

An Improved Proximity Bound for Bike-Dock Reallocation Problem in Bike Sharing System

Akiyoshi Shioura

Department of Industrial Engineering and Economics, Institute of Science Tokyo, Tokyo 152-8550, Japan

Abstract

We consider a class of nonlinear integer programming problems arising from re-allocation of dock-capacity in a bike sharing system. The main aim of this note is to derive an improved proximity bound for the problem and its scaled variant. This makes it possible to refine the time bound for the polynomial-time proximity-scaling algorithm by Freund et al. (2022).

Keywords: resource allocation problem, steepest descent algorithm, proximity-scaling algorithm, multimodular function

1. Introduction.

We deal with a class of nonlinear integer programming problems arising from re-allocation of dock-capacity in a bike sharing system, which we refer to as the *dock re-allocation problem*. This problem is originally discussed by Freund, Henderson, and Shmoys [1], where a mathematical formulation of the dock re-allocation problem is provided and various algorithms for solving the problem are proposed. Moreover, Freund et al. [1] apply the proposed algorithms to data sets from several cities in the US to investigate the effect of the (re)allocation of dock-capacity. In this paper, we focus on the algorithmic results for the dock re-allocation problem.

The formulation of the dock re-allocation problem is explained below. Let $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of bike stations. We use two kinds of variables $d(i)$ and $b(i)$ for each station $i \in N$. The total number of docks at station i is given by $d(i) + b(i)$, where the variable $d(i)$ denotes the number of open docks (without bikes), while $b(i)$ is the number of docks with bikes, i.e., each of $b(i)$ docks is equipped with one bike. Initially, $d(i)$ and $b(i)$ are set to $\bar{d}(i)$ and $\bar{b}(i)$, respectively, and we need to re-allocate docks and bikes appropriately to improve user satisfaction.

Function $c_i : \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in variables $d(i)$ and $b(i)$ represents the expected number of dissatisfied users at station i (see [1] for the precise definition of function c_i), and it is shown to have the property of *multimodularity* (see Section 2 for the definition of a multimodular function). We want to minimize the total expected number of dissatisfied users $c(d, b) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(d(i), b(i))$ by re-allocation of docks and bikes.

When re-allocating docks and bikes among stations, we need to satisfy several conditions, where $D = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{d}(i)$ and $B = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{b}(i)$:

- The total number of docks should be the same, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n (d(i) + b(i)) = D + B$.
- The total number of bikes cannot be increased, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n b(i) \leq B$.
- The difference between the new and old allocation of docks should be small. This condition is represented as $\|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma$ by using ℓ_1 -distance between the new allocation $d + b$ and the old allocation $\bar{d} + \bar{b}$ and some positive constant γ .

Email address: shioura.a.aa@m.titech.ac.jp (Akiyoshi Shioura)

- The new dock allocation $d + b$ should be between given lower and upper bounds, i.e., $\ell \leq d + b \leq u$.

In summary, the dock re-allocation problem, denoted as DR, is formulated as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize} \quad c(d, b) \\ \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (d(i) + b(i)) = D + B, \\ \quad \quad \quad \sum_{i=1}^n b(i) \leq B, \\ \quad \quad \quad \|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma, \\ \quad \quad \quad \ell \leq d + b \leq u, \\ \quad \quad \quad d, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n. \end{array} \right.$$

In [1], a steepest descent (or greedy) algorithm for the problem DR is proposed, which repeatedly updates a constant number of variables by ± 1 . It is shown by using the multimodularity of the objective function that the algorithm finds an optimal solution in at most γ iterations. Hence, the running time of the steepest descent algorithm is pseudo-polynomial.

To speed up of the algorithm, proximity-scaling technique is applied to the steepest descent algorithm in [1] (see, e.g., [2, 3, 5, 9] for algorithms based on proximity-scaling technique). Time bound of the proximity-scaling algorithm in [1] is dependent on a proximity bound for the distance between optimal solutions of the problem DR and its scaled version $\text{DR}(\lambda)$. The scaled problem $\text{DR}(\lambda)$ with integer parameter λ is the problem obtained from DR by restricting the values of variables $d(i)$ and $b(i)$ to be integer multiples of λ for $i \in N$ (see Section 2 for a more precise definition of $\text{DR}(\lambda)$). It is shown that the proximity-scaling algorithm runs in $O(n^2 M \log n \log(D + B))$ time, provided that the ℓ_1 -distance between optimal solutions of DR and $\text{DR}(\lambda)$ is $O(M\lambda)$ for some $M > 0$. In addition, it is shown that the proximity bound M is $O(n^7)$ (see Lemma EC.3 of the online appendix in [1]).

Proposition 1 ([1]). *Let λ be a positive integer, and (d, b) be an optimal solution of $\text{DR}(\lambda)$. Then, there exists an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR such that $\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_1 \leq 16n^6(n + 4)\lambda$.*

This implies that the running time of the proximity-scaling algorithm is $O(n^9 \log n \log(D + B))$, which is quite large. An alternative algorithm for the problem DR based on a different approach is proposed by Shioura [10], which runs in $O(n \log n \log((D + B)/n) \log B)$.

The main aim of this paper is to derive an alternative, smaller proximity bound for DR and $\text{DR}(\lambda)$ to improve the running time of the proximity-scaling algorithm in [1].

Theorem 2. *Let λ be a positive integer, and (d, b) be an optimal solution of $\text{DR}(\lambda)$. Then, there exists an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR such that*

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_1 \leq 10n\lambda.$$

This theorem shows that the proximity bound M is $O(n)$, which is much smaller than the bound $O(n^7)$ in [1]. Therefore, the estimate of the running time for the proximity-scaling algorithm is improved to $O(n^3 \log n \log(D + B))$, which is comparable to the running time $O(n \log n \log((D + B)/n) \log B)$ of the algorithm in [10].

Remark 3. We can obtain a better time bound $O(n^2 \log n \log((D + B)/n))$ time by using Theorem 2 and a modified version of the proximity-scaling algorithm in [1]. See Appendix for details. \square

Due to the page limitation, some of the proofs for theorems and lemmas are given in Appendix.

2. Proximity Theorem for Problem DR

In this section, we describe the statement of the proximity result for the problem DR in more detail. Our proximity result refers to an alternative formulation of DR to be described below, instead of the original formulation. To the end of this paper, we denote $y(X) = \sum_{i \in X} y(i)$ for a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $X \subseteq N$.

