

The Strength of Fuel Refueling Location Problem Formulations

Nagisa Sugishita^{1*}, Margarida Carvalho¹ and Ribal Atallah²

^{1*}CIRRELT and Departement d'informatique et de recherche operationnel, Université de Montréal, 2920 Chemin de la Tour, Montréal, H3T 1N8, QC, Canada.

²Institut de Recherche d'Hydro-Quebec, 1800 Boulevard Lionel-Boulet, Varennes, J3X 1S1, QC, Canada.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): nagisa.sugishita@umontreal.ca;
Contributing authors: carvalho@iro.umontreal.ca;
atallah.ribal@hydroquebec.com;

Abstract

The Fuel Refueling Location Problem (FRLP) is a stylized model for determining the optimal siting of refueling stations for vehicles with limited travel ranges, such as hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and electric vehicles. This problem becomes particularly relevant when the goal is to facilitate long-distance travel using these vehicles. A variant of the FRLP, known as the Deviation Fuel Refueling Location Problem, accounts for the possibility that drivers may deviate from their preferred routes to ensure sufficient fuel or charging to complete their trips. While solution techniques based on various mathematical programming formulations have been thoroughly explored for these problems, there is a lack of theoretical insights into the relationships and strengths of these formulations. In this work, we study formulations of these problems used in the literature and compare their strengths in terms of linear programming relaxations. Furthermore, we explore approaches to tighten the formulations.

Keywords: Benders Decomposition, Branch-and-Cut, Integer Programming, Fuel Refueling Location Problems, Electric Vehicles

1 Introduction

The Fuel Refueling Location Problem (FRLP), introduced by Kuby and Lim [9], extends flow-capturing location models [6] to address the optimal siting of refueling facilities for vehicles with limited range. In the model by Kuby and Lim [9], each demand is associated with an origin, a destination and a flow volume, and is considered served if there are enough refueling facilities to ensure that the drivers can complete their journey with limited-range vehicles. The goal of the FRLP is to maximize the amount of served demands.

On the practical level, the growing popularity of hydrogen-powered vehicles and electric vehicles (EVs), as well as governmental incentives in some countries to support their adoption, underscores the relevance of the FRLP. Indeed, given the current insufficiency of refueling and charging infrastructure, it is critical to deploy these facilities effectively. In what follows, we use the EVs application to unify our terminology around the FRLP, referring to charging stations for refueling facilities and EVs for limited-range vehicles.

On the methodological side, the literature in the context of the FRLP mostly focuses on integer programming-based approaches. Kuby and Lim [9] present a mixed-integer programming formulation. However, it grows rapidly as the problem size increases. To overcome this limitation, Capar et al [3] develop a new formulation with superior scalability. Arslan and Karaşan [1] study the application of Benders decomposition based on this formulation to speed up the solution process. Kadri et al [7] extend the FRLP to handle a multi-stage stochastic setup and apply Benders decomposition. The approach is closely related to that of Arslan and Karaşan [1] and, in particular, the separation subproblem has the same structure.

The FRLP imposes the assumption that drivers strictly follow their predetermined (e.g., shortest) paths without deviation. However, in practice, drivers may deviate from their usual paths for a short distance if it is necessary to charge their EVs. To account for this deviation, Kim and Kuby [8] present an extension of the FRLP that incorporates the possibility of drivers deviating from their usual paths, the Deviation Fuel Refueling Location Problem. Yıldız et al [10] propose an improved version of the formulation of this FRLP variant using the technique proposed by Capar et al [3]. Arslan et al [2] and Göpfert and Bock [5] introduce another mixed-integer formulation and apply a Branch-and-Cut algorithm, which greatly outperforms previously proposed solution methods and successfully solves instances of practical sizes.

In the literature, there is another variant of the FRLP that seeks to minimize the number of charging stations while serving a predefined amount of demand (e.g., see [3, 5]). In this paper, we focus on the variant that maximizes the amount of served demand.

Finally, on the theoretical front, the comparative strength of the different FRLP formulations discussed above remains unexplored. In this paper, we are interested in this aspect, especially for the mixed-integer programs used by the state-of-the-art solution methods developed by Arslan et al [2] and Göpfert and Bock [5], which consider the extension of the FRLP to possible route deviations by the drivers. By gaining deeper insights into the underlying formulations, we aim to understand the

strong performance of these state-of-the-art solution methods. The contributions of this paper are as follows.

- We provide a straightforward method for deriving the formulation used by Arslan et al [2] and Göpfert and Bock [5]. Our approach is more flexible, allowing us to specify any set of paths as candidate routes that the drivers may use, whereas their methods are based on the assumption that drivers may use any path shorter than a predefined threshold.
- We study the strength of the aforementioned formulation by comparing it with that of Yıldız et al [10]. In particular, we show that the former formulation always provides a tighter linear programming (LP) relaxation and that the relative difference between the bounds given by the LP relaxations can be arbitrarily large.
- We introduce two families of valid inequalities to tighten the formulation of Arslan et al [2] and Göpfert and Bock [5] when the feasible region is defined by a simple budget constraint.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce necessary notations and present two formulations of the FRLP. Section 3 studies the strengths of the two formulations by comparing the LP relaxations. In Section 4, we present two approaches to tighten the formulation, assuming the feasible region is given by a simple budget (cardinality) constraint. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Formulations of FRLP

In this section, we present the notations used to define the FRLP, as well as two formulations of it.

Let $G = (N, A)$ be an undirected graph, where N is the set of nodes and A is the set of edges, and Q be a set of demands. Each demand $q \in Q$ is associated with an origin node, a destination node, a set R_q of paths in G between the origin and destination, and a flow volume f_q . Each demand $q \in Q$ represents a set of drivers who travel between the same origin and destination using any path in R_q . Since the travel range of a vehicle is limited, it may require charging the EV multiple times to complete the travel. Demand $q \in Q$ is considered served if there is at least one path in R_q that is traversable without running out of battery. We assume that the graph does not contain edges longer than the travel range of a vehicle and $R_q \neq \emptyset$ for each $q \in Q$. Note that we can remove excessively long edges or demands q with empty R_q without modifying the set of feasible solutions, which is defined later.

