of allocations and costs of each carrier, we express the model as a single-level MINLP and discretize the outsourcing fee decisions for the MCFOD problem. By deriving necessary adaptations for the other three problem variants, we prove that MCFOD and $r\text{MCFOD}$ result in the same optimal solution. By exploiting structural properties of the optimal solutions, we introduce several MILP formulations for the MCFOD and show how to adapt them for the other problem variants. Some of these MILP approaches *explicitly* identify the routing of the flows for the served commodities, possibly aggregating them, whereas an alternative MILP approach uses *implicit path* variables to determine the routing of commodities based on carrier allocations.

Our computational study is based on established benchmark sets from the literature. We first study the scalability of the proposed MILP formulations. The obtained results demonstrate the superiority of the implicit paths formulation which is able to solve instances with up to 200 nodes and 6 carriers to optimality within one hour. We also provide some interesting managerial insights by analyzing how the reservation prices, the two different strategies of the follower, and fixing of

outsourcing fees affect the profit of the leader and the overall service level. These findings provide motivation for studying more complex systems in the future.

The article is organized as follows. We close the Introduction with a review of some related literature. The MCFOD and the MCFOD_F and their “relaxed” counterparts, $r\text{MCFOD}$ and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$, are formally defined in Section 2, where the notation is introduced and an illustrative example is presented. Bilevel formulations and single-level MINLP reformulations are developed in Section 3, whereas solution properties and the problem complexity are studied in Section 4. Based on these properties, in Section 5 we introduce single-level MILP reformulations for the studied models, and provide an extensive computational analysis in Section 6. The paper closes in Section 7 with some conclusions and avenues for future research.

Literature Overview. Hierarchical decision making problems in which a major company decides to outsource some activities to third parties and needs to anticipate the optimal responses of the followers, are typically modeled as Stackelberg games using the tools of bilevel optimization. For recent surveys on mixed integer optimization approaches in bilevel optimization, see Kleinert et al. [2021], Beck et al. [2023]; for a more general introduction to bilevel optimization see the book by Dempe [2020].

In the context of last-mile delivery, for example, a logistics peer-to-peer platform acts as the leader and decides to outsource some of the delivery activities to individual carriers (e.g., occasional drivers, who act as followers) who receive a compensation for each parcel delivered. In Mofidi and Pazour [2019], the platform makes personalized offers to the carriers, who then select a subset of parcels from this list. The problem is modeled as a Stackelberg game, using a deterministic bilevel model. To deal with uncertainties regarding drivers’ preferences, Horner et al. [2021] and Ausseil et al. [2022] propose stochastic bilevel models.

While in all these studies the outsourcing fees are assumed to be given, Hong et al. [2019] propose another Stackelberg game model in which the outsourcing fees are optimized along with the offers made to the carriers. In Gdowska et al. [2018] and Barbosa et al. [2023] both a professional delivery fleet and a set of occasional drivers are taken into account, and it is assumed that each delivery request has a fixed probability of being rejected by the driver.

In all of these models, routing costs for the drivers are not taken explicitly into account. This is done for the first time in a recent work by Cerulli et al. [2023] in which the platform decides on the fees to be paid to individual drivers, while anticipating that they may refuse to deliver some parcels if the profit of the underlying route is not maximized.

Contrary to last-mile deliveries, in which the whole service (i.e., delivery of a parcel) is outsourced to a single carrier, in this study we assume that the first leg of the service can be performed by one carrier, the middle leg is performed by the major company, and the third leg can be performed by another carrier. Such settings are common in freight transportation, for example. In a recent study, Delle Donne et al. [2023] propose to use a public transportation service (PTS) to route commodities in the middle leg, whereas the first leg is performed by 3-PL who transports commodities from a distribution center to the entry points of the PTS network, and in the third leg individual carriers deliver the parcels to the final destination. This concept is known as Freight-on-Transit (FOT), and Delle Donne et al. [2023] study the problem from a perspective of a single decision maker who makes strategic and tactical decisions regarding the design of the FOT network. However, extensions like the ones proposed in this paper would allow to model the operational decisions concerning the service of the first and last leg of FOT in a more precise manner.

Our problem is closely related to the Multi-Commodity Flow Problem (MCFP), in which we are given a set of commodities with their origins, destinations and demands, and arc-routing costs

and the goal is to find routing paths for each commodity, while minimizing the total routing costs. In its basic version, the problem is polynomially solvable, see Ahuja et al. [1995]. Moreover, when there are no arc capacities, the optimal route of each commodity corresponds to the shortest path in the given network. Many NP-hard variants (that include additional network-design, scheduling or capacity decisions) have been intensively studied in the literature (see, e.g., Crainic and Laporte [1997], Crainic [2000], as well as the more recent results in Legault et al. [2023], Gendron [2019], Chouman et al. [2017], Gendron and Gouveia [2017] and further references therein). Our problem introduces outsourcing decisions that need to be applied to the first and last leg of the routing paths of commodities. As we will see later, these additional decisions also render the problem NP-hard, and they distinguish the problem from the known MCFP variants studied so far.

We can also find relationship with prize-collecting hub location problems, where the goal is to locate the set of hubs and choose a subset of commodities to route so as to maximize the profit, see, e.g., Alibeyg et al. [2016, 2018], Taherkhani and Alumur [2019], Taherkhani et al. [2020]. Contrary to these hub location problems, in our setting, the backbone network induced by the set of open hubs is already given.

2 Problem definition

Input Data: Let $G = (V, A)$ be a given directed graph, with $n = |V|$ nodes. Let $H \subset V$ be the set of *hub nodes* and $V \setminus H$ the remaining nodes, referred to as *non-hub nodes*. The backbone network, consisting of the arcs between hub nodes, is defined as $A_H = \{(i, j) : i, j \in H\}$ forming a complete network. By definition, A_H considers the existence of *loop* type connections, i.e. connections with same end nodes. The arc set is defined by the union of the backbone network and the arcs between non-hub and hub nodes as:

$$A = A_H \cup \{(i, j) : i \in V \setminus H, j \in H\} \cup \{(i, j) : i \in H, j \in V \setminus H\}.$$

There is a service demand expressed by means of a set of commodities, indexed in a set R .

- Each commodity $r \in R$ is associated with a triplet $(o(r), d(r), w^r)$, where $o(r), d(r) \in V$ denote its origin and destination nodes, respectively, and $w^r > 0$ the flow that must be sent from $o(r)$ to $d(r)$. Commodities need not be served necessarily; if commodity $r \in R$ is served, it produces a revenue $b^r > 0$.

We are also given a set of external carriers (i.e., followers) $K = \{1, \dots, |K|\}$. In addition:

- We are given $\bar{c}_{ij}^{rk} > 0$ representing the *reservation price* of carrier $k \in K$ for serving commodity $r \in R$ through *access* arcs $\{(i, j) : i = o(r) \notin H, j \in H\}$ or *distribution* arcs $\{(i, j) : i \in H, j = d(r) \notin H\}$. This value accounts for the cost of carrier k for routing the demand w^r through arc (i, j) plus an additional profit margin that carrier k charges the leader to perform the service. This reservation price \bar{c}_{ij}^{rk} may depend not only on the carrier k , the arc (i, j) , and the amount of demand w^r , but also on the commodity r itself.
- The cost of the leader for routing the demand w^r through inter-hub arc $(i, j) \in A_H$ is given as $c_{ij}^r > 0$. This cost may depend not only on the arc (i, j) and on the amount of demand of commodity r , w^r , but also on the commodity itself. For each $r \in R$, the vector c^r satisfies the triangle inequality.

Table 8 in Appendix A-1 summarizes the notation used in this paper.

Decisions of the leader: The leader must decide on a set of commodities to serve together with an origin/destination route for each served commodity. Service routes must be of the form $o(r) - i(r) - j(r) - d(r)$, where $i(r), j(r) \in H$ are hub nodes (possibly $i(r) = j(r)$) decided by the leader. The *intermediate leg* of each served commodity $r \in R$, $(i(r), j(r))$, will be handled by the leader, incurring his own routing costs c_{ij}^r , whereas service of the *first* and *third legs*, $(o(r), i(r))$ and $(j(r), d(r))$, respectively, will be outsourced to some external carrier(s). We assume a *multiple allocation* strategy so commodities with the same non-hub origin but different destinations can be connected to the backbone network through different hubs, and flows may arrive to non-hub destinations from different hub nodes.

The leader allocates every non-hub node $i \in V \setminus H$ to at most one carrier; this means that the first and third legs of all the routed commodities with origin or destination at node i will be handled by that carrier. Furthermore, for each commodity $r \in R$ such that $o(r) \notin H$ the leader offers an *outsourcing fee* p_i^r for routing the first leg of r through access arc $(o(r), i)$, where $i \in H$. Similarly, for each $r \in R$ such that $d(r) \notin H$ the leader offers an *outsourcing fee* q_i^r for routing the third leg of r through distribution arc $(i, d(r))$, where $i \in H$. In each case, the involved carrier will accept or deny the service based on his own reservation price (see further description below).

The leader eventually decides on the commodities that will be routed. When end-nodes of the commodities are non-hubs, the commodity cannot be routed unless some outsourcing fee for its first, respectively third leg has been accepted by the involved carriers. This means that the commodities entailing both a first and a third leg cannot be routed unless both a first and a third leg fee have been accepted. Therefore, the allocation of carriers to non-hub nodes becomes a major decision for the leader since, due to their different reservation prices, different carriers could give different responses to given outsourcing fees $p_i^r, q_i^r, i \in H$. These responses condition the commodities that the leader may decide to serve, and thus the overall revenue.

Summarizing, the decisions of the leader are the following:

- Allocate each non-hub node $i \in V \setminus H$ to at most one carrier. Let $a : V \setminus H \mapsto K \cup \{0\}$ be a mapping that maps each non-hub node $i \in V \setminus H$ to a carrier $k \in K$, and let $a(i) = 0$ if i is not allocated to any carrier.
- For each $r \in R$ and each $i \in H$, determine outsourcing fees for access arcs p_i^r (if $o(r) \notin H$) and distribution arcs q_i^r (if $d(r) \notin H$).
- Identify the set of commodities to be eventually served, $R^* \subseteq R$, among the ones with accepted outsourcing fees for their first and third legs and determine the service route for each of them.

Without loss of generality, we assume that all commodities $r \in R$ such that $o(r), d(r) \in H$ are preprocessed. First, the service for these commodities will not be outsourced. Second, the profit of the leader for each of these commodities is $b_r - c_{o(r)d(r)}^r$, so the commodity will be served if and only if $b_r - c_{o(r)d(r)}^r > 0$.

For each $r \in R$, $A^r \subset A_H$ denotes the set of potential interhub arcs for the service route of commodity r :

$$A^r = \begin{cases} \{(o(r), j) : j \in H\} & \text{if } o(r) \in H, d(r) \notin H \\ \{(i, d(r)) : i \in H\} & \text{if } o(r) \notin H, d(r) \in H \\ \{(i, j) : i, j \in H\} & \text{if } o(r) \notin H, d(r) \notin H. \end{cases}$$

Decisions of the Followers: We consider two alternative settings for the decision of the followers.

1. **Profit-Maximizing Carriers:** For each $r \in R$ such that $o(r) \in V \setminus H$, if $o(r)$ is allocated to carrier $k \in K$, the carrier observes the offered outsourcing fees p_i^r for all $i \in H$ and accepts the most profitable one (provided that it results in a non-negative profit), or refuses to serve commodity r , otherwise.

Similarly, if $d(r)$ is allocated to $k \in K$, the carrier observes the outsourcing fees q_i^r , $i \in H$ and accepts the most profitable one (if it produces a non-negative profit), or refuses to serve commodity r , otherwise.

The profit functions for routing the first, respectively third leg, for a given $r \in R$, $k \in K$ and outsourcing fees p and q are, therefore, defined as follows:

$$\Pi^k(r, p) = \left[\max_{i \in H} \{p_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}\} \right]^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^k(r, q) = \left[\max_{i \in H} \{q_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}\} \right]^+, \quad (1)$$

where $[\alpha]^+ = \max\{0, \alpha\}$.

In the above two functions, when the value of the inner maximum is non-negative, the respective sets of optimal solutions (hubs) are denoted by $I_k(r, p)$ and $J_k(r, q)$. If the inner maximum in $\Pi^k(r, p)$ or $\Gamma^k(r, q)$ is negative, we define $I_k(r, p) = \emptyset$ and $J_k(r, q) = \emptyset$, respectively. That is

$$I_k(r, p) = \begin{cases} \arg \max_{i \in H} \{p_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}\} & \text{if } \max \{p_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} : i \in H\} \geq 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$J_k(r, q) = \begin{cases} \arg \max_{i \in H} \{q_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}\} & \text{if } \max \{q_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} : i \in H\} \geq 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The problem can now be formally stated as follows:

Definition 2.1 (Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions, MCFOD). *The Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions can be expressed as the following bilevel optimization problem:*

$$\max_{\substack{R^* \subseteq R, a: V \setminus H \rightarrow K \cup \{0\} \\ p \geq 0, q \geq 0}} \sum_{r \in R^*} [b_r - C_r(a, p, q)]$$

where, for each commodity $r \in R$ the routing costs $C_r(a, p, q)$ are calculated as:

$$C_r(a, p, q) = \begin{cases} \min \{p_i^r + c_{ij}^r + q_j^r : i \in I_{a(o(r))}(r, p), j \in J_{a(d(r))}(r, q)\} & o(r) \notin H, d(r) \notin H \\ \min \{p_i^r + c_{id(r)}^r : i \in I_{a(o(r))}(r, p)\} & o(r) \notin H, d(r) \in H \\ \min \{c_{o(r)j}^r + q_j^r : j \in J_{a(d(r))}(r, q)\} & d(r) \notin H, o(r) \in H, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

and $a(o(r))$ and $a(d(r))$ refer to the carrier the origin, respectively destination of commodity r is allocated to.

In the definition of $C_r(a, p, q)$, the conditions $i \in I_{a(o(r))}(r, p)$ and $j \in J_{a(d(r))}(r, q)$ reveal the bilevel nature of the MCFOD: they enforce that i and j are *optimal followers' responses* for routing the first, respectively third leg, given the allocation and outsourcing fee decisions of the leader.

The allocated carrier refuses to serve the first, respectively third leg of commodity r if $I_{a(o(r))}(r, p) = \emptyset$ or $I_{a(d(r))}(r, q) = \emptyset$, and hence the overall routing cost must be set to ∞ .

We consider an *optimistic* bilevel optimization setting in which the leader chooses the most profitable routing path in case there are multiple optimal responses of the followers. This is embedded in the definition of $C_r(a, p, q)$. If $|I_{a(o(r))}(r, p)| > 1$ or $|J_{a(d(r))}(r, q)| > 1$ so the respective carriers can route commodity r through multiple alternative hubs i or j while receiving the maximum profit, the leader will choose to route r through inter-hub arc $(i(r), j(r)) \in A^r$ such that the overall routing cost plus outsourcing fees for commodity r is minimized, i.e. $(i(r), j(r)) \in \arg \min\{p_i^r + c_{ij}^r + q_j^r : i \in I_{a(o(r))}(r, p), j \in J_{a(d(r))}(r, q)\}$.

2. **Reservation-Price-Oriented Carriers:** Alternatively, we may assume that the followers react to the leader's offers following a more flexible policy, according to which they are willing to accept any offered outsourcing fee, provided that it meets their reservation price, even if it is not the most profitable one. This policy can be modeled by redefining the set of acceptable connecting hubs for first and third leg offers to:

$$rI_k(r, p) = \{i \in H : p_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad rJ_k(r, q) = \{i \in H : q_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \geq 0\},$$

respectively. So, for each commodity $r \in R$ the routing costs, now denoted as $rC_r(a, p, q)$, become:

$$rC_r(a, p, q) = \begin{cases} \min\{p_i^r + c_{ij}^r + q_j^r : i \in rI_{a(o(r))}(r, p), j \in rJ_{a(d(r))}(r, q)\} & o(r) \notin H, d(r) \notin H \\ \min\{p_i^r + c_{id(r)}^r : i \in rI_{a(o(r))}(r, p)\} & o(r) \notin H, d(r) \in H \\ \min\{c_{o(r)j}^r + q_j^r : j \in rJ_{a(d(r))}(r, q)\} & d(r) \notin H, o(r) \in H. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This policy leads to the *relaxed Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions* defined next:

Definition 2.2 (*relaxed Multi-Commodity Flow Problem with Outsourcing Decisions, rMCFOD*). *The rMCFOD can be expressed as the following optimization problem:*

$$\max_{\substack{R^* \subseteq R, a: V \setminus H \mapsto K \cup \{0\} \\ p \geq 0, q \geq 0}} \sum_{r \in R^*} [b_r - rC_r(a, p, q)],$$

where, for each commodity $r \in R$ the routing costs $rC_r(a, p, q)$ are calculated as in (4).