Recall that the problem DR is formulated as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize} \quad c(d, b) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(d(i), b(i)) \\ \text{subject to} \quad d(N) + b(N) = D + B, \\ \quad \quad \quad b(N) \leq B, \\ \quad \quad \quad \|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma, \\ \quad \quad \quad \ell \leq d + b \leq u, \\ \quad \quad \quad d, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \end{array} \right.$$

where each $c_i : \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *multimodular* function, i.e., it satisfies the following inequalities by definition (see, e.g., [1, 7]):

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(\alpha + 1, \beta + 1) - c_i(\alpha + 1, \beta) &\geq c_i(\alpha, \beta + 1) - c_i(\alpha, \beta) \\ &\quad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } \alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0), \\ c_i(\alpha - 1, \beta + 1) - c_i(\alpha - 1, \beta) &\geq c_i(\alpha, \beta) - c_i(\alpha, \beta - 1) \\ &\quad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } \alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1), \\ c_i(\alpha + 1, \beta - 1) - c_i(\alpha, \beta - 1) &\geq c_i(\alpha, \beta) - c_i(\alpha - 1, \beta) \\ &\quad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } \alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1). \end{aligned}$$

To obtain an alternative formulation for DR, consider a relaxed problem of DR obtained by removing the ℓ_1 -distance constraint $\|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma$, and let (d^\bullet, b^\bullet) be an optimal solution of the relaxed problem with the minimum value of $\|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1$. Such an optimal solution can be computed in $O(n \log n \log((D + B)/n))$ time [10, Theorem 6.1], and this running time does not affect the running time for solving DR.

Let

$$P = \{i \in N \mid d^\bullet(i) + b^\bullet(i) > \bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i)\}, \quad Q = N \setminus P.$$

Proposition 4 (cf. [10, Section 6.2]). *There exists an optimal solution (d, b) of DR such that*

$$d(i) + b(i) \begin{cases} \geq \bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i) & \text{for } i \in P, \\ \leq \bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i) & \text{for } i \in Q. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover, if (d^\bullet, b^\bullet) violates the ℓ_1 -distance constraint, then, every optimal solution (d, b) of DR satisfies the inequality $\|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma$ with equality.

If (d^\bullet, b^\bullet) satisfies the ℓ_1 -distance constraint, then it is also an optimal solution of DR. Therefore, we may assume that (d^\bullet, b^\bullet) violates the ℓ_1 -distance constraint. Proposition 4 shows that the upper/lower-bound constraint (2.1) for the values $d(i) + b(i)$ ($i \in N$) can be added to the problem DR, which is denoted as DR'. Note that under the condition (2.1), the ℓ_1 -distance constraint $\|(d + b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \leq 2\gamma$ is equivalent to the linear inequalities

$$d(P) + b(P) \leq \xi_P, \quad d(Q) + b(Q) \geq \xi_Q$$

with

$$\xi_P = \bar{d}(P) + \bar{b}(P) + \gamma, \quad \xi_Q = \bar{d}(Q) + \bar{b}(Q) - \gamma.$$

In summary, the problem DR' is formulated as

$$\text{(DR')} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize} \quad c(d, b) \\ \text{subject to} \quad d(N) + b(N) = D + B, \\ \quad \quad \quad b(N) \leq B, \\ \quad \quad \quad d(P) + b(P) \leq \xi_P, \quad d(Q) + b(Q) \geq \xi_Q, \\ \quad \quad \quad \ell' \leq d + b \leq u', \\ \quad \quad \quad d, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \end{array} \right.$$

where vectors ℓ' and u' are given as

$$\ell'(i) = \begin{cases} \max\{\ell(i), \bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i)\} & \text{if } i \in P, \\ \ell(i) & \text{if } i \in Q, \end{cases}$$

$$u'(i) = \begin{cases} u(i) & \text{if } i \in P, \\ \min\{u(i), \bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i)\} & \text{if } i \in Q. \end{cases}$$

In the following, we mainly deal with DR' instead of DR.

To state a proximity result for the problem DR', let us consider a ‘‘scaled’’ version of DR', denoted by DR'(λ), with parameter λ given by a positive integer. The scaled problem DR'(λ) is obtained by adding to DR the following constraint:

$$d(i) \equiv \tilde{d}(i) \pmod{\lambda}, \quad b(i) \equiv \tilde{b}(i) \pmod{\lambda} \quad (i \in N),$$

where (\tilde{d}, \tilde{b}) is an arbitrarily chosen feasible solution of DR'. Note that this constraint can be simplified to the following:

$$d(i) \text{ and } b(i) \text{ are integer multiples of } \lambda \text{ for } i \in N,$$

provided that there exists a feasible solution (\tilde{d}, \tilde{b}) of DR' such that each component of \tilde{d} and \tilde{b} is integer multiple of λ . Hence, the problem DR'(λ) with $\lambda = 1$ is the same as the original problem DR'. Note that (\tilde{d}, \tilde{b}) is a feasible solution of DR'(λ) for all λ .

It should be mentioned that the scaled problem DR'(λ) has the same structure as the problem DR'; in particular, the multimodularity of the objective function is preserved by this scaling operation. Therefore, various properties and algorithms for DR' can be applied to DR'(λ) with some appropriate modification.

In this paper, we show the following proximity bound for optimal solutions of DR' and DR'(λ).

Theorem 5. *Let λ be a positive integer, and (d, b) be an optimal solution of DR'(λ). Then, there exists an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR' such that*

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_1 < 10\lambda n.$$

Proof of this theorem is given in Section 3 (and in Appendix). By Theorem 5 and the fact that the structure of the problem DR'(λ) is the same as the original problem DR', the following (seemingly) generalized proximity result for DR' can be obtained.

Corollary 6. *Let λ and ν be positive integers, and (d, b) be an optimal solution of DR'($\lambda\nu$). Then, there exists some λ -optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR'(λ) such that*

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_1 < 10\lambda\nu n.$$

As an immediate corollary to Theorem 5, we can also obtain the following proximity bound with respect to ℓ_∞ -distance.