In [9], each demand is associated with a single shortest path, so for each $q \in Q$, R_q is a singleton consisting of the shortest path between the origin and the destination. In [8], the deviation of drivers is taken into account: for each $q \in Q$, R_q contains all the paths of lengths smaller than some threshold. In this study, we do not make assumptions on how R_q is obtained. Hence, our analysis is valid for both settings, i.e., the first FRLP proposed and the Deviation FRLP.

We consider the installation of charging stations in nodes of N . For each $j \in N$, we use the binary variable x_j to indicate the installation of a charging station at node

j . We write the set of feasible siting of charging stations as

$$X = \bar{X} \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\bar{X} = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]^{|N|} : Ax \leq a \right\}$$

denotes the LP relaxation of X . For example, X can model charging station locations that satisfy a budget constraint.

As discussed in [3], given a path and the travel range of a vehicle, one can construct a family $C \subset \mathcal{P}(N)$ of node sets such that the path is traversable with the vehicle if and only if $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1$ for all $S \in C$, where $\mathcal{P}(N)$ is the power set of N . Thus, for each $q \in Q$ and $r \in R_q$, we can find a family $C_r^{\text{disagg}} \subset \mathcal{P}(N)$ of node sets such that r is traversable if and only if $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1$ for all $S \in C_r^{\text{disagg}}$. Therefore, demand $q \in Q$ is served if and only if there exists $r \in R_q$ such that $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1$ for all $S \in C_r^{\text{disagg}}$. Thus, we can obtain the following formulation of the FRLP:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in X, z \in \{0, 1\}^{|R|}} \quad & \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{r \in R_q} f_q z_r \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{r \in R_q} z_r \leq 1, \quad \forall q \in Q, \\ & \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq z_r, \quad \forall q \in Q, r \in R_q, S \in C_r^{\text{disagg}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $R = \cup_{q \in Q} R_q$ and, for each $q \in Q$, the auxiliary variable z_r is 1 if path r is traversable and 0 otherwise. Formulation (2) is proposed in [10].

To derive an alternative formulation, let us look at another way to formulate the condition of demand $q \in Q$ being served. For $q \in Q$, let $C_q^{\text{agg}} = \{\cup_{r \in R_q} S_r : S_r \in C_r^{\text{disagg}}, r \in R_q\}$, i.e., an element of C_q^{agg} is the union of one S_r for each $r \in R$. The set C_q^{agg} has the following property, whose proof is given in Appendix A.1.

Lemma 1. *Demand $q \in Q$ is served if and only if $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1$ for all $S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$.*

Therefore, we obtain the second formulation

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in X, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|Q|}} \quad & \sum_{q \in Q} f_q y_q \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y_q, \quad \forall q \in Q, S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where y_q is 1 if demand $q \in Q$ is served, and 0 otherwise. This is the formulation used in [2, 5], although our reasoning to derive C_q^{agg} is different, allowing us to keep the set R_q general. Note that when R_q is a singleton for each $q \in Q$, formulations (2) and (3) coincide and are equivalent to the one used in [3].

Formulation (3) has fewer variables than formulation (2), but many constraints since

$$|C_q^{\text{agg}}| = \prod_{r \in R_q} |C_r^{\text{disagg}}|,$$

which grows rapidly as the number of paths in R_q increases. As shown below, some of the constraints are redundant. To facilitate the discussion, let us define

$$\bar{P}(C) = \left\{ (x, y) \in [0, 1]^{|N|+1} : \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y, \quad \forall S \in C \right\}$$

where $C \subset \mathcal{P}(N)$ is a family of node sets.

Proposition 2. *Let $C \subset \mathcal{P}(N)$ be a family of node sets and $C' \subset C$ be the family of minimal ones:*

$$C' = \{S' \in C : S = S' \vee S \not\subset S', \quad \forall S \in C\}.$$

The following statements hold:

1. *We have $\bar{P}(C) = \bar{P}(C')$.*
2. *Let $S \in C'$, then there exists $(x, y) \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1}$ such that $(x, y) \in \bar{P}(C \setminus \{S\}) \setminus \bar{P}(C)$.*
3. *Let $S \in C'$, then $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y_S$ is facet-defining for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}(C) \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$.*

The proof is given in Appendix A.2. In particular, Proposition 2 implies that, for $q \in Q$, we can drop the node sets from C_q^{agg} that are not minimal. However, dropping a minimal node set from C_q^{agg} may introduce extra integer points. For $q \in Q$, when R_q consists of a single, simple path, the polytope $\bar{P}(C_q^{\text{agg}})$ has the following property, which is proven in Appendix A.3.

Proposition 3. *Let $q \in Q$. Suppose R_q consists of a single, simple path. Then, $\bar{P}(C_q^{\text{agg}})$ is integral (i.e. all the vertexes of $\bar{P}(C_q^{\text{agg}})$ are integral).*

3 Strength of Formulations

In Section 2, two formulations of the FRLP were presented. In this section, we compare their strengths, in terms of the tightness of the bounds given by their LP relaxations.

To facilitate the discussion, we rewrite formulations (2) and (3). It can be shown that the optimal objective value of (2) is not affected if we relax the integrality constraints of z_r . Thus, we can rewrite formulation (2) as

$$\max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x), \tag{4}$$

where for each $q \in Q$ and $x \in [0, 1]^{|N|}$, we have ¹

$$v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) = \max_{z_q \in [0, 1]^{|R_q|}} \left\{ \sum_{r \in R_q} f_q z_{qr} : \sum_{r \in R_q} z_{qr} \leq 1, \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq z_{qr}, \forall r \in R_q, S \in C_r^{\text{disagg}} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Being the value function of an LP, v_q^{disagg} is concave for each $q \in Q$.

