

An Integer Programming Approach for Quick-Commerce Assortment Planning

Yajing Chen Taotao He Ying Rong Yunlong Wang

Antai College of Economics and Management, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200030, China.

Contact: yajingchen@sjtu.edu.cn (YC), hetaotao@sjtu.edu.cn (TH), yrong@sjtu.edu.cn (YR), wylwork_sjtu@sjtu.edu.cn (YW)

In this paper, we explore the challenge of assortment planning in the context of quick-commerce, a rapidly-growing business model that aims to deliver time-sensitive products. In order to achieve quick delivery to satisfy the immediate demands of online customers in close proximity, personalized online assortments need to be included in brick-and-mortar store offerings. With the presence of this physical linkage requirement and distinct multinomial logit (MNL) choice models for online consumer segments, the firm seeks to maximize overall revenue by selecting an optimal assortment of products for local stores and by tailoring a personalized assortment for each online consumer segment. We refer to this problem as quick-commerce assortment planning (QAP). We employ an integer programming approach to solve this NP-hard problem to global optimality. Specifically, we propose convexification techniques to handle its combinatorial and nonconvex nature. We capture the consumer choice of each online segment using a convex hull representation. By exploiting the geometry behind Luce’s choice axiom, we provide a compact polyhedral characterization of the convex hull under various operational constraints that are not totally-unimodular. Furthermore, we conduct a polyhedral study on the relation between assortment decisions for products to offer and choice probabilities of products under the MNL model. Our methodology, coupled with a modified choice probability ordered separation algorithm, yields formulations that provide a significant computational advantage over existing methods. Through comprehensive numerical studies, we emphasize the significance of aligning offline and online assortment decisions and underscore the perils associated with inaccurately specifying customer behavior models. Finally, we use the geometry insights from our polyhedral results to develop a polynomial time randomized algorithm for solving a variant of QAP.

Key words: quick commerce; assortment optimization; multinomial logit model; mixed-integer nonlinear programming; convexification

History: This version: Sep 17, 2023

1. Introduction

Over recent years, brick-and-mortar stores have witnessed slower growth compared to the online sector. Nevertheless, there exist certain product categories, including meals, fresh food, groceries, and flowers, which are not well-suited for next-day delivery, which is the fastest service offered by many online retail giants. Consumers demand these time-sensitive products to be delivered within an hour to satiate their immediate demands. With the advent of third-party delivery platforms, such as DoorDash, Meituan, Delivery Hero and Grab, brick-and-mortar stores are capitalizing on

their proximity to local consumers to offer their products online and deliver them within a short timeframe. This strategy has given birth to the rapidly-evolving business model of quick-commerce, which is expected to produce a global market volume of 185 billion US dollars in 2027 (Statista 2022).

As brick-and-mortar stores are increasingly teaming up with third-party delivery platforms to offer quick delivery services, some online retail giants are taking an alternative approach by establishing their own local stores that serve both online and offline consumers. Alibaba's Hema Fresh is a prime example of such an approach. The store guarantees delivery within 30 minutes to online consumers residing within three kilometers of their local stores. By leveraging in-store staff to handpick products for online consumers, Hema Fresh is able to enhance its sales per square foot and even to venture into opening massive stores in prime downtown areas. Similarly, Amazon chose to acquire Whole Foods and to roll out speedy delivery to the consumers in the selected cities.

In traditional omni-channels, the constraints of physical space often lead to a smaller assortment of products available in brick-and-mortar stores compared to that of the online channel. These offline outlets typically serve as an extension of the online channel, allowing consumers to touch, feel, and sample products in person (Dzyabura and Jagabathula 2018, Lo and Topaloglu 2022). However, the quick-commerce model generally focuses on providing products that consumers are already familiar with. The advantage of quick-commerce lies in leveraging the in-store product assortment to facilitate prompt delivery and to satisfy the immediate demands of local consumers.

In this paper, we explore the challenge of product assortment in the context of quick commerce. To meet the need for speedy delivery, it is essential for all products, whether offered online or offline, to be available at brick-and-mortar stores. Offline consumers can choose their desired products in the conventional manner, whereas the delivery platform or online retailers can leverage extensive consumer data, such as browsing and purchase behavior, to offer personalized assortments to online consumers.

Specifically, we assume that the choice behaviors of both offline consumers and each of the online consumer segments follow separate multinomial logit (MNL) models. The linkage between the offline and online channels in the quick commerce setting is established by ensuring that the personalized assortments for each online segment are carried at a local brick-and-mortar store. The goal is to maximize the expected revenue by finding the optimal assortment to carry at the local store and the personalized assortment for every online consumer segment, subject to the linkage constraint and the other operational constraints. We refer to this problem as the quick-commerce assortment problem.

In this paper, we formally define the quick-commerce assortment problem as in (QAP). We show that this problem is NP-hard even when there are no operational constraints and there is

one single online consumer type. Nevertheless, we develop integer programming techniques for solving (QAP) to its global optimality. In particular, we propose convexification techniques to address the combinatorial and nonconvex nature of the optimization problem. Our methodology yields formulations of (QAP) that are not only capable of providing provably optimal solutions at a large scale but also offer flexibility in accommodating complex operational considerations.

1.1. Contribution

We summarize the contribution of our study as follows:

1. We prove in Theorem 1 that individually relaxing each online consumer type’s choice behavior to its convex hull representation still yields an exact formulation. Then, by exploiting the geometry behind Luce’s choice axiom, we show that a compact polyhedral formulation for the convex hull can be constructed provided that there is a compact formulation for operational constraints. This polyhedral result generalizes the linear programming (LP) formulation for the MNL model under totally unimodular (TU) constraints (Davis et al. 2013, Sumida et al. 2021). As an illustrative example, we use a compact formulation of the chain polytope to derive a compact LP formulation for assortment optimization under the two-stage Luce choice model, introduced by Echenique and Saito (2019), which satisfactorily handles zero-probability choices.

2. We conduct a convex hull study on the relation between assortment decisions for *all* products and choice probabilities of products under the MNL model. We show that it is impossible to obtain a tractable convex hull description unless $P=NP$. Nonetheless, we provide a tractable convex hull characterization tailored to the *single* product case (detailed from Theorem 3 to Theorem 5). Then, the geometry of the convex hull is used to develop a polynomial time randomized rounding algorithm for solving a variant of (QAP). In this variant, each online consumer type selects products according independent demand model and the firm faces a specific class of precedence constraints (as referenced in Theorem 6). This advancement generalizes the tractable LP formulation for assortment optimization under a mixture of independent demand and multinomial logit models, as presented in Cao et al. (2023).

3. We apply the convex hull results to obtain formulation CH (resp. CH-Chain) for the quick-commerce assortment problem under the MNL choice model (resp. under the two-stage Luce model). Our formulations, coupled with a modified choice probability ordered cutting-plane algorithm (refer to Algorithm 2), surpass the performance of the formulations based on the state-of-the-art conic integer optimization approach (Sen et al. 2018). The computational efficiency of our formulations enables us to conduct extensive numerical studies on the quick-commerce assortment problem. Initially, we explore how the optimal assortment structure evolves with variations in parameters, such as preference weights. Subsequently, we demonstrate situations wherein substantial advantages arise from jointly optimizing offline and online assortments. Additionally, we

demonstrate that ignoring consumer behavior when choosing under the two-stage Luce model can lead to detrimental outcomes.

1.2. Literature Review

Our research is related to the field of optimizing product assortments by using random utility choice models, specifically the widely used MNL model (Luce 1959, Plackett 1975, McFadden 1978). In this case, with no restrictions on offered assortments, Gallego et al. (2004) and Talluri and Van Ryzin (2004) show that the optimal assortment under the MNL model is revenue-ordered, including a subset of products with the highest revenues. In more recent works, assortment planning problems under MNL are considered with various constraints (Rusmevichientong et al. 2010, Wang 2012, Davis et al. 2013, Sumida et al. 2021). Some research has been focused on the assortment optimization problem under a mixture of multinomial logit (MMNL) models in which there are multiple consumer types and consumers of various types choose according to different MNL models. Rusmevichientong et al. (2014) demonstrate that the assortment problem under the MMNL model is NP-hard even when the number of mixtures is two. Despite these hardness results, some approximation algorithms to solve the problem have been developed (Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Désir et al. 2022, El Housni and Topaloglu 2023).

The majority of research on assortment optimization problems focuses on a single channel context. However, with the rise of omni-channel retailing, assortment planning in omni-channel systems has emerged as a relatively new and important topic for both academics and practitioners. Dzyabura and Jagabathula (2018) study the problem of determining the subset of products from the retailer’s online channel to offer in the offline channel to maximize the aggregate revenue. It is assumed that each product is defined by a set of attributes, and there is a utility associated with each attribute that depends on whether the product is offered in the offline channel. They incorporate the impact of physical evaluation on preferences into the consumer demand model. Under this model, they demonstrate that the decision problem is NP-hard and propose approximation algorithms with theoretical guarantees. Lo and Topaloglu (2022) introduce a novel features-tree structure to organize products by features in an omni-channel setting for the assortment optimization problem of a retailer that operates a physical store and an online store. The nonleaf vertices on the tree correspond to features, and the leaf vertices correspond to products. The ancestors of a leaf correspond to the features of the product. They show that the assortment optimization problem in this setup is NP-hard, and leverage the features tree structure to provide an FPTAS based on dynamic programming that allows for approximately optimal assortments. Chen et al. (2022a) study the optimal offline store locations and location-dependent assortments decision problem for an omni-channel retailer in the presence of an online channel that carries all products. They

develop a tractable mixed integer second-order conic programming reformulation and explore the structural properties of the reformulation to derive strengthening cuts in closed form.

Our paper most closely related to the growing literature on developing integer programming techniques to solve optimization problems involving customer choice model. Sen et al. (2018) propose a conic integer optimization formulation for assortment problem under MMNL model. Bertsimas and Misić (2019) propose a new mixed integer optimization model of the product line design problem under a first-choice rule, and solve the model using benders decomposition. Chen and Misić (2021) develop a mixed-integer optimization methodology for solving the assortment optimization problem when the choice model is a decision forest model. Chen et al. (2022a) develop a tractable mixed integer second-order conic programming reformulation for location-dependent offline-channel assortment planning in omnichannel retailing. Li et al. (2022) propose mixed-integer linear programming formulations for solving assortment planning with multi-choice rank list model in e-commerce. Chen et al. (2023) use disjunctive programming to solve model-free assortment pricing with transaction data.

Last, we comment on the relation of our paper to the optimization literature. First, our paper provides new insights into the Charnes-Cooper transformation which is proposed in Charnes and Cooper (1962) to solve linear fractional programs. Second, our convex hull characterization of choice probabilities under MNL model with operational constraints is related to Megiddo (1979), which shows that optimizing a rational function over a combinatorial set is polynomial time solvable if optimizing a linear function over the feasible region is polynomial time solvable. Last, our polyhedral study on the relation between assortment decision and choice probabilities under MNL is related to the literature on mixed-integer bilinear programming. We review recent developments in this topic as follows. Convex hulls of bilinear functions are studied in Tawarmalani et al. (2013) and Gupte et al. (2020). Gupte et al. (2013) present a mixed-integer linear programming formulation for mixed integer bilinear problems. Convex hulls of various mixed integer bilinear sets are studied in (Tawarmalani et al. 2010, Chung et al. 2014, Bonami et al. 2018, Fampa and Lee 2021, Gu et al. 2023).

1.3. Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate our quick-commerce assortment optimization problem (QAP) and show that it is NP-hard. In Section 3, we give the relaxation model (QAP-RLX) and show its exactness. In Section 4, we provide a compact polyhedral formulation for each online segment. In Section 5, we conduct a convex hull study on the relation between assortment decisions and choice probabilities of products. In Section 6, we propose formulations for (QAP) and present computational experiments. In Section 7, we present a polynomial-time solvable variant of (QAP). Finally, conclusions are given in Section 8.