Corollary 7. *Let λ be a positive integer, and (d, b) be an optimal solution of DR'(λ). Then, there exists an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR' such that*

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_\infty < 10\lambda n.$$

3. Proof of Proximity Theorem

3.1. Proof of Theorem 5

To prove Theorem 5, let (d, b) be an optimal solution of DR'(λ), and show that there exists some optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR' such that

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d + b)\|_1 < 10\lambda n. \tag{3.1}$$

Let (d^*, b^*) be an optimal solution of DR' that minimizes the value $\|d^* - d\|_1 + \|b^* - b\|_1$. Also, let $x = d + b$ and $x^* = d^* + b^*$. It suffices to show that the inequality $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 10\lambda n$ holds. Note that by Proposition 4 and feasibility of (d, b) , it holds that

$$x(P) \leq \xi_P = x^*(P), \quad x(Q) \geq \xi_Q = x^*(Q). \quad (3.2)$$

In the proof, we use some useful inequalities for the objective function $c(d, b) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(d(i), b(i))$, which follow from multimodularity of functions c_i .

Proposition 8 (cf. [10, Proposition 3.1]). *Let $(d, b), (d', b') \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \times \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, and put $x = d + b$, $x' = d' + b'$. Also, let $i, j, h, k, s \in N$ be elements such that*

$$\begin{aligned} i &\in \text{supp}^+(d - d') \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x'), & j &\in \text{supp}^-(b - b') \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x'), \\ h &\in \text{supp}^-(d - d') \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x'), & k &\in \text{supp}^+(b - b') \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x'), \\ s &\in \text{supp}^-(d - d') \cap \text{supp}^+(b - b'). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the following inequalities hold:

$$c(d, b) + c(d', b') \geq c(d - \chi_i + \chi_h, b) + c(d' + \chi_i - \chi_h, b'), \quad (3.3)$$

$$c(d, b) + c(d', b') \geq c(d, b + \chi_j - \chi_k) + c(d', b' - \chi_j + \chi_k), \quad (3.4)$$

$$c(d, b) + c(d', b') \geq c(d - \chi_i, b + \chi_j) + c(d' + \chi_i, b' - \chi_j), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c(d, b) + c(d', b') \\ \geq c(d - \chi_i + \chi_s, b + \chi_j - \chi_s) + c(d' + \chi_i - \chi_s, b' - \chi_j + \chi_s), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} c(d, b) + c(d', b') \\ \geq c(d - \chi_i + \chi_h, b + \chi_j - \chi_k) + c(d' + \chi_i - \chi_h, b' - \chi_j + \chi_k). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By Proposition 8 and the choice of $(d, b), (d^*, b^*)$, we obtain the following property. Proof is given in Section 3.2.

Lemma 9.

(i) *Let $i \in \text{supp}^+(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*)$, $h \in \text{supp}^-(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*)$, and suppose that either $i, h \in P$ or $i, h \in Q$ holds. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} c(d - \lambda' \chi_i + \lambda' \chi_h, b) &> c(d - (\lambda' + 1) \chi_i + (\lambda' + 1) \chi_h, b) \\ (0 \leq \lambda' < \min\{d(i) - d^*(i), d^*(h) - d(h)\}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

(ii) *Let $j \in \text{supp}^-(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*)$, $k \in \text{supp}^+(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*)$, and suppose that either $j, k \in P$ or $j, k \in Q$ holds. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} c(d, b + \lambda' \chi_j - \lambda' \chi_k) &> c(d, b + (\lambda' + 1) \chi_j - (\lambda' + 1) \chi_k) \\ (0 \leq \lambda' < \min\{b^*(j) - b(j), b(k) - b^*(k)\}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

(iii) *Let $i \in \text{supp}^-(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*)$, $j \in \text{supp}^+(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*)$, and suppose that either $i, j \in P$ or $i, j \in Q$ holds. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} c(d + \lambda' \chi_i, b - \lambda' \chi_j) &> c(d + (\lambda' + 1) \chi_i, b - (\lambda' + 1) \chi_j) \\ (0 \leq \lambda' < \min\{d^*(i) - d(i), b(j) - b^*(j), b(N) - b^*(N)\}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

(iv) *Let $i \in \text{supp}^-(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*)$, $j \in \text{supp}^+(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*)$, $s \in \text{supp}^+(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(b - b^*)$, and suppose that either $i, j \in P$ or $i, j \in Q$ holds. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} c(d - \lambda' \chi_s + \lambda' \chi_i, b + \lambda' \chi_s - \lambda' \chi_j) \\ > c(d - (\lambda' + 1) \chi_s + (\lambda' + 1) \chi_i, b + (\lambda' + 1) \chi_s - (\lambda' + 1) \chi_j) \\ (0 \leq \lambda' < \min\{d^*(i) - d(i), b(j) - b^*(j), d(s) - d^*(s), b^*(s) - b(s)\}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$




Figure 1: Regions corresponding to sets I_1 and I_2




Figure 2: Regions corresponding to sets I_3 and I_4

(v) Let

$$i \in \text{supp}^+(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*), \quad j \in \text{supp}^-(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*), \\ h \in \text{supp}^-(d - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x - x^*), \quad k \in \text{supp}^+(b - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x - x^*),$$

and suppose that either of (a) $i, j \in P$, $h, k \in Q$ and (b) $i, j \in Q$, $h, k \in P$ holds. Then, we have

$$c(d - \lambda' \chi_i + \lambda' \chi_h, b + \lambda' \chi_j - \lambda' \chi_k) \\ > c(d - (\lambda' + 1)\chi_i + (\lambda' + 1)\chi_h, b + (\lambda' + 1)\chi_j - (\lambda' + 1)\chi_k) \\ (0 \leq \lambda' < \min\{d(i) - d^*(i), b^*(j) - b(j), d^*(h) - d(h), b(k) - b^*(k)\}). \quad (3.12)$$

Derivation of the inequality $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 10\lambda n$ is done by case analysis. For this, define the following six sets (see Figures 1, 2, and 3):

$$I_1 = \{i \in N \mid d(i) - d^*(i) \geq \lambda, b(i) - b^*(i) \leq -\lambda\}, \quad (3.13)$$

$$I_2 = \{j \in N \mid d(j) - d^*(j) \leq -\lambda, b(j) - b^*(j) \geq \lambda\}, \quad (3.14)$$

$$I_3 = \{i \in N \mid x(i) - x^*(i) \geq \lambda, d(i) - d^*(i) \geq \lambda\}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$I_4 = \{j \in N \mid x(j) - x^*(j) \leq -\lambda, d(j) - d^*(j) \leq -\lambda\}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$I_5 = \{i \in N \mid x(i) - x^*(i) \geq \lambda, b(i) - b^*(i) \geq \lambda\}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$I_6 = \{j \in N \mid x(j) - x^*(j) \leq -\lambda, b(j) - b^*(j) \leq -\lambda\}. \quad (3.18)$$