The definitions of the above two problems show that the leader faces the following trade-off for finding suitable outsourcing fees. On the one hand, it can be convenient to increase outsourcing fees so as to get more positive responses, which may produce a higher total revenue for the served commodities. On the other hand, high outsourcing fees reduce the leader's net profit, possibly resulting in fewer served commodities.

In this paper we also introduce variants of MCFOD and rMCFOD in which the outsourcing fees are fixed. Fees can be fixed by an external (regulating) authority, so that the leader only has to choose the allocation of non-hubs to carriers, the commodities to be served, and their routing paths. The problems are defined as:

Definition 2.3 (MCFOD and rMCFOD with Fixed Outsourcing Fees, MCFOD_F and rMCFOD_F). *Let \bar{p}_i^r and \bar{q}_i^r be the given outsourcing fees for each $r \in R, i \in H$.*

- The $MCFOD_F$ can be expressed as the following bilevel optimization problem:

$$\max_{R^* \subseteq R, a: V \setminus H \rightarrow K \cup \{0\}} \sum_{r \in R^*} [b_r - C_r(a, \bar{p}, \bar{q})]$$

where the function $C_r(a, \bar{p}, \bar{q})$ is defined as in (3).

- The $rMCFOD_F$ can be expressed as the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{R^* \subseteq R, a: V \setminus H \rightarrow K \cup \{0\}} \sum_{r \in R^*} [b_r - rC_r(a, \bar{p}, \bar{q})]$$

where the function $rC_r((a, \bar{p}, \bar{q}))$ is defined as in (4).

We observe that in both the $MCFOD_F$ and the $rMCFOD_F$, the leader still has to decide on the optimal allocation of non-hub nodes to carriers, the commodities to be served and their routing paths. We also observe that the $MCFOD_F$ is still modeled as an optimistic bilevel problem.

The following properties apply to any of the problems defined above.

Remark 2.1.

1. By associating sufficiently large profits to each commodity, we obtain the problem in which all demand must be satisfied, while minimizing the sum of routing and outsourcing cost.
2. The assumption that the hub network induced by the nodes H is a complete graph with routing costs that satisfy triangle inequality, can be done without loss of generality. Indeed, for each commodity $r \in R$ and each arc (i, j) , $i, j \in H$, $i \neq j$, the routing cost c_{ij}^r will correspond to the cost of the shortest i - j path in the hub network (see also the example below).
3. There is an optimal solution in which the routing of each commodity is not split among multiple paths.


Example 1. Consider the $MCFOD_F$ example of Figure 1(a) on a network with four hub nodes, $H = \{3, 4, 6, 7\}$, and three non-hubs $V \setminus H = \{1, 2, 5\}$, with symmetric routing costs c_{ij}^r , the same for all commodities (displayed next to each edge). This backbone network is not complete, so we first make it complete by adding links (i, j) for all distinct pairs $i, j \in H$ with the cost of the shortest i - j path, and then we remove redundant hubs 6 and 7, i.e., those hubs which are not adjacent to $V \setminus H$ (see Figure 1(b)).

We furthermore assume that there are two carriers $K = \{1, 2\}$, and four commodities with respective origins and destinations $(o(r), d(r))$ given by $(1, 5), (2, 5), (3, 5), (4, 5)$, all of them with demand of one unit and associated revenue of 100, i.e., $w^r = 1, b^r = 100, r \in R = \{1, \dots, 4\}$.


The routing costs for the leader and the reservation prices for the carriers are given in Table 1. For ease of presentation, we assume in this example that these values only depend on the arc but not on the commodity itself. As indicated above this will not be the case in general.

Table 2 shows fixed outsourcing fees, \bar{p}_i^r and \bar{q}_i^r , for all $r \in R, i \in H$. For $r = 4, (o(4), d(4)) = (4, 5)$, since its origin is a hub, only the outsourcing fees for the third leg, namely \bar{q}_i^r , are required.

Table 2 also shows the carriers' responses for the $MCFOD$ to the offers \bar{p}_i^r and \bar{q}_i^r . There are two rows associated with each carrier. One with its response (YES or NO) to the fixed outsourcing fees \bar{p}_i^r and \bar{q}_i^r , and another one with the carriers reservation price of the arc against which the fees should be contrasted.



(a) Original network, considering non-complete hub network with possible redundant hubs.



(b) Network after making the hub network complete and removing redundant hubs.

Figure 1: Network for Example 1 with set of commodities $\{(1, 5), (2, 5), (3, 5), (4, 5)\}$.

Squares indicate hub nodes from H , solid lines the interhub links with their corresponding leader routing costs, and dotted lines potential access or distribution arcs to/from the backbone network.

Table 1: Routing costs and reservation prices.

	(1, 3)	(1, 4)	(2, 3)	(2, 4)	(3, 4)	(3, 5)	(4, 5)
Routing costs c_{ij}^r (Leader)	–	–	–	–	10	–	–
Reservation prices \bar{c}_{ij}^{rk} (Carriers)	k=1	10	40	25	40	–	40
	k=2	30	40	20	40	–	45

The same for all commodities $r \in R$

For example, the first block of columns in Table 2 shows the followers' responses for the first leg if fixed outsourcing fees are $\bar{p}_3^1 = 30$, $\bar{p}_4^1 = 50$. That is, the carrier allocated to non-hub node 1 would receive 30 or 50 euros depending on whether the commodity is routed through access arc (1, 3) or (1, 4), respectively.

Even if the offer is higher for the latter connection, only carrier 2 would accept it. The reason is that, by accepting the offer of 30 euros for access arc (1, 3), carrier 1 would obtain a higher net profit namely $30 - 10 = 20$ than the one it would obtain if it accepted the 50 euros offer for access arc (1, 4), which would be of $50 - 40 = 10$ euros. Offers that are not accepted because, even if they are profitable, they do not produce the highest net profit to the carrier are marked with an asterisk.

Similarly, for $\bar{q}_3^1 = 45$, $\bar{q}_4^1 = 40$, carrier 2 would accept to route the third leg of commodity $r = 1$ through hub 4, achieving the net profit of $40 - 20 = 20$. It can also be observed that some offers would not be accepted neither by carrier 1 nor 2; for instance, $\bar{q}_3^3 = 30$.

Table 2: Carriers' responses to fixed outsourcing fees offers (MCFOD $_F$).

r	(1, 5)		(2, 5)		(3, 5)		(4, 5)		
	p_i^r	q_i^r	p_i^r	q_i^r	p_i^r	q_i^r	p_i^r	q_i^r	
	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	
Fixed outsourcing fee	30	50	45	40	15	35	40	30	
Response	$k = 1$	YES (10)	NO* (40)	YES (40)	NO* (40)	NO (25)	NO (40)	YES (40)	NO (40)
	$k = 2$	NO* (30)	YES (40)	NO* (45)	YES (20)	NO (20)	NO (45)	NO (45)	YES (20)

Note that, in this example, the carrier allocation of node 2 is irrelevant because no offer related to routing the first leg of commodity (2, 5), which is the only one involved in that node, is accepted. For the fixed outsourcing fees as depicted in Table 2, Table 3 analyzes the possible MCFOD outcomes depending on the allocation of carriers to non-hub nodes 1 and 5.

The table shows the routing paths and associated outsourcing plus routing costs for the cases where the involved carriers would accept the corresponding offers. This is why the entries of commodity (3, 5) when $a(5) = 1$ are empty. We observe, that for the allocation $a(1) = 2$ and $a(5) = 1$ commodity (1, 5) would not be served, because even if both carriers would accept the offers of the leader, the overall outsourcing fee plus routing cost (105) exceeds the revenue (100) for serving it.

Indeed, if the outsourcing fees are fixed as in Table 2 the best MCFOD solution for the given fixed outsourcing fees is to allocate carrier 2 to node 5 and carrier 1 to node 1 (i.e. $a(1) = 1$, $a(5) = 2$). Then, the leader is able to route three out of the four commodities with a resulting net profit of 150 euros.

Table 3: Potential allocation of carriers to non-hub nodes.

$a(5)$	$a(1)$	$r = 1$		$r = 3$		$r = 4$		R^*	Net Profit
		$(o(r), d(r)) = (1, 5)$ path	$C_r(a, p, q)$	$(o(r), d(r)) = (3, 5)$ path	$C_r(a, p, q)$	$(o(r), d(r)) = (4, 5)$ path	$C_r(a, p, q)$		
1	1	1-3-5	30+45					{1, 4}	$200 - (75 + 40) = 85$
	2	1-4-3-5	$50 + 10 + 45 > 100$			4-5	40	{4}	$100 - 40 = 60$
2	1	1-3-4-5	$30 + 10 + 40$	3-4-5	$10 + 20$	4-5	40	{1, 3, 4}	$300 - (80 + 30 + 40) = 150$
	2	1-4-5	$50 + 40$						$300 - (90 + 30 + 40) = 140$

Service paths and net profits for the solutions with carriers' positive responses for both the first and third legs for fixed outsourcing fees as in Table 2.

This example also illustrates the bilevel nature of $MCFOD_F$. If we consider $rMCFOD_F$, so that the condition that accepted offers must be optimal for the carriers is substituted by the condition that accepted offers must result in a non-negative profit for the carriers, then routes involving profitable but non optimal offers (marked with an asterisk in Table 2) should also be considered. In that case, nothing would change for commodities (3, 5) and (4, 5). However, for commodity (1, 5) the allocation $a(1) = a(5) = 2$ would produce positive answers of carrier 2 for $\bar{p}_3^{(1,5)}$ and $\bar{q}_4^{(1,5)}$. Then, the path 1 – 3 – 5 would be accepted, since its outsourcing fees plus routing cost of $75 = 30 + 45$ is smaller than the total cost of the original 1 – 4 – 5 route ($90 = 50 + 40$). Again, the same three commodities are served but the route of commodity (1, 5) would be 1 – 3 – 5 with a resulting net profit of $155 = 300 - (75 + 30 + 40)$.

Hence, $rMCFOD_F$ produces an overestimation of the leader's profit in $MCFOD_F$, given that any offer acceptable for $MCFOD_F$ would also be acceptable for $rMCFOD_F$.

However, if the leader could choose the outsourcing fees, the solution would be very different. Table 4 shows outsourcing fees for an optimal solution for the MCFOD problem whose routing cost and reservation prices are provided in Table 1. Specifically, we show the optimal outsourcing fees and the respective carrier responses that the leader would anticipate before making the allocation and routing decisions.

Table 4: Optimal outsourcing fees and carriers responses for MCFOD.

r	(1, 5)				(2, 5)				(3, 5)		(4, 5)
	p_i^r		q_i^r		p_i^r		q_i^r		q_i^r		q_i^r
$i(r)/j(r)$	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4
Outsourcing fee	10	0	0	20	20	0	0	20	0	20	20
Response	$k = 1$	YES (10)	NO (40)	NO (40)	NO (40)	NO (25)	NO (40)	NO (40)	NO (40)	NO (40)	NO (40)
	$k = 2$	NO (25)	NO (40)	NO (45)	YES (20)	YES (20)	NO (45)	NO (45)	YES (20)	NO (45)	YES (20)

Considering data provided in Table 1

The optimal solution for this example shows that by considering the outsourcing fees as decision variables, we are able to serve all four commodities and maximize the leader's profit, while maintaining positive responses from the carriers. The optimal allocations are defined with $a(1) = 1$ and $a(2) = a(5) = 2$. The total leader's profit increases from 150 to 260 euros.

3 Bilevel Formulation and a Single-Level MINLP Reformulation

In this section we first provide a bilevel problem formulation for the more general MCFOD and we derive a single-level MINLP reformulation by exploiting strong duality conditions applied to the lower level problems. As we will see, for MCFOD_F the resulting reformulation is a MILP. We also show how to adapt these formulations for r MCFOD and r MCFOD_F.

3.1 Bilevel MILP formulation for the MCFOD

We define the following sets of decision variables:

- For the upper level problem, associated with the decisions of the leader:

$s^r \in \{0, 1\}$, $r \in R$, for the commodities that are served.

$a_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \in V \setminus H$, $k \in K$, for the allocation of non-hub nodes to carriers.

$x_{ij}^r \in \{0, 1\}$, $(i, j) \in A^r$, $r \in R$, for the commodities that are served using the interhub arc (i, j) .

$p_i^r \geq 0$: outsourcing fee for access arc $(o(r), i)$ for commodity $r \in R$.

$q_i^r \geq 0$: outsourcing fee for distribution arc $(i, d(r))$ for commodity $r \in R$.

- For the lower level problem, associated to the carrier $k \in K$:

$f_i^{rk} \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \in H$, $r \in R$. f_i^{rk} takes the value 1 if and only if $o(r) \in V \setminus H$ is allocated to carrier $k \in K$ and k accepts the offer for routing the first leg of commodity r through access arc $(o(r), i)$. That is, $f_i^{rk} = 1 \Rightarrow i \in I_k(r, p)$ for the outsourcing fee p_i^r .

$t_i^{rk} \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \in H$, $r \in R$. t_i^{rk} takes the value 1 if and only if $d(r) \in V \setminus H$ is allocated to carrier $k \in K$ and k accepts the offer for routing the third leg of commodity r through distribution arc $(i, d(r))$. That is, $t_i^{rk} = 1 \Rightarrow i \in J_k(r, q)$ for the outsourcing fee q_i^r .

The formulation of the multicommodity flow problem with outsourcing decision for the leader is:

$$\max \sum_{r \in R} b^r s^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} [p_i^r + q_j^r + c_{ij}^r] x_{ij}^r \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \leq 1 \quad i \in V \setminus H \quad (8b)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \leq \sum_{k \in K} f_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, i \in H, \text{ s.t. } o(r) \neq i \quad (8c)$$

$$\sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r \leq \sum_{k \in K} t_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, i \in H \text{ s.t. } d(r) \neq i \quad (8d)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r = s^r \quad r \in R \quad (8e)$$

$$f^{rk} \in \arg \max F^{rk}(a_{o(r)k}, p) \quad r \in R, k \in K \text{ s.t. } o(r) \notin H \quad (8f)$$

$$t^{rk} \in \arg \max T^{rk}(a_{d(r)k}, q) \quad r \in R, k \in K \text{ s.t. } d(r) \notin H \quad (8g)$$

$$p_i^r, q_i^r \geq 0 \quad i \in H, r \in R \quad (8h)$$

$$x_{ij}^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R, (i, j) \in A^r \quad (8i)$$

$$s^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R \quad (8j)$$

$$a_{ik} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in V \setminus H, k \in K, \quad (8k)$$

where $F^{rk}(a_{o(r)k}, p)$ and $T^{rk}(a_{d(r)k}, q)$ denote the subproblems for carrier $k \in K$ for the first and third legs of commodity $r \in R$, defined by (9) and (10), respectively.

Constraints (8b) impose that only non-hub nodes can be allocated to carriers, and that each non-hub node can be allocated to at most one carrier. Constraints (8c) and (8d) relate the interhub arcs (possibly loops) used in the routing of served commodities with their first and third legs, respectively. Constraints (8e) identify served commodities by associating them to a routing arc (possibly a loop) of the backbone network, which, by Constraints (8c)-(8d) will be the one connecting their first and third legs. By Constraints (8f)-(8g) the first and third legs that are accepted by the carriers correspond to optimal decisions of the carriers to the leader's outsourcing fees and to the allocation to carriers to non-hub nodes to carriers.

The first term of the objective function is the total revenue for the served commodities, whereas the second term refers to routing costs and outsourcing fees. Note that this second term is bilinear, hence, the overall formulation is a bilevel MINLP with non-convex objective function and lower-level problems being linear programs as shown below.