2. Model

2.1. Formulation

We consider a set of products $N := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Due to enormous data available from online consumers, we assume that the firm can segment the online consumers into m types. Let $M := \{1, \dots, m\}$ denote the set of consumer types in the online channel and let $\{0\}$ denote the only consumer segment in the offline channel. Let $M^+ = \{0\} \cup M$ denote the set of all consumer types, which include $\{0\}$ and M . For each consumer type $i \in M^+$ and each product $j \in N$, let r_{ij} denote the revenue obtained from selling the product j to the type i consumer, which allows for modeling personalized pricing such as discounts for VIP consumers or personalized discount offered by mobile application (Elmachtoub et al. 2021). The probability of a consumer of type i arriving to the system is α_i , where $\sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i = 1$.

For each type $i \in M^+$, let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in}) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be a binary decision variable to model the subset of products offered to consumer type i , namely, $x_{ij} = 1$ if and only if product j is offered to consumer type i . In the online channel, \mathbf{x}_i can be different as the firm can utilize the personalized assortment to enhance revenue (El Housni and Topaloglu 2023). In addition, due to the prompt delivery requirement under quick commerce, it is required that the personalized online assortment needs to be included in the physical store, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i$.

The choice behavior of each consumer type, from either offline or online channels, follows the multinomial logit (MNL) model. For each consumer type $i \in M^+$, we use $u_{ij} \geq 0$ to denote their preference weight on product j , and u_{i0} to denote their preference weight on the no-purchase option. If we offer $\mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ to a consumer of type i , the consumer purchases product j with probability $u_{ij}x_{ij}/(u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij}x_{ij})$. Thus, the expected revenue obtained from consumer type i is given by

$$R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i) := \frac{\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} x_{ij}}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_{ij}}.$$

We note that products such as fresh food and groceries, which are provided through quick-commerce approaches, are those that consumers are already acquainted with. As a result, the attractiveness of a product in one channel does not directly correlate with its availability in the other channel. Moreover, it is quite common for consumers to possess a strong channel preference. Certain consumers may opt to primarily purchase products online, whereas others may lean toward offline shopping experiences. Hence, in the context of quick commerce, the value of u_{ij} for $i \in M$ is independent of the value of u_{0j} .

For a consumer of type $i \in M$, we assume that products recommended to her must be stocked in the physical store. Our goal is to jointly find feasible offline assortment and personalized assortments to online consumers to maximize the expected revenue over all consumer types. More specifically, we

are interested in solving the following nonlinear discrete optimization problem for quick commerce assortment planning¹:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M \\ & \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n \quad \text{for } i \in M^+, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{QAP})$$

where the first constraint models that products recommended to online consumers must be available in the offline physical store, and \mathcal{F}_i is the set of feasible assortments that we can offer to consumer type $i \in M^+$, which will be specified later.

2.2. Two step revenue-ordered policy

When there is no constraint on assortments, that is, $\mathcal{F}_i = \{0, 1\}^n$, a natural idea for solving (QAP) is to use a two step revenue-ordered (RO) policy. In the first step, the offline assortment is determined by maximizing the revenue from the offline channel only. The structure of the offline assortment possesses the revenue-order property because it is equivalent to solving the optimal assortment under MNL. In the second step, the personalized online assortment for each consumer type is chosen from the offline assortment obtained in the first step. Similarly, the personalized online assortment obtained in the second step also possesses the revenue-order property. Formally, the RO policy can be obtained by solving the following sequential problems.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}} &\in \arg \max \{R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0) \mid \mathbf{x}_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n\} \\ \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{RO}} &\in \arg \max \{R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid \mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n, \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}} \geq \mathbf{x}_i\} \quad \text{for } i \in M, \end{aligned} \quad (2\text{-STEP-RO})$$

Unfortunately, this strategy fails to solve (QAP) to global optimality, as we illustrate in the next example.

EXAMPLE 1. Here, we consider a toy example with four products and two consumer types in the online channel. The arrival rates of the three types are $\alpha = (0.1, 0.8, 0.1)$, and the revenues of products are $(r_{01}, r_{02}, r_{03}, r_{04}) = (r_{11}, r_{12}, r_{13}, r_{14}) = (r_{21}, r_{22}, r_{23}, r_{24}) = (10, 8, 5, 4)$. The preference weight of products are $(u_{01}, u_{02}, u_{03}, u_{04}) = (6, 8, 9, 7)$, $(u_{11}, u_{12}, u_{13}, u_{14}) = (1, 2, 8, 9)$ and $(u_{21}, u_{22}, u_{23}, u_{24}) = (8, 5, 7, 2)$, and the preference weights of the no-purchase option is $u_{00} = u_{10} = u_{20} = 10$. As shown in Table 1, (2-STEP-RO) offers products $\{1, 2\}$ to all three consumer types, while (QAP) offers $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ to consumer type 0 and type 1 and $\{1, 2\}$ to consumer type 2. By adding product $\{3, 4\}$ to offline assortment $\{1, 2\}$, the online revenue increases by 1.12, while the offline revenue decreases by 0.03. \square

¹ Instead of modeling online consumers by using the MNL model, many online platforms utilize typical machine learning based algorithms assuming independent demand in practice (Feldman et al. 2022). In Section 7, we replace the MNL choice models with the independent choice models for online consumer types. Under such scenario, our theoretical results yield a polynomial time solvable linear programming formulation (refer to Theorem 6)

Table 1 Assortment and revenue of two methods

Channel	2-STEP-RO		QAP	
	Assort.	Exp. Rev.	Assort.	Exp. Rev.
Offline	{1, 2}	0.52	{1, 2, 3, 4}	0.49
Online	{1, 2}{1, 2}	2.12	{1, 2, 3, 4}{1, 2}	3.24

The key insight behind this example is that the RO policy ignores the needs of online consumers completely when determining the assortment for the offline channel. Online consumers who do not appreciate the high priced-products often leave the firm’s online channel without making a purchase. To provide a better experience to those consumers, it is necessary to expand the assortments.

In Proposition 1, we argue that solving (QAP) to global optimality not only generates more revenue but also yields more selections to offline stores than the revenue-ordered policy.

PROPOSITION 1. *Assume that the price ranks of products are consistent across different consumer types, that is, $r_{i1} \geq r_{i2} \geq \dots \geq r_{in}$ for each $i \in M^+$. Let $\mathbf{x}^{\text{RO}} := (\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{\text{RO}})$ be a solution given by (2-STEP-RO). Let $\mathbf{x}^{\text{QAP}} := (\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{\text{QAP}})$ be the optimal solution of (QAP). When there exist multiple optimal solutions of (QAP), \mathbf{x}^{QAP} is the optimal solution with the maximal number of activated products in all channels. Then we have $\mathbf{x}^{\text{RO}} \leq \mathbf{x}^{\text{QAP}}$.*

To gauge consumer satisfaction in the assortment planning setting, the total utility of the offered assortment is utilized by Sumida et al. (2021) and Feldman and Jiang (2023). Higher total utility of the offered assortment corresponds to greater consumer satisfaction. Proposition 1 suggests that optimizing assortments jointly for offline and online channels, as opposed to sequentially, can lead to simultaneous increases in overall revenue and consumer satisfaction for all consumer types simultaneously. This is due to the higher total utility of the optimal assortment achieved under joint optimization.

2.3. The Connection between (QAP) and Other Assortment Problems

The assortment under quick commerce is closely related to two other assortment problems. The first is the assortment under the mixture of MNL models (Bront et al. 2009, Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Sen et al. 2018, Désir et al. 2022). The difference between (QAP) and this stream of literature is that the assortment for each consumer type can be different. If we modify the constraint in (QAP) to require $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_i$ instead of $\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i$, then it becomes assortment optimization under the mixture of MNL models. Thus, (QAP) generates more revenue by allowing personalized assortments for different online consumer types.

The second closely related problem is to analyze the value of personalized assortment with each consumer type following the MNL model (El Housni and Topaloglu 2023). In the case where the offline channel is disabled (i.e., $\alpha_0 = 0$), there is a cardinality constraint on the assortment from the offline channel (i.e., $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\mathbf{x}_0 \mid \sum_{j \in N} x_{0j} \leq k\}$), and the prices of all products are the same across different consumer types (i.e., $r_{ij} = r_{i'j}$ for $i \neq i'$), then (QAP) reduces to the problem studied in El Housni and Topaloglu (2023).

Similar to the aforementioned assortment problems, the following proposition also shows that (QAP) is an NP-hard problem.

PROPOSITION 2. *The maximization problem (QAP) is NP-hard even when there is only one online consumer type, $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}_1 = \{0, 1\}^n$, and $\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{r}_1$.*

There are two different directions to tackle difficult assortment problems. The first is to develop approximation algorithms (Bront et al. 2009, Rusmevichientong et al. 2014, Désir et al. 2022, El Housni and Topaloglu 2023). The other direction is to aim for global optimality in solving such problems (Sen et al. 2018). In this paper, we take the latter approach by deriving integer programming formulation techniques for (QAP).

3. Reformulation Framework

In this section, we aim to provide a framework to reformulate (QAP). Our framework is built upon a convex relaxation. Namely, we relax the optimization problem of each online consumer type to its tightest convex relaxation while keeping the offline optimization problem the same. We show that such relaxation is exact although (QAP) is nonseparable due to the presence of linkage constraints $\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i$ for each $i \in M$. This idea reduces the number of binary variables in (QAP) from $mn + n$ to n . Moreover, it yields a framework for constructing integer programming formulations of (QAP), paving the way for our studies in Sections 4 and 5.

3.1. Preliminaries

Before presenting our relaxation of (QAP), we review some basic concepts that we use throughout this paper. First, we review a prevalent transformation which is proposed in Charnes and Cooper (1962) to solve linear fractional programming. For each segment $i \in M^+ := \{0\} \cup M$, the Charnes-Cooper (C-C) transformation, denoted as Π_i , maps an assortment offering $\mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ to a vector (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) defined as follows:

$$y_{i0} = \frac{1}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_{ij}} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_{ij}} \quad \text{for } j \in N.$$

The C-C transformation has a few properties that are useful in our development. Algebraically, for a given set of assortments $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, it is a one-to-one mapping between \mathcal{F}_i and the image set

$$\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i) := \left\{ (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \left| u_{i0}y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij}y_{ij} = 1, \mathbf{y}_i \in y_{i0} \cdot \mathcal{F}_i, y_{i0} > 0 \right. \right\},$$

where we recall that for a set S in \mathbb{R}^n and a real scalar $\lambda > 0$, the scalar multiple $\lambda \cdot S$ is defined as $\{\lambda x \mid x \in S\}$. Geometrically, the image set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ can be viewed as the intersection of a hyperplane and a cone, given as follows:

$$\left\{ (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \left| u_{i0}y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij}y_{ij} = 1 \right. \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \left| \mathbf{y}_i \in y_{i0} \cdot \mathcal{F}_i, y_{i0} > 0 \right. \right\},$$

respectively. This geometrical interpretation will be used to prove the main result of Section 4.1.

In addition to the geometrical interpretation in $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$, the vector (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) can be used to generate the choice probability in (QAP). Specifically, for each fixed point (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) in $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$, we may interpret $u_{ij}y_{ij}$ as the probability that a consumer of type i chooses item j and $u_{i0}y_{i0}$ as the probability that such consumer chooses the outside option. In other words, the set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ captures the choice probabilities among the products in the given assortment and the no-purchase alternative. In Section 5, we use this interpretation to devise a (choice) probability-ordered algorithm for generating cutting planes. Henceforth, we will refer to $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ as *choice probability set* over a given set of assortments, and we will refer to \mathbf{x}_i as *assortment variable* and $\mathbf{y}_i \in \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ as *choice probability variable*.