For $t = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, we also denote

$$I_t^P = I_t \cap P, \quad I_t^Q = I_t \cap Q,$$




Figure 3: Regions corresponding to sets I_5 and I_6

and consider the following four cases:

- (Case P1) $I_4^P = I_6^P = \emptyset$,
- (Case P2) $I_3^P = I_5^P = \emptyset$,
- (Case P3) $I_3^P \neq \emptyset$, $I_6^P \neq \emptyset$, $I_2 = \emptyset$, $I_4^P = I_5^P = \emptyset$, $b(N) - b^*(N) > -\lambda$, and $d(N) - d^*(N) < \lambda$,
- (Case P4) $I_4^P \neq \emptyset$, $I_5^P \neq \emptyset$, $I_1 = \emptyset$, $I_3^P = I_6^P = \emptyset$, $b(N) - b^*(N) < \lambda$, and $d(N) - d^*(N) > -\lambda$.

We will show that the cases P1, P2, P3, and P4 cover all possible cases by using the fact that (d, b) (resp., (d^*, b^*)) is an optimal solution of $(DR'(\lambda))$ (resp., DR'). Proof is given in Section 3.3.

Lemma 10. *At least one of the cases P1, P2, P3, and P4 occurs.*

In addition, we consider additional four cases Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4, which are obtained by replacing the sets I_t^P in P1, P2, P3, and P4 with I_t^Q , and show that the cases Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 cover all possible cases; proof is similar to that for Lemma 10 and omitted.

Lemma 11. *At least one of the cases Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 occurs.*

Hence, we have 16 possible combinations of the cases in $\{P1, P2, P3, P4\}$ and in $\{Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4\}$, and we denote each of possible combinations as P1-Q1, P1-Q2, P1-Q3, etc.

We then show that the cases P3-Q4 and P4-Q3 are not possible, and derive the inequality $|x(i) - x^*(i)| < 10\lambda n$ for all remaining cases.

Lemma 12. (i) *The cases P3-Q4 and P4-Q3 do not occur.*

(ii) *For all combinations of the cases, except for P3-Q4 and P4-Q3, it holds that $|x(i) - x^*(i)| < 10\lambda n$ for $i \in N$.*

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

3.2. Proof of Lemma 9

In the following we prove (v) only since other claims can be proved similarly and more easily.

Setting

$$d' = d - \lambda' \chi_i + \lambda' \chi_h, \quad b' = b + \lambda' \chi_j - \lambda' \chi_k, \quad x' = d' + b',$$

we can rewrite the inequality (3.12) as

$$c(d', b') > c(d' - \chi_i + \chi_h, b' + \chi_j - \chi_k). \quad (3.19)$$

By the choice of λ' and i, j, k, h , we have

$$\begin{aligned} i &\in \text{supp}^+(d' - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x' - x^*), \quad j \in \text{supp}^-(b' - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x' - x^*), \\ h &\in \text{supp}^-(d' - d^*) \cap \text{supp}^-(x' - x^*), \quad k \in \text{supp}^+(b' - b^*) \cap \text{supp}^+(x' - x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from (3.7) in Proposition 8 that

$$c(d', b') + c(d^*, b^*) \geq c(d' - \chi_i + \chi_h, b' + \chi_j - \chi_k) + c(d^* + \chi_i - \chi_h, b^* - \chi_j + \chi_k). \quad (3.20)$$

Note that $(d^{**}, b^{**}) \equiv (d^* + \chi_i - \chi_h, b^* - \chi_j + \chi_k)$ is also a feasible solution of DR' since

$$\begin{aligned} (d^* + \chi_i - \chi_h)(P) + (b^* - \chi_j + \chi_k)(P) &= d^*(P) + b^*(P), \\ (d^* + \chi_i - \chi_h)(Q) + (b^* - \chi_j + \chi_k)(Q) &= d^*(Q) + b^*(Q), \\ b^{**}(N) &= b^*(N) \leq B. \end{aligned}$$

Since $i \in \text{supp}^+(d' - d^*)$, $j \in \text{supp}^+(b' - b^*)$, $h \in \text{supp}^-(d' - d^*)$, and $k \in \text{supp}^+(b' - b^*)$, we have

$$\|d^{**} - d\|_1 + \|b^{**} - b\|_1 = (\|d^* - d\|_1 - 2) + (\|b^* - b\|_1 - 2) < \|d^* - d\|_1 + \|b^* - b\|_1.$$

Since (d^*, b^*) is an optimal solution of DR' that minimizes the value $\|d^* - d\|_1 + \|b^* - b\|_1$, the inequality $c(d^*, b^*) < c(d^{**}, b^{**})$ holds. This inequality, together with (3.20), implies the desired inequality (3.19).

3.3. Proof of Lemma 10

We use the following two lemmas to prove Lemma 10.

Lemma 13. *Let $S \in \{P, Q\}$.*

- (i) *At least one of $I_3^S = \emptyset$ and $I_4^S = \emptyset$ holds.*
- (ii) *At least one of $I_5^S = \emptyset$ and $I_6^S = \emptyset$ holds.*

Proof. We consider the case $S = P$ only since the proof for the case $S = Q$ can be done in the same way.

We first prove (i). Assume, to the contrary, that both of $I_3^P \neq \emptyset$ and $I_4^P \neq \emptyset$ hold, and let $i \in I_3^P$ and $j \in I_4^P$. Then, $i \neq j$ holds since $I_3^P \cap I_4^P = \emptyset$ (see Figure 2).

We consider the pair of vectors $(d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j, b)$. Since $i \in I_3^P$ and $j \in I_4^P$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j)(P) + b(P) &= d(P) + b(P), \\ (d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j)(Q) + b(Q) &= d(Q) + b(Q), \\ (d(i) - \lambda) + b(i) &= x(i) - \lambda \geq x^*(i) = d^*(i) + b^*(i) \geq \ell'(i), \\ (d(j) + \lambda) + b(j) &= x(j) + \lambda \leq x^*(j) = d^*(j) + b^*(j) \leq u'(j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j, b)$ is a feasible solution of DR'(λ). Since (d, b) is an optimal solution of DR'(λ), we have

$$c(d, b) \leq c(d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j, b). \quad (3.21)$$

On the other hand, it follows from $i \in I_3^P$ and $j \in I_4^P$ that $\min\{d(i) - d^*(i), d^*(s) - d(s)\} \geq \lambda$, which, together with Lemma 9 (i), implies that $c(d, b) > c(d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_j, b)$, a contradiction to (3.21).