The carriers' subproblems. Given a first-level solution, with outsourcing fees \bar{p} , \bar{q} , and allocation of non-hub nodes \bar{a} , each carrier $k \in K$ must identify the commodities' first and third leg offers it will accept, among the ones starting at or arriving to the nodes allocated to, as stated in (1). The decisions on the different commodities are independent from each other. To determine the most profitable access arc for the first leg of carrier k for commodity r we solve the following problem:

$$F^{rk}(\bar{a}_{o(r)k}, \bar{p}) = \max \sum_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk} f_i^{rk} \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in H} f_i^{rk} \leq \bar{a}_{o(r)k} \quad (9b)$$

$$f_i^{rk} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in H, \quad (9c)$$

where $\rho_i^{rk} = \bar{p}_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}$, $i \in H$.

We notice that the optimal solution value of problem (9) is always non-negative. If $\rho_i^{rk} < 0$ for all $i \in H$ then $f_i^{rk} = 0$ for all $i \in H$. Indeed, $F^{rk}(\bar{a}_{o(r)k}, \bar{p}) = \Pi^k(r, \bar{p})$ when $\bar{a}_{o(r)k} = 1$ and 0, otherwise.

Analogously, the third leg subproblem of carrier k for commodity r is:

$$T^{rk}(\bar{a}_{d(r)k}, \bar{q}) = \max \sum_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk} t_i^{rk} \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{i \in H} t_i^{rk} \leq \bar{a}_{d(r)k} \quad (10b)$$

$$t_i^{rk} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in H, \quad (10c)$$

where $\gamma_i^{rk} = \bar{q}_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}$, $i \in H$. We also have that $T^{rk}(\bar{a}_{d(r)k}, \bar{q}) = \Gamma^k(r, \bar{q})$ when $\bar{a}_{o(r)k} = 1$ and 0, otherwise.

Remark 3.1. *It is easy to see that the integrality conditions on variables t_i^{rk} and q_i^{rk} can be relaxed and replaced by non-negativity constraints. Then, the optimal values of the carriers subproblems, $F^{rk}(\bar{a}_{o(r)k}, \bar{p})$ and $T^{rk}(\bar{a}_{d(r)k}, \bar{q})$, can be obtained alternatively via their respective dual problems namely*

$$F^{rk}(\bar{a}_{o(r)k}, \bar{p}) = \min \bar{a}_{o(r)k} u_{rk} \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } u_{rk} \geq \rho_i^{rk} \quad i \in H \quad (11b)$$

$$u_{rk} \geq 0 \quad i \in H, \quad (11c)$$

$$T^{rk}(\bar{a}_{d(r)k}, \bar{q}) = \min \bar{a}_{d(r)k} v_{rk} \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } v_{rk} \geq \gamma_i^{rk} \quad i \in H \quad (12b)$$

$$v_{rk} \geq 0 \quad i \in H, \quad (12c)$$

whose optimal solutions are $u_{rk}^* = [\max_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk}]^+$ and $v_{rk}^* = [\max_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk}]^+$, respectively. Hence, we have $F^{rk}(\bar{a}_{o(r)k}, \bar{p}) = \bar{a}_{o(r)k} [\max_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk}]^+$ and $T^{rk}(\bar{a}_{d(r)k}, \bar{q}) = \bar{a}_{d(r)k} [\max_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk}]^+$.

3.2 Single-level MI(N)LP Reformulation

In order to guarantee that first and third legs correspond to optimal carriers' decisions, we substitute (8f)-(8g) by primal-dual optimality conditions on the carriers' decisions. For this, as explained in Remark 3.1, we introduce additional dual variables u_{rk} , v_{rk} , $r \in R$, $k \in K$ associated with the constraints (9b) and (10b) of the carriers subproblems, respectively. Then, the single-level

reformulation of MCFOD reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \sum_{r \in R} b^r s^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} [c_{ij}^r + p_i^r + q_j^r] x_{ij}^r & \quad (13a) \\
\text{s.t. } \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} & \leq 1 \quad i \in V \setminus H \quad (13b) \\
\sum_{k \in K} f_i^{rk} & \geq \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \quad r \in R, i \in H \text{ s.t. } o(r) \neq i \quad (13c) \\
\sum_{k \in K} t_i^{rk} & \geq \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r \quad r \in R, i \in H \text{ s.t. } d(r) \neq i \quad (13d) \\
\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r & = s^r \quad r \in R \quad (13e) \\
\sum_{i \in H} f_i^{rk} & \leq a_{o(r)k} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (13f) \\
\sum_{j \in H} t_j^{rk} & \leq a_{d(r)k} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (13g) \\
u_{rk} & \geq \rho_i^{rk} \quad i \in H, r \in R, k \in K \quad (13h) \\
v_{rk} & \geq \gamma_i^{rk} \quad i \in H, r \in R, k \in K \quad (13i) \\
u_{rk} a_{o(r)k} & \leq \sum_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk} f_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (13j) \\
v_{rk} a_{d(r)k} & \leq \sum_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk} t_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (13k) \\
s^r & \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R, \quad (13l) \\
p_i^r, q_i^r & \geq 0 \quad i \in H, r \in R \quad (13m) \\
f_i^{rk}, t_i^{rk} & \geq 0 \quad i \in H, r \in R, k \in K \quad (13n) \\
a_{ik} & \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in V \setminus H, k \in K \quad (13o) \\
x_{ij}^r & \geq 0 \quad (i, j) \in A^r, r \in R \quad (13p) \\
u_{rk}, v_{rk} & \geq 0 \quad r \in R, k \in K. \quad (13q)
\end{aligned}$$

where, $\rho_i^{rk} = p_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}$, and $\gamma_i^{rk} = q_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}$, for all $i \in H, r \in R, k \in K$.

Constraints(13f) and (13g) guarantee that, for all $r \in R, k \in K$, variables f_i^{rk} , and t_i^{rk} determine feasible solutions for $F^{rk}(a_{o(r)k}, p)$ and $T^{rk}(a_{d(r)k}, q)$, respectively, whereas Constraints (13h)-(13i) guarantee the feasibility of the dual variables u_{rk} and v_{rk} . Finally, Constraints (13j) and (13k) impose that the objective function values of $F^{rk}(a_{o(r)k}, p)$ and $T^{rk}(a_{d(r)k}, q)$ coincide with those of their respective duals, thus guaranteeing the optimality of both the primal and dual solutions.

Remark 3.2. For $MCFOD_F$, the model (13) is an MILP reformulation. Indeed, taking into account Remark 3.1, we can overcome the bilinear terms in the left-hand-sides of (13j)-(13k) by projecting

out u and v variables and substituting constraints (13h)-(13k) by the following:

$$a_{o(r)k} \left[\max_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk} \right]^+ \leq \sum_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk} f_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (14a)$$

$$a_{d(r)k} \left[\max_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk} \right]^+ \leq \sum_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk} t_i^{rk} \quad r \in R, k \in K. \quad (14b)$$

where, for the fixed outsourcing fees \bar{p} and \bar{q} , the values of ρ and γ can be precalculated, and hence (14) can be turned into linear constraints.

The following criteria can be applied to eliminate decision variables from model (13) for MCFOD_F :

- $x_{ij}^r = 0$ for all $r \in R$, $(i, j) \in A^r$ such that $\bar{p}_i^r + \bar{q}_j^r + c_{ij}^r \geq b^r$.
- $f_i^{rk} = 0$ for all $i \in H$, $r \in R$, $k \in K$ such that $\rho_i^{rk} < 0$.
- $t_i^{rk} = 0$ for all $i \in H$, $r \in R$, $k \in K$ such that $\gamma_i^{rk} < 0$.

Remark 3.3. *Single-level formulations for $r\text{MCFOD}$ and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ can be obtained from those of MCFOD and MCFOD_F , respectively, by replacing constraints (14) by the following ones, where it is assumed that outsourcing fees offered by the leader will be accepted, as long as they result in a non-negative profit for the follower. Depending on the case, the outsourcing fees would be decision variables or fixed:*

$$\sum_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk} f_i^{rk} \geq 0 \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (15a)$$

$$\sum_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk} t_i^{rk} \geq 0 \quad r \in R, k \in K, \quad (15b)$$

As mentioned, and also illustrated in Example 1, these are relaxations of their respective bilevel problems.

4 Solution Properties and Problem Complexity

Below we discuss some properties of optimal solutions and show that all four problems, namely, MCFOD , $r\text{MCFOD}$, MCFOD_F , and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ are NP-hard. Contrary to the intuition that MCFOD should be more difficult to solve than MCFOD_F (since there are less decisions to be made for MCFOD_F), we will see that (thanks to certain properties of optimal solutions) the MCFOD is a *soft* bilevel problem, as it will be possible to find an optimal solution by solving an auxiliary single-level problem, in which outsourcing fees are not explicitly stated. Surprisingly, even though problems $r\text{MCFOD}$ and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ are relaxations of the original setting, they remain in the same complexity class as MCFOD .

4.1 Optimal outsourcing fees for given non-hub allocations, and first and third legs

Even if, in principle, outsourcing fees, p_i^r , q_i^r , may take continuous non-negative values, we next show that there is an optimal solution where the values of these variables can be restricted to a

finite set of $\mathcal{O}(|R| \cdot |H| \cdot |K|)$ elements. Moreover, we will see that an optimal set of outsourcing fees, \bar{p} , \bar{q} can be easily found, for any solution when its allocation along with its first and third legs are given.

Let \bar{f} , \bar{t} , and \bar{a} satisfying Constraints (13b)-(13g) be given. For each $r \in R$, let $k(r), l(r) \in K$ be the carriers such that $\bar{a}_{o(r)k(r)} = 1$ and $\bar{a}_{o(r)l(r)} = 1$, respectively. When $\sum_{i \in H} \bar{f}_i^{rk(r)} = 1$, let $i(r) \in H$ be the hub such that $\bar{f}_{i(r)}^{rk(r)} = 1$. Similarly, when $\sum_{i \in H} \bar{t}_i^{rl(r)} = 1$, let $j(r) \in H$ be the hub such that $\bar{t}_{j(r)}^{rl(r)} = 1$.

Consider the following outsourcing fees: For each $r \in R$, such that $o(r) \notin H$, let:

$$\bar{p}_i^r = \begin{cases} \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk(r)} & \text{if } i = i(r) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i \in H. \quad (16)$$

Similarly, for each $r \in R$, such that $d(r) \notin H$, let:

$$\bar{q}_i^r = \begin{cases} \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rl(r)} & \text{if } j = j(r) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i \in H. \quad (17)$$

With the above fees, for all $r \in R$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_i^{rk} &= \bar{p}_i^r - \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} = \begin{cases} 0 & k = k(r), i = i(r) \\ -\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad k \in K, i \in H, \\ \bar{\gamma}_i^{rk} &= \bar{q}_i^r - \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} = \begin{cases} 0 & k = l(r), i = j(r) \\ -\bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad k \in K, i \in H. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for the given \bar{f} , \bar{t} , \bar{a} , the outsourcing fees obtained according to (16) and (17), not only satisfy the non-negativity conditions (15), but they also satisfy the bilevel optimality constraints (14). Moreover, these fees take the smallest possible values that, in each case, produce positive responses from the involved carriers for both r MCFOD and MCFOD. As a consequence, we have the following result:

Proposition 4.1. *Let \bar{f} , \bar{t} , and \bar{a} be given first and third legs, and non-hub allocations satisfying (13b)-(13g). Then, the outsourcing fees \bar{p} and \bar{q} obtained according to (16) and (17) are optimal for \bar{f} , \bar{t} , and \bar{a} , for both r MCFOD and MCFOD.*

Proposition 4.1 has two main consequences. The first one is that, for both MCFOD and r MCFOD, there is an optimal solution with outsourcing fees $p_i^r \in P_i^r := \{\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} : k \in K\} \cup \{0\}$ and $q_i^r \in Q_i^r := \{\bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} : k \in K\} \cup \{0\}$. Therefore, in formulation (8) the conditions $p_i^r \geq 0$ and $q_i^r \geq 0$ can be substituted by $p_i^r \in P_i^r$ and $q_i^r \in Q_i^r$, respectively.

The second consequence of Proposition 4.1 is that optimal outsourcing fees can be determined according to (16) and (17), from optimal non-hub allocations, and first and third leg decisions.

If an optimal MCFOD solution routes commodity $r \in R$ using as first and third legs the ones associated with $\bar{f}_{i(r)}^{rk(r)}$ and $\bar{t}_{j(r)}^{rl(r)}$, respectively, the overall outsourcing plus routing cost incurred by the leader will be:

$$C_{k(r)l(r)}^{i(r)j(r)} = \bar{p}_i^r + c_{i(r),j(r)}^r + \bar{q}_j^r = \bar{c}_{o(r)i(r)}^{rk(r)} + c_{i(r)j(r)}^r + \bar{c}_{j(r)d(r)}^{rl(r)},$$

whereas the outsourcing fees associated with any other first leg \bar{f}_{ik}^{rk} or third leg \bar{t}_{ik}^{rk} can be set to zero. Indeed, the above comment applies to r MCFOD as well.

The above observation indicates that, even if, in principle, outsourcing fees are independent on the carriers who would route the first and third legs, optimal outsourcing fees will, in fact, depend on who are the carriers in charge of access (first) and distribution (third) legs. By setting the outsourcing fees as in (16) and (17), the followers will be incentivized to accept the offer which is the most profitable for the leader. This is quite intuitive for the problem at hand and allows us to model the MCFOD as a problem that considers only the leader costs along with allocation decisions, where the costs (outsourcing fees) of the first and third legs are precisely the carriers reservation prices of the corresponding legs.

Furthermore, if the carriers $k(r)$ and $l(r)$ are known for commodity $r \in R$, then the best interhub arc for routing it, $(i(r), j(r))$, can be determined *a priori* by finding:

$$(i(r), j(r)) \in \arg \min \{ \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk(r)} + \bar{c}_{jd(r)}^{rl(r)} + c_{ij}^r : i, j \in H \}.$$

For any pair (k, l) of carriers potentially serving the first, respectively third leg of commodity r , we can precompute in $O(|H|^2)$ time the total routing cost for the leader through path $o(r) - i(r) - j(r) - d(r)$ as:

$$C_{kl}^r = \min \{ \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} + \bar{c}_{jd(r)}^{rl} + c_{ij}^r : i, j \in H \}. \quad (18)$$

The above expression is also valid for routes that do not have a first or a third leg. Specifically, the route of a given commodity $r \in R$ will have a first leg only if $o(r) \notin H$, and it will have a third leg only if $d(r) \notin H$. If $o(r) \in H$, then $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} + \bar{c}_{jd(r)}^{rl} + c_{ij}^r = \bar{c}_{jd(r)}^{rl} + c_{ij}^r$ so, for a given $l \in K$, C_{kl}^r takes the same value for all $k \in K$. Likewise, if $d(r) \in H$, then $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} + \bar{c}_{jd(r)}^{rl} + c_{ij}^r = \bar{c}_{io(r)}^{rk} + c_{ij}^r$ so, for a given $k \in K$, C_{kl}^r takes the same value for all $l \in K$. The routing costs defined in (18) determine, in each case, the best overall routing costs for the commodities. From the definition of (18), we observe that the set R can be reduced *a priori*.

Remark 4.1. *If $\min_{k,l \in K} C_{kl}^r \geq b^r$ then commodity r will not be profitable and can be removed from R .*

We can provide now an alternative problem definition obtained after preprocessing routing costs.

Proposition 4.2 (MCFOD with preprocessed routing costs). *Let C_{kl}^r be the costs for routing commodity $r \in R$ if its origin is served by carrier k and its destination is served by carrier l , defined as in (18). Then, an optimal MCFOD solution is obtained by allocating each non-hub node to at most one carrier and finding a subset of commodities $R^* \subseteq R$, that maximize*

$$\sum_{r \in R^*} [b^r - C_{k(r)l(r)}^r]$$

where for each $r \in R$, its origin and destination are allocated to carriers $k(r)$ and $l(r)$, respectively.

In the above definition the allocation of non-hubs to carriers becomes the major decision, as the hub network is totally preprocessed. This alternative point of view will allow us to prove the problem complexity below.