Similarly, it can be shown that the optimal objective value does not change if we relax the integrality constraint of y_q for $q \in Q$ in formulation (3). Therefore, we can rewrite formulation (3) as

$$\max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x), \quad (6)$$

where, for each $q \in Q$ and $x \in [0, 1]^{|N|}$, we have

$$v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = \max_{y_q \in [0, 1]} \left\{ f_q y_q : \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y_q, \forall S \in C_q^{\text{agg}} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Note that this is also a concave function.

For any $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}$ and $q \in Q$, we have

$$v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) = v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = \begin{cases} f_q & \text{if demand } q \text{ is served,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) = \max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x).$$

However, functions v_q^{disagg} and v_q^{agg} may not agree on $x \in \bar{X}$ (i.e. if x is fractional), and in particular, the LP relaxations of (2) and (3) may give different upper bounds

$$\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) \neq \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x).$$

In general, for each $q \in Q$, if we have a concave function v_q on $[0, 1]^{|N|}$ that agrees with v_q^{agg} on $\{0, 1\}^{|N|}$, we can replace v_q^{agg} with v_q without affecting the optimal objective value nor the structure of the problem:

$$\max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = \max_{x \in X} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q(x). \quad (8)$$

¹The vector $z_q \in [0, 1]^{|R_q|}$ in v_q^{disagg} is not the same as $z \in [0, 1]^{|R|}$ in (2), but both reflect the traversability of the corresponding paths.

Let us define

$$K_q = \left\{ v : v \text{ is a concave function on } [0, 1]^{|N|} \wedge v_q^{\text{agg}}(x') = v(x'), \quad \forall x' \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

We have $K_q \neq \emptyset$ since $v_q^{\text{agg}} \in K_q$. Now, let

$$v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) = \inf_{v \in K_q} \{v(x)\}.$$

Being the point-wise infimum of concave functions, v_q^{tight} is concave and thus $v_q^{\text{tight}} \in K_q$. The following Lemma gives an alternative definition of v_q^{tight} . The proof is given in Appendix A.4.

Lemma 4. *Let us denote $\{0, 1\}^{|N|} = \{\beta_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{|N|}\}$, that is, $\beta_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}$ for each i and $\beta_i \neq \beta_j$ for any $i \neq j$. Then, we have*

$$v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) = \max_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i v_q^{\text{agg}}(\beta_i) : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i \beta_i = x, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\}.$$

In particular, Lemma 4 implies that v_q^{tight} is polyhedral for any $q \in Q$.

The set K_q consists of concave functions that model the amount of served demand corresponding to $q \in Q$. The tightest function in K_q is v_q^{tight} in the sense that it gives the best continuous (LP) relaxations among K_q :

$$\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q(x), \quad \forall v_q \in K_q, q \in Q.$$

Now we are ready to state our first comparison result.

Proposition 5. *Let $q \in Q$ and $x \in [0, 1]^{|N|}$.*

1. *We have*

$$v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x).$$

2. *If R_q consists of a single path, we have*

$$v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x).$$

3. *If R_q consists of a single, simple path, we have*

$$v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) = v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x). \quad (10)$$

Proof.

1. The inequality $v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)$ follows from the definition, thus we will show $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x)$. If $v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) = f_q$, the inequality follows from $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq f_q$.

Thus, assume $v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) < f_q$. Let $z \in [0, 1]^{|R|}$ and $y_q \in [0, 1]$ be the solution of the LPs in (5) and (7). Since $v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) < f_q$, we have

$$\sum_{r \in R_q} z_{qr} < 1.$$

For each $r \in R_q$, there exists $S_{qr} \in C_q^{\text{disagg}}$ such that

$$\sum_{j \in S_{qr}} x_j = z_{qr},$$

since otherwise we can increase z_{qr} and improve the objective value. Now, let

$$S_q = \bigcup_{r \in R_q} S_{qr}.$$

We have

$$v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = f_q y_q \leq f_q \sum_{j \in S_q} x_j \leq f_q \sum_{r \in R_q} \sum_{j \in S_{qr}} x_j = f_q \sum_{r \in R_q} z_{qr} = v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x).$$

2. The equality follows from the definitions.
3. We have seen that $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x)$, so we will show $v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) = v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)$. Observe that

$$\text{subgraph}(v_q^{\text{agg}}) = \left\{ (x, \theta) \in [0, 1]^{|N|} \times \mathbb{R} : f_q \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq \theta, S \in C_q^{\text{agg}} \right\}.$$

Similar to Proposition 3 (see Appendix A.3), we can show that if R_q consists of a single, simple path, all the vertexes of $\text{subgraph}(v_q^{\text{agg}})$ are $\{(x, v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)) : x \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}\}$. Thus,

$$\text{subgraph}(v_q^{\text{agg}}) = \text{conv}\{(x, v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)) : x \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}\} + \{(0, r) : r \leq 0\}.$$

Lemma 4 implies that $\text{subgraph}(v_q^{\text{tight}})$ has the same set of vertexes and

$$\text{subgraph}(v_q^{\text{tight}}) = \text{conv}\{(x, v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)) : x \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}\} + \{(0, r) : r \leq 0\}.$$

Thus, $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = v_q^{\text{tight}}(x)$ for any $x \in [0, 1]^{|N|}$.

□

Proposition 5 implies that the LP relaxation of (2) gives a looser upper bound than that of (3). A natural question to ask is how large the difference between the two bounds can be. The answer depends on X . Here, we assume that X is given by a simple budget constraint.

Assumption 6. X is given by

$$X = \bar{X} \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\bar{X} = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]^{|N|} : \sum_{j \in N} x_j \leq b \right\}. \quad (12)$$

and b is a positive integer.

Proposition 7. Suppose Assumption 6 holds.