Next, we review some concepts from integer programming. Consider a set defined by linear inequalities and continuous and integer variables as follows

$$E = \{(x, y, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^s \times \mathbb{Z}^t \mid Ax + By + C\lambda \leq b\},$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times t}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We say that E is a *mixed integer programming (MIP) formulation* of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if the projection of E onto the space of x variables is S , that is $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists (y, \lambda) \text{ s.t. } (x, y, \lambda) \in E\}$. The polyhedron obtained by dropping all integrality requirements in E is called the *continuous relaxation* or *linear programming (LP) relaxation* of E . One of the factors that has a strong impact on the performance of an MIP formulation is the strength of the LP relaxation (Vielma 2015). For two MIP formulations E_1 and E_2 of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we say E_1 is a *tighter* than E_2 if the LP relaxation of E_1 is contained in that of E_2 .

When MIP formulations already have a number of constraints that is exponential in the data size of the problem, solving the corresponding LP relaxations is not straightforward. In this case, we would like to solve the *separation problem* of these linear programs, namely, given a polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a point $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, either show that $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in P$ or give a valid inequality $\langle \alpha, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \beta$ for P such

that $\langle \alpha, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \rangle > \beta$. The celebrated theorem of Grötschel et al. (1981) states that optimizing a linear function over P can be solved in polynomial time if and only if the separation problem over P can be solved in polynomial time.

One of the most successful techniques for deriving MIP formulations is *convexification*, see books and monographs Schrijver (2003), Bertsimas and Weismantel (2005), Conforti et al. (2014). The basic idea in convexification is to identify substructures, which capture the essence in the problem at hand, and then derive the convex hull of substructures. Given a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the *convex hull* of S , denoted as $\text{conv}(S)$, is the inclusionwise minimal convex set containing S . To prove a convex hull result, it is often useful to invoke its dual definition, that is, the convex hull of S is the set of all possible convex combinations of points in S .

3.2. Reformulation via relaxing choice probability sets

By using the algebraic property of the C-C transformation, we obtain an mixed integer bilinear reformulation of (QAP), that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i) \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \mathbf{y}_i = y_{i0} \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M. \end{aligned}$$

Since the objective function only involves the choice probability variable $(\mathbf{y}_i)_{i \in M^+}$, we use the relation $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{y}_i / y_{i0}$ to project the online assortment variable \mathbf{x}_i out of the feasible region, and obtain an equivalent formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i) \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ && \text{(CHOICE-PROB)} \\ & \mathbf{y}_0 = y_{00} \mathbf{x}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n && \text{(OFF-BI)} \\ & \mathbf{y}_i \leq y_{i0} \mathbf{x}_0 \quad \text{for } i \in M. && \text{(LINK-BI)} \end{aligned}$$

Constraint (CHOICE-PROB) describes both offline and online consumers' choice behavior in the space of choice probability variables as the set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ captures the choice probabilities among the products in \mathcal{F}_i and the no-purchase alternative. Constraint (OFF-BI) models offline consumers' choice behavior using a bilinear relation between the assortment variable and the choice probability variable. Last, the bilinear inequality (LINK-BI) models that if a product does not appear in the offline store then a consumer in an online channel purchases such a product with a probability of zero.

Now, we are ready to construct our relaxation for (QAP). We relax each choice probability set in (CHOICE-PROB) to its convex hull and obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \text{conv}(\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)) \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \text{(OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI).} \end{aligned} \tag{QAP-RLX}$$

Theorem 1 shows that such relaxation is an exact reformulation of (QAP). As a consequence, to obtain an MIP formulation for (QAP), it suffices to derive the convex hull of $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ and MIP formulations for (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI). The resulting formulations introduce n binary assortment variables to select an optimal assortment carried at local stores. In contrast, (QAP) introduces $mn + n$ binary assortment variables to decide whether we offer a product $j \in N$ to a consumer segment $i \in M^+$.

Next, we prove the exactness of (QAP-RLX). The main step in the proof is to perform a convex decomposition of a feasible solution to (QAP-RLX). This is done by observing that a given offline assortment induces a face for the convex hull of each online choice probability set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$, and then by invoking a facial decomposition result, described as in Lemma 1 and visualized in Figure 1. This lemma has been used in studying disjunctive programming (e.g. Lemma 5.1 in Balas 1998) and in analyzing the lift-and-project rank for mixed 0-1 linear programs (e.g. Theorem 5.22 in Conforti et al. 2014).

LEMMA 1. Consider a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a hyperplane $H := \{x \mid \alpha^\top x = \beta\}$ such that $\alpha^\top x \leq \beta$ for $x \in S$. Then, $\text{conv}(S) \cap H = \text{conv}(S \cap H)$.

In Figure 1, we present two cases to demonstrate the significance of H being the face of set S in validating the decomposition result in Lemma 1. The line segment connecting two red dots represents $\text{conv}(S \cap H)$, and the blue line segment represents $\text{conv}(S) \cap H$. When H defines a face of set S , the line segment connecting two red points is exactly equal to $\text{conv}(S) \cap H$. However, when H does *not* define a face of set S , then $\text{conv}(S \cap H)$ is strictly contained in $\text{conv}(S) \cap H$. Using Lemma 1, we derive the main result of Section 3.

THEOREM 1. Problem (QAP) has the same optimal objective value as (QAP-RLX).

To conclude the discussion of this section, we emphasize that the exact result presented here is a crucial foundation for the rest of this paper. Specifically, the following two sections build upon this result:

- In Section 4, we characterize conditions under which a polynomial-time tractable convex hull description of the choice probability set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ can be obtained. This characterization generalizes




Figure 1 Illustration of the facial decomposition in Lemma 1.

linear programming formulations for MNL under totally unimodular constraints (Davis et al. 2013, Sumida et al. 2021), and it can handle assortment applications with more practical considerations, which are discussed in Section 4.2.

- In Section 5, we propose convexification techniques to obtain tight MIP formulations for (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI). In particular, we provide a complete convex hull description of the relation between a single offline assortment variable x_{0j} and the choice probability variables (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) of the i^{th} type of consumers. In addition, we devise a modified *probability-ordered* policy to solve the separation problem of the convex hull.

4. Convex Hull Results on Choice Probability Sets

To utilize Theorem 1, an important steppingstone is to specify the condition that the convex hull of the choice probability set (i.e. $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$) for each consumer type i can be found efficiently. The early works by Davis et al. (2013) and Sumida et al. (2021) provide such a clue. The authors show that the convex hull of the choice probability set coincides with its linear programming relaxation when the feasible assortment set \mathcal{F}_i is characterized by a totally unimodular matrix. This important finding enables the assortment problem under the MNL model to efficiently tackle the applications arising from cardinality constraints, display location effects, discrete price menus, price ladder constraints and product precedence constraints. In Section 4.1, we first characterize general conditions on the set of feasible assortments \mathcal{F}_i for which a polynomial time tractable convex hull description of $\Pi(\mathcal{F}_i)$ can be obtained. That is,

$$\text{conv}(\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)) \text{ is polynomial time tractable if } \text{conv}(\mathcal{F}_i) \text{ is polynomial time tractable.}$$

Built upon this theoretical result, in Section 4.2, we provide tractable formulations with an applications that arise in quick-commerce assortment planning.

Before we proceed with the main results in this section, we remove the subscript i to streamline the presentation. More specifically, we study the convex hull of the choice probability set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F})$ over a given set of feasible assortments \mathcal{F} , where

$$\Pi(\mathcal{F}) := \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \left| v_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} v_j y_j = 1, \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \mathcal{F}, y_0 > 0 \right. \right\},$$

where \mathcal{F} is a subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ and models constraints on available products.

4.1. Convex hull characterization via geometric decomposition

In this subsection, we use the geometry of the choice probability set to obtain its convex hull description. For a given nonempty subset \mathcal{F} of $\{0, 1\}^n$, the choice probability set $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ is the intersection of a hyperplane H and a cone K , where,

$$H := \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \left| u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1 \right. \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad K := \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \left| \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \mathcal{F}, y_0 > 0 \right. \right\}.$$

Recall that the expression $u_i y_i$ can be interpreted as the probability of purchasing product i and that $u_0 y_0$ can be interpreted as the nonpurchase probability. The hyperplane H is used to enforce probability normalization, which requires that the sum of those probabilities equals one. Hence, H is referred to as the *probability normalization* hyperplane.

We note that objective function of (QAP) incorporates the form of the MNL choice model, while the purchase probability in (QAP-RLX) is directly linked with the \mathbf{y} variable. Therefore, the structure of the MNL choice model must be embedded in $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$. Since the hyperplane H enforces only the probability normalization requirement, the cone K must reflect the structure of the MNL choice model. The derivation of the MNL choice model is based on independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA), the Luce model's main axiom (Luce 1959). Essentially, the relative ratio of purchase probabilities of two *offered* alternatives is independent of others. Suppose that products a and b are offered to the consumer. Their purchase probabilities are $u_a y_a$ and $u_b y_b$, respectively. Essentially, any solution satisfying the cone K implies

$$\frac{u_a y_a}{u_b y_b} = \frac{u_a y_0}{u_b y_0} = \frac{u_a}{u_b}.$$

Thus, the solution to the cone K satisfies IIA. In addition, cone K also involves the feasibility condition of the assortments specified by \mathcal{F} . Thus, the cone K is referred to as the *IIA-assortment* cone. The following example illustrates the geometry of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ and its role in the convex hull characterization.

EXAMPLE 2. Let us consider the case with two products where $(u_0, u_1, u_2) = (1, 1, 2)$. We consider two structures of feasible assortments. One is $\mathcal{F} = \{0, 1\}^2$ in Figure 2a and the other is $\mathcal{F} =$




Figure 2 Illustrate of the geometric decomposition in Lemma 2.

$\{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ in Figure 2b. In both settings, the probability normalization hyperplane H is the same as the fixed value of preference weights, which is visualized as the light blue plane. The IIA-assortment cone K is depicted as ultrathick dark rays. The intersection between H and K are blue points, which correspond to the \mathbf{y} variable generated by all feasible assortments specified by \mathcal{F} . Finally, one can visualize the red polygon, which depicts $\text{conv}(H \cap K)$, as the intersection of the normalization hyperplane and the gray shadow, which depicts $\text{conv}(K)$.

In Example 2, we obtain the convex hull of a choice probability set by taking the intersection of the normalization hyperplane and the convex hull of IIA-assortment cone. In addition, the vertices of the convex hull of a choice probability set can be derived from the vertices of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$. The following lemma shows that such an observation is not limited to the special structure of \mathcal{F} in Example 2. This lemma is inspired by the geometry behind the disjunctive programming (Balas 1998).

LEMMA 2. For any set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, we have

1. $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F})) = H \cap \text{conv}(K)$ and $\text{conv}(K) = \{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \text{conv}(\mathcal{F}), y_0 > 0\}$.
2. The vertices of $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}))$ are given as $H \cap \{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \mathcal{F}, y_0 > 0\}$.

The connection between the vertices of $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}))$ and those of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ shown in part 2 in Lemma 2 can be helpful. In particular, in Theorem 3, we exploit this vertex characterization to derive valid inequalities for (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI).

In the remainder of this subsection, we formally discuss the technical implication of part 1 in Lemma 2 when a compact extended formulation of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ is given. Here, we say a system of linear inequalities that defines a polyhedron $Q := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+q} \mid A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$ is an *extended formulation* of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ if

$$\text{conv}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{proj}_{\mathbf{x}}(Q) := \{\mathbf{x} \mid \exists \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^q \text{ s.t. } (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \in Q\}.$$

Furthermore, we say that the extended formulation is *compact* if both q and the number of inequalities defining Q is polynomial in n .