We have a similar result for the MCFOD_F when outsourcing fees, \bar{p} and \bar{q} , are fixed. Now, for a given commodity $r \in R$, if the carriers $k(r)$ and $l(r)$ are known, then the best interhub arc for

routing r , $(i(r), j(r))$, can be determined *a priori* by finding the best interhub arc $(i, j) \in A^r$ among where hubs i and j are optimal responses of $k(r)$ and $l(r)$ for outsourcing fees \bar{p} and \bar{q} , respectively:

$$(i(r), j(r)) \in \arg \min \{ \bar{p}_i^r + \bar{q}_j^r + c_{ij}^r : i \in I_{k(r)}(r, \bar{p}), j \in J_{l(r)}(r, \bar{q}) \}.$$

That is interhub arc $(i, j) \in A^r$ can be used for routing r only when $i \in I_{k(r)}(r, \bar{p})$, and $j \in J_{l(r)}(r, \bar{q})$. Thus, the preprocessed routing costs are defined as

$$\widehat{C}_{kl}^r = \begin{cases} \min \{ \bar{p}_i^r + \bar{q}_j^r + c_{ij}^r : (i, j) \in A^r, \text{ s.t. } i \in I_k(r, \bar{p}), j \in J_l(r, \bar{q}) \} & \text{if } I_k(r, \bar{p}) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } J_l(r, \bar{q}) \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Proposition 4.3 (MCFOD_F with preprocessed routing costs). *Let \bar{p} and \bar{q} be given outsourcing fees. Let also \widehat{C}_{kl}^r be the costs for routing commodity $r \in R$ if its origin is served by carrier k and its destination is served by carrier l , defined as in (19). Then, an optimal MCFOD_F solution is obtained by finding an allocation of each non-hub node to at most one carrier, together with a subset of commodities $R^* \subseteq R$, that maximize*

$$\sum_{r \in R^*} \left[b^r - \widehat{C}_{k(r)l(r)}^r \right]$$

where for each $r \in R$, its origin and destination are allocated to carriers $k(r)$ and $l(r)$, respectively.

4.1.1 Analysis for r MCFOD

One of the consequences of Proposition 4.1 is that for any given solution \bar{f} , \bar{t} , and \bar{a} , satisfying (13b)-(13g), the outsourcing fees \bar{p} , \bar{q} as determined by (16) and (17) are optimal for both MCFOD and r MCFOD. That is, MCFOD and r MCFOD are, in fact, the same problem. The same conclusion can be reached for r MCFOD as the preprocessed routing costs (18) are exactly the same.

On the contrary, MCFOD_F and r MCFOD_F are different problems, as can be seen by comparing the preprocessed routing costs of MCFOD_F and r MCFOD_F. For the latter, the preprocessed routing costs are defined as

$$\widetilde{C}_{kl}^r = \begin{cases} \min \{ \bar{p}_i^r + \bar{q}_j^r + c_{ij}^r : (i, j) \in A^r, \text{ s.t. } i \in rI_k(r, \bar{p}), j \in rJ_l(r, \bar{q}) \} & \text{if } rI_k(r, \bar{p}) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } rJ_l(r, \bar{q}) \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

so an optimal r -MCFOD_F solution can be obtained by by maximizing $\sum_{r \in R^*} \left[b^r - \widetilde{C}_{k(r)l(r)}^r \right]$.

4.2 Problem complexity

We first prove NP-hardness of MCFOD. We then show that the problem remains NP-hard, even when the outsourcing fees are fixed.

Proposition 4.4. *The MCFOD is NP-hard, even with a single hub node.*

Proof: We show this result by a polynomial reduction from the NP-hard Quadratic Semi-Assignment Problem (QSAP) [see, e.g., Greenberg, 1969, Loiola et al., 2007]. The QSAP is defined as follows. We are given a set F of facilities and a set L of locations. For each pair of facilities

$(i, j) \in F \times F, i \neq j$, we are given a weight $w_{ij} > 0$ and for each pair of locations $(k, l) \in L \times L$ we are given a distance $d_{kl} \geq 0$. The goal is to find a mapping $f : F \mapsto L$ such that each facility $i \in F$ is allocated to one location $f(i) \in L$, so that

$$\sum_{i,j \in F} w_{ij} d_{f(i)f(j)}$$

is minimized.

Given an input instance of QSAP, we transform it into an MCFOD instance (according to Proposition 4.2) as follows. Let $K := L, H := \{0\}, V \setminus H := F, R := \{(o, d) : o, d \in F, o \neq d\}, C_{kl}^r := w_r d_{kl}, b^r := M$, for all $r \in R$ where $M := \max_{r \in R, k, l \in L} C_{kl}^r + 1$. In this transformation, the set of hub nodes is a singleton, and contains an auxiliary hub node denoted by 0.

Then, according to Proposition 4.2, and by definition of b^r , in an optimal solution of such constructed MCFOD instance, all the commodities will be routed. The profit of such obtained solution is equal to

$$\sum_{r \in R} [M - w_r d_{k(r)l(r)}] = M \cdot |F| \cdot (|F| - 1) - \sum_{r \in R} w_r d_{k(r)l(r)} = M \cdot |F| \cdot (|F| - 1) - OPT,$$

where OPT refers to the optimal solution value of QSAP. Indeed, the optimal allocation of non-hubs to carriers corresponds to the optimal allocation of facilities F to locations L , and hence, we have a polynomial time reduction from QSAP to MCFOD. Since in this reduction the size and structure of the hub network play no role, we conclude that the result holds even when the hub network contains a single node. ■

Proposition 4.5. *The MCFOD can be solved in polynomial time if the number of carriers is constant.*

Proof: For $|K| = \kappa = \text{const}$, there are $|V \setminus H|^{\kappa+1}$ possible allocation decisions that could be enumerated. For each such allocation, calculating C_{kl}^r and finding the optimal subset of commodities to be routed can be done in $O(|H|^2 \cdot |R|)$ time, and hence, the optimal solution could be found in $O(\kappa^2 \cdot |H|^2 \cdot |R|)$ time. ■

We now turn our attention to the complexity of MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$.

Proposition 4.6. *The MCFOD_F and the $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ are NP-hard.*

Proof: Again we show this result by reduction from the QSAP. Given an input instance of QSAP, we will transform it into an MCFOD_F instance as follows. Let $K := L$ and $R := \{(o, d) : o, d \in F, o \neq d\}$.

Consider a backbone network consisting of $|K|^2$ hubs (as many as possible combinations for the carriers allocation to the origins and destinations of the commodities). Let $H := \{v_{kl}\}_{kl \in K \times K}$ denote the set of hubs and let $V = H \cup F$. The leader's routing costs for the non-loop arcs of the backbone network are set to an arbitrarily large constant D , i.e., $c_{ij}^r = D$, for all $r \in R, i, j \in H, i \neq j$. With these interhub costs, the only routing paths for commodity r that do not have arbitrarily large costs are of the form $o(r) - v_{kl} - d(r)$.

The outsourcing fees are defined as follows:

$$\bar{p}_i^r = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} w_{o(r)d(r)} d_{kl} & \text{if } i = v_{kl} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{q}_i^r = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} w_{o(r)d(r)} d_{kl} & \text{if } i = v_{kl} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The carriers reservation prices are defined as follows:

$$\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} = \begin{cases} \bar{p}_i^r & \text{if } i = v_{kl} \text{ for some } l \in K \\ \bar{p}_i^r + 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rl} = \begin{cases} \bar{q}_i^r & \text{if } i = v_{kl} \text{ for some } k \in K \\ \bar{q}_i^r + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

With the above reservation prices, for a given commodity $r \in R$ and a given pair of carriers (k and l , respectively) $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} = \bar{p}_i^r$ and $\bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rl} = \bar{q}_i^r$ for $i = v_{kl}$, but when $i \neq v_{kl}$, either $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} > \bar{p}_i^r$ or $\bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rl} > \bar{q}_i^r$ (or both). That is, with the above routing costs, the only offer that would be accepted by the pair of carriers k and l , is the one with $i = v_{kl}$. Moreover, the overall cost of such offer for the leader is precisely $\bar{p}_i^r + \bar{q}_i^r = w_r d_{kl}$. Hence, following (19), we define, $\widehat{C}_{kl}^r := w_r d_{kl}$ for all $r \in R, k, l \in K$. In addition, $b^r := M$, for all $r \in R$ where $M := \max_{r \in R, k, l \in L} \widehat{C}_{kl}^r + 1$. Then, by Proposition 4.3 and the definition of b^r , in an optimal solution of such constructed MCFOD_F instance, all the commodities will be routed. The profit of such solution is:

$$\sum_{r \in R} [M - w_r d_{k(r)l(r)}] = M \cdot |F| \cdot (|F| - 1) - \sum_{r \in R} w_r d_{k(r)l(r)} = M \cdot |F| \cdot (|F| - 1) - \text{OPT},$$

where OPT refers to the optimal solution value of QSAP. Indeed, the optimal allocation of non-hubs to carriers corresponds to the optimal allocation of facilities F to locations L , and hence, we have a polynomial time reduction from QSAP to MCFOD_F .

Finally, we observe that the above construction can be also used to transform the QSAP instance into an $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ instance. Indeed, by defining an $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ instance on the same graph, and with the above outsourcing fees and reservation prices as above, the only offers that would be accepted by both carriers (non-negative net profit for both involved carriers) are those with both $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} > \bar{p}_i^r$ and $\bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rl} > \bar{q}_i^r$. Hence, the preprocessed routing costs of the $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ instance would be precisely $\widetilde{C}_{kl}^r = \widehat{C}_{kl}^r$. Thus, an optimal solution of the $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ instance would produce an optimal solution to QSAP. ■

5 Single-level MILP reformulations for MCFOD

Model (13) given in Section 3 is a single-level reformulation for MCFOD as an MINLP. Besides the bilinear terms in the objective function, this model also introduces additional bilinear terms in constraints enforcing lower-level optimality conditions (13j)-(13k). As such, this model is computationally highly intractable. Instead of using standard linearization techniques to get rid of these bilinear terms, in this section we will exploit solution properties presented in Section 4 to obtain more efficient MILP formulations for MCFOD.

The first group of reformulations exploits Proposition 4.1 and postpones the decisions on the optimal outsourcing fees, which, as we have seen, can be determined *ex post*. In the first among these formulations (that we call the *explicit paths formulation*), the follower's responses are modeled explicitly and hence a large number of four-index variables is needed. In the remainder of Section 5.1, we then show alternative flow-based formulations, that allow us to reduce the number of four-index variables. In Section 5.4 we then provide another model (*implicit paths formulation*) which exploits Proposition 4.2 and is derived from the problem definition obtained after preprocessing the routing costs.

As to what concerns MCFOD_F , we will explain how these models need to be adapted for this case.

5.1 Explicit Paths (EP) Formulation

The explicit Paths (EP) formulation considers the MCFOD as the problem of finding an optimal set of commodities to be served and an allocation of carriers to non-hubs that maximizes the overall net profit of the routed commodities (total revenue minus overall routing cost). Hence, a formulation for this model that uses the same decision variables as (13), except for the p and q variables is:

$$(EP) \quad \max \sum_{r \in R} b^r s^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} c_{ij}^r x_{ij}^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in H} [\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} f_i^{rk} + \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} t_i^{rk}] \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \leq 1 \quad i \in V \setminus H \quad (21b)$$

$$\sum_{i \in H} f_i^{rk} \leq a_{o(r)k} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (21c)$$

$$\sum_{j \in H} t_j^{rk} \leq a_{d(r)k} \quad r \in R, k \in K \quad (21d)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} f_i^{rk} \geq \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \quad r \in R, i \in H \text{ s.t. } o(r) \neq i \quad (21e)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} t_i^{rk} \geq \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r \quad r \in R, i \in H \text{ s.t. } d(r) \neq i \quad (21f)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r = s^r \quad r \in R \quad (21g)$$

$$s^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R, \quad (21h)$$

$$f_i^{rk}, t_i^{rk} \geq 0 \quad i \in H, r \in R \quad (21i)$$

$$a_{ik} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in V \setminus H, k \in K \quad (21j)$$

$$x_{ij}^r \geq 0 \quad (i, j) \in A^r, r \in R. \quad (21k)$$

Recall that Proposition 4.1 states that the optimal outsourcing fees for commodity r should be set to $\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}$ if it is to be routed through hub i and if the non-hub $o(r)$ is allocated to k , whereas all other values of p^r should be set to zero. This allows to state the objective function as in (21a) and to get rid of p and q variables from model (13). The meaning of Constraints (21b)-(21g) is similar to that of Constraints (13b)-(13e), so the main difference of (EP) with respect to the bilevel formulation of MCFOD affects the removal of the lower level optimality conditions and corresponding reformulation of the objective function.

Optimality condition. There is an optimal solution to (EP) that satisfies the following inequalities:

$$2 x_{ij}^r + a_{(o(r)k)} + a_{(d(r)l)} \leq 2 \text{ for all } r \in R, (i, j) \in A^r, k, l \in K \text{ such that } \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} + \bar{c}_{d(r)j}^{rl} + c_{ij}^r \geq b^r.$$

We notice that the explicit path MILP formulation for MCFOD_F is given by model (13), where p_i^r and q_i^r are fixed to their given values.

5.2 Reducing the number of 4-index variables

Since f and t variables used in (EP) involve four indices, next we develop alternative formulations with fewer first and third leg decision variables.

5.2.1 Explicit Flow formulation

We replace the original f and t variables while still modelling the carriers' decisions by considering the following continuous cost variables for the first and third travel legs:

- $\mathcal{F}_i^r \geq 0$, $r \in R$, $i \in H$, the cost of routing the first leg of commodity r through hub i .
- $\mathcal{T}_i^r \geq 0$, $r \in R$, $i \in H$, the cost of routing the third leg of commodity r through hub i .

The resulting Explicit Flow (EF) formulation is:

$$(EF) \quad \max \sum_{r \in R} b^r s^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} c_{ij}^r x_{ij}^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{i \in H} (\mathcal{F}_i^r + \mathcal{T}_i^r) \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \leq 1 \quad i \in V \setminus H \quad (22b)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \leq \sum_{k \in K} a_{o(r)k} \quad i \in H, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (22c)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \leq \sum_{k \in K} a_{d(r)k} \quad j \in H, r \in R : d(r) \notin H \quad (22d)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_i^r \geq \sum_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} a_{o(r)k} - M_{ir}^F (1 - \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r) \quad i \in H, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (22e)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_i^r \geq \sum_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} a_{d(r)k} - M_{ir}^T (1 - \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r) \quad i \in H, r \in R : d(r) \notin H \quad (22f)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r = s^r \quad r \in R \quad (22g)$$

$$s^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R \quad (22h)$$

$$x_{ij}^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R, (i, j) \in A^r \quad (22i)$$

$$a_{ik} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in V \setminus H, k \in K \quad (22j)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_i^r, \mathcal{T}_i^r \geq 0 \quad i \in H, r \in R. \quad (22k)$$

The objective function has been updated to include the total overall profit and the routing costs of the first and third legs, which are now adjusted by subtracting the new cost variables \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{T} .

Similarly to previous Constraints (21c)–(21d), Constraints (22c) and (22d) indicate that, to route a commodity, there must be a carrier allocated to its origin and/or destination in case both/any of them are non-hub nodes. Constraints (22e) restrict the minimum value of the first leg fee. Given that nodes can only be allocated at most to one carrier, the right hand side coefficient considers that, if the origin of a commodity r is not a hub and it is served through interhub arc (i, j) , then the value of the fee for the the first leg must be the carrier's reservation price for connecting $o(r)$ to i . Similarly, Constraints (22f) provide the lower bound value for the cost of the third leg.

The big- M coefficients used are $M_{ir}^F = \max_{k \in K} \left\{ \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \right\}$ for each node $i \in H$ and commodity $r \in R$ in the context of constraint (22e), and $M_{ir}^T = \max_{k \in K} \left\{ \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \right\}$ for each node $i \in H$ and commodity $r \in R$ in the context of Constraints (22f).