We omit the proof for (ii) since the claim (ii) is symmetric to (i) and therefore the proof for (ii) can be obtained by interchanging the roles of d, d^* with b, b^* in the proof of (i). \square

Lemma 14. *Let $S \in \{P, Q\}$.*

- (i) *If $I_1 \neq \emptyset$, then at least one of I_4^S and I_5^S is an empty set.*
- (ii) *If $b(N) - b^*(N) \geq \lambda$, then at least one of I_4^S and I_5^S is an empty set.*
- (iii) *If $I_2 \neq \emptyset$, then at least one of I_3^S and I_6^S is an empty set.*
- (iv) *If $b(N) - b^*(N) \leq -\lambda$, then at least one of I_3^S and I_6^S is an empty set.*

Proof. Proof is similar to that for Lemma 13 and given in Appendix B.1. \square

We now prove Lemma 10, i.e., we show that at least one of Cases P1, P2, P3, and P4 occurs. Suppose that neither of Cases P1 and P2 occurs. Then, it holds that

$$I_4^P \neq \emptyset \text{ or } I_6^P \neq \emptyset \text{ (or both),} \quad \text{and} \quad I_3^P \neq \emptyset \text{ or } I_5^P \neq \emptyset \text{ (or both).}$$

By Lemma 13, we have either

$$I_4^P = I_5^P = \emptyset, I_3^P \neq \emptyset, I_6^P \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{or} \quad I_3^P = I_6^P = \emptyset, I_4^P \neq \emptyset, I_5^P \neq \emptyset.$$

In the former case, we have $I_2 = \emptyset$ by Lemma 14 (iii) and $b(N) - b^*(N) > -\lambda$ by Lemma 14 (iv); the inequality $b(N) - b^*(N) > -\lambda$ and the equation $x(N) = D + B = x^*(N)$ imply $d(N) - d^*(N) < \lambda$. Thus, Case P3 occurs in the former case. Similarly, the latter case implies Case P4.

3.4. Proof of Lemma 12 (i)

Lemma 12 (i) follows immediately from the following fact.

Lemma 15.

- (i) At least one of the sets I_3^P, I_6^P, I_4^Q , and I_5^Q is an empty set.
- (ii) At least one of the sets I_4^P, I_5^P, I_3^Q , and I_6^Q is an empty set.

Proof. We prove the statement (i) only since (ii) can be proved similarly. Assume, to the contrary, that all of the sets I_3^P, I_6^P, I_4^Q , and I_5^Q are nonempty, and let $i \in I_3^P, j \in I_6^P, h \in I_4^Q$, and $k \in I_5^Q$. Then, elements i, j, h, k are distinct since $P \cap Q = \emptyset, I_3 \cap I_6 = \emptyset$, and $I_4 \cap I_5 = \emptyset$.

Consider the pair of vectors $(\tilde{d}, \tilde{b}) \equiv (d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_h, b + \lambda\chi_j - \lambda\chi_k)$. By the choice of i, j, h, k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &\leq \tilde{d} + \tilde{b} \leq u, \\ \tilde{d}(P) + \tilde{b}(P) &= d(P) + b(P), \\ \tilde{d}(Q) + \tilde{b}(Q) &= d(Q) + b(Q), \\ \tilde{b}(N) &= b(N) \leq B. \end{aligned}$$

That is, (\tilde{d}, \tilde{b}) is a feasible solution of $DR'(\lambda)$. Since (d, b) is an optimal solution of $DR'(\lambda)$, we have

$$c(d, b) \leq c(d - \lambda\chi_i + \lambda\chi_h, b + \lambda\chi_j - \lambda\chi_k). \quad (3.22)$$

On the other hand, the choice of i, j, k, h that

$$\min\{d(i) - d^*(i), b^*(j) - b(j), d^*(h) - d(h), b(k) - b^*(k)\} \geq \lambda,$$

which, together with Lemma 9 (v), implies that

$$c(d, b) > c(d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i, b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j),$$

a contradiction to (3.22). □

3.5. Proof of Lemma 12 (ii)

We prove Lemma 12 (ii) by case analysis. See Table 1 for summary of the bounds for all possible cases.

We first consider the cases P1–Q1, P2–Q2, P3–Q3, and P4–Q4, which imply the cases N1, N2, N3, and N4, respectively, where

- (Case N1) $I_4 = I_6 = \emptyset$,
- (Case N2) $I_3 = I_5 = \emptyset$,
- (Case N3) $I_2 = I_4 = I_5 = \emptyset, b(N) - b^*(N) > -\lambda$, and $d(N) - d^*(N) < \lambda$,
- (Case N4) $I_1 = I_3 = I_6 = \emptyset, b(N) - b^*(N) < \lambda$, and $d(N) - d^*(N) > -\lambda$.

Table 1: Summary of the bounds for all possible cases.

	P1	P2	P3	P4
Q1	$4\lambda n$ (Lem. 16)	$4\lambda n$ (Lem. 17)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 19)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 19)
Q2	$4\lambda n$ (Lem. 17)	$4\lambda n$ (Lem. 16)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 19)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 19)
Q3	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 18)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 18)	$8\lambda n$ (Lem. 16)	—
Q4	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 18)	$10\lambda n$ (Lem. 18)	—	$8\lambda n$ (Lem. 16)




Figure 4: Proof of Lemma 17. $I_4^P = I_6^P = \emptyset$ implies that the point $(d(i) - d^*(i), b(i) - b^*(i))$ for $i \in P$ is not located on the shaded regions, implying that $x(i) - x^*(i) > -2\lambda$.

The following bounds are known to these cases, which immediately yields the bounds for the cases P1–Q1, P2–Q2, P3–Q3, and P4–Q4:

Lemma 16 ([10, Section 6.4]). *We have $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 4\lambda n$ if Case N1 or N2 occurs, and $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 8\lambda n$ if N3 or N4 occurs.*

We then consider the cases P1–Q2 and P2–Q1.