THEOREM 2. *Let $A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{z} \leq b$ be an extended formulation for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$. Then, an extended formulation for $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}))$ is $\{(y_0, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \mid A\mathbf{y} + B\mathbf{z} \leq by_0, (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in H, y_0 \geq 0\}$. Moreover, if $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ admits a compact extended formulation then so does $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}))$.*

When the feasible assortment set is defined by a totally unimodular matrix, Davis et al. (2013) show that assortment optimization under the MNL choice model can be formulated as a compact linear program. Here, Theorem 2 shows that the complexity of characterizing a compact convex hull description of a choice probability set is equivalent to that of the feasible assortment set. Relying on the progress in polyhedral combinatorics, one can explore the structure of \mathcal{F} beyond the totally unimodular matrix. As a result, Theorem 2 extends the polynomial solvable boundary for polyhedral methods on the assortment problem under the MNL choice model. In Section 4.2.1, we utilize Theorem 2 to handle a more general choice model, the two-stage Luce model, by using a compact extended formulation of the chain polytope.

To conclude this subsection, we note that Megiddo (1979) constructs a fast combinatorial algorithm for connecting the complexity of optimizing a linear function over \mathcal{F} and over $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$. Specifically, maximizing a linear function over $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ is solvable in $\mathcal{O}(p(n) \cdot (p(n) + q(n)))$ if maximizing a linear function over \mathcal{F} is solvable within $\mathcal{O}(p(n))$ comparisons and $\mathcal{O}(q(n))$ additions. While this combinatorial algorithm is sufficient to solve the stand-alone assortment problem with a single consumer type, it cannot be directly integrated into the master problem of quick commerce assortment planning. In contrast, as demonstrated in Theorems 1 and 2, the compact extended formulation for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ can be easily incorporated into the MIP formulation of (QAP-RLX), which can be directly solved by modern commercial solvers.

4.2. Polyhedral characterizations in assortment planning

Polyhedral characterizations of combinatorial structures have proven to be a powerful and unifying tool in combinatorial optimization. There has been a tremendous amount of research in polyhedral methods and combinatorial optimization, see books and monographs (Grötschel et al. 2012, Cornuéjols 2001, Schrijver 2003, Conforti et al. 2014). Here, we present a polyhedral characterization of a combinatorial structure arising naturally in quick-commerce assortment planning.

4.2.1. Two-stage Luce model In reality, an online consumer segment may never purchase certain products within the same category. According to the dataset of Taobao, Chen et al. (2022b) find that the consumer-item matrices are very sparse (only 1.25% nonzero entries), indicating the zero-probability scenario of consumer behavior in real-world scenarios. Many utility based discrete

choice models are not able to capture zero-probability scenarios. For example, if a person always prefers Coke to Pepsi, then the probability of choosing Pepsi is always zero if Coke is in the assortment. However, if Coke is unavailable, this person has a positive probability purchasing Pepsi. Such behavior cannot be modeled by the MNL model. To address this, [Echenique and Saito \(2019\)](#) propose a two-stage Luce model (2SLM) to accommodate the dominance relationship among some products. Under the 2SLM, given an assortment, all the *dominated products* are removed by the consumers in the first stage and then they make the choice according to the *MNL model* based on the remaining undominated products. [Ok and Tserenjigmid \(2023\)](#) develop a methodology to make rationality comparisons between stochastic choice functions, and show that the 2SLM is at least as rational as any stochastic choice function.

To obtain a linear programming formulation for the 2SLM, one needs to model the set of all undominated products. The polytope associated with all undominated products is called *chain polytope*, which is introduced in [Stanley \(1986\)](#). To formally describe chain polytope and its extended formulation, we introduce some notation that we use in this subsection. Let \mathcal{P} be a partial order set specifying consumers' preference on the set of n products, where the partial order is denoted by \preceq . A strict order $a_1 \prec a_2$ means that $a_1 \preceq a_2$ and $a_1 \neq a_2$. An *antichain* in \mathcal{P} is a collection of elements of \mathcal{P} such that no two in the collection are comparable in the partial order. A *chain* in \mathcal{P} on the other hand is a collection of elements that are totally ordered. Finally, we say that a_2 *cover* a_1 if $a_1 \prec a_2$ and there is no $b \in \mathcal{P}$ with $a_1 \prec b \prec a_2$, and we call this a *cover relation*. Then, the set of all undominated products in the partial order set is

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid 0 \leq x_{a_1} + \dots + x_{a_k} \leq 1 \text{ for chains } a_1 \prec \dots \prec a_k \text{ in } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

The convex hull of \mathcal{F} is called the *chain polytope* of \mathcal{P} . The continuous relaxation of \mathcal{F} yields a linear programming formulation for the chain polytope, but its size is exponential. Corollary 2.9 in [Fawzi et al. \(2022\)](#) gives an extended formulation for the chain polytope with $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ inequalities and n additional variables. This formulation, together with Theorem 2, gives a compact extended formulation for the convex hull of the choice probability set $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$, that is, $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belongs to the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ if there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq z_{a_1} \leq z_{a_2} \leq y_0 & \quad \text{for all } a_2 \succeq a_1 \text{ in } \mathcal{P} \\ 0 \leq y_{a_i} \leq z_{a_i} - z_{a_j} & \quad \text{for all cover relation } a_i \succ a_j \\ y_{a_i} = z_{a_i} & \quad \text{for all minimal element } a_i \in \mathcal{P} \\ u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1 & \quad \text{and } y_0 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2-STAGE-LUCE}$$

This formulation reduces to the formulation of the chain polytope given by Corollary 2.9 of [Fawzi et al. \(2022\)](#) when $y_0 = 1$ and the normalization plane is removed.

5. Convexification Techniques for (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI)

After establishing tractable formulations for the convex hull of the choice probability set, the next step is to derive an MIP formulation for (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI). To do so, we need to devise an efficient method to deal with the constraints related to bilinear terms. A prevalent method is to use the McCormick inequalities (McCormick 1976), which, in the context of quick commerce assortment planning, reformulates (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ij} &\leq y_{i0}^U \cdot x_j & y_{ij} &\leq y_{i0}^L \cdot x_j + y_{i0} - y_{i0}^L & \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\ y_{0j} &\geq y_{00}^L \cdot x_j & y_{0j} &\geq y_{00}^U \cdot x_j + y_0 - y_{00}^U & \text{for } j \in N, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{McCORMICK})$$

where y_{i0}^L (resp. y_{i0}^U) is a constant lower (resp. upper) bound on the no-purchase probability variable y_{i0} of consumer type i . However, (McCORMICK) ignores the relation between offline assortment decisions and choice probabilities of offline and online consumer segments. It is this relation on which we will conduct a convex hull study. In Section 5.1, we formally define the nonconvex sets that are studied, and, at the end of Section 5.1, we overview our theoretical findings.

5.1. Motivation: tractable and intractable results

To streamline the presentation of Section 5, we remove the subscript i . Moreover, we assume that there are no constraints on the feasible assortments, that is $\mathcal{F} = \{0, 1\}^n$. Thus, we can use a compact notation Y to denote the convex hull of a choice probability set, that is,

$$Y = \text{conv}(\Pi(\{0, 1\}^n)) = \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1, 0 \leq y_j \leq y_0 \text{ for all } j \in N \right\}.$$

Now, (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI) lead us to study two mixed integer bilinear sets

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\}^n \times Y \mid y_j = y_0 x_j \text{ for all } j \in N \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^{\leq} := \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\}^n \times Y \mid y_j \leq y_0 x_j \text{ for all } j \in N \right\},$$

respectively. However, the following complexity result shows that it is impossible to obtain a tractable description for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\leq})$.

PROPOSITION 3. *The separation problems of $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\leq})$ are NP-hard.*

Thus, instead of studying $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\leq})$, we opt to focus on a mixed integer bilinear set that is specifically associated with a single product j , that is

$$\mathcal{B}_j := \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\} \times Y \mid y_j = y_0 x_j\}.$$

We also consider a decomposition of \mathcal{B}_j , that is $\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} \cap \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}$, where

$$\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} := \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\} \times Y \mid y_j \leq y_0 x_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} := \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\} \times Y \mid y_j \geq y_0 x_j\}.$$

These sets are relevant to our study since their convex hulls provide a partial description of the convex hull of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}^{\leq} . In the following two remarks, we discuss relevant convexification results on single product bilinear sets.

REMARK 1. The convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j , the bilinear set associated with a single product j , can be obtained by using disjunctive programming (Balas 1998)² since \mathcal{B}_j is expressible as the union of two polytopes

$$\mathcal{B}_j \cap \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid x_j = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_j \cap \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid x_j = 1\}.$$

This approach requires a convex multiplier and a copy of (x_i, y_0, \mathbf{y}) variables for each disjunction, thus introducing $2(n+2) + 1$ additional continuous variables. Hence, using the disjunctive programming approach in our MIP framework for (QAP) needs to introduce $(mn+n) \cdot (2(n+2) + 1)$ continuous variables since there are $mn+n$ single product bilinear terms in (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI). \square

REMARK 2. Sen et al. (2018) propose a novel conic quadratic mixed-integer formulation for assortment optimization under the MMNL model. This approach yields a convex relaxation for \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} given as follows:

$$\left\{ (x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid wy_j \geq x_j^2 \text{ for } j \in N, wy_0 \geq 1, w = u_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j x_j, (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in Y, \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n \right\},$$

by exploiting the relation $x_j^2 = x_j$ for binary variable x_j . However, this relaxation strictly contains the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} . To see this, we consider the following example where $n = 2$, and $(u_0, u_1, u_2) = (1, 1, 2)$. To depict its convex hull in 3D, we consider \mathcal{B}_1^{\geq} in the space of (x_1, y_1, y_2) variables, that is

$$\mathcal{B}_1^{\geq} = \left\{ (x_1, y_1, y_2) \mid 0 \leq y_1 \leq 1 - y_1 - 2y_2, 0 \leq y_2 \leq 1 - y_1 - 2y_2, y_1 \geq x_1(1 - y_1 - 2y_2), x_1 \in \{0, 1\} \right\}.$$

The convex hull of \mathcal{B}_1^{\geq} , depicted as a gray polytope in Figure 3, is given by

$$\left\{ (x_1, y_1, y_2) \mid 0 \leq y_1 \leq 1 - y_1 - 2y_2, 0 \leq y_2 \leq 1 - y_1 - 2y_2, 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1, \right. \\ \left. 2y_1 + 2y_2 - x_1 \geq 0, 4y_1 - x_1 \geq 0 \right\},$$

where the last two inequalities are derived using (UNDER) in Theorem 3, and, in Theorem 5, we show that they indeed yield a convex hull description for \mathcal{B}_1^{\geq} . In contrast, the convex relaxation from Sen et al. (2018) is given as follows:

$$\left\{ (x_1, y_1, y_2) \mid wy_1 \geq x_1^2, wy_2 \geq x_2^2, wy_0 \geq 1, w = 1 + x_1 + 2x_2, \right. \\ \left. 0 \leq y_1 \leq y_0, 0 \leq y_2 \leq y_0, y_0 + y_1 + 2y_2 = 1, \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^2 \right\}.$$

² Disjunctive programming has been utilized in other assortment problems, such as model-free assortment pricing (Chen et al. 2023).