5.2.2 Implicit-Flows formulation

We introduce an aggregated variant of the previous formulation that redefines the cost variables \mathcal{F}_i^r and \mathcal{T}_i^r for all potential origins/destinations of the first and third legs of commodity $r \in R$. These newly defined variables are denoted as $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^r$ and $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^r$. The model (*IF*) is obtained from (*EF*) by replacing Constraints (22e) and (22f) with the following ones:

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}^r \geq \sum_{i \in H} \overline{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r - M_{rk}^F (1 - a_{o(r)k}) \quad k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (23a)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}^r \geq \sum_{i \in H} \overline{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r - M_{rk}^T (1 - a_{d(r)k}) \quad k \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (23b)$$

The new big- M coefficients used are $M_{rk}^F = \max_{i \in H} \left\{ \overline{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \right\}$ for each commodity $r \in R$ and carrier $k \in K$ for Constraints (23a), and $M_{rk}^T = \max_{i \in H} \left\{ \overline{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \right\}$ for each commodity $r \in R$ and carrier $k \in K$ for Constraints (23b). The corresponding term in the objective function is replaced with: $-\sum_{r \in R} (\overline{\mathcal{F}}^r + \overline{\mathcal{T}}^r)$.

5.2.3 Removing big- M coefficients

To accurately model first and third leg outsourcing fees in (*EF*) and (*IF*), we further exploit conditions that must hold when routing a commodity $r \in R$ whose origin and/or destination is a non-hub node. If $\sum_{i \in H \setminus o(r)} x_{ij}^r = 1$ and $a_{o(r)k} = 1$, then the first leg outsourcing fee for r must be $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^r \geq \overline{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}$. Similarly, for the third leg, if $\sum_{j \in H \setminus d(r)} x_{ji}^r = 1$ and $a_{d(r)k} = 1$, then $\overline{\mathcal{T}}^r \geq \overline{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}$.

To represent these conditions for (*EF*), we can replace (22e) and (22f) with the following constraints:

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i^r \geq \overline{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r + a_{o(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in H, k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (24a)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_i^r \geq \overline{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \left(\sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r + a_{d(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in H, k \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (24b)$$

For (*IF*), constraints (23a) and (23b) can be replaced with the following ones:

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}^r \geq \overline{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r + a_{o(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in H, k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (25a)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}^r \geq \overline{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \left(\sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r + a_{d(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in H, k \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (25b)$$

5.3 Adapting (*EP*), (*EF*), and (*IF*) to MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$

Next we explain how to adapt formulations (*EP*), (*EF*), and (*IF*) for MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$. The adaptations for MCFOD_F will be referred to as (*EP_F*), (*EF_F*), and (*IF_F*), respectively. For $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ they will be referred to as (*rEP_F*), (*rEF_F*), and (*rIF_F*), respectively.

Formulations (EP_F) and (rEP_F). Formulation (EP) can be easily adapted to $MCFOD_F$, by considering the objective function (13a) with the given outsourcing fees $\bar{p}_i^r, \bar{q}_i^r, i \in H, r \in R$, and adding the Constraints (14) (note that the coefficients $[\max_{i \in H} \rho_i^{rk}]^+$ and $[\max_{i \in H} \gamma_i^{rk}]^+$ are now constants). When dealing with $rMCFOD_F$, the Constraints (14) should be substituted by their relaxed counterpart (15).

Formulations (EF_F) and (rEF_F). In order to adapt (EF) for $MCFOD_F$, we note that when the outsourcing fees are given, then \mathcal{F}_i^r will take the value p_i^r , provided that the first leg of commodity r is routed through hub i . Similarly, \mathcal{T}_i^r will take the value q_i^r , provided that the third leg of commodity r is routed through hub i . However, the constraints

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_i^r \geq p_i^r \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \quad i \in H, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (26a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}_i^r \geq q_i^r \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r \quad i \in H, r \in R : d(r) \notin H, \quad (26b)$$

are not enough to guarantee that feasible solutions correspond to optimal carriers decisions. Indeed, when the outsourcing fees are given, optimal carriers responses require that the first leg of a commodity served by carrier $k \in K$ is routed through some node $i \in I_k(r, p)$ and the third leg of a served commodity served by carrier $k \in K$ is routed through some node $i \in J_k(r, q)$. Note that such a choice of the *connecting hub* vertices already guarantees that $\mathcal{F}_i^r \geq p_i^r \geq \bar{c}_i^{rk}$ and $\mathcal{T}_i^r \geq q_i^r \geq \bar{c}_i^{rk}$. Hence, for (EF_F) in formulation (22) we substitute Constraints (22e)-(22f) by

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_i^r \geq p_i^r \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r + a_{o(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in I_k(r, p), k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (27a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}_i^r \geq q_i^r \left(\sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r + a_{d(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in J_k(r, q), k \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H, \quad (27b)$$

whereas for (rEF_F) it is enough to consider Constraints (26a)-(26b) instead.

Note that (27a)-(27b) are, in fact a re-statement of Constraints (24a)-(24b) for the case of fixed fees which, in addition, guarantee the optimality of the carriers' responses.

Formulations (IF_F) and (rIF_F). In order to adapt (IF) for $MCFOD_F$, we proceed quite similarly to the case of (EF). Now we observe that when the outsourcing fees are given, then $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^r$ will take the value $\sum_{i \in H} p_i^r \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r$ and $\bar{\mathcal{T}}^r$ will take the value $\sum_{i \in H} q_i^r \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r$, independently of the carriers to which $o(r)$ and $d(r)$ are assigned, respectively. Now, the constraints

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}^r \geq \sum_{i \in H} p_i^r \sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r \quad r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (28a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}^r \geq \sum_{i \in H} q_i^r \sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r \quad r \in R : d(r) \notin H \quad (28b)$$

are not enough to ensure that the obtained solutions correspond to optimal carriers decisions. Arguments similar to the above ones lead to use the following sets of constraints in (IF_F):

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}^r \geq p_i^r \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in A^r} x_{ij}^r + a_{o(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in I_k(r, p), k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (29a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{T}}^r \geq q_i^r \left(\sum_{(j,i) \in A^r} x_{ji}^r + a_{d(r)k} - 1 \right) \quad i \in I_k(r, q), k \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (29b)$$

Similarly, for (rIF_F) it is enough to consider constraints (28a)-(28b) instead.

The reader may again appreciate that (29a)-(29b) are, in fact a re-statement of constraints (25a)-(25b) for the case of fixed fees which, in addition, guarantee the optimality of the carriers' responses.

5.4 Implicit Paths (*IP*) formulation

We now provide alternative single-level reformulations for MCFOD and MCFOD_F based on Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, respectively. That is, we model the problems after preprocessing the routing costs. We use decision variables associated with potential implicit paths for serving the commodities, with preprocessed routing costs C_{kl}^r and \widehat{C}_{kl}^r , as indicated in (18) and (19), respectively. In addition to the service and allocation variables used in the bilevel formulation (8), s , a , respectively, we define binary decision variables π_{kl}^r , $r \in R$, $k, l \in K$, which take the value one if and only if first and third legs of commodity $r \in R$ are "served" by carriers $k, l \in K$, respectively. Then, the formulation for MCFOD is:

$$(IP) \quad \max \sum_{r \in R} b^r s^r - \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{k, l \in K} C_{kl}^r \pi_{kl}^r \quad (30a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \leq 1 \quad i \in V \setminus H \quad (30b)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in K \\ l \in K}} \pi_{kl}^r = s^r \quad r \in R \quad (30c)$$

$$\sum_{l \in K} \pi_{kl}^r \leq a_{o(r)k} \quad k \in K, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (30d)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} \pi_{kl}^r \leq a_{d(r)l} \quad l \in K, r \in R : d(r) \notin H \quad (30e)$$

$$\pi_{kl}^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad k \in K, l \in K, r \in R \quad (30f)$$

$$s^r \in \{0, 1\} \quad r \in R \quad (30g)$$

$$a_{ik} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in V \setminus H, k \in K, \quad (30h)$$

where constraints (30b) model the allocation decision to non-hub nodes by the leader. To serve a commodity, Constraints (30c) indicate that routing costs must be incurred. For commodities whose origin are non-hub nodes, Constraints (30d) imply that a carrier must be allocated to the origin node if the commodity is to be served. Analogously, Constraints (30e) apply the same functionality for commodities with non-hub destination nodes. One could easily remove variables s from the model, but we prefer to keep them.

To obtain a valid formulation for MCFOD_F, the cost coefficients in the objective function must be set to \widehat{C}_{kl}^r as defined in (19). The resulting formulation will be referred to as (IP_F) . Formulation (IP) can also be easily adapted to r MCFOD_F by using cost coefficients \widetilde{C}_{kl}^r , as defined in (20).

6 Computational Results

In this section we report results from computational experiments with benchmark instances adapted from the hub location literature. The main purpose of this computational study is to: 1) empirically evaluate the computational performance and scalability of the proposed models and formulations;

and 2) derive some managerial insights concerning the sensitivity of decisions for MCFOD and MCFOD_F.

Experiments have been performed on a PC equipped with a Ryzen 7 5700G CPU and 32Gb of RAM. Models have been implemented in Python 3.11 and solved with Gurobi 10.0.1. To provide reproducible results, we set Gurobi’s *Threads* parameter to 1 and turned off the *Presolve* option.

6.1 Datasets, testing methodology, and parameter computing

For the computational experiments we have used benchmark instances generated from two well-known datasets from the hub location literature:

- The Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) dataset, contains data from 100 cities in the United States of America [see O’kelly, 1987]. It provides symmetric commodities demands, w^r and unit arc costs \hat{c}_{ij} . Instances have been generated from this data set with a number of nodes $|V| \in \{20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70\}$. For every instance size $n = |V|$ ten subsets of n nodes have been randomly selected from the original data set, and their associated data adopted. For each subset of nodes we have obtained two instances, one for every number of carriers $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$. In total, we have generated 120 CAB instances.
- The Australian Post (AP) dataset, first published by Ernst and Krishnamoorthy [1996], contains data from 200 nodes with non-integer asymmetric demands for the commodities w^r and unit arc costs \hat{c}_{ij} . In these instances self flows $w_{ii} \neq 0, i \in V$. Still, we ignore them since we assume that $o(r) \neq d(r), r \in R$. Instances from this data set with a number of nodes $n \in \{100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200\}$ have been generated. For every instance size $n \neq 200$, ten subsets of n nodes have been randomly selected from the original data set and their associated data adopted. One single set with all the nodes of the original data set is considered for $n = 200$. For each subset of nodes we have obtained two instances, one for every number of carriers $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. In total, we have generated 153 AP instances.

The parameters $n, |K|$, and $|H|$, are displayed in the first column of Tables 5-6.

Appendix A-2 gives the details on how we have generated the additional data that was not included in the original instances: *i*) set of hubs, *ii*) routing costs and reservation prices, *iii*) commodities revenues, and *iv*) outsourcing first and third leg fees for MCFOD_F and r MCFOD_F.

For all the experiments the time limit was set to 600 seconds for the smaller CAB instances and to 3600 seconds for the larger AP instances.

6.2 Comparison of formulations for MCFOD

Next we compare the computational performance of the formulations proposed for MCFOD: (*EP*), (*EF*), (*IF*) and (*IP*) with the 120 instances generated from the CAB data set as explained above.

First, we carried out some preliminary tests for finding out the best modeling and algorithmic settings for (EF) and (IF). Detailed explanations on the considered alternatives and their performance can be found in Appendix A-3. The best results were obtained with a *lazy-callback* strategy according to which violated Big- M constraints (22e)-(22f) (or (27a)-(27b) for the fixed fees versions) are dynamically added. Thus, this is the variant used for both (EF) and (IF) in the experiments reported in the remainder of this section.

Comparison of (EP), (EF), (IF) and (IP). Results are summarized in Table 5 where, for each tested formulation and group of instances, we show its runtime in seconds ($t(s)$), the amount of explored nodes in the enumeration tree ($Nodes$) and the percent optimality gap at termination ($GAP(\%)$). The rows of the table display average results over the ten instances of the corresponding dimensions.

Consistently, (IF) is the formulation performing worse, followed by (EF). (IF) reaches the time limit already for instances with $n = 30$ and $|K| = 3$. (EF) produces optimal solutions for all instances although, on average, more than four minutes are needed when $n = 70$. Therefore, we no longer consider (EF) or (IF), as they are significantly outperformed by (EP) as well as by (IP), both of which solve all instances without branching and within a few seconds, even for the largest CAB instances with $n = 70$ and $|K| = 4$.

The computing times of (EP) and (IP) are similar for small size instances of up to 30 nodes. Still, (IP) clearly outperforms (EP) as n and $|K|$ increase. This is due to the smaller number of variables and constraints required by (IP). For the largest instance referenced in Table 5, with $n = 70$ and $|K| = 4$, (EP) has 440,214 variables and 108,843 constraints, whereas (IP) has 72,261 variables and 44,170 constraints.

Table 5: Computational performance comparison for CAB[20-70] instances with $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$.

Instance $ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP)			(EF)			(IF)			(IP)		
	$t(s)$	Nodes	GAP(%)	$t(s)$	Nodes	GAP(%)	$t(s)$	Nodes	GAP(%)	$t(s)$	Nodes	GAP(%)
20.3.1	0.03	1	0.00	0.35	1	0.00	67.04	50485	0.00	0.01	1	0.00
20.4.1	0.03	1	0.00	0.51	1	0.00	244.50	137555	0.01	0.02	1	0.00
30.3.2	0.10	1	0.00	2.00	1	0.00	–	33854	0.25	0.03	1	0.00
30.4.2	0.11	1	0.00	2.02	1	0.00	–	33237	0.82	0.04	1	0.00
40.3.2	0.29	1	0.00	7.81	1	0.00	–	22599	0.67	0.06	1	0.00
40.4.2	0.32	1	0.00	8.21	1	0.00	–	18005	1.01	0.10	1	0.00
50.3.3	0.68	1	0.00	25.20	2	0.00	–	6157	0.76	0.10	1	0.00
50.4.3	0.74	1	0.00	30.78	7	0.00	–	3484	1.36	0.16	1	0.00
60.3.3	1.57	1	0.00	92.05	1	0.00	–	1796	1.51	0.16	1	0.00
60.4.3	1.83	1	0.00	87.15	5	0.00	–	1115	2.07	0.31	1	0.00
70.3.4	2.95	1	0.00	248.80	5	0.00	–	381	1.39	0.23	1	0.00
70.4.4	3.23	1	0.00	268.26	35	0.00	–	241	2.56	0.48	1	0.00

Time limit reached (–).

Scalability of (EP) and (IP). To test the scalability of (EP) and (IP), we use the 153 larger instances generated from the AP data set with $n \in [100, 200]$ and $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Table 6 reports computing times in seconds for each phase of the solution process: preprocessing (*Preprocess*), loading the model (*Loading*), and solving the respective MILP (*Runtime*). All instances are solved to optimality at the root node, so the number of nodes explored in the enumeration tree is not shown. Rows corresponding to instances with $n < 200$ display average values over the ten instances in the corresponding group, whereas the last three rows give results for the only instance with $n = 200$, for the different values of $|K|$.

Since the preprocessing phase of the two formulations is quite different, it is not surprising that the time consumed at this phase is quite different as well. The preprocessing of (EP) removes all infeasible and/or unnecessary *routing* variables x , f and t . Preprocessing (IP) involves computing the total routing cost C_{kl}^r for each commodity $r \in R$ and pair of carriers $k, l \in K$. For a fair comparison of formulations, we report the time needed for computing such costs, even if it depends on the data structures and not on the solver.

The loading phase includes the time needed for generating and loading the model. Note that

for both (EP) and (IP), loading times exceed solution times, which can be explained by the fact that both formulations use four-index variables and several families of constraints that involve three indices. Hence, the time needed to load the formulations increases very fast with the input size.

The results shown in Table 6 confirm the overall superiority of (IP), even if preprocessing times are larger and increase faster for (IP) than for (EP). Observe that, on average, the computing time needed to load and solve (IP) is 13 and 20 times smaller than that of (EP), respectively.

Table 6: Computing times of the different phases for solving (EP) and (IP) for AP[100-200] with $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$.