Lemma 17. *We have $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 4\lambda n$ if the case P1–Q2 or P2–Q1 occurs.*

Proof. Since the cases P1–Q2 and P2–Q1 are symmetric, it suffices to consider the case P1–Q2 only. Below we will prove the inequalities

$$\sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| < 4\lambda|P|, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\sum_{i \in Q} |x(i) - x^*(i)| < 4\lambda|Q|, \quad (3.24)$$

which can be done in the same way as in the proof for the cases N1 and N2 in [10]. From (3.23) and (3.24) we obtain the desired inequality as follows:

$$\|x - x^*\|_1 = \sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| + \sum_{i \in Q} |x(i) - x^*(i)| < 4\lambda|P| + 4\lambda|Q| = 4\lambda|N| = 4\lambda n.$$

We first prove (3.23). Putting $P^- = \text{supp}^-(x - x^*) \cap P$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| &= \sum_{i \in P \setminus P^-} (x(i) - x^*(i)) - \sum_{j \in P^-} (x(j) - x^*(j)) \\
&= \left(x(P \setminus P^-) - x^*(P \setminus P^-) \right) - \left(x(P^-) - x^*(P^-) \right) \\
&= (x(P) - x^*(P)) - 2(x(P^-) - x^*(P^-)) \\
&\leq -2(x(P^-) - x^*(P^-)),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where the last inequality is by (3.2). Since $I_4^P = I_6^P = \emptyset$, we have (see Figure 4)

$$x(i) - x^*(i) > -2\lambda \quad (i \in P), \tag{3.26}$$

which, together with (3.25), implies that

$$\sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| = -2(x(P^-) - x^*(P^-)) < 4\lambda|P^-| \leq 4\lambda|P|.$$

The proof of (3.24) can be done in a similar way as that for (3.23) by using the inequality $x(Q) \geq x^*(Q)$. \square

Proof for the remaining cases is given in Appendix B.2.

Acknowledgments.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K10995. The author thanks Kazuo Murota for valuable comments on the manuscript.

References

- [1] D. Freund, S.G. Henderson, and D.B. Shmoys, Minimizing multimodular functions and allocating capacity in bike-sharing systems. *Oper. Res.* 70 (2022), 2715–2731.
- [2] D.S. Hochbaum, Lower and upper bounds for the allocation problem and other nonlinear optimization problems. *Math. Oper. Res.* 19 (1994), 390–409.
- [3] D.S. Hochbaum and J.G. Shanthikumar, Nonlinear separable optimization is not much harder than linear optimization. *J. ACM* 37 (1990), 843–862.
- [4] S. Moriguchi and K. Murota, On fundamental operations for multimodular functions. *J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan* 62 (2019), 53–63.
- [5] S. Moriguchi, A. Shioura, and N. Tsuchimura, M-convex function minimization by continuous relaxation approach: proximity theorem and algorithm. *SIAM J. Optim.* 21 (2011), 633–668.
- [6] K. Murota. *Discrete Convex Analysis*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2003.
- [7] K. Murota, Note on multimodularity and L-convexity. *Math. Oper. Res.* 30 (2005), 658–661.
- [8] K. Murota and A. Shioura, M-convex function on generalized polymatroid. *Math. Oper. Res.* 24 (1999), 95–105.
- [9] A. Shioura, Fast scaling algorithms for M-convex function minimization with application to the resource allocation problem. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 134 (2004), 303–316.
- [10] A. Shioura, M-convex function minimization under L1-distance constraint and its application to dock re-allocation in bike sharing system. *Math. Oper. Res.* 47 (2022), 1566–1611.

Appendix A. Algorithm

We present a proximity-scaling algorithm for computing an optimal solution of problem DR (problem DR', to be more precise). Our algorithm is similar to the one proposed by Freund et al. [1], but the algorithm description and its analysis given below are simpler.

The algorithm consists of several λ -scaling phases, where λ is a scaling parameter given by a positive integer. Initially, λ is set to $2^{\lceil \log_2((D+B)/n) \rceil}$, and after each scaling phase terminates, λ is divided by two; the algorithm stops at the end of the 1-scaling phase. That is, the algorithm consists of $\lceil \log_2((D+B)/n) \rceil$ scaling phases.

In each λ -scaling phase, we compute an optimal solution $\text{DR}'(\lambda)$ by using an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2\lambda)$ that is computed in the previous scaling phase. We will show that the running time for each scaling phase is $O(n^2 \log n)$, which results in the total time complexity $O(n^2 \log n \log((D+B)/n))$ of the proximity-scaling algorithm.

To the end of this section, we show that each λ -scaling phase can be done in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time. Since the problem structure of $\text{DR}'(\lambda)$ (resp., $\text{DR}'(2\lambda)$) is the same as that for $\text{DR}'(1)$ (resp., $\text{DR}'(2)$), we assume in the following that $\lambda = 1$, i.e., we show that an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(1) = \text{DR}'$ can be computed in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time by using an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2)$.

Computation of an optimal solution of DR' consists of the following steps:

Step 1 Let $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ be an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2)$. Convert $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ of $\text{DR}'(2)$ into a bike-optimal solution; definition of bike-optimality is given below.

Step 2 We reduce the feasible region of DR' by using $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$.

Step 3 Using $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ as an initial solution, compute a feasible solution (\hat{d}, \hat{b}) of DR' with the minimum value of $(1/2)\|(d+b) - (\hat{d}, \hat{b})\|_1$; if there are many such feasible solutions, then we take the one minimizing the objective function value $c(\hat{d}, \hat{b})$.

Step 4 Using (\hat{d}, \hat{b}) as an initial solution, compute an optimal solution of DR' by a steepest descent algorithm in [10].

Details of each step will be explained below.

We first convert the optimal solution $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ of $\text{DR}'(2)$ to a bike-optimal solution. A feasible solution (d, b) of DR' is said to be *bike-optimal* if $c(d, b) \leq c(d', b')$ holds for every feasible solution (d', b') of DR' with $d' + b' = d + b$. Using the fact that $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ is an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2)$, conversion into a bike-optimal solution can be done in $O(n \log n)$ time (see Section 6.3.2 in [10]). Hence, we may assume that $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ is bike-optimal.