Figure 3 The conic quadratic relaxation in Sen et al. (2018) fails to describe $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_1^{\geq})$

This relaxation contains the red point $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2) = (0.95, 0.25, 0.2)$ in Figure 3 since it can be extended to a point $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2) = (0.35, 0.25, 0.2)$, $\bar{w} = 3.61$, $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = (0.95, 0.83)$ which satisfies constraints in the relaxation. However, the red point does not belong to the gray polytope as it violates one of the defining inequalities $2y_1 + 2y_2 - x_1 \geq 0$ and its projection of the plane $2y_1 + 2y_2 - x_1 = 0$ is depicted as the blue point in Figure 3. \square

On the one hand, disjunctive programming provides a convex hull description of \mathcal{B}_j using $2(n+2)+1$ additional continuous variables. On the other hand, while the state-of-the-art conic formulation yields a strong relaxation for \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} using few additional variables, it fails to describe the convex hull for \mathcal{B}_j . It seems that there is a trade-off between size and tightness in describing the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j . In fact, the remainder of Section 5 aims to demonstrate the existence of a tractable convex hull description of \mathcal{B}_j without the introduction of new variables. In particular, in Section 5.2, we present a family of valid linear inequalities, (OVER) and (UNDER), for the single product set \mathcal{B}_j . Although the number of inequalities is exponential in the number of products, we develop a modified choice probability-ordered policy in Section 5.3 to solve its separation problem. In Section 5.4, we leverage this modified choice probability-ordered policy to establish that

(OVER) and (UNDER) describe $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j)$ without using additional variables.

5.2. Single product relaxations

To streamline the presentation in the rest of this section, we define

$$U(S) := u_0 + \sum_{i \in S} u_i \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(S) := \frac{1}{U(S)} \quad \text{for every } S \subseteq N.$$

In Theorem 3, we provide a constructive procedure to derive valid linear inequalities, (OVER) and (UNDER), for the single product set \mathcal{B}_j . Our rationale is that this constructive procedure may be useful in generating valid inequalities for similar structures. Before proceeding to the formal description, we use the following example to illustrate the basic idea.

EXAMPLE 3. In this example, we consider the case where $n = 2$ and $(u_0, u_1, u_2) = (1, 1, 2)$ again, and derive one of the inequalities defining the polytope in Figure 3. Recall that we are interested in deriving the convex hull of $\mathcal{B}_1^\geq = \{(x_1, y_0, y_1, y_2) \in \{0, 1\} \times Y \mid y_1 \geq x_1 y_0\}$, where $Y = \{(y_0, y_1, y_2) \mid y_0 + y_1 + 2y_2 = 1, 0 \leq y_1 \leq y_0, 0 \leq y_2 \leq y_0\}$. Our procedure exploits structures in vertices of Y , which can be obtained by using part 2 of Lemma 2 as follows:

$$\text{ext}(\emptyset) = (1, 0, 0) \quad \text{ext}(\{1\}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \quad \text{ext}(\{2\}) = \left(\frac{1}{3}, 0, \frac{1}{3}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ext}(\{1, 2\}) = \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right),$$

where, in addition to satisfying the probability normalization condition, the j^{th} coordinate of an extreme point is either zero or equal to the 0th coordinate, for example, $\text{ext}(\{1\})$ means that only the first coordinate is nonzero. Our procedure starts by using an extreme point, for example $\text{ext}(\{1\})$, to define a truncated function $\tau : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that is, $\tau(y_0, y_1, y_2) := \max\{y_0, \frac{1}{2}\}$, which can be interpreted as the range of y_0 provided that products in $\{1\}$ are available to be selected. Next, we use the truncated function to obtain a linear underestimating function of $x_1 y_0$ over $\{0, 1\} \times Y$ as follows:

$$y_1 \geq x_1 y_0 = x_1 \cdot \tau(y_0, y_1, y_2) + x_1 (y_0 - \tau(y_0, y_1, y_2)) \geq x_1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + y_0 - \tau(y_0, y_1, y_2) \geq x_1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} - y_2,$$

where the equality expands $x_1 y_0$ using the truncated function as an intermediate step, the second inequality holds since the two terms are relaxed individually. For the first term, the truncated function is relaxed to its lower bound $\frac{1}{2}$, and for the second term, x_1 is relaxed to its upper bound 1. The last inequality holds since $-y_2$ is a linear underestimating function of $y_0 - \tau(y_0, y_1, y_2)$. This relaxation is performed by linearly interpolating the concave function $(1 - y_1 - 2y_2) - \tau(y_0, y_1, y_2)$ over the extreme point $\text{ext}(\{1\})$ and its neighborhood $\text{ext}(\{1, 2\})$. \square

THEOREM 3. Fix a product $j \in N$. For $S \subseteq N \setminus j$, the following inequalities are valid for \mathcal{B}_j

$$y_j \geq \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot x_j - \sum_{t \in N \setminus (S \cup j)} u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot y_t \quad (\text{UNDER})$$

$$y_j \leq \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot x_j + (1 - (u_0 + u_j) \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot y_0 - \sum_{t \in S} u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot y_t. \quad (\text{OVER})$$

Next, we specialize (OVER) and (UNDER) to the case when $S \in \{\emptyset, N \setminus j\}$. The resulting four inequalities imply McCormick inequalities, thus yielding an MIP formulation of (OFF-BI) and (LINK-BI) which is tighter than that based on (McCORMICK).

COROLLARY 1. Let $j \in N$ be a given product. For $S \in \{\emptyset, N \setminus j\}$, (UNDER) and (OVER) yield

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &\geq \alpha(N) \cdot x_j & y_j &\geq \alpha(\emptyset) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(\emptyset) \\ y_j &\leq \alpha(j) \cdot x_j & y_j &\leq \alpha(N \setminus j) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(N \setminus j), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{McCORMICKPLUS})$$

which implies McCormick inequalities for the bilinear set \mathcal{B}_j .

Finally, we show that the proposed inequalities are strong in a sense that they are *facet-defining*. In other words, each inequality in **(UNDER)** (resp. **(OVER)**) contributes to describing the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} (resp. \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq}).

PROPOSITION 4. *For a given product $j \in N$, **(UNDER)** and **(OVER)** are facet-defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq})$ and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq})$, respectively.*

5.3. Modified choice probability ordered separation

Although the inequalities in Theorem 3 are effective due to Corollary 1 and Proposition 4, the number of inequalities is exponential in the number of products. In order to leverage these inequalities to speed up the computation time for **(QAP-RLX)**, we need to design an efficient algorithm to find an inequality, out of the exponential many, to separate an infeasible solution. The main result in this subsection is that a modified choice probability-order policy yields a separation algorithm with a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

Given a vector $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in Y$ and $\bar{x} \in [0, 1]$, finding a violated inequality in **(UNDER)** and **(OVER)** is equivalent to solving the following combinatorial optimization problems

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}} \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}_j}{U(S \cup j)} - \frac{\sum_{t \notin (S \cup j)} u_t \cdot \bar{y}_t}{U(S \cup j)} \right\}, & \quad \text{(SEP-UNDER)} \\ \min_{S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}} \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}_j}{U(S \cup j)} + \frac{\sum_{t \in S} u_t \cdot (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_t)}{U(S \cup j)} \right\}, & \quad \text{(SEP-OVER)} \end{aligned}$$

respectively. The optimization problem defined in **(SEP-UNDER)** and **(SEP-OVER)** can be interpreted as follows. We assume that a set $S \cup \{j\}$ is the ‘‘imaginary’’ assortment offered to consumers. If $S \cup \{j\}$ is indeed the actual offered assortment (i.e. y_t is equal to y_0 for $t \in S \cup \{j\}$ and 0 otherwise), then \bar{y}_j should be exactly equal to $\frac{\bar{x}_j}{U(S \cup j)}$. However, the actual assortment induced by a feasible solution $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_j, \dots, \bar{y}_n)$ to \mathcal{B}_j may not be $S \cup \{j\}$. Therefore, the value of \bar{y}_t can deviate from $\frac{\bar{x}_j}{U(S \cup j)}$. If \bar{y}_t is positive for $t \notin S \cup j$, it indicates that consumers choose products outside the imaginary assortment. Thus, the probability of choosing product j needs to be adjusted downward. On the other hand, if \bar{y}_t is strictly less than \bar{y}_0 for $t \in S$, it means that some products inside of the imaginary assortment are chosen less than expected. As a result, the probability of choosing product j needs to be adjusted upward. Both adjustments are conducted according to the preference weights. The optimization problem of **(SEP-UNDER)** and **(SEP-OVER)** is to seek the best imaginary assortment that provides the largest lower bound and the smallest upper bound.

Next, we present Algorithm 1, a modified choice probability-order policy to obtain the optimal assortments for **(SEP-UNDER)** and **(SEP-OVER)** for a given solution $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. The algorithm involves sorting \bar{y}_t in descending order once. Theorem 4 shows that the optimal solution to **(SEP-UNDER)** is the assortment with products whose modified probability \bar{y}_t is no less than \bar{y}_j ,

while the optimal solution to (SEP-OVER) is the assortment with products whose modified probability is no less than $\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_j$. Sorting has a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$, so the overall time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

Algorithm 1: Separation for (UNDER) and (OVER)

Data: $\bar{x}_j \in [0, 1]$ and $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in Y$

Result: either $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfies (UNDER) and (OVER) or a violated inequality

find a permutation σ of $N \setminus \{j\}$ so that $\bar{y}_{\sigma(1)} \geq \dots \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(n-1)}$;

$S^* \leftarrow \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k) \mid \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \geq \bar{y}_j\}$;

$T^* \leftarrow \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k) \mid \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \geq \bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_j\}$;

if $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfies (UNDER) with $S = S^*$ and (OVER) with $S = T^*$ **then**
 | $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfies (UNDER) and (OVER);

else

| either (UNDER) with $S = S^*$ or (OVER) with $S = T^*$ violates at point $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$;

end

THEOREM 4. (SEP-UNDER) and (SEP-OVER) have modified choice probability-ordered optimal solutions. Algorithm 1 separates (UNDER) and (OVER) in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

5.4. Convex hull characterizations

In this subsection, we investigate the theoretical strength of our proposed inequalities. In particular, we show that (UNDER) and (OVER) yield a convex hull description for a single product bilinear set \mathcal{B}_j . We start with a decomposition result on the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j .

LEMMA 3. $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq}) \cap \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq})$.

Due to this lemma, it suffices to characterize the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} and \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} individually. The hard part of the proof is to show that for a given point satisfying (UNDER) (resp. (OVER)), we need to decompose into a convex combination of points in \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} (resp. \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}). In the proof of Theorem 5, this decomposition is found by using the modified choice probability-ordered separation algorithm.

THEOREM 5. For a given product j , (UNDER) and (OVER) describe $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq})$ and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq})$, respectively.

By combining Lemma 3 and Theorem 5, we can conclude that (UNDER) and (OVER) describe the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j without using additional variables.

6. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present the results of our numerical experiments. In Section 6.1, we leverage the convex hull results established in Section 3 to Section 5 to present explicit reformulations for the quick-commerce assortment planning problems (**QAP**). Specifically, we offer reformulations for both scenarios: one involving the MNL choice model (referred to as **CH**) and the other encompassing the two-stage Luce choice model (referred to as **CH-Chain**). Subsequently, we delve into a discussion about the implementation aspect, wherein we propose a cutting-plane algorithm. In Section 6.2, we report the performance of our formulation **CH** and **CH-Chain**, comparing them to other formulations using synthetic data. In Section 6.3, our objective is to offer managerial insights into the nature of (**QAP**).

All our numerical studies are performed in Python 3.10 on a Virtual Machine with 32 GB RAM and a 4-core Intel Core (Broadwell) @2.20 GHz processor. All linear, second order conic and mixed-integer optimization problems were solved by using Gurobi 10.01 (**Gurobi Optimization, LLC 2023**).