Instance $ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP)			(IP)		
	Preprocess (s)	Loading (s)	Runtime (s)	Preprocess (s)	Loading (s)	Runtime (s)
100.3.5	0.57	20.55	9.32	4.85	2.62	0.51
100.4.5	0.59	24.81	9.80	8.36	4.27	1.24
100.5.5	0.61	29.08	10.83	12.87	6.15	1.97
120.3.6	1.24	38.64	21.44	10.05	3.68	0.99
120.4.6	1.29	46.05	22.36	17.48	5.95	1.81
120.5.6	1.30	54.61	24.22	26.25	8.89	4.30
140.3.7	2.32	65.73	41.26	18.34	5.31	1.44
140.4.7	2.34	78.51	43.45	31.49	8.62	3.14
140.5.7	2.29	90.72	45.68	49.94	12.25	6.25
160.3.8	3.83	105.32	70.59	31.79	6.81	2.31
160.4.8	3.87	120.31	72.37	53.90	10.99	4.69
160.5.8	3.93	137.23	77.17	81.64	15.81	9.29
180.3.9	6.25	158.42	142.13	48.57	8.78	2.96
180.4.9	6.48	187.64	135.34	85.52	13.98	7.34
180.5.9	6.38	213.35	136.69	129.93	20.79	12.32
200.3.10	9.43	314.43	191.25	78.47	10.95	5.70
200.4.10	12.63	365.26	202.15	141.74	17.86	10.36
200.5.10	9.56	333.90	243.67	212.63	26.30	15.75

6.3 Comparison of formulations for $MCFOD_F$ and $rMCFOD_F$

First we compare the effect of the preprocessing on the formulations for the models with fixed outsourcing fees, $MCFOD_F$ and $rMCFOD_F$. For these experiments two different sets of fixed outsourcing fees for first and third legs have been generated for each instance, as explained in Appendix A-4. The first one considers as outsourcing fees the carriers maximum reservation prices, whereas the second one considers as outsourcing fees the average values over the reservation prices of all the carriers.

Table 11 of Appendix A-4 displays average percentages of the number of variables fixed in the preprocessing phase of (EP_F) and (IP_F). Since no noticeable differences have been observed when varying the number of carriers or when considering *maximum* or *average* outsourcing fees, for a given input size n , the average is computed over all the instances of size n for varying values of $|K|$ and the two considered alternatives of outsourcing fees. Disaggregated results are also shown in Tables 12– 13 of Appendix A-4.

As can be seen, for (EP_F) the preprocessing removes, on average, more than 90% of the routing variables x and about 50% of the first and third leg variables f and t , respectively. Note that, even if the percentage of fixed variables is high, the remaining formulation still has a considerable size.

For example, on the AP instance with 180 nodes and 4 carriers the remaining number of variables (s , x , f and t) is 691,360. The reduction in the number of x variables is aligned with the results reported in Alibeyg et al. [2018], where more than 85% routing variables are fixed in the preprocess of a prize-collecting hub location model.

Tables 14–15 of Appendix A-4 display results of the different formulations for MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ for the (preprocessed) benchmark instances from the CAB data set, using the *maximum* and *average* fixed outsourcing fees, respectively. We report runtimes in seconds, ($t(s)$), number of explored nodes ($Nodes$), and percent optimality gaps at termination (%GAP). Each row displays average values over the 10 instances with the corresponding number of nodes and carriers. Broadly speaking, the obtained results show again the superiority of implicit-path formulations over explicit-path formulations for both MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$.

As can be observed, the choice of the fixed outsourcing fees has a different impact on the difficulty for solving the selected formulation. In particular, for (rEP_F) the increase of computing times with the instance size remains very moderate for *maximum* outsourcing fees but is remarkable for *average* outsourcing fees. This is clearly related to the algorithmic burden for the separation of Constraints (27a)-(27b), which become redundant for *maximum* fees (any offer would be accepted by the carriers), but are dynamically separated for *average* outsourcing fees. Nevertheless, the effect of the outsourcing fee, is not so relevant for (EP_F), where notably fewer offers would be accepted by the carriers independently of the choice of outsourcing fees, so the separation of the inequalities has a minor impact on the overall performance of the formulation.

Instead, neither implicit path formulation is noticeably affected by the choice of outsourcing fees, even if a slight influence can be appreciated in the case of (rIP_F).

The joint effect of the above remarks is that, while all tested instances could be solved to proven optimality both with (EP_F) and (IP_F), the largest 70 node CAB instances could not be solved within the five minutes time limit by the worse performing formulation, (rEP_F), when *average* outsourcing fees are considered.

The above observations are also supported by the results on the larger instances from the AP data set with $n \in \{100, 120, 140, 160, 180, 200\}$ and $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, which are summarized in Tables 16–17 of Appendix A-4. For each tested formulation we include the computing times consumed in the preprocessing phase (*Prep.*), instance loading phase (*Load.*) and solution phase (*Run.*). The rows corresponding to instances with less than 200 nodes display average values over the ten instances in the corresponding group, whereas the last three rows give the results for the only instance with 200 nodes and the corresponding number of carriers. Note that for the largest instances with 200 nodes, the solver runs out of memory in the optimization phase of both (EP_F) and (rEP_F) (already when solving the linear programming relaxation) both with *maximum* and *average* outsourcing fees, whereas with both (IP_F) and (rIP_F) all the instances can be solved to proven optimality within the one hour time limit for both versions of the outsourcing fees.

Further insight on the scalability of the implicit-path formulations, which are the best performing ones, can be obtained by increasing the number carriers on the instances generated from the largest AP dataset. Table 7 displays computing times for instances with $n = 200$ nodes and a number of carriers $|K| \in \{6, 7, 8\}$. As can be observed, for both outsourcing fees variants, the preprocessing times of (rIP_F) are more than one order of magnitude higher than those of (IP_F), and the differences increase with the value of $|K|$. This is clearly due to the increase of the computational burden required to compute the coefficients \widehat{C}_{km}^r , which, for the largest instance with eight carriers, takes more than one hour.

Table 7: Time comparison for fixed outsourcing fees when considering (IP_F) and $|K| \in \{6, 7, 8\}$ on AP dataset with 200 nodes.

$ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(IP_F)						(rIP_F)					
	Average			Maximum			Average			Maximum		
	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.
200.6.10	186.13	35.69	3.14	306.85	35.82	2.72	1160.50	35.95	25.31	2491.58	35.73	9.29
200.7.10	273.30	47.66	4.43	409.89	47.85	3.81	1617.29	47.26	40.87	3389.77	48.02	13.52
200.8.10	525.58	60.01	7.49	526.06	60.41	5.20	2234.48	60.45	145.44	4424.94	60.69	17.72

6.4 Analysis of optimal solutions

In this section we analyze some characteristics of optimal solutions to MCFOD, MCFOD_F, and rMCFOD_F obtained with the best performing formulations, (IP) , (IP_F) , and (rIP_F) , respectively. For this analysis we have used 24 instances generated from the CAB dataset, with a number of nodes ranging in 30-100, and a number of carriers $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. These instances have been generated so they share the backbone network with the same 5 hub nodes. Moreover, when increasing the number of nodes, we ensure that the smaller instance is contained in the larger one, so the \hat{C}_{km}^r values corresponding to pairs of nodes of the smaller network remain unchanged.

Figure 2 depicts the number of served commodities for MCFOD and compares it with MCFOD_F for both *average* outsourcing fees (Figure 2(a), left) and *maximum* outsourcing fees (Figure 2(b), right). Both figures also depict the total number of commodities (which increases quadratically in n).

Indeed, the number of commodities served is always notably larger for MCFOD than for MCFOD_F. Even if, for both models, the number of served commodities increases with $|V|$, the increase on the number of served commodities is smaller than the increase on the number of commodities, resulting in an overall decrease of the service rate. Still, the service rate of MCFOD remains close to $\frac{1}{2}$ for all instance sizes, whereas it is considerably smaller for MCFOD_F with both *average* and *maximum* outsourcing fees.




Figure 2: Comparison between optimal MCFOD and MCFOD_F solutions on served commodities and commodity evolution for instances from the CAB dataset.

This decrease of the service rate can be better appreciated in Table 18 of the Appendix A-5, which displays the average percentage of served commodities in optimal solutions to (IP) , (IP_F) , and (rIP_F) . The row corresponding to each value of n shows average results over the three instances with n nodes and a number of carriers $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. As expected, the percentage of served commodities, is higher for MCFOD, where the leader chooses the best outsourcing fees, than for any of the models with fixed fees. Within the two models with fixed fees, the highest service rates are attained by the *relaxed* model where carriers accept any profitable offer. The service rates attained by $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ are only slightly smaller than those of MCFOD, but notably larger than those of MCFOD_F . Still, as n increases the percentage of served commodities decreases for all three models.

The choice of outsourcing fees affects differently MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$. For MCFOD_F , *average* outsourcing fees lead, on average, to a 9.7% service rate, outperforming the 7.2% average service rate obtained with *maximum* outsourcing fees. Very few offers are acceptable for the carriers with MCFOD_F for both types of outsourcing fees, but the cost for the leader of the accepted offers is cheaper when using *average* outsourcing fees. On the contrary, for $r\text{MCFOD}_F$, the *maximum* outsourcing fees produce an average service rate of around 40%, which is higher than the 38% obtained with the *average* outsourcing fees. This is natural since with $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ all *maximum* outsourcing fees offers are acceptable (profitable) for the carriers so the leader has a wider range of available options among which to decide.

We finally analyze the total profit produced by the different models. Figure 3 in the Appendix A-5 compares the net profit for optimal solutions to MCFOD, MCFOD_F , and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$. The figure shows that the highest profits are obtained with MCFOD, even if $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ compares very closely. The superiority of MCFOD is due to its flexibility, as it allows the leader to adapt the values of the outsourcing fees according to its own interest. The difference between MCFOD and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ is due, not only to the fact that in the former commodities may become profitable by decreasing the outsourcing fees, but also to the fact offers that in $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ are rejected by the carriers, may become acceptable for the carriers (and also for the leader) by increasing the outsourcing fees in MCFOD. This is also consistent with the results of Table 18, where it is shown that MCFOD always display the largest percentage of served commodities.

7 Conclusions

We have addressed a problem of routing a subset of commodities within an existing network so as to maximize the collected profit. Contrary to the standard setting in which a single agent controls all the decisions, we introduced a new problem in which interactions between several actors are modeled within a Stackelberg game. The major decision maker (the leader) selects a subset of commodities to serve, and also seeks to outsource the first- and the last-leg of these commodities to external carriers. These multiple independent carriers receive the outsourcing offers of the leader and decide whether to accept them or not, based on their individual profits. In this context, the leader makes critical decisions regarding carrier allocation to non-hub nodes and corresponding payments for outsourcing the service, while anticipating the optimal responses of the carriers. Initially, we formulated this problem as a bilevel MINLP model. Two additional problem settings were considered: one in which the leader only decides how to allocate carriers to non-hub nodes, whereas the outsourcing fees are fixed, and the other one in which the followers refuse the offer only if their resulting profit is negative. We showed that all considered problem variants are NP-hard and proposed several MILP formulations for solving them to optimality. In a computational study, we studied computational scalability of these formulations and compared them based on different criteria such as the number of

nodes explored, runtimes and gaps at termination. Among the formulations considered, the implicit path formulation, which simultaneously encodes allocation and routing decisions, exhibits the best computational performance. It requires a more computationally demanding preprocessing phase, but it allows to significantly reduce the size of the model, by removing non-profitable carrier-to-non-hub allocations.

Furthermore, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of the effects of various parameters on problem resolution and on the structure of the obtained solution, notably the profit of the leader and the service rate. The high reservation prices of the carriers tend to have a larger influence on runtimes when the number of available carriers and the number of nodes is larger, justifying a more complex decision for allocating the carriers and deciding the commodities to serve. Indeed, when these values increase, the overall service rate tends to decrease. The overall profit of the leader tends to decrease as the carriers apply a larger reservation price, meanwhile the carriers profit tends to increase. More importantly, our computational experiments indicate that including decisions about outsourcing fees can significantly improve service rates and the profit of the major firm, compared to the setting in which the outsourcing fees are regulated. Finally, we also investigated how the profit-maximizing vs. reservation-price-oriented strategies of the carriers affect the overall profit of the leader and the service rate. We observed that profit-maximizing carriers tend to reduce the overall service rate and profit of the leader as compared to reservation-price-oriented ones. This could be expected, since profit-maximizing carriers will accept fewer transportation offers, thus reducing the profitable alternatives for the leader.

As future work, we identify the following several relevant extensions of the MCFOD :

- Variations concerning the backbone network or the service mode of commodities, which may fit better some potential applications. These include single-allocation of origins/destinations, where all commodities with the same origin will be routed through the same hub node, as well as extensions that incorporate hub location decisions for the leader.
- Arc capacities. These could be considered both on hub arcs and on access/distribution arcs. Concerning the former, in the MCFP with arc capacities, the commodity flow may be split, and imposing the unsplitable flow already renders the problem NP-hard [Even et al., 1975]. Hence, assuming that the hub network is complete can no longer be done without loss of generality, and different bilevel models need to be considered. Capacity restrictions on access/distribution arcs, or hub or non-hub nodes will affect the optimality conditions of the carriers' subproblems, and would therefore lead to different problem formulations.
- Carriers' capacity or fairness constraints: Imposing a maximum service capacity on the carriers would no longer allow to consider each commodity and each carrier independently. Moreover, the regulatory authorities may force the leader to consider some additional fairness allocation constraints, by e.g., minimizing the gap between the maximum and minimum demand allocated to each carrier.
- Dealing with imperfect information: A common criticism in bilevel optimization is the assumption of perfect information. In our context, it may be very difficult for the leader to acquire full knowledge about the reservation prices of the carriers, or the demand, or the routing costs. To overcome these difficulties, one could exploit bilevel optimization under uncertainty [Beck et al., 2023], in which the leader has to set the optimal outsourcing fees and allocate non-hubs to carriers, while hedging against the uncertain parameters. Stochastic bilevel models would be considered in case the leader has knowledge about the distribution of uncertain parameters, otherwise, robust bilevel optimization [Beck et al., 2022] would be a model of choice.

All the above problem variants render the problem even more difficult, and we consider them worth exploring for future work. They would require the development of innovative solution algorithms to address large-scale instances effectively. It would also be interesting to explore extensions of the applied techniques (discretization and linearization) to other types of problems (e.g., in the context of last mile delivery).

References

- R. K. Ahuja, T. L. Magnanti, and J. B. Orlin. *Network flows: theory, algorithms and applications*. Prentice Hall, 1995.
- A. Alibeyg, I. Contreras, and E. Fernández. Hub network design problems with profits. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 96:40–59, 12 2016.
- A. Alibeyg, I. Contreras, and E. Fernández. Exact solution of hub network design problems with profits. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 266(1):57–71, 2018.
- R. Ausseil, J. A. Pazour, and M. W. Ulmer. Supplier menus for dynamic matching in peer-to-peer transportation platforms. *Transportation Science*, 56(5):1304–1326, 2022.
- M. Barbosa, J. P. Pedroso, and A. Viana. A data-driven compensation scheme for last-mile delivery with crowdsourcing. *Computers & Operations Research*, 150:106059, 2023.
- Y. Beck, I. Ljubić, and M. Schmidt. A brief introduction to robust bilevel optimization. *SIAG on Optimization Views and News. A Forum for the SIAM Activity Group on Optimization*, 30(2): 1–10, 2022.
- Y. Beck, I. Ljubić, and M. Schmidt. A survey on bilevel optimization under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 311(2):401–426, 2023.
- M. Cerulli, C. Archetti, E. Fernández, and I. Ljubić. A bilevel approach for compensation and routing decisions in last-mile delivery, 2023.
- M. Chouman, T. G. Crainic, and B. Gendron. Commodity representations and cut-set-based inequalities for multicommodity capacitated fixed-charge network design. *Transportation Science*, 51(2):650–667, 2017.
- E. Commission, D.-G. for Mobility, and Transport. *Study on employment and working conditions of aircrews in the EU internal aviation market: final report*. 2019. doi: 10.2832/37654.
- E. Commission, D.-G. for Mobility, and Transport. *Study on the economic developments of the EU air transport market: final report*. 2021. doi: 10.2832/561694.
- T. G. Crainic. Service network design in freight transportation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 122(2):272–2888, 2000.
- T. G. Crainic and G. Laporte. Planning models for freight transportation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 97(3):409–438, 1997.