We then reduce the feasible region of DR' so that an optimal solution of DR' can be computed efficiently. Since $(d^{(2)}, b^{(2)})$ is an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2)$, Corollary 7 implies that there exists an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of DR' such that

$$\|(d^* + b^*) - (d^{(2)} + b^{(2)})\|_\infty < 20n.$$

Based on this fact, we update the upper/lower bound vector u', ℓ' in the constraint $\ell' \leq d + b \leq u'$ by

$$\begin{aligned} u'(i) &:= \min\{u'(i), d^{(2)}(i) + b^{(2)}(i) + 20n\} \quad (i \in N), \\ \ell'(i) &:= \max\{\ell'(i), d^{(2)}(i) + b^{(2)}(i) - 20n\} \quad (i \in N). \end{aligned}$$

After this update, every feasible solution (d, b) of problem DR' satisfies

$$\|(d+b) - (d^{(2)} + b^{(2)})\|_\infty = O(n). \tag{A.1}$$

Let γ_{\min} be an integer given as

$$\gamma_{\min} = \min\{(1/2)\|(d+b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \mid (d, b) : \text{feasible solution of DR}'\}.$$

For each γ' with $\gamma_{\min} \leq \gamma' \leq \gamma$, we define an auxiliary problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma'}$ as the problem obtained from DR' by adding an extra constraint that

$$\|(d+b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 = 2\gamma'.$$

A feasible solution (d, b) of DR' satisfies $\|(d+b) - (\bar{d}, \bar{b})\|_1 = 2\gamma'$ if and only if (d, b) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d(P) + b(P) &= \bar{d}(P) + \bar{b}(P) + \gamma', \\ d(Q) + b(Q) &= \bar{d}(Q) + \bar{b}(Q) - \gamma'. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4, an optimal solution of the auxiliary problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma'}$ is also optimal to DR' , and vice versa. Based on this fact, we compute an optimal solution of DR' by using the steepest descent algorithm in [10], which requires an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$ as an initial solution. For this purpose, we compute an optimal solution (\hat{d}, \hat{b}) of $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$.

Due to the definition of γ_{\min} , the problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$ can be reformulated as a relaxed problem of DR' . Consider the problem obtained from DR' by removing the ℓ_1 -distance constraint and adding an extra term $\Upsilon\|(d+b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1$ to the objective function with a sufficiently large positive Υ . The resulting objective function is given as

$$\begin{aligned} c(d, b) + \|(d+b) - (\bar{d} + \bar{b})\|_1 \\ = \sum_{i \in N} [c_i(d(i), b(i)) + |(d(i) + b(i)) - (\bar{d}(i) + \bar{b}(i))|], \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the multimodularity of objective function is preserved. Since the reformulated problem does not have ℓ_1 -distance constraint, the result in [10, Section 6.1] can be applied to show that an optimal solution of the problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$ is obtained in $O(n + \tau \log n)$ time with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau = (1/2) \min\{ \|(d+b) - (d^{(2)} + b^{(2)})\|_1 \mid \\ (d, b) \text{ is an optimal solution of } \text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By (A.1), we have $\tau = O(n^2)$, implying that an optimal solution (\hat{d}, \hat{b}) of the problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$ can be obtained in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time.

We can compute an optimal solution (d^*, b^*) of the problem DR'_{γ} by applying the steepest descent algorithm in [10, Section 6] (see also [10, Section 4]). Using the optimal solution (\hat{d}, \hat{b}) of the problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma_{\min}}$ as an initial solution, the steepest descent algorithm iteratively computes an optimal solution of the problem $\text{DR}'_{\gamma'}$ for $\gamma' = \gamma_{\min} + 1, \gamma_{\min} + 2, \dots$ by local changes of a solution, and finally finds an optimal solution of the problem DR'_{γ} , which is also an optimal solution of DR' . The running time of the steepest descent algorithm is given as $O(n + (\gamma - \gamma_{\min}) \log n)$ time. The equation (A.1) implies $\gamma - \gamma_{\min} = O(n^2)$. Hence, the steepest descent algorithm finds an optimal solution of DR' in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time.

This concludes the proof for the statement that an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(1) = \text{DR}'$ can be computed in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time by using an optimal solution of $\text{DR}'(2)$.

Appendix B. Proofs of Lemmas

Appendix B.1. Proof of Lemma 14

All of the claims (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) can be proved in a similar way as in Lemma 13. Below we give proofs of (i) and (ii) for the case $S = P$.

[Proof of (i)] Assume, to the contrary, that all of the sets I_1 , I_4^P , and I_5^P are nonempty, and let $s \in I_1$, $i \in I_4^P$, and $j \in I_5^P$. Then, elements s, i, j are distinct since sets I_1, I_4^P , and I_5^P are mutually disjoint (see Figures 1, 2, and 3).

Consider the pair of vectors $(d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i, b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j)$. Since $i \in I_4^P$ and $j \in I_5^P$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (d(i) + \lambda) + b(i) &= x(i) + \lambda \leq x^*(i) = d^*(i) + b^*(i) \leq u'(i), \\ d(j) + (b(j) - \lambda) &= x(j) - \lambda \geq x^*(j) = d^*(j) + b^*(j) \geq \ell'(j), \\ (d(s) - \lambda) + (b(s) + \lambda) &= d(s) + b(s). \end{aligned}$$

Since $i, j \in P$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i)(P) + (b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j)(P) &= d(P) + b(P), \\ (d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i)(Q) + (b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j)(Q) &= d(Q) + b(Q), \\ (b + \lambda\chi_i - \lambda\chi_j)(N) &= b(N) \leq B. \end{aligned}$$

From these inequalities and equations we see that $(d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i, b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j)$ is a feasible solution of $DR'(\lambda)$. Since (d, b) is an optimal solution of $DR'(\lambda)$, we have

$$c(d, b) \leq c(d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i, b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

On the other hand, it follows from the choice of i, j, s that

$$\min\{d^*(i) - d(i), b(j) - b^*(j), d(s) - d^*(s), b^*(s) - b(s)\} \geq \lambda,$$

which, together with Lemma 9 (iv), implies that

$$c(d, b) > c(d - \lambda\chi_s + \lambda\chi_i, b + \lambda\chi_s - \lambda\chi_j),$$

a contradiction to (B.1).

[Proof of (ii)] Assume, to the contrary, that $b(N) - b^*(N) \geq \lambda$, $I_4^P \neq \emptyset$, and $I_5^P \neq \emptyset$ hold, and let $i \in I_4^P$ and $j \in I_5^P$. Then, elements i, j are distinct since sets I_4^P and I_5^P are disjoint.