1. For any $\gamma > 0$, there exists an FRLP instance such that

$$\underbrace{\gamma \cdot \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)}_{\text{UB from LP relaxation of (3)}} \leq \underbrace{\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x)}_{\text{UB from LP relaxation of (2)}}.$$

2. For any $\gamma > 0$, there exists an FRLP instance such that

$$\underbrace{\gamma \cdot \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{tight}}(x)}_{\text{UB from LP relaxation with } v^{\text{tight}}} \leq \underbrace{\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x)}_{\text{UB from LP relaxation of (3)}}.$$

Proposition 7 states that the relative difference between the bounds given the LP relaxations of the three formulations can be arbitrarily large. The proof is given in Appendix A.5.

4 Tightening Formulations

For each $q \in Q$, any function $v_q \in K_q$ agrees with v_q^{disagg} over $\{0, 1\}^{|N|}$, thus the optimal solution does not change even if we replace v_q^{disagg} with v_q . Consequently, they can be seen as an alternative formulation of (4) and (6). It follows from Proposition 5 that (6) is tighter than (4) (equivalently, (3) is tighter than (2)), and in particular the tightest among K_q when R_q consists of a single, simple path for each $q \in Q$. However, the definition of K_q is restrictive in the sense that, if we have the knowledge of X , we can use

$$K'_q = \left\{ v : v \text{ is a concave function on } [0, 1]^{|N|} \wedge v_q^{\text{agg}}(x') = v(x'), \quad \forall x' \in X \right\}$$

as the set of candidate formulations. It can be shown that v_q^{agg} is not the tightest among those in K'_q .

To discuss more concretely, for $q \in Q$, let

$$\bar{P}_q^X = \left\{ (x, y) \in \bar{X} \times [0, 1] : \sum_{j \in N} x_j \geq y, \quad \forall S \in C_q^{\text{agg}} \right\}.$$

Note that $\bar{P}_q^X = \bar{P}(C_q^{\text{agg}}) \cap (\bar{X} \times [0, 1])$ and it is the projection of the feasible region of the LP relaxation of (3) onto (x, y_q) space. Proposition 3 states that $\bar{P}(C_q^{\text{agg}})$ is integral if R_q consists of a single, simple path. However, \bar{P}_q^X may not be integral. In other words, we may be able to tighten formulation (3) by tightening the existing constraints or adding valid inequalities. In the remainder, we focus on tightening formulation (3) using these two approaches since it is tighter than formulation (2).

Throughout this section, we make the following assumption, as well as Assumption 6.

Assumption 8. For each $q \in Q$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = f_q$.

Essentially, this assumption assumes that there is a feasible x with which demand $q \in Q$ can be served. Moreover, together with Assumption 6, Assumption 8 implies that $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$ is full-dimensional.

4.1 Tightening Constraints

The first approach to tighten formulation (3) is to tighten existing constraints in the formulation. Let

$$N_q = \left\{ j \in N : \exists x \in X \text{ s.t. } x_j = 1 \wedge \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1, \forall S \in C_q^{\text{agg}} \right\}.$$

Namely, N_q is the set of nodes where we can place a charging station while serving the demand q . Under Assumption 8, $S \cap N_q \neq \emptyset$ for any $S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$.

Proposition 9. Suppose Assumptions 6 and 8 hold. Let $q \in Q$ and $S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$. Then,

$$\sum_{j \in S \cap N_q} x_j \geq y_q \tag{13}$$

is valid for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$. Furthermore, if R_q consists of a single, simple path, and $S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$ is minimal, it is facet-defining for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$.

The proof is given in Appendix A.6.

4.2 Valid Inequalities

Next, we will derive a family of valid inequalities for \bar{P}_q^X . Let

$$M_q = \bigcup_{S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}} S$$

and $\bar{M}_q = N \setminus M_q$. The set of nodes \bar{M}_q does not interfere with the serving of demand q . Furthermore, let $w_q = \min_{x \in X} \{\|x\|_1 : v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) = f_q\}$ be the minimum number of charging stations required to serve demand q . When we serve demand q (i.e. $y_q = 1$), we can only place at most $b - w_q$ charging stations in \bar{M}_q . This simple observation gives the following, whose proof is given in Appendix A.7.

Proposition 10. *Suppose Assumptions 6 and 8 hold. Let T be any subset of \bar{M}_q such that $b - w_q + 1 \leq |T| \leq b - 1$. The following inequality is facet-defining for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$:*

$$\sum_{j \in T} x_j \leq b - w_q + (|T| - b + w_q)(1 - y_q). \quad (14)$$

Inequality (14) is quite special in that it concerns only x_j where $j \in T$ does not interfere with q in the sense that $j \notin M_q$. However, the number of possible choices of T grows rapidly as the number of nodes $|N|$ increases. In particular, Proposition 10 implies that the number of facets of $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$ is large.

5 Conclusions

We studied two formulations of the FRLP from the literature. In particular, we showed the formulation (3) used in the state-of-the-art algorithm is tighter than the other. Under an additional assumption (each demand is associated with a single, simple path), the formulation was the tightest among those that do not use the knowledge of the feasible region. This tightness of the formulation may partially explain the success of the state-of-the-art methods. We also briefly mentioned two ways to further tighten the formulation, under the assumption that the feasible region is a simple budget constraint. This revealed that the number of facets of the feasible region of the linear programming relaxation increases quickly as the problem size (the number of nodes and the size of the budget) grows.

Data Availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by Hydro-Québec, NSERC Collaborative Research and Development Grant CRDPJ 536757 - 19.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Appendix A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof of Lemma 1. Suppose that $q \in Q$ is served. Then, there exists $r' \in R_q$ such that

$$\sum_{j \in S'} x_j \geq 1, \quad \forall S' \in C_{r'}^{\text{disagg}}.$$

Let $S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$. By definition, we can write S as

$$S = \bigcup_{r \in R_q} S_r,$$

where $S_r \in C_r^{\text{disagg}}$ for each $r \in R_q$. It follows that

$$\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq \sum_{j \in S_{r'}} x_j \geq 1.$$

Next, suppose that $q \in Q$ is not served. For any $r \in R_q$, there exists $S'_r \in C_q^{\text{disagg}}$ such that

$$\sum_{j \in S'_r} x_j = 0.$$

Let

$$S' = \bigcup_{r \in R_q} S'_r.$$

Then, $S' \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$ and

$$\sum_{j \in S'} x_j \leq \sum_{r \in R_q} \sum_{j \in S_r} x_j = 0.$$

□

A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof of Proposition 2.