- D. Delle Donne, L. Alfandari, C. Archetti, and I. Ljubić. Freight-on-transit for urban last-mile deliveries: A strategic planning approach. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 169: 53–81, 2023.
- S. Dempe. *Bilevel Optimization: Theory, Algorithms, Applications and a Bibliography*, pages 581–672. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020.
- D. J. Dimitriou. The evolution in transport operator’s corporate structure: Ownership and governance. In *Outsourcing and Offshoring*. IntechOpen, 2021.
- A. T. Ernst and M. Krishnamoorthy. Efficient algorithms for the uncapacitated single allocation p-hub median problem. *Location Science*, 4(3):139–154, 1996.
- S. Even, A. Itai, and A. Shamir. On the complexity of time table and multi-commodity flow problems. In *16th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (SFCS 1975)*, pages 184–193, 1975.
- K. Gdowska, A. Viana, and J. P. Pedroso. Stochastic last-mile delivery with crowdshipping. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 30:90–100, 2018. EURO Mini Conference on “Advances in Freight Transportation and Logistics”.
- B. Gendron. Revisiting lagrangian relaxation for network design. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 261:203–218, 2019.
- B. Gendron and L. E. N. Gouveia. Reformulations by discretization for piecewise linear integer multicommodity network flow problems. *Transportation Science*, 51(2):629–649, 2017.
- H. Greenberg. A quadratic assignment problem without column constraints. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 16(3):417–421, 1969.
- H. Hong, X. Li, D. He, Y. Zhang, and M. Wang. Crowdsourcing incentives for multi-hop urban parcel delivery network. *IEEE Access*, 7:26268–26277, 2019.
- H. Horner, J. Pazour, and J. E. Mitchell. Optimizing driver menus under stochastic selection behavior for ridesharing and crowdsourced delivery. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 153:102419, 2021.
- T. Kleinert, M. Labbé, I. Ljubić, and M. Schmidt. A survey on mixed-integer programming techniques in bilevel optimization. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 9:100007, 2021.
- R. Legault, J. Côté, and B. Gendron. A novel reformulation for the single-sink fixed-charge transportation problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 202(1):169–198, 2023.
- E. M. Loiola, N. M. M. de Abreu, P. O. Boaventura-Netto, P. Hahn, and T. Querido. A survey for the quadratic assignment problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 176(2):657–690, 2007.
- S. S. Mofidi and J. A. Pazour. When is it beneficial to provide freelance suppliers with choice? a hierarchical approach for peer-to-peer logistics platforms. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 126:1–23, 2019.

- M. E. O'Kelly. A quadratic integer program for the location of interacting hub facilities. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 32(3):393–404, 1987.
- G. Taherkhani and S. A. Alumur. Profit maximizing hub location problems. *Omega*, 86:1–15, 7 2019.
- G. Taherkhani, S. A. Alumur, and M. Hosseini. Benders decomposition for the profit maximizing capacitated hub location problem with multiple demand classes. *Transportation Science*, 54: 1446–1470, 11 2020.

A-1 Summary of notation

Table 8: General notation used.

Sets	V	Node set, $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$
	H	Hub nodes set, $H \subset V$.
	$V \setminus H$	Non-hub nodes set.
	A_H	Arcs of the backbone network, $\{(i, j) : i, j \in H\}$
	A	Arc set, $A_H \cup \{(i, j) : (i \in V \setminus H, j \in H) \text{ or } (i \in H, j \in V \setminus H)\}$
	R	Index set for commodities.
	A^r	Potential interhub connections for serving commodity $r \in R$
	K	Index set for carriers $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, K \}$
Additional data	$(o(r), d(r), w^r, b^r)$	Origin, destination, amount of demand and revenue of commodity $r \in R$
	\bar{c}_{ij}^{rk}	Reservation price of carrier $k \in K$ to serve commodity $r \in R$ through arc $(i, j) \in A$
	c_{ij}^r	Leader's routing cost for serving commodity $r \in R$ through interhub $(i, j) \in A_H$
	p_i^r	First leg outsourcing fee to serve commodity $r \in R$ through hub $i \in H$
	q_i^r	Third leg outsourcing fee to serve commodity $r \in R$ through hub $i \in H$

A-2 Data generation for benchmark instances

Below we describe how we have generated the data that was not included in the original benchmark CAB and AP instances.

Setting the set of hubs H . For every instance, the backbone network is established through the following steps. First, the number of hubs is set to $|H| = \lceil \tau |V| \rceil$, where we use the fraction $\tau = 0.05$. Then, the center of mass of the input graph is computed, based on the node positions and their respective total demand. Then, a radius is incrementally expanded around this center until the cumulative demand covered reaches a specified threshold μW , where $W = \sum_{r \in R} w^r$ and $\mu = 0.6$. Finally, the $|H|$ nodes with the highest total demand within the current coverage radius are designated as hubs, so A_H as well as $V \setminus H$ and the access/distribution arcs are well defined. The resulting number of hubs, together with the parameters n and $|K|$, are displayed in the first column of Table 5.

Setting the routing costs and reservation prices. The leader's routing cost of interhub arc $(i, j) \in A_H$ is set to $c_{ij}^r = w^r \alpha \hat{c}_{ij}$ where $\alpha = 0.5$ is an interhub discount factor. We set the carriers reservation prices based on their routing costs through access and distribution arcs. For this, for each non-hub node $i \in V \setminus H$ and carrier $k \in K$, a coefficient θ_{ki} is drawn from a uniform distribution $U[0.6, 1.2]$, which represents a perturbation associated with the allocation of origin i to carrier k . In addition, for each access/distribution arc $(i, j) \in A \setminus A_H$, a coefficient χ_{ij} is drawn from a uniform distribution $U[0.89, 0.99]$, which represents a perturbation associated with the connection between origin/destination node i and hub j . Then, for every commodity $r \in R$ the carriers' routing costs for access arc $(o(r), i)$ are set to $w^r \theta_{ko(r)} \chi_{o(r)i} \hat{c}_{o(r)i}$, $k \in K$, whereas the carriers' routing costs for distribution arc $(i, d(r))$ are set to $w^r \theta_{kd(r)} \chi_{id(r)} \hat{c}_{id(r)}$, $k \in K$. Finally, the reservation prices are set to

$$\bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} = w^r \theta_{ko(r)} \chi_{o(r)i} \hat{c}_{o(r)i} (1 + \epsilon), \quad \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} = w^r \theta_{kd(r)} \chi_{id(r)} \hat{c}_{id(r)} (1 + \epsilon),$$

where $\epsilon = 0.01$ indicates the profit margin for a carrier in order to accept the service.

Setting the revenues. Following Alibeyg et al. [2018], the revenues, b^r , $r \in R$, are generated as

$$b^r = w^r \varphi_r \sum_{(i,j) \in A_H} \frac{\Lambda_{ij}^r}{|A_H|},$$

where, $\Lambda_{ij}^r = \hat{c}_{o(r)i} + \alpha \hat{c}_{ij} + \hat{c}_{jd(r)}$ is the total unit routing cost of path $o(r) - i - j - d(r)$ relative to the original data set unit costs \hat{c}_{ij} , when applying a discount factor $\alpha = 0.5$ to the interhub arc, and φ_r is drawn from a uniform distribution $U[0.25, 0.35]$.

Setting the outsourcing fees for MCFOD_F. Two sets of fixed outsourcing fees for first and third legs have been generated for each instance. The first one considers the carriers maximum reservation prices, i.e.,

$$\bar{p}_i^r = \max_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk} \quad i \in H, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (31a)$$

$$\bar{q}_i^r = \max_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk} \quad i \in H, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (31b)$$

From the carriers' point of view, these offers would always produce some profit as their values are at least those of the reservation prices. Thus, this variant represents the worst-case scenario for the leader for MCFOD_F. The second set considers the average values over the reservation prices of all the carriers, i.e.,

$$\bar{p}_i^r = \frac{\sum_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{o(r)i}^{rk}}{|K|} \quad i \in H, r \in R : o(r) \notin H \quad (32a)$$

$$\bar{q}_i^r = \frac{\sum_{k \in K} \bar{c}_{id(r)}^{rk}}{|K|} \quad i \in H, r \in R : d(r) \notin H. \quad (32b)$$

This variant represents an intermediate scenario in which offers could be rejected by some carriers even if they could be profitable for the leader.

A-3 Best modeling and algorithmic settings for (EF) and (IF)

We first compared the variants of (EF) and (IF), which use the *BigM* constraints (22e) and (22f), respectively, against the *NoBigM* variants, which use (24a) and (24b), respectively. Each variant, was tested under three alternative algorithmic settings. The first one (*No-Lazy*) is to enumerate all of the constraints at the beginning; the second setting (*Lazy-Attr*) is to apply Gurobi's *lazy* attribute; and the third approach (*Lazy-Callback*) is to dynamically add violated constraints as lazy constraints using callbacks.

For both (EF) and (IF) there are two different families of constraints that can be applied. The *BigM* variant uses (22e) and (22f), whereas the *NoBigM* variant uses (24a) and (24b).

Table 9: Performance comparison for (EF) considering CAB[20-70] and $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$.

Dataset $ V , K $	Approach	BigM			NoBigM		
		t(s)	Nodes	GAP(%)	t(s)	Nodes	GAP(%)
20.3	No-Lazy	0.48	1	0.00	–	177129	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	176977	–			
	Lazy-Callback	0.35	1	0.00	–	400554	0.10
20.4	No-Lazy	0.51	1	0.00	–	185590	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	162302	–			
	Lazy-Callback	0.37	1	0.00	–	230196	0.20
30.3	No-Lazy	3.30	1	0.00	–	84574	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	84174	–			
	Lazy-Callback	2.00	1	0.00	–	36822	0.50
30.4	No-Lazy	4.49	7	0.00	–	81681	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	69691	–			
	Lazy-Callback	2.02	1	0.00	–	33314	0.63
40.3	No-Lazy	19.87	1	0.00	–	35454	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	26614	–			
	Lazy-Callback	7.81	1	0.00	–	6791	1.31
40.4	No-Lazy	30.03	14	0.00	–	41814	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	21009	–			
	Lazy-Callback	8.21	1	0.00	–	5937	1.80
50.3	No-Lazy	41.58	10	0.00	–	13882	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	6763	–			
	Lazy-Callback	25.20	2	0.00	–	3295	–
50.4	No-Lazy	62.62	64	0.00	–	17607	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	6823	–			
	Lazy-Callback	30.78	7	0.00	–	3704	–
60.3	No-Lazy	194.19	371	0.00	–	5208	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	1754	–			
	Lazy-Callback	92.05	1	0.00	–	2568	–
60.4	No-Lazy	273.44	272	0.00	–	6500	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	2136	–			
	Lazy-Callback	87.15	5	0.00	–	2122	–
70.3	No-Lazy	–	1	0.10	–	4384	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	1924	–			
	Lazy-Callback	248.80	5	0.00	–	1128	–
70.4	No-Lazy	–	1	0.17	–	3317	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	1655	–			
	Lazy-Callback	268.26	35	0.00	–	1128	–

–: Time limit reached or no feasible solution found.

Table 10: Performance comparison for (IF) considering CAB[20-70] and $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$.

Dataset $ V , K $	Approach	BigM			NoBigM		
		t(s)	Nodes	GAP(%)	t(s)	Nodes	GAP(%)
20.3	No-Lazy	67.04	50485	0.00	–	151244	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	126740	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	652558	0.11	–	450107	0.14
20.4	No-Lazy	244.50	137555	0.01	–	190940	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	146133	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	471470	0.44	–	322586	0.79
30.3	No-Lazy	–	33854	0.25	–	63200	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	56553	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	121391	0.41	–	54444	1.41
30.4	No-Lazy	–	33237	0.82	–	63200	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	68018	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	103822	1.04	–	36313	1.42
40.3	No-Lazy	–	15634	0.87	–	53648	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	40093	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	22599	0.67	–	6783	–
40.4	No-Lazy	–	11364	1.34	–	46875	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	46184	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	18005	1.01	–	7635	6.30
50.3	No-Lazy	–	4032	1.65	–	16583	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	6999	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	6157	0.76	–	4251	–
50.4	No-Lazy	–	3474	1.95	–	12381	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	9572	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	3484	1.36	–	5172	–
60.3	No-Lazy	–	1796	1.51	–	5507	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	2870	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	1712	1.71	–	1653	–
60.4	No-Lazy	–	1893	2.23	–	3261	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	3311	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	1115	2.07	–	1526	–
70.3	No-Lazy	–	381	1.39	–	2823	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	1481	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	325	56.09	–	1101	–
70.4	No-Lazy	–	241	2.56	–	2543	–
	Lazy-Attr.	–	1274	–			
	Lazy-Callback	–	98	43.95	–	1022	–

–: Time limit reached or no feasible solution found.

Tables 9-10 summarize the obtained results for the CAB instances for (EF) and (IF) , respectively. The tables have a block of three columns for each modeling variant ($BigM$, $NoBigM$). Columns $t(s)$ give computing times in seconds (or a dash when the maximum time limit was reached), columns $Nodes$ show the number of nodes explored in the enumeration tree, and columns $GAP\%$ the percent optimality gap at termination, calculated as $|\frac{UB-LB}{UB}| \times 100$. The rows of the tables display average results over the ten instances of the corresponding dimensions for the respective algorithmic approach. As can be seen, the best results are obtained with the $BigM$ variant when solved with the $Lazy-Callback$ strategy. Thus, this is the variant that is used for both (EF) and (IF) in the remainder of this paper.

A-4 Comparison of MCFOD $_F$ and r MCFOD $_F$ for *average* and *maximum* fixed outsourcing fees

Table 11 displays average percentages of the number of variables fixed in the preprocessing phase of (EP_F) and (IP_F) .

Table 11: Average percentage of preprocessed variables for MCFOD $_F$ and r MCFOD $_F$ with fixed outsourcing fees.

Dataset	$ V , H $	x variables			f variables			t variables			π variables		
		Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%
CAB	20.1	10000	1417	85.83	7000	4025	42.83	7000	4025	42.83	4818	877	83.71
	30.2	22500	2329	89.65	15750	9128	42.38	15750	9128	42.38	10459	1253	86.97
	40.2	40000	4884	87.79	28000	16370	41.83	28000	16370	41.83	18929	1752	90.80
	50.3	62500	6798	89.12	43750	25788	41.37	43750	25788	41.37	29043	2836	90.41
	60.3	90000	8804	90.22	63000	37530	40.73	63000	37530	40.73	42333	4866	88.59
	70.4	122500	10835	91.15	85750	51030	40.77	85750	51030	40.77	56920	7062	87.18
-----	100.5	250000	1221	99.51	200000	123233	39.07	200000	123233	39.07	155220	22857	85.30
AP	120.6	360000	1375	99.62	288000	179120	38.48	288000	179120	38.48	223282	33524	84.41
	140.7	490000	1549	99.68	392000	245653	38.01	392000	245653	38.01	303683	62491	79.71
	160.8	640000	1913	99.70	512000	320533	38.07	512000	320533	38.07	396424	71252	82.46
	180.9	810000	2081	99.74	648000	405540	38.09	648000	405540	38.09	501504	99156	79.75

Tables 12–13 show disaggregated results on the variables eliminated in (EP_F) and (IP_F) due to the preprocessing for fixed outsourcing fees used to compute Table 11.

Table 12: Number of preprocessed variables for MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ with maximum fixed outsourcing fees.