6.1. Formulation **CH** and **CH-Chain**

We start by presenting formulation **CH** for unconstrained (**QAP**) with the MNL choice model, that is, the set of feasible assortments $\mathcal{F}_i = \{0, 1\}^n$ for all $i \in M^+$. Recall that Theorem 1 provides an alternative formulation (**QAP-RLX**) of (**QAP**). This reformulation consists of three types of nonconvex constraints, (**CHOICE-PROB**), (**OFF-BI**) and (**LINK-BI**), which can be convexified using techniques in Sections 4 and 5. This progress leads us to the following equivalent formulation of (**QAP**), which we refer to as formulation **CH**

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{CH: max} \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n \\
& u_{i0} y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{i0} \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \quad (1a) \\
& y_{0j} \geq \alpha_0(S \cup j) x_j - \sum_{t \in N \setminus (S \cup j)} u_{0t} \alpha_0(S \cup j) y_{0t} \quad \text{for } j \in N \text{ and } S \subseteq N \setminus j \quad (1b) \\
& y_{ij} \leq \alpha_i(S \cup j) x_j + (1 - (u_{i0} + u_{ij}) \alpha_i(S \cup j)) y_{i0} - \sum_{t \in S} u_{it} \alpha_i(S \cup j) y_{it} \\
& \quad \text{for } i \in M^+, j \in N \text{ and } S \subseteq N \setminus j \quad (1c) \\
& (u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_j) y_{i0} \geq 1 \quad \text{for } i \in M^+, \quad (1d)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_i(S) := \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in 0 \cup S} u_{ij}}$ for each $i \in M^+$ and $S \subseteq N$. It follows from Theorem 2 that constraint (1a) describes the convex hull of the choice probability set $\Pi(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for the case when $\mathcal{F}_i = \{0, 1\}^n$. The

constraint (1b) is derived by applying (UNDER) in Theorem 3 to each product j in the offline segment. The constraint (1c) is obtained by applying (OVER) in Theorem 3 to each product j cross all offline and online segments. We can interpret constraint (1b) (resp. (1c)) as polyhedral under-estimation (resp. over-estimation) of choice probability variable y_{ij} of the j^{th} product in the i^{th} segment. Note that we have not yet imposed additional constraints on the no-purchase probability variable y_{i0} except the normalization requirement in (1a). Next, we argue that it is natural to impose constraint (1d) as a convex under-estimation of the no-purchase probability variable. Recall that in formulation (QAP-RLX), ideally we wish to enforce the following constraint

$$y_{i0} = \frac{1}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} / y_{i0}} \quad \text{for } i \in M^+,$$

where y_{ij}/y_{i0} models whether we offer product j to consumer type i . This is nonconvex. However, we can relax this constraint as follows

$$y_{i0} \geq \frac{1}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} / y_{i0}} \geq \frac{1}{u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_j} \quad \text{for } i \in M^+,$$

where the second inequality holds since $y_{ij}/y_{i0} \leq x_j$ for all i and j . If we now move the denominator of the right-hand side to the left, we arrive at constraint (1d).

Since the number of constraints in (1b) and (1c) is exponential in the number of products n , even the continuous relaxation of CH can not be efficiently solved by using state-of-the art commercial solvers. To circumvent this difficulty, we propose a cutting plane algorithm, Algorithm 2, to generate a compact approximation of CH. Instead of optimizing over all inequalities in (1b) and (1c), Algorithm 2 starts with processing a base formulation, referred to as CH-0, which is constructed using inequalities in (McCormickPlus)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CH-0: } \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\ \text{s.t. } \quad & \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (1a) \\ & (u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_j) y_{i0} \geq 1 \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & y_{0j} \geq \alpha_0(N) x_j \text{ and } y_{0j} \geq \alpha_0(\emptyset) x_j + y_{00} - \alpha(\emptyset) \quad \text{for } j \in N \\ & y_{ij} \leq \alpha_i(j) x_j \text{ and } y_{ij} \leq \alpha_i(N \setminus j) x_j + y_{00} - \alpha(N \setminus j) \quad \text{for } i \in M^+, j \in N. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we solve the continuous relaxation of CH-0 and obtain an optimal solution $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. For each $i \in M^+$ and $j \in N$, we use the separation oracle, Algorithm 1, to generate cuts, out of exponentially many ones in (1b) and (1c), to cut off infeasible point $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_{i0}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i)$ from the feasible region of CH. Adding newly generated cuts into the base formulation CH-0 yields a tighter formulation CH-1. One can repeat this procedure K times, and obtain a formulation, which is referred to as CH-K.

Algorithm 2: A cutting-plane implementation of CH**Data:** Formulation CH-0 and a positive integer K **Result:** Formulation CH-K $k \leftarrow 1;$ **while** $k \leq K$ **do** $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{y}) \leftarrow$ an optimal solution to the continuous relaxation of CH-(k-1); Cuts $\leftarrow \emptyset$; **for** i in M^+ **do** **for** j in N **do** $\ell \leftarrow$ call the separation oracle, Algorithm 1, to separate $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_{i0}, \bar{y}_i)$; push(ℓ , Cuts); **end** **end** CH-k \leftarrow add Cuts into formulation CH-(k-1); $k = k + 1;$ **end**

Next, we present formulation CH-Chain for (QAP) when consumers in each online segment make a choice decision according to the two-stage Luce model (2SLM), a choice model introduced in Section 4.2. For each $i \in M$, let \mathcal{P}_i be a partial order set specifying consumers' preference on the set of n products, where the partial order is denoted as \succeq_i . In this setting, online consumers of type i make the choice according to the MNL model based on the undominated products \mathcal{F}_i , where

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \{ \mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid 0 \leq x_{ia_1} + \dots + x_{ia_k} \leq 1 \text{ for chains } a_1 \succ_i \dots \succ_i a_k \text{ in } \mathcal{P}_i \}. \quad (2)$$

In other words, we need to derive a formulation for (QAP) when \mathcal{F}_i is defined as in (2) for each $i \in M$. In Section 4.2.1, we show that $(y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \text{conv}(\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i))$ if and only if there exists $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq z_{ia_1} \leq z_{ia_2} \leq y_{i0} & \quad \text{for all } a_2 \succeq_i a_1 \text{ in } \mathcal{P}_i \\ 0 \leq y_{ia_i} \leq z_{ia_i} - z_{ia_j} & \quad \text{for all cover relation } a_i \succ_i a_j \\ y_{a_i} = z_{ia_i} & \quad \text{for all minimal element } a_i \in \mathcal{P}_i \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$u_{i0}y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij}y_{ij} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad y_{i0} \geq 0.$$

Recall that letting $y_{i0} = 1$, the first three constraints in (3) describe the *chain polytope*, which is defined as the convex hull of (2). Thus, the formulation of (QAP) obtained from replacing (1a) in formulation CH with (3) is referred to as formulation CH-Chain. Similarly, the formulation obtained from replacing (1a) in formulation CH-0 with (3) is referred to as CH-Chain-0, and the formulation generated by Algorithm 2 with input CH-Chain-0 is referred to as CH-Chain-K.

6.2. Computational performance of formulation CH and CH-Chain

6.2.1. Alternate formulations We describe two alternate formulations for (QAP). For the unconstrained case, we consider

Conic: This is a conic integer optimization formulation based on techniques in Sen et al. (2018), and its derivation is detailed in Appendix B.1;

MILP: This is a mixed-integer linear formulation based on the standard big-M linearization, and its deviation is detailed in Appendix B.2.

For the case when customers in each online segment make a choice decision according to the two-stage Luce model, we consider

Conic-Chain: This is obtained by adding into Conic constraints in (2) that describe the set of undominated products of each online segment;

MILP-Chain: This is obtained by adding into MILP constraints in (2).

6.2.2. Problem setting We randomly generate data for the revenue and preference weight of each product across the offline and online segments. Details about data generation can be seen in Appendix C.1. Generally, we set the revenue of each product for the offline consumer segment as a random variable of uniform distribution $U[10, 20]$. We assume that the online segments are divided into two groups: the regular group and the VIP group. For each product, the revenue from the consumers in the regular group is the same as that from the offline consumer segment and the revenue from the consumers in the VIP group is lower than that from the regular group. We set the preference weight on each product across the offline and online consumer segments as a random variable from the uniform distribution $U[0, 1]$. In addition, we fix the preference weight on the no-purchase option for the offline consumer segment to be 1, while varying that for the online consumer segments in $\{2, 5, 10\}$. Furthermore, we assume that the probability of the offline consumer segment arriving in the system is α_0 and that of each online segment $i \in M$ is $(1 - \alpha_0)/m$ equally, i.e., $\sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i = 1 - \alpha_0$.

We explore two choice models for the online segments: the standard MNL model and the 2SLM. The reason for considering the 2SLM exclusively for the online segments is that there is more data available in the online environment, which enables the firm to gain better insights into the consumer's choice behavior. If the behavior of an online consumer is captured by the 2SLM, we proceed to randomly generate a series of dominant relationships among the products for the online consumer segment. Specifically, for each online segment, we select a random set containing $\lfloor 0.25 \times n \rfloor$ products and randomly generate arcs joining two products among them. We record the dominant relationship by a directed acyclic graph $G(N, E)$ for which the details about the generation of arcs can be found in Appendix C.2 (Algorithm 3).

6.2.3. Numerical results We compare three different approaches in terms of the following performance measures: the average computation time (labeled as “Time”), the minimal computation time (labeled as “min”), the maximal computation time (labeled as “max”), the standard deviation of the computation time (labeled as “std”)³, the average number of explored nodes by the Gurobi solver (labeled as “Nodes”) and the number of solved instances within a 3600 second time limit (labeled as “Solved”). In our implementation of formulation CH and CH-Chain, we use the Algorithm 2 with $K = 2$ to obtain CH-2 and CH-Chain-2, respectively. Importantly, the running time of Algorithm 2 is labeled “Alg. 2 running time”.

Table 2 reports the results for various configurations involving various problem sizes (i.e. $(n, m) \in \{(100, 50), (150, 75), (200, 100)\}$) and different preference weight values for the nonpurchase rate of online segments (i.e. $u_0^{\text{on}} \in \{2, 5, 10\}$). Each configuration includes 36 instances following the data generating process described in Section 6.2.2 (see details in Appendix C), and the offline consumer segment arrival probability for each instance is $\alpha_0 = 0.5$.

Based on the results from Table 2, it is evident that CH-2 performs best in all the mentioned aspects for both choice models, MNL and 2SLM. Specifically, for the MNL, both CH-2 and Conic are able to solve all the 36 instances with the default optimality gap 0.01% and with a time limit of 3600 s. However, MILP even fails to solve an instance for $(n, m) = (100, 50)$, not to mention the configuration with a larger problem size. For the 2SLM, CH-Chain-2 is able to solve all the instances with the average computation time being less than double that under MNL. This indicates the scalability of our approach as we explore the structure of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ effectively. However, the number of solved instances drops significantly for Conic, while MILP barely solves any instances for the 2SLM. The computational advantage of CH can be attributed to the fact that our formulation is tighter than the other two approaches, as indicated by the number of explored nodes under all three approaches. Especially when the preference weight of non-purchase for the online segment is small, it takes only one node to solve CH-2.

By examining the “max” and “std” under the “Time” rows in Table 2, it becomes evident that our proposed approaches exhibit robustness across all the configurations with random instances. To further visualize the computational performance of our approaches, we employ the performance profile, introduced by Dolan and Moré (2002), which is commonly utilized to compare different solution approaches. In particular, the performance profile⁴ in terms of CPU time on the instances tested in Table 2 is displayed in Figure 4, where the time of CH (CH-Chain) denotes the sum of

³ The std is omitted (denoted by “-”) if some instances are not solved successfully

⁴ Letting $\tau_{p,c}$ denote the CPU time that approach c consumed in solving problem p and Θ denote the set of n_p test problems, the distribution function $\pi_c(\tau)$ for approach c is defined as $\pi_c(\tau) = \text{size}\{p \in \Theta : \tau_{p,c} \leq \tau\} / n_p, \tau > 0$, which serves as a performance metric for the approach c , with respect to the CPU time. The performance profile of each approach c is generated by plotting the corresponding distribution function $\pi_c(\tau)$.