1. It is clear that $\bar{P}(C) \subset \bar{P}(C')$, so we will show $\bar{P}(C) \supset \bar{P}(C')$. To derive a contradiction, suppose that $\bar{P}(C) \not\supset \bar{P}(C')$ and let $(x, y) \in \bar{P}(C') \setminus \bar{P}(C)$. Since $(x, y) \in \bar{P}(C')$, $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and $0 \leq y \leq 1$. Furthermore, since $(x, y) \notin \bar{P}(C)$, there exists $S \in C$ such that $\sum_{j \in S} x_j < y$. However, we can find $S' \in C'$ such that $S' \subset S$, for which we have $\sum_{j \in S'} x_j \leq \sum_{j \in S} x_j < y$. This contradicts the assumption that $(x, y) \in \bar{P}(C')$. Thus, it follows that $\bar{P}(C) \supset \bar{P}(C')$.
2. Let S be any node set in C' . Define

$$x_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \in S, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for any $S' \in C \setminus \{S\}$, we have $S' \setminus S \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise S is not minimal and $S \notin C'$) and thus

$$\sum_{j \in S'} x_j \geq 1.$$

Therefore, $(x, 1) \in \bar{P}(C \setminus \{S\})$. However, since

$$\sum_{j \in S} x_j = 0,$$

we have $(x, 1) \notin \bar{P}(C)$.

3. Observe that $\text{conv}(\bar{P}(C) \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$ is full dimensional and that the inequality is valid for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}(C) \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|})$. The following set contains $|N| + 1$ affinely independent points that satisfy the inequality with equality:

$$\left\{ (0, 0) \right\} \cup \left\{ (e_j, 0) : j \in N \setminus S \right\} \cup \left\{ \left(e_j + \sum_{j' \in N \setminus S} e_{j'}, 1 \right) : j \in S \right\},$$

where $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|}$ is the j -th unit vector. Therefore, the given inequality is facet-defining. □

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Lemma 11. *Let $C \subset \mathcal{P}(N)$ be a family of node sets and (x^*, y^*) be a vertex of $\bar{P}(C)$. Then, we have $y^* \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. Let us rewrite the definition of polyhedron $\bar{P}(C)$ as

$$\bar{P}(C) = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|+1} : \begin{array}{ll} \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y, & S \in C, \\ x_j \geq 0, & j \in N, \\ x_j \leq 1, & j \in N, \\ a_j y \geq b_j, & j \in \{1, 2\} \end{array} \right\},$$

where $a = (1, -1)$ and $b = (0, -1)$. There are $|N| + 1$ inequalities that are active at (x^*, y^*) and whose coefficients are linearly independent. That is, we can find $I_1 \subset C$, $I_2, I_3 \subset N$ and $I_4 \subset \{1, 2\}$ such that $|I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3| + |I_4| = |N| + 1$ and (x^*, y^*) is a unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j \in S} x_j = y, & S \in I_1, \\ x_j = 0, & j \in I_2, \\ x_j = 1, & j \in I_3, \\ a_j y = b_j, & j \in I_4. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

If $1 \in I_4$, $y \geq 0$ is active at (x^*, y^*) and $y^* = 0$. Similarly, if $2 \in I_4$, $y \leq 1$ is active at (x^*, y^*) and $y^* = 1$. In the following, suppose that $I_4 = \emptyset$.

If $I_3 \cap S = \emptyset$ for any $S \in I_1$, then

$$x_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in I_3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad y = 0$$

is a solution to (A1). Since (x^*, y^*) is the unique solution to (A1), we have $y^* = 0$.

If there exists $S \in I_1$ such that $I_3 \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then

$$y^* = \sum_{j \in S} x_j^* \geq \sum_{j \in S \cap I_3} x_j^* = |S \cap I_3| \geq 1,$$

where we used the assumption that $\sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y$ and $x_j \leq 1$ for $j \in I_3$ are active at (x^*, y^*) . Since $(x^*, y^*) \in \bar{P}(C)$, we have $y^* \leq 1$. Therefore, $y^* = 1$. \square

Lemma 12. *Let $q \in Q$ and define*

$$U(C_q^{agg}) = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]^{|N|} : \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1, \quad \forall S \in C_q^{agg} \right\}.$$

If R_q contains a single, simple path, $U(C_q^{agg})$ is integral.

Proof. By relabeling the nodes N if necessary, we can assume that $N = \{1, 2, \dots, |N|\}$ and the path in R_q is $(1, 2, \dots, t)$. The argument of Capar et al [3] ensures that any $S \in C_q^{agg}$ is a set of consecutive integers. That is, if we write

$$U(C_q^{agg}) = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]^{|N|} : Bx \geq 1 \right\},$$

where $B \in \{0, 1\}^{|C_q^{agg}| \times |N|}$, 1s in each row of B occur in consecutive positions. It is known that B is totally unimodular [4]. It is straightforward to see that all vertexes of $U(C_q^{agg})$ are integral. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. Let us denote $\{0, 1\}^{|N|} = \{\beta_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{|N|}\}$ and the set of vertexes of a polyhedron P by $V(P)$. Then, Lemma 11 implies that

$$V(\bar{P}(C_q^{agg})) = \{(\beta_i, 0) : i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{|N|}\} \cup \{(x, 1) : x \in V(U(C_q^{agg}))\}.$$

Now invoke Lemma 12 to show that $V(U(C_q^{agg}))$ only contains integral points. \square