Consider the pair of vectors $(d + \lambda\chi_i, b - \lambda\chi_j)$. Since $i, j \in P$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (d + \lambda\chi_i)(P) + (b - \lambda\chi_j)(P) &= d(P) + b(P), \\ (d + \lambda\chi_i)(Q) + (b - \lambda\chi_j)(Q) &= d(Q) + b(Q), \\ (b - \lambda\chi_j)(N) &= b(N) - \lambda \leq B, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(d + \lambda\chi_i, b - \lambda\chi_j)$ is a feasible solution of $DR'(\lambda)$. Since (d, b) is an optimal solution of $DR'(\lambda)$, we have

$$c(d, b) \leq c(d + \lambda\chi_i, b - \lambda\chi_j). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

On the other hand, it follows from $i \in I_4^P$, $j \in I_5^P$, and $b(N) - b^*(N) \geq \lambda$ that $\min\{d^*(i) - d(i), b(j) - b^*(j), b(N) - b^*(N)\} \geq \lambda$, which, together with Lemma 9 (iii), implies that $c(d, b) > c(d + \lambda\chi_i, b - \lambda\chi_j)$, a contradiction to (B.2).

Appendix B.2. Proofs of the Bounds for the Remaining Cases

We first consider the cases P1-Q3, P1-Q4, P2-Q3, and P2-Q4.

Lemma 18. *We have $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 10\lambda n$ if one of the cases P1-Q3, P1-Q4, P2-Q3, and P2-Q4 occurs.*

Proof. Proof. We first consider the case P1-Q3 (see Figure B.5). Since the case P1 occurs, we have

$$\sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| < 4\lambda|P|$$

(see (3.23) in the proof of Lemma 17). We will show that

$$\|d - d^*\|_1 < 4\lambda n, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)| < 4\lambda|Q| + 2\lambda|P|. \quad (\text{B.4})$$




Figure B.5: Regions corresponding to the case P1–Q3. Combination of the cases P1 and Q3 implies that the points $(d(i) - d^*(i), b(i) - b^*(i))$ for $i \in P$ and $(d(j) - d^*(j), b(j) - b^*(j))$ for $j \in Q$ are not located on the shaded regions.

These inequalities imply the desired inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x - x^*\|_1 &= \sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| + \sum_{i \in Q} |x(i) - x^*(i)| \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| + \sum_{i \in Q} |d(i) - d^*(i)| + \sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)| \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in P} |x(i) - x^*(i)| + \|d - d^*\|_1 + \sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)| \\
&< 4\lambda|P| + 4\lambda n + (4\lambda|Q| + 2\lambda|P|) \\
&= 8\lambda n + 2\lambda|P| \leq 10\lambda n.
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that (see Figure B.5) $I_4^P = I_6^P = I_2 = \emptyset$ implies

$$d(i) - d^*(i) \geq -2\lambda, \quad x(i) - x^*(i) \geq -2\lambda \quad (i \in P), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and $I_4^Q = I_5^Q = I_2 = \emptyset$ implies

$$d(i) - d^*(i) \geq -2\lambda, \quad b(i) - b^*(i) \leq 2\lambda \quad (i \in Q). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We use these inequalities to prove (B.3) and (B.4).

[Proof of (B.3)] Put $N' = \text{supp}^+(d - d^*)$. If $N' = \emptyset$, then we have

$$\|d - d^*\|_1 = - \sum_{i \in N} (d(i) - d^*(i)) < 2\lambda \cdot |N| = 4\lambda n,$$

where the inequality is by (B.5) and (B.6). Otherwise, $|N \setminus N'| \leq n - 1$ and therefore it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d - d^*\|_1 &= \sum_{i \in N'} (d(i) - d^*(i)) - \sum_{i \in N \setminus N'} (d(i) - d^*(i)) \\
&= (d(N') - d^*(N')) - (d(N \setminus N') - d^*(N \setminus N')) \\
&= (d(N) - d^*(N)) - 2(d(N \setminus N') - d^*(N \setminus N')) \\
&< \lambda + 2 \cdot 2\lambda \cdot |N \setminus N'| \\
&\leq 4\lambda n,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by the assumption $d(N) - d^*(N) < \lambda$, (B.5), and (B.6).




Figure B.6: Regions corresponding to Case P1-Q4.

[Proof of (B.4)] We first bound the values $b(P) - b^*(P)$ and $b(Q) - b^*(Q)$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
b(P) - b^*(P) &= \sum_{i \in P} (b(i) - b^*(i)) \\
&= \sum_{i \in P} [(x(i) - x^*(i)) - (d(i) - d^*(i))] \\
&= (x(P) - x^*(P)) - \sum_{i \in P} (d(i) - d^*(i)) \leq 0 + 2\lambda|P|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is by (3.2) and (B.5). From this inequality it follows that

$$b(Q) - b^*(Q) = (b(N) - b^*(N)) - (b(P) - b^*(P)) > -\lambda - 2\lambda|P|, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the inequality is by the assumption $b(N) - b^*(N) > -\lambda$.

We now bound the value $\sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)|$. Put $Q' = \text{supp}^+(b - b^*) \cap Q$. If $Q' = Q$, it holds that

$$\sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)| = b(Q) - b^*(Q) \leq 2\lambda|Q|,$$

where the inequality is by (B.6). Otherwise, we have $|Q'| \leq |Q| - 1$ and therefore it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in Q} |b(i) - b^*(i)| &= (b(Q') - b^*(Q')) - (b(Q \setminus Q') - b^*(Q \setminus Q')) \\
&= 2(b(Q') - b^*(Q')) - (b(Q) - b^*(Q)) \\
&< 2 \cdot 2\lambda|Q'| + (\lambda + 2\lambda|P|) \\
&\leq 4\lambda|Q| + 2\lambda|P|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is by (B.7).

This concludes the proof for the case P1-Q3. We see that each of the cases P1-Q4, P2-Q3, and P2-Q4 is symmetric to the case P1-Q3 (see Figures B.6, B.7, and B.8), the proofs for these cases can be done in the same way and therefore omitted. \square

The cases P3-Q1, P3-Q2, P4-Q1, and P4-Q2 are also symmetric to the cases P1-Q3, P1-Q4, P2-Q3, and P2-Q4, and therefore we obtain the following bound for the cases:

Lemma 19. *We have $\|x - x^*\|_1 < 10\lambda n$ if one of the cases P3-Q1, P3-Q2, P4-Q1, and P4-Q2 occurs.*




Figure B.7: Regions corresponding to Case P2-Q3.




Figure B.8: Regions corresponding to Case P2-Q4.