Table 2 Computational Performance Comparison

Formul.	(n, m)	(100, 50)			(150, 75)			(200, 100)		
	$(u_0^{\text{off}}, u_0^{\text{on}})$	(1,2)	(1,5)	(1,10)	(1,2)	(1,5)	(1,10)	(1,2)	(1,5)	(1,10)
CH-2	Time	1.6	4.7	11.7	5.5	28.9	79.7	13.6	156.0	448.6
	min	0.4	0.8	1.8	1.7	5.1	17.0	3.9	18.1	71.0
	max	5.3	26.2	50.8	15.7	153.0	250.6	46.8	3358.0	2014.2
	std	1.2	5.7	11.2	2.7	30.9	62.1	9.7	554.1	458.4
Conic	Time	75.8	120.8	190.6	347.5	583.9	1040.3	744.8	2189.1	3286.3
	min	5.7	36.5	56.0	121.0	216.5	346.5	297.4	683.9	2024.8
	max	240.2	588.8	490.9	845.9	2034.9	2430.9	3600	3600	3600
	std	48.7	96.4	127.7	146.0	430.9	531.5	–	–	–
MILP	Time	46.8	131.8	663.6	251.2	1190.9	3169.8	329.2	3225.4	3600
	min	3.4	17.1	50.6	39.4	141.2	793.1	85.9	1658.2	3600
	max	175.9	611.4	3600	544.5	3600	3600	3241.6	3600	3600
	std	42.2	131.9	–	132.3	–	–	519.1	–	–
CH-2	Nodes	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	15.8	1.0	95.3	101.8
Conic	Nodes	14.4	219.6	482.3	44.1	506.3	752.2	166.7	718.7	892.4
MILP	Nodes	411.2	3732.6	19321.2	577.0	10686.7	23726.2	1493.4	12141.4	9841.4
CH-2	Solved	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36
Conic	Solved	36	36	36	36	36	36	35	24	17
MILP	Solved	36	36	35	36	31	10	36	13	0
Alg. 2 running time		6.6	10.4	16.9	16.0	19.4	112.0	31.8	40.7	95.9
CH-Chain-2	Time	2.0	8.7	18.2	8.4	40.3	113.0	26.3	184.4	608.4
	min	0.6	1.2	3.3	3.3	9.9	30.0	7.4	44.1	66.4
	max	6.3	34.4	62.1	16.1	140.0	271.0	119.3	3052.2	3469.3
	std	1.3	7.7	14.5	3.1	32.7	79.3	18.1	495.1	638.9
Conic-Chain	Time	335.4	551.2	709.4	2130.7	2948.4	2837.1	3510.1	3600	3600
	min	32.9	149.2	290.7	332.4	853.8	1249.5	2281.9	3600	3600
	max	3600	1250.6	1874.0	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600
	std	–	227.7	345.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
MILP-Chain	Time	3233.0	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	360	3600	3600
	min	72.9	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600
	max	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600
	std	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CH-Chain-2	Nodes	1.0	1.4	25.2	1.0	10.2	38.2	1.0	109.7	162.9
Conic-Chain	Nodes	5234.4	2628.8	2201.3	25308.7	12792.8	8082.9	7338.2	1546.8	1507.6
MILP-Chain	Nodes	308996.9	182801.1	113729.0	105800.7	45419.9	16591.3	25915.5	10538.1	5426.1
CH-Chain-2	Solved	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36
Conic-Chain	Solved	35	36	36	28	16	25	5	0	0
MILP-Chain	Solved	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alg. 2 running time		7.5	9.1	12.9	23.4	29.0	31.8	60.1	71.9	83.4

the time for solving the IP problem CH-2 (CH-Chain-2) and the corresponding Alg. 2 running time, respectively.

The performance profile clearly demonstrates that our approach outperforms the other approaches in terms of CPU time. Moreover, the performance difference between CH and CH-Chain is very small, indicating the scalability of our approaches when the assortment set \mathcal{F} can be efficiently represented. Notably, both CH and CH-Chain successfully solve nearly all instances within 1000 seconds, while Conic (Conic-Chain) and MILP (Conic-Chain) complete approximately 72% (34%) and 61%(1%) of all instances for the MNL (2SLM) choice model within the same time frame, respectively. Based on these compelling findings, we can confidently conclude that our approaches demonstrate significant efficiency, making it a preferred choice for handling these complex assortment planning problems.




Figure 4 Time performance profile in terms of CPU time.

6.3. Managerial Insights

Thanks to the efficiency of CH and CH-Chain, in this subsection, we are able to provide some managerial insights regarding the quick-commerce assortment planning based on our solution approach.

6.3.1. Assortment Map We employ an Assortment Map to visually capture the impact of different parameters on the optimal assortment. Figure 5 presents the assortment map by varying the proportion of the offline channel α_0 , across a range from 0.01 to 0.99, using increments of 0.05. Additionally, Figure 6 displays the assortment map by varying the online consumers' preference weight on the no-purchase option, i.e., u_0^n , ranging from 1 to 20 with a step of 1.

In both figures, we visually depict the purchase probabilities for three distinct consumer segments: the offline consumer segment, a regular online consumer segment, and a VIP online consumer

segment. These depictions are presented under two scenarios: one employing the MNL choice model and the other utilizing the two-stage Luce choice model. The y-axis in all figures corresponds to the product index, which is arranged according to the descending order of product price for the offline consumer segment, despite potential variations in price orders between the offline and VIP segments. A smaller product index indicates a higher price for the corresponding product in the offline channel regardless of its price for the VIP segment. Only the results for the first 100 products are disclosed because few of the remaining products are offered. Each square block in the subfigures represents the purchase rate corresponding to a specific product under different values of a parameter. Darker shades of blue indicate higher purchase probabilities. These assortment maps provide valuable insights into the influence of different parameters on the optimal assortment for the quick commerce assortment planning problem.

In Figure 5, we observe that when α_0 is close to 1, indicating a predominant share of traffic from the physical store, the offline assortment aligns with the ranking based on product price. As α_0 diminishes and more traffic shifts to online channels, more products are activated in the optimal offline assortment. This change occurs because the decreased importance of the offline segment makes the cannibalization effect in the offline channel less relevant from the perspective of the entire market. As a result, it becomes more beneficial to provide a broader assortment of products in the offline channel to cater to the needs of different online segments. However, under smaller α_0 , the optimal offline assortment departs from adhering solely to the product ranking based on price. This deviation underscores the necessity to account for the intricate influence of online segments more comprehensively on the assortment planning process.

In Figure 6, as the preference weight of the nonpurchase option for online segments increases, the cannibalization effect in the online channel becomes less significant. Consequently, it becomes more advantageous to offer a broader assortment of products for online segments. As a result, more products are offered in the optimal assortment in the offline channel.

Furthermore, when comparing the case with the MNL model, it becomes evident that the pattern of the optimal assortment for the online segments becomes more intricate under the 2SLM, primarily due to the influence of dominant relationships among products. However, it is important to note that these dominant relationships among different online segments are generated independently, which subsequently limits their impact on the offline segment. As a consequence, assortment planning in the offline segment maintains a relatively stable nature.

6.3.2. Benefit of the Joint Optimization Next, we will assess the benefits of jointly optimizing assortments from both the offline and online channels. In Section 2.2, we introduce a two-step revenue-ordered policy (RO) procedure. This strategy involves initially determining the assortment




Figure 5 Assortment maps by varying α_0 with $u_0^{\text{on}} = 5$




Figure 6 Assortment maps by varying u_0^{on} with $\alpha_0 = 0.5$.

for the offline channel and then utilizing this assortment as a candidate set for each online segment to select their respective optimal assortments. We denote the resulting revenue of the firm using the RO procedure as rev^{RO} . Furthermore, we use rev^{opt} to represent the optimal revenue achieved by solving the joint optimization of quick-commerce assortment planning. To gauge the benefits of

this joint optimization approach, we quantify the benefit of joint optimization as follows:

$$Gain^{Joint} := \frac{rev^{opt} - rev^{RO}}{rev^{opt}},$$

In Figure 7, we present box plots of $Gain^{Joint}$ for each scenario using 12 random instances. Figure 7a delves into the impact of α_0 on $Gain^{Joint}$. Notably, as α_0 decreases, $Gain^{Joint}$ increases. This trend arises from the growing importance of accounting for the online channel's influence on the offline assortment, which becomes particularly pronounced as the market share of the online channel expands. This is further evidenced by Figure 5a, where the optimal offline assortment is the smallest with α_0 close to 1. As α_0 decreases, the optimal offline assortment expands. This reflects how the joint optimization process incorporates the requirements of the online channel when devising the optimal offline assortment.

In Figure 7b, we explore the influence of u_0^{on} on $Gain^{Joint}$. Clearly, as u_0^{on} rises, so does $Gain^{Joint}$. This outcome can be attributed to the heightened need for more extensive assortments in the online segments due to a larger preference weight assigned to the non-purchase option. However, the offline assortment determined by the RO procedure neglects these attributes, and the resulting significant disparity between desired offline and online assortments leads to a higher revenue loss attributed to the RO policy. This is also evident from Figure 6a that the optimal offline assortment expands when u_0^{on} increases under the joint optimization approach.




Figure 7 The Benefit of Joint Optimization under $(n, m) = (200, 100)$.


6.3.3. Revenue Loss of the Model Mis-Specification Leveraging the data accessibility in the online channel, the firm can pinpoint the dominant product relationships for each online segment, as shown in Section 4.2.1. Unfortunately, these influential relationships are often disregarded during assortment planning. Let us delve into a scenario where this misspecification occurs: the firm develops an assortment strategy assuming that consumers, who actually follow the 2SLM,

behave in the same manner as consumers in the conventional MNL model. Our primary objective is to quantitatively assess the resulting loss from this misspecification.

In cases of model misspecification, the firm tackles the joint optimization for the quick-commerce assortment planning problem under the presumption that consumer behavior adheres to the MNL model. Nevertheless, with the implemented assortment, consumers make selections in accordance with their inherent two-stage procedure following the 2SLM. We denote the resulting revenue arising from this model misspecification as rev^{mis} . Hence, the metric used to gauge the loss attributed to model misspecification can be expressed as follows:

$$Loss^{\text{mis}} := \frac{rev^{\text{opt}} - rev^{\text{mis}}}{rev^{\text{opt}}},$$

The trends observed in Figure 8 highlight that the loss amplifies with a decrease in α_0 or u_0^{on} . This pattern can be elucidated as follows. As α_0 decreases, the significance of online segments in the overall revenue generation becomes more pronounced. On the other hand, reducing u_0^{on} leads to an increase in revenue from online segments due to the decreased likelihood of nonpurchase. Consequently, the contribution of online segments to the total revenue becomes more prominent. In both scenarios, neglecting the inherent behaviors of online consumers results in elevated losses.



(a) varying α_0 with $u_0^{\text{on}} = 5$

(b) varying u_0^{on} with $\alpha_0 = 0.5$

Figure 8 The Loss of Model Mis-Specification under $(n, m) = (200, 100)$.

7. A Polynomial-time Solvable Quick-Commerce Assortment model

Oftentimes, due to the low access cost in the online channel as opposed to the offline channel (where a click replaces a physical visit), the rate of non-purchases is much higher in the online environment. Consequently, the independent demand assumption can serve as a reliable choice model. According to [van Ryzin \(2005\)](#), vast revenue management systems are built upon such a independent demand model (IDM) in practice. In this section, we aim to capture the distinction in choice models between offline and online channels. We assume that a consumer in the online

segment makes purchase decisions in accordance with the independent choice model, while the offline customers continue to adhere to the MNL model.