Dataset	$ V \cdot K $	x variables			$(EP) \ \& \ (rEP)$ f variables			t variables			(IP_F) π variables			(rIP_F) π variables		
		Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%
CAB	20.3	10000	1419	85.81	6000	3800	36.67	6000	3800	36.67	3512	510	85.48	3512	510	85.48
	20.4	10000	1420	85.80	8000	5700	28.75	8000	5700	28.75	6124	2156	64.79	6124	2156	64.79
	30.3	22500	2333	89.63	13500	8700	35.56	13500	8700	35.56	7622	1189	84.40	7622	2393	68.60
	30.4	22500	2334	89.63	18000	13050	27.50	18000	13050	27.50	13296	671	94.95	13296	3106	76.64
	40.3	40000	4899	87.75	24000	15600	35.00	24000	15600	35.00	13752	1246	90.94	13752	2006	85.41
	40.4	40000	4904	87.74	32000	23400	26.88	32000	23400	26.88	24106	2215	90.81	24106	3818	84.16
	50.3	62500	6818	89.09	37500	24500	34.67	37500	24500	34.67	21110	471	97.77	21110	4978	76.42
	50.4	62500	6825	89.08	50000	36750	26.50	50000	36750	26.50	36976	1035	97.20	36976	9617	73.99
	60.3	90000	8828	90.19	54000	35400	34.44	54000	35400	34.44	30720	974	96.83	30720	9191	70.08
	60.4	90000	8837	90.18	72000	53100	26.25	72000	53100	26.25	53946	1349	97.50	53946	17122	68.26
	70.3	122500	10864	91.13	73500	48300	34.29	73500	48300	34.29	41326	1091	97.36	41326	14848	64.07
	70.4	122500	10875	91.12	98000	72450	26.07	98000	72450	26.07	72514	2531	96.51	72514	17229	76.24
	100.3	250000	1200	99.52	150000	99000	34.00	150000	99000	34.00	84840	3359	96.04	84840	25136	70.37
	100.4	250000	1196	99.52	200000	148500	25.75	200000	148500	25.75	149200	4612	96.91	149200	46780	68.65
100.5	250000	1195	99.52	250000	198000	20.80	250000	198000	20.80	231620	9210	96.02	231620	64610	72.11	
120.3	360000	1351	99.62	216000	142800	33.89	216000	142800	33.89	121992	6251	94.88	121992	42543	65.13	
120.4	360000	1346	99.63	288000	214200	25.63	288000	214200	25.63	214614	5311	97.53	214614	63918	70.22	
120.5	360000	1344	99.63	360000	285600	20.67	360000	285600	20.67	333240	14130	95.76	333240	87150	73.85	
140.3	490000	1523	99.69	294000	194600	33.81	294000	194600	33.81	165872	7697	95.36	165872	65526	60.50	
140.4	490000	1515	99.69	392000	291900	25.54	392000	291900	25.54	291886	11507	96.06	291886	113706	61.04	
140.5	490000	1513	99.69	490000	389200	20.57	490000	389200	20.57	453292	20215	95.54	453292	188417	58.43	
160.3	640000	1884	99.71	384000	254400	33.75	384000	254400	33.75	216480	6254	97.11	216480	76451	64.68	
160.4	640000	1868	99.71	512000	381600	25.47	512000	381600	25.47	381016	8521	97.76	381016	123632	67.55	
160.5	640000	1861	99.71	640000	508800	20.50	640000	508800	20.50	591776	11065	98.13	591776	242826	58.97	
180.3	810000	2048	99.75	486000	322200	33.70	486000	322200	33.70	273816	8652	96.84	273816	121125	55.76	
180.4	810000	2032	99.75	648000	483300	25.42	648000	483300	25.42	482004	13700	97.16	482004	205400	57.39	
180.5	810000	2024	99.75	810000	644400	20.44	810000	644400	20.44	748692	22388	97.01	748692	278762	62.77	

Table 13: Number of preprocessed variables for MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ with average fixed outsourcing fees.

Dataset	$ V \cdot K $	x variables			$(EP) \ \& \ (rEP)$ f variables			t variables			(IP_F) π variables			(rIP_F) π variables		
		Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%	Initial	Remaining	%
CAB	20.3	10000	1415	85.85	6000	2780	53.67	6000	2780	53.67	3512	143	95.93	3512	143	95.93
	20.4	10000	1415	85.85	8000	3820	52.25	8000	3820	52.25	6124	697	88.62	6124	697	88.62
	30.3	22500	2325	89.67	13500	6240	53.78	13500	6240	53.78	7622	659	91.35	7622	911	88.05
	30.4	22500	2324	89.67	18000	8520	52.67	18000	8520	52.67	13296	289	97.83	13296	806	93.94
	40.3	40000	4868	87.83	24000	11320	52.83	24000	11320	52.83	13752	747	94.57	13752	953	93.07
	40.4	40000	4865	87.84	32000	15160	52.63	32000	15160	52.63	24106	1341	94.44	24106	1691	92.99
	50.3	62500	6776	89.16	37500	17850	52.40	37500	17850	52.40	21110	408	98.07	21110	1695	91.97
	50.4	62500	6772	89.16	50000	24050	51.90	50000	24050	51.90	36976	876	97.63	36976	3606	90.25
	60.3	90000	8777	90.25	54000	26340	51.22	54000	26340	51.22	30720	648	97.89	30720	2821	90.82
	60.4	90000	8773	90.25	72000	35280	51.00	72000	35280	51.00	53946	1237	97.71	53946	5584	89.65
	70.3	122500	10802	91.18	73500	35910	51.14	73500	35910	51.14	41326	1187	97.13	41326	6573	84.09
	70.4	122500	10800	91.18	98000	47460	51.57	98000	47460	51.57	72514	3331	95.41	72514	9703	86.62
	100.3	250000	1245	99.50	150000	69700	53.53	150000	69700	53.53	84840	4013	95.27	84840	16162	80.95
	100.4	250000	1241	99.50	200000	99700	50.15	200000	99700	50.15	149200	7494	94.98	149200	31624	78.80
100.5	250000	1247	99.50	250000	124500	50.20	250000	124500	50.20	231620	14295	93.83	231620	46983	79.72	
120.3	360000	1404	99.61	216000	103080	52.28	216000	103080	52.28	121992	7874	93.55	121992	31171	74.45	
120.4	360000	1400	99.61	288000	146520	49.13	288000	146520	49.13	214614	9027	95.79	214614	46804	78.19	
120.5	360000	1405	99.61	360000	182520	49.30	360000	182520	49.30	333240	18274	94.52	333240	69839	79.04	
140.3	490000	1583	99.68	294000	142380	51.57	294000	142380	51.57	165872	7609	95.41	165872	48634	70.68	
140.4	490000	1576	99.68	392000	204260	47.89	392000	204260	47.89	291886	19589	93.29	291886	88901	69.54	
140.5	490000	1582	99.68	490000	251580	48.66	490000	251580	48.66	453292	26919	94.06	453292	151172	66.65	
160.3	640000	1958	99.69	384000	185600	51.67	384000	185600	51.67	216480	6307	97.09	216480	57672	73.36	
160.4	640000	1949	99.70	512000	265440	48.16	512000	265440	48.16	381016	15320	95.98	381016	98784	74.07	
160.5	640000	1955	99.69	640000	327360	48.85	640000	327360	48.85	591776	20612	96.52	591776	187575	68.30	
180.3	810000	2131	99.74	486000	235440	51.56	486000	235440	51.56	273816	8082	97.05	273816	95734	65.04	
180.4	810000	2123	99.74	648000	331200	48.89	648000	331200	48.89	482004	21289	95.58	482004	165891	65.58	
180.5	810000	2130	99.74	810000	416700	48.56	810000	416700	48.56	748692	30260	95.96	748692	218583	70.80	

Tables 14–15 display results of MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ for the (preprocessed) benchmark instances from the CAB dataset, using the *maximum* and *average* fixed outsourcing fees, respectively.

Table 14: Comparison of $MCFOD_F$ and $rMCFOD_F$ formulations on CAB[20-70] with $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$ with average fixed outsourcing fees.

$ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP_F)			(rEP_F)			(IP_F)			(rIP_F)		
	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP
20.3.1	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.12	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00
20.4.1	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.09	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00
30.3.2	0.09	1.0	0.00	0.57	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00
30.4.2	0.13	1.0	0.00	0.83	1.2	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.04	1.0	0.00
40.3.2	0.28	1.0	0.00	3.07	1.0	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.05	1.0	0.00
40.4.2	0.45	1.0	0.00	6.68	25.2	0.00	0.05	1.0	0.00	0.08	1.0	0.00
50.3.3	0.63	1.0	0.00	10.82	58.6	0.00	0.04	1.0	0.00	0.08	1.0	0.00
50.4.3	0.94	1.0	0.00	21.74	132.8	0.00	0.08	1.0	0.00	0.13	1.0	0.00
60.3.3	1.39	1.0	0.00	54.58	220.0	0.00	0.06	1.0	0.00	0.12	1.0	0.00
60.4.3	2.02	1.0	0.00	64.31	354.4	0.00	0.10	1.0	0.00	0.21	1.0	0.00
70.3.4	2.50	1.0	0.00	–	733.2	0.22	0.08	1.0	0.00	0.17	1.0	0.00
70.4.4	4.07	1.0	0.00	–	690.2	0.95	0.14	1.0	0.00	0.36	1.0	0.00

Table 15: Comparison of $MCFOD_F$ and $rMCFOD_F$ formulations on CAB[20-70] with $|K| \in \{3, 4\}$ with maximum fixed outsourcing fees.

$ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP_F)			(rEP_F)			(IP_F)			(rIP_F)		
	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP	t(s)	Nodes	GAP
20.3.1	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00
20.4.1	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.01	1.0	0.00
30.3.2	0.09	1.0	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00	0.02	1.0	0.00
30.4.2	0.13	1.0	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.04	1.0	0.00
40.3.2	0.28	1.0	0.00	0.07	1.0	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.00	0.04	1.0	0.00
40.4.2	0.46	1.0	0.00	0.08	1.0	0.00	0.05	1.0	0.00	0.07	1.0	0.00
50.3.3	0.70	1.0	0.00	0.14	1.0	0.00	0.04	1.0	0.00	0.07	1.0	0.00
50.4.3	1.10	1.0	0.00	0.17	1.0	0.00	0.07	1.0	0.00	0.12	1.0	0.00
60.3.3	1.56	1.0	0.00	0.28	1.0	0.00	0.05	1.0	0.00	0.11	1.0	0.00
60.4.3	2.35	1.0	0.00	0.33	1.0	0.00	0.10	1.0	0.00	0.18	1.0	0.00
70.3.4	3.00	1.0	0.00	0.47	1.0	0.00	0.08	1.0	0.00	0.15	1.0	0.00
70.4.4	4.81	1.0	0.00	0.55	1.0	0.00	0.13	1.0	0.00	0.32	1.0	0.00

Tables 16 -17 give the results on the larger instances from the AP data set. We report runtimes, in seconds, ($t(s)$), number of explored nodes ($Nodes$), and percent optimality gaps at termination (%GAP). The values displayed in each row are averages over the 10 instances with the corresponding number of nodes and carriers.

Table 16: Comparison of MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ on AP[100-200] with $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ with average fixed outsourcing fees.

$ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP)						(IP)					
	$SDOD_F$			$rSDOD_F$			$SDOD_F$			$rSDOD_F$		
	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.
100.3.5	29.39	77.00	6.26	29.45	71.50	152.49	13.74	2.55	0.15	69.58	2.54	0.36
100.4.5	34.05	88.86	9.50	34.24	81.84	—	33.98	4.13	0.34	129.75	4.13	0.97
100.5.5	38.67	100.63	12.99	38.58	90.64	—	33.40	6.06	0.44	188.67	6.01	1.61
120.3.6	43.03	148.23	13.90	42.85	137.75	—	14.50	3.78	0.22	42.23	3.69	0.54
120.4.6	49.58	169.75	19.43	49.59	156.01	—	31.82	6.12	0.50	78.32	6.19	1.30
120.5.6	58.10	189.60	29.92	58.46	171.87	—	36.73	9.04	0.84	114.00	9.10	2.16
140.3.7	59.61	256.28	26.90	59.84	240.77	—	23.30	5.30	0.33	77.24	5.27	0.96
140.4.7	70.94	290.38	35.97	71.40	267.80	—	51.80	8.47	0.77	145.72	8.60	2.41
140.5.7	84.70	320.05	57.66	85.01	294.41	—	57.15	12.60	1.11	213.67	12.60	4.56
160.3.8	82.59	423.94	45.66	83.16	397.52	—	33.67	7.13	0.43	132.37	7.12	1.41
160.4.8	102.69	476.20	64.66	102.69	436.70	—	78.96	11.45	1.04	251.59	11.31	3.55
160.5.8	122.39	529.62	110.33	122.71	478.08	—	82.01	17.03	1.37	360.29	16.99	7.50
180.3.9	147.48	660.11	129.65	146.56	625.00	—	46.55	8.99	0.54	211.10	9.18	2.14
180.4.9	164.66	738.98	177.13	165.47	673.10	—	112.77	14.43	1.35	392.49	14.40	5.85
180.5.9	201.36	807.43	210.13	199.61	731.78	—	116.41	21.54	1.99	572.64	21.18	10.21
200.3.10							60.04	10.86	0.57	308.86	11.22	2.83
200.4.10			Out of memory.				153.03	17.54	1.54	587.91	17.54	8.31
200.5.10							152.83	26.13	2.28	872.72	25.93	16.04

Table 17: Comparison of MCFOD_F and $r\text{MCFOD}_F$ on AP[100-200] with $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ with maximum fixed outsourcing fees.

$ V \cdot K \cdot H $	(EP_F)			(rEP_F)			(IP_F)			(rIP_F)		
	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.	Prep.	Load.	Run.
100.3.5	29.25	77.31	7.99	29.24	70.86	1.64	20.57	2.54	0.14	141.58	2.53	0.31
100.4.5	34.27	88.74	13.58	34.49	81.89	2.05	33.93	4.09	0.29	250.63	4.12	0.74
100.5.5	38.71	100.72	17.97	38.70	90.81	2.48	50.28	5.95	0.42	389.05	5.99	1.20
120.3.6	42.43	148.11	15.97	42.37	138.44	3.28	19.71	3.83	0.21	85.44	3.73	0.48
120.4.6	49.40	169.03	28.33	49.47	156.22	4.12	32.67	6.12	0.45	150.76	6.17	1.01
120.5.6	58.36	190.46	41.35	58.71	173.06	5.36	48.46	9.12	0.77	235.08	9.18	1.52
140.3.7	58.80	256.07	29.99	59.24	240.48	5.82	31.45	5.24	0.38	159.87	5.22	0.81
140.4.7	71.43	290.61	50.15	71.68	267.02	7.36	52.20	8.41	0.67	282.21	8.50	1.76
140.5.7	84.24	320.12	78.05	84.97	294.77	9.06	78.38	12.72	0.96	436.44	12.54	2.70
160.3.8	83.82	419.23	50.73	84.17	398.48	9.77	47.53	6.95	0.42	274.61	6.99	1.08
160.4.8	103.99	469.25	87.62	104.99	439.15	12.36	79.03	11.25	0.89	480.59	11.13	2.62
160.5.8	122.05	519.08	167.23	122.25	480.06	15.60	116.45	16.79	1.26	743.08	16.79	3.64
180.3.9	120.13	644.85	99.53	120.00	615.96	54.89	67.52	8.86	0.61	436.18	9.06	1.79
180.4.9	149.42	719.53	155.15	149.47	679.01	83.81	112.79	14.31	1.22	773.14	14.32	3.41
180.5.9	174.64	792.17	225.16	175.66	740.28	74.82	167.91	21.34	1.79	1197.13	21.25	5.24
200.3.10							90.78	10.83	0.61	641.81	10.81	2.26
200.4.10			Out of memory				153.22	17.61	1.45	1157.00	17.75	4.56
200.5.10							229.71	26.31	1.97	1820.99	25.91	6.81

A-5 Percentage of served commodities and net profit comparison

Table 18 displays the average percentage of served commodities in optimal solutions to (IP) , (IP_F) , and (rIP_F) . The row corresponding to each number of nodes (n) shows average results over the three instances with n nodes and varying number of carriers $|K| \in \{3, 4, 5\}$.

Table 18: Service level comparison among MCFOD, MCFOD $_F$, and rMCFOD $_F$ on CAB[30-100].

Instance	Average		Maximum		Optimal MCFOD (%)
	MCFOD $_F$ (%)	rMCFOD $_F$ (%)	MCFOD $_F$ (%)	rMCFOD $_F$ (%)	
30	13.86	41.38	11.60	42.96	44.00
40	12.88	43.37	10.15	44.98	46.37
50	11.00	42.84	8.19	44.65	46.91
60	9.18	39.98	6.31	41.97	44.06
70	8.21	37.22	5.63	39.98	41.97
80	8.63	37.08	5.97	39.76	41.64
90	7.19	31.39	5.05	33.77	35.45
100	6.81	32.59	4.92	35.50	37.19
Average	9.72	38.23	7.23	40.45	42.20

Figure 3 compares the net profit associated with for optimal solutions to MCFOD, MCFOD $_F$, and rMCFOD $_F$.




Figure 3: Average total profit comparison for CAB dataset