A.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof of Lemma 4. Let us write

$$v_q(x) = \max_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i v_q^{agg}(\beta_i) : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i \beta_i = x, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\},$$

where v_q is polyhedral and concave since it is the value function of an LP. Furthermore, $v_q(x) = v_q^{agg}(x)$ for any $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|N|}$. We show that for any $v'_q \in K_q$, we have $v_q \leq v'_q$, which implies that $v_q^{tight} = v_q$. Fix any $v'_q \in K_q$. To derive a contradiction, suppose there exists $x' \in [0, 1]^{|N|}$ such that $v_q(x') > v'_q(x')$. Let α' be the solution of the LP in the definition in v_q given $x = x'$. In particular, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha'_i \beta_i = x'.$$

We have

$$v'_q(x') < v_q(x') = \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha'_i v_q^{\text{agg}}(\beta_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha'_i v'_q(\beta_i),$$

contradicting the assumption that v'_q is concave. Therefore, we have $v_q \leq v'_q$. \square

A.5 Proof of Proposition 7

Proof of Proposition 7. 1. Let n be a positive integer such that

$$\gamma < \frac{n+1}{2}.$$

Consider the following graph $G = (N, A)$, where $N = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$ and

$$A = \{(1, j), (j, n+2) : j = 2, 3, \dots, n+1\} \cup \{(j, j+1) : j = n+2, n+3, \dots, 2n-1\}.$$

Suppose each edge is of length d , where d is the travel range. The graph is shown in Figure A1.




Fig. A1 Graph G where d is the travel range

Let $Q = \{1\}$, where the origin and the destination of the demand are 1 and $2n$, respectively, and R_1 contains all the $(1, 2n)$ -path of length nd :

$$R_1 = \{r_j := (1, j+1, n+2, n+3, \dots, 2n) : j = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Finally, suppose that

$$\bar{X} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : \sum_{j=1}^{2n} x_j \leq 2 \right\}.$$

On this instance, following the argument by Capar et al [3], for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$C_{r_j}^{\text{disagg}} = \left\{ \{1\}, \{j+1\}, \{n+2\}, \{n+3\}, \dots, \{2n\} \right\}.$$

That is, each path $r \in R_1$ is traversable if and only if all nodes in r have charging stations. Let

$$x'_j = \frac{1}{n}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n.$$

Note that $x' \in \bar{X}$. Since

$$z'_{1r} = \frac{1}{n}, \quad r \in R_1,$$

is feasible for the LP in the RHS of (5) for $x = x'$,

$$\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x) \geq v_1^{\text{disagg}}(x') \geq \sum_{r \in R_1} f_1 z'_{1r} = f_1.$$

Next, we will obtain a bound on v_1^{agg} . It is clear that

$$\{1\}, \{2, 3, \dots, n+1\}, \{n+2\}, \{n+3\}, \dots, \{2n\} \in C_1^{\text{agg}}.$$

Therefore, for any $x \in \bar{X}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{\text{agg}}(x) &= \max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \left\{ f_1 y_1 : \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq y_1, \quad \forall S \in C_1^{\text{agg}} \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \left\{ f_1 y_1 : x_1 \geq y_1, \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} x_j \geq y_1, x_{n+2} \geq y_1, x_{n+3} \geq y_1, \dots, x_{2n} \geq y_1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Sum up the constraints to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \left\{ f_1 y_1 : x_1 \geq y_1, \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} x_j \geq y_1, x_{n+2} \geq y_1, x_{n+3} \geq y_1, \dots, x_{2n} \geq y_1 \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \left\{ f_1 y_1 : \sum_{j=1}^{2n} x_j \geq (n+1)y_1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $x \in \bar{X}$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{2n} x_j \leq 2$. Therefore,

$$\max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \left\{ f_1 y_1 : \sum_{j=1}^{2n} x_j \geq (n+1)y_1 \right\} \leq \max_{y_1 \in [0,1]} \{ f_1 y_1 : 2 \geq (n+1)y_1 \} \leq \frac{2}{n+1} f_1.$$

By combining the above inequalities, we get

$$\max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq \frac{2}{n+1} f_1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\gamma \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq \frac{n+1}{2} \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x) \leq f_1 \leq \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{disagg}}(x).$$

2. Let $n \geq \max\{6\gamma, 2\}$ be an integer. Consider a graph $G = (N, A)$, where $N = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n+4\}$ and

$$A = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 2n+3), (2n+3, 2n+4)\} \cup \{(i, j) : 3 \leq i, j \leq 2n+2, i \neq j\}.$$

The edges 1-2 and $(2n+3)$ - $(2n+4)$ are of length $d - \delta$, edges 2-3 and 3 - $(2n+1)$ are of length 2δ and all the other edges are of length $(d - \delta)/n$, where $0 < \delta < 1/n^2$ and d is the travel range. The graph is illustrated in Figure A2.




Fig. A2 Graph G where $0 < \delta < 1/n^2$ and d is the travel range

Suppose that $Q = \{1\}$, where the origin and the destination of the demand are 1 and $2n+4$, respectively. Furthermore, assume that R_1 contains a single path $r = (1, 2, r', 2n+3, 2n+4)$, where r' is a path that starts and ends at 3 and contains all the permutations of $\{3, 4, \dots, 2n+2\}$. For example, in case of $n = 3$, we may have

$$r = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 7, \dots, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 9, 10).$$

We have

$$C_1^{\text{agg}} = \left\{ \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2n+3\}, \{2n+4\} \right\} \cup \left\{ S : S \subset \{3, 4, \dots, 2n+2\}, |S| = n \right\}.$$

Note that the demand is served if and only if

$$x_1 = x_2 = x_{n+3} = x_{n+4} = 1 \wedge \sum_{j=3}^{2n+2} x_j \geq n+1. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Now, let us consider \bar{X} given by a simple budget constraint

$$\bar{X} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : \sum_{j=1}^{2n+4} x_j \leq 6 \right\}.$$

It is straightforward to see that $v_1^{\text{agg}}(x') = f_1$ for

$$x'_j = \begin{cases} 1, & j \in \{1, 2, 2n+3, 2n+4\}, \\ 1/n, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will obtain a bound on $v_1^{\text{tight}}(x)$ for $x \in \bar{X}$. In the proof of Lemma 4, we showed that

$$v_1^{\text{tight}}(x) = \max_{\alpha} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i v_1^{\text{agg}}(\beta_i) : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i \beta_i = x, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\},$$

where $\{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{N}|} = \{\beta_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{N}|}\}$. Let I_1, I_2 be a partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, 2^{|\mathcal{N}|}\}$ such that

$$\|\beta_i\|_1 \leq n-1, \quad \forall i \in I_1, \quad \|\beta_i\|_1 \geq n, \quad \forall i \in I_2. \quad (\text{A3})$$

It follows from (A2) that

$$v_1^{\text{agg}}(\beta_i) = \begin{cases} 0, & i \in I_1, \\ f_1, & i \in I_2, \end{cases}$$

and thus, for $x \in \bar{X}$,

$$v_1^{\text{tight}}(x) = \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i \beta_i = x, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Now, we will obtain a bound by constructing relaxations. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{\text{tight}}(x) &= \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i \beta_i = x, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i \beta_i \right\|_1 = \|x\|_1, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\} \\ &= \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i \|\beta_i\|_1 = \|x\|_1, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|\mathcal{N}|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i \in I_1} \alpha_i \|\beta_i\|_1 + \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i \|\beta_i\|_1 = \|x\|_1, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\} \\
&\leq \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i \|\beta_i\|_1 \leq \|x\|_1, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\beta_i\|_1 \geq n$ for $i \in I_2$ and $\|x\|_1 \leq 6$ for $x \in \bar{X}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i \|\beta_i\|_1 \leq \|x\|_1, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\} \\
&\leq \max_{\alpha} \left\{ f_1 \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i : n \sum_{i \in I_2} \alpha_i \leq 6, \sum_{i=1}^{2^{|N|}} \alpha_i = 1, \alpha \geq 0 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that for $x \in \bar{X}$

$$v_1^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq \frac{6}{n} f_1.$$

Thus,

$$\gamma \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq \frac{n}{6} \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{tight}}(x) \leq f_1 = \max_{x \in \bar{X}} \sum_{q \in Q} v_q^{\text{agg}}(x).$$

□

A.6 Proof of Proposition 9

Proof of Proposition 9. By the definition of N_q , it follows immediately that (13) is valid for $\text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{|N|+1})$.

Assume that R_q consists of a single, simple path. Then, as we discussed in Proposition 3, we can assume that $N = \{1, 2, \dots, |N|\}$. Denote $C_q^{\text{agg}} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|C_q^{\text{agg}}|}\}$ so that for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, |C_q^{\text{agg}}|$,

$$\min S_i \leq \min S_{i+1}, \quad \max S_i \leq \max S_{i+1}.$$

Let $S' = \{j_1, j_1 + 1, \dots, j_2\} \in C_q^{\text{agg}}$ be any minimal node set.

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ x \in X : \sum_{j \in S} x_j \geq 1, \forall S \in C_q^{\text{agg}} \right\}.$$

By the definition of N_q , for each $j \in S' \cap N_q$, there exists $x^{(j)} \in G$ such that $x_j^{(j)} = 1$. Now, for each $j \in S \cap X$, define $x^{<j>} \in X$ by

$$x_{j'}^{<j>} = \begin{cases} x_{j'}^{(j)} & j' \leq j_1 - 2, \\ 1 & j' = j_1 - 1 \text{ and } \sum_{j'=j_1}^{j-1} x_{j'}^{(j)} \geq 1, \\ x_{j'}^{(j)} & j' = j_1 - 1 \text{ and } \sum_{j'=j_1}^{j-1} x_{j'}^{(j)} = 0, \\ 0 & j_1 \leq j' \leq j - 1, \\ 1 & j' = j, \\ 0 & j + 1 \leq j' \leq j_2, \\ x_{j'}^{(j)} & j' = j_2 + 1 \text{ and } \sum_{j'=j+1}^{j_2} x_{j'}^{(j)} = 0, \\ 1 & j' = j_2 + 1 \text{ and } \sum_{j'=j+1}^{j_2} x_{j'}^{(j)} \geq 1, \\ x_{j'}^{(j)} & j' \geq j_2 + 2. \end{cases}$$

Since S' is minimal, for each $j \in S \cap X$, it can be shown that $x^{<j>} \in \mathcal{G}$ and

$$\sum_{j' \in S' \cap N_q} x_{j'}^{<j>} = 1.$$

Observe that the following set contains $|N| + 1$ affinely independent points that satisfy the inequality with equality:

$$\{(0, 0)\} \cup \{(e_j, 0) : j \in N \setminus (S' \cap N_q)\} \cup \{(x^{<j>}, 1) : j \in S' \cap N_q\}$$

Therefore, the given inequality is facet-defining. \square

A.7 Proof of Proposition 10

Lemma 13. *Let m and n be positive integers such that $m < n$ and*

$$W_{mn} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & J_{1m} \\ & I_m & & J_{mm} \\ & & I_r & J_{rm} \\ J_{m1} & L_m + I_m & & U_m \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)},$$

where $r = n - m - 1$, I_p is the p by p identity matrix, J_{pq} is p by q matrices with all 1s, and

$$L_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times p}, \quad U_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times p}.$$

Then, W_{mn} is non-singular, and $\text{trace}(W_{mn}^{-1}) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let

$$W'_{mn} = \begin{pmatrix} m & -J_{1m} & & & \\ -J_{m1} & (m+1)I_m - J_{mm} & & & \\ -J_{r1} & -J_{rm} & (m+1)I_r & & \\ H_m & (m+1)I_m - J_{mm} & & D_m & \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$H_m = \begin{pmatrix} m \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ \vdots \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1},$$

$$D_m = \begin{pmatrix} -m-1 & & & & & \\ m+1 & -m-1 & & & & \\ & m+1 & -m-1 & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & -m-1 & \\ & & & & m+1 & -m-1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}.$$

Direct computation shows that $W'_{mn} = W_{mn}^{-1}$. Furthermore, we have $\text{trace}(W'_{mn}) = (n-m)(n+1) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 14. Let m and n be positive integers such that $m \geq n+1$ and

$$W_{mn} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & J_{1n-1} \\ & I_{n-1} & & J_{n-1 \ n-1} \\ & & I_r & J_{r \ n-1} \\ J_{n-1 \ 1} & L_{n-1} + I_{n-1} & & U_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m},$$

where $r = \max\{m-2n+1, 0\}$, I_p is the p by p identity matrix, J_{pq} is p by q matrices with all 1s, and

$$L_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times p}, \quad U_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times p}.$$

Then, W_{mn} is non-singular, and $\text{trace}(W_{mn}^{-1}) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let

$$W'_{mn} = \begin{pmatrix} n-1 & & -J_{1 \ n-1} & & \\ -J_{n-1 \ 1} & nI_{n-1} - J_{n-1 \ n-1} & & & \\ -J_{r1} & & -J_{r \ n-1} & & nI_r \\ H_{n-1} & nI_{n-1} - J_{n-1 \ n-1} & & & D_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$H_{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \\ \vdots \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times 1},$$

$$D_{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -n & & & & \\ n & -n & & & \\ & n & -n & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & -n \\ & & & & n & -n \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}.$$

Direct computation shows that $W'_{mn} = W_{mn}^{-1}$. Furthermore, one can compute $\text{trace}(W'_{mn}) = n(n-2m+1) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 15. *Let l, m and n be positive integers such that $m \geq 2n-1$.*

$$Z_{lmn} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{ll} & J_{lm} & \\ Y_{ml} & W_{mn} & J_{m1} \\ & J_{1m} & \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(l+m+1) \times (l+m+1)}$$

is non-singular, where $Y_{m \ l}$ is any $m \times l$ matrix.

Proof. It is equivalent to showing that the following matrix is non-singular, which is obtained by partially applying Gaussian elimination to Z_{lmn} :

$$Z'_{lmn} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{ll} & & & \\ Y_{ml} & W_{mn} & J_{m1} & \\ & J_{1m} & & \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{ll} & & -J_{l1} \\ & I_{mm} & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} Z_{lmn}.$$

Using the Schur complement repeatedly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \det(Z'_{lmn}) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} W_{mn} & J_{m1} \\ J_{1m} & \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det(W_{mn}) \det(-J_{1m} W_{mn}^{-1} J_{m1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \det(W_{mn})(-1)^m \text{trace}(W_{mn}^{-1}).$$

Invoke Lemma 14 to get $\det(W_{mn}) \neq 0$ and $\text{trace}(W_{mn}^{-1}) \neq 0$. Thus, $\det(Z'_{l_{mn}}) \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 10. Without loss of generality, let us write

$$N = \{1, 2, \dots, |N|\}, \quad \bigcup_{S \in C_q^{\text{agg}}} S = \{1, 2, \dots, j_1\},$$

$$\bar{M}_q \setminus T = \{j_1 + 1, j_1 + 2, \dots, j_2\}, \quad T = \{j_2 + 1, j_2 + 2, \dots, |N|\}.$$

Let $x' \in X$ be such that $\|x'\|_1 = w_q$ and $v_q^{\text{agg}}(x') = f_q$. Define

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} I_{j_1} & & J_{j_1} & |T| \\ & I_{j_2-j_1} & J_{j_2-j_1} & |T| \\ Y & & W_{|T|} & b-w_q \\ & & J_1 & |T| \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(|N|+1) \times (|N|+1)},$$

where for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, |T|$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_1$,

$$Y_{ij} = x'_j.$$

Lemma 15 states that U is non-singular. Thus, the row vectors $\{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{|N|+1}\}$ are affinely independent. Furthermore, $\{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{|N|+1}\} \subset \text{conv}(\bar{P}_q^X \cap \{0, 1\}^{(|N|+1)})$ and the inequality is satisfied as equality at these $|N| + 1$ points. Therefore, the given inequality is facet-defining. \square

References

- [1] Arslan O, Karaşan OE (2016) A benders decomposition approach for the charging station location problem with plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 93:670–695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2016.09.001>
- [2] Arslan O, Karaşan OE, Mahjoub AR, et al (2019) A branch-and-cut algorithm for the alternative fuel refueling station location problem with routing. *Transportation Science* 53(4):1107–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.2018.0869>
- [3] Capar I, Kuby M, Leon VJ, et al (2013) An arc cover–path-cover formulation and strategic analysis of alternative-fuel station locations. *European Journal of Operational Research* 227(1):142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2012.11.033>
- [4] Fulkerson D, Gross O (1965) Incidence matrices and interval graphs. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 15(3):835–855. <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1965.15.835>
- [5] Göpfert P, Bock S (2019) A branch&cut approach to recharging and refueling infrastructure planning. *European Journal of Operational Research* 279(3):808–823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.06.031>

- [6] Hodgson MJ (1990) A flow-capturing location-allocation model. *Geographical Analysis* 22(3):270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-4632.1990.tb00210.x>
- [7] Kadri AA, Perrouault R, Boujelben MK, et al (2020) A multi-stage stochastic integer programming approach for locating electric vehicle charging stations. *Computers & Operations Research* 117:104888. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2020.104888>
- [8] Kim J, Kuby M (2012) The deviation-flow refueling location model for optimizing a network of refueling stations. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 37(6):5406–5420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2011.08.108>, optimization Approaches to Hydrogen Logistics
- [9] Kuby M, Lim S (2005) The flow-refueling location problem for alternative-fuel vehicles. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 39(2):125–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2011.08.108>
- [10] Yıldız B, Arslan O, Karaşan OE (2016) A branch and price approach for routing and refueling station location model. *European Journal of Operational Research* 248(3):815–826. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.05.021>