For each online type $i \in M$ and for each product $j \in N$, we use $\theta_{ij} > 0$ to denote the probability that a consumer in online segment i purchases product j . Letting r_{ij} be the revenue obtained from selling a product $j \in N$ to a consumer in online segment $i \in M$, if we decide to offer assortment $\mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ then the expected revenue obtained from the online segment i is

$$R_i^{\text{IDM}}(\mathbf{x}_i) := \sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} \theta_{ij} x_{ij}.$$

For offline consumers, we use u_j to denote their preference weight on the product j , and u_0 to denote their preference weight on the no-purchase option. Given an offline assortment $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the expected revenue is given as follows

$$R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \frac{\sum_{j \in N} r_{0j} u_j x_{0j}}{u_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j x_{0j}}.$$

Moreover, we assume that the set of feasible assortments that we can offer to the offline store needs to satisfy *precedence constraints*, see [Davis et al. \(2013\)](#), [Sumida et al. \(2021\)](#) for applications of precedence constraints in assortment planning. More specifically, letting $G = (N, E)$ be a directed graph, where N is a set of nodes and E is a set of arcs, we assume that the set of feasible assortments is given by $x_{0j} \geq x_{0k}$ for $(j, k) \in E$. Our goal is to solve the following variant of [\(QAP\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \alpha_0 R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i R_i^{\text{IDM}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M \\ & x_{0j} \geq x_{0k} \quad \text{for } (j, k) \in E. \end{aligned} \tag{QAP-IDM}$$

The main result of this section is to show that inequalities [\(UNDER\)](#) yield a polynomial time solvable linear programming (LP) formulation for [\(QAP-IDM\)](#), that is

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \alpha_0 \sum_{j \in N} r_{0j} u_j y_j + \sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} \theta_{ij} x_j \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1 \\ & 0 \leq y_j \leq y_0 \quad \text{for } j \in N \\ & y_j \geq y_k \quad \text{for } (j, k) \in E \\ & (x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \text{ satisfies } \text{(UNDER)} \quad \text{for } j \in N \text{ and } S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}. \end{aligned} \tag{QAP-IDM-LP}$$

In particular, we use a randomized rounding approach to prove the correctness of the LP formulation. This approach has been used in [Teo and Sethuraman \(1998\)](#) to provide an elegant proof

of the integrality of the stable marriage polytope, and more applications can be found in Section 3.3 of [Bertsimas and Weismantel \(2005\)](#). The general idea of the rounding approach is as follows. We solve [\(QAP-IDM-LP\)](#) and obtain an optimal solution (x, y_0, \mathbf{y}) and optimal revenue r^* . Then, from \mathbf{y} we create a new random assortment, that is feasible to [\(QAP-IDM\)](#), and show that the expected revenue generated from the random assortment is r^* . This shows the equivalence between [\(QAP-IDM\)](#) and [\(QAP-IDM-LP\)](#). The key in the proof is to design an appropriate randomization method, which is inspired by the exactness proof of [\(UNDER\)](#) in [Theorem 5](#).

THEOREM 6. [\(QAP-IDM-LP\)](#) is a polynomial-time solvable linear programming formulation of [\(QAP-IDM\)](#).

Last, we discuss a consequence of [Theorem 6](#). In [Cao et al. \(2023\)](#), they consider assortment optimization problems when customers choose under a mixture of MNL and IDM, that is

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{i \in N} r_i \left(\alpha \frac{v_i x_i}{v_0 + \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i} + (1 - \alpha) \theta_i x_i \right) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n \right\}, \quad (\text{MIXTURE})$$

where r_i is the revenue obtained from selling product $i \in N$, v_i denote consumers' preference on product $i \in N$, θ_i is the probability that a consumer select product $i \in N$, and α is the probability that an arriving customer is in the first segment. It is shown in [Cao et al. \(2023\)](#) that [\(MIXTURE\)](#) is polynomial time tractable by solving a linear program when $\mathcal{F} = \{0, 1\}^n$, and, unfortunately, is NP-hard when the feasible region \mathcal{F} is defined by a cardinality constraint. A natural follow-up question is to characterize a class of constraints under which [\(MIXTURE\)](#) is polynomial time solvable. Next, we show that [Theorem 6](#) implies that [\(MIXTURE\)](#) with precedence constraints is polynomial time solvable.

COROLLARY 2. Let $G = (N, E)$ be a directed graph. If $\mathcal{F} = \{ \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid x_j \geq x_k \text{ for } (j, k) \in E \}$ then inequalities [\(UNDER\)](#) yield a polynomial time solvable LP formulation for [\(MIXTURE\)](#).

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we study the assortment problem within the quick-commerce context. Recognizing the face-inducing property of the physical linkage constraint, we adopt a convex hull representation to depict the customer choice behavior for each online segment. Capitalizing on the algebraic and geometric structures of the MNL choice model, we unveil a series of convex hull results that shed light on the set of choice probabilities under general operational constraints and on the interaction between offline assortment decisions and online/offline choice probabilities. These methodologies effectively address the challenges posed by the quick-commerce assortment problem. We hope that our results will inspire further exploration of polyhedral methods in addressing assortment optimization challenges. To elaborate, we envision two specific avenues for future research. First, it

is natural to inquire whether our geometric insights into Luce's choice axioms can be applied to derive compact polyhedral formulations for other Luce-type choice models proposed in Kovach and Tserenjigmid (2022), Tserenjigmid (2021), Echenique and Saito (2019), Echenique et al. (2018). Second, it is interesting to investigate the computational performance of inequalities (**OVER**) and (**UNDER**) in solving other assortment optimization problems.

References

- Balas E (1998) Disjunctive programming: Properties of the convex hull of feasible points. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 89(1-3):3–44.
- Bertsimas D, Misić VV (2019) Exact first-choice product line optimization. *Operations Research* 67(3):651–670.
- Bertsimas D, Weismantel R (2005) *Optimization over integers*, volume 13 (Dynamic Ideas Belmont).
- Bonami P, Günlük O, Linderoth J (2018) Globally solving nonconvex quadratic programming problems with box constraints via integer programming methods. *Mathematical Programming Computation* 10(3):333–382.
- Bront JJM, Méndez-Díaz I, Vulcano G (2009) A column generation algorithm for choice-based network revenue management. *Operations Research* 57(3):769–784.
- Cao Y, Rusmevichientong P, Topaloglu H (2023) Revenue management under a mixture of independent demand and multinomial logit models. *Operations Research* 71(2):603–625.
- Charnes A, Cooper WW (1962) Programming with linear fractional functionals. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 9(3-4):181–186.
- Chen J, Liang Y, Shen H, Shen ZJM, Xue M (2022a) Offline-channel planning in smart omnichannel retailing. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 24(5):2444–2462.
- Chen N, Cire AA, Hu M, Lagzi S (2023) Model-free assortment pricing with transaction data. *Management Science* URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4651>.
- Chen R, Jiang B, Ryan C, Zhang N (2022b) A data-driven approach to modeling assortment optimization: The tractable case of similar substitutes. *Available at SSRN 4072188* .
- Chen YC, Misić VV (2021) Assortment optimization under the decision forest model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14067* .
- Chung K, Richard JPP, Tawarmalani M (2014) Lifted inequalities for mixed-integer bilinear covering sets. *Mathematical Programming* 145(1-2):403–450.
- Conforti M, Cornuéjols G, Zambelli G, et al. (2014) *Integer programming*, volume 271 (Springer).
- Cornuéjols G (2001) *Combinatorial optimization: Packing and covering* (SIAM).
- Davis J, Gallego G, Topaloglu H (2013) Assortment planning under the multinomial logit model with totally unimodular constraint structures. *Work in Progress* .

- Désir A, Goyal V, Zhang J (2022) Capacitated assortment optimization: Hardness and approximation. *Operations Research* 70(2):893–904.
- Dolan ED, Moré JJ (2002) Benchmarking optimization software with performance profiles. *Mathematical Programming* 91(2):201–213.
- Dzyabura D, Jagabathula S (2018) Offline assortment optimization in the presence of an online channel. *Management Science* 64(6):2767–2786.
- Echenique F, Saito K (2019) General luce model. *Economic Theory* 68(4):811–826.
- Echenique F, Saito K, Tserenjigmid G (2018) The perception-adjusted luce model. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 93:67–76.
- El Housni O, Topaloglu H (2023) Joint assortment optimization and customization under a mixture of multinomial logit models: On the value of personalized assortments. *Operations Research* 71(4):1197–1215.
- Elmachtoub AN, Gupta V, Hamilton ML (2021) The value of personalized pricing. *Management Science* 67(10):6055–6070.
- Fampa M, Lee J (2021) Convexification of bilinear forms through non-symmetric lifting. *Journal of Global Optimization* 80:287–305.
- Fawzi H, Gouveia J, Parrilo PA, Saunderson J, Thomas RR (2022) Lifting for simplicity: Concise descriptions of convex sets. *SIAM Review* 64(4):866–918.
- Feldman J, Jiang P (2023) Display optimization under the multinomial logit choice model: Balancing revenue and customer satisfaction. *Production and Operations Management* URL <http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.14040>.
- Feldman J, Zhang DJ, Liu X, Zhang N (2022) Customer choice models vs. machine learning: Finding optimal product displays on alibaba. *Operations Research* 70(1):309–328.
- Gallego G, Iyengar G, Phillips R, Dubey A (2004) Managing flexible products on a network. Technical report, Department of IEOR, Columbia University, URL <http://www.corc.ieor.columbia.edu/reports/techreports/tr-2004-01.pdf>.
- Grötschel M, Lovász L, Schrijver A (1981) The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica* 1:169–197.
- Grötschel M, Lovász L, Schrijver A (2012) *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, volume 2 (Springer Science & Business Media).
- Gu X, Dey SS, Richard JPP (2023) Lifting convex inequalities for bipartite bilinear programs. *Mathematical Programming* 197(2):587–619.
- Gupte A, Ahmed S, Cheon MS, Dey S (2013) Solving mixed integer bilinear problems using milp formulations. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 23(2):721–744.

- Gupte A, Kalinowski T, Rigterink F, Waterer H (2020) Extended formulations for convex hulls of some bilinear functions. *Discrete Optimization* 36:100569.
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC (2023) Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual. URL <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- Kovach M, Tserenjigmid G (2022) The focal luce model. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 14(3):378–413.
- Kunnumkal S, Martínez-de Albéniz V (2019) Tractable approximations for assortment planning with product costs. *Operations Research* 67(2):436–452.
- Li X, Lin H, Liu F (2022) Shall We only store popular products? Warehouse assortment selection for e-companies. *Available at SSRN 4212027* .
- Lo V, Topaloglu H (2022) Omnichannel assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with a features tree. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 24(2):1220–1240.
- Luce RD (1959) *Individual choice behavior: A theoretical analysis* (Courier Corporation).
- McCormick GP (1976) Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part I—convex underestimating problems. *Mathematical Programming* 10(1):147–175.
- McFadden D (1978) Modelling the choice of residential location. Snikers F, Karlquist A, Lundquist L, Weibull J, eds. *Spatial Interaction Theory and Planning Models* (North-Holland, Amsterdam), 75–96.
- Megiddo N (1979) Combinatorial optimization with rational objective functions. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 4(4):414–424.
- Méndez-Díaz I, Miranda-Bront JJ, Vulcano G, Zabala P (2014) A branch-and-cut algorithm for the latent-class logit assortment problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 164:246–263.
- Ok EA, Tserenjigmid G (2023) Measuring stochastic rationality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08202* .
- Plackett RL (1975) The analysis of permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* 24(2):193–202.
- Rusmevichientong P, Shen ZJM, Shmoys DB (2010) Dynamic assortment optimization with a multinomial logit choice model and capacity constraint. *Operations Research* 58(6):1666–1680.
- Rusmevichientong P, Shmoys D, Tong C, Topaloglu H (2014) Assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with random choice parameters. *Production and Operations Management* 23(11):2023–2039.
- Schrijver A (2003) *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24 (Springer).
- Sen A, Atamtürk A, Kaminsky P (2018) A conic integer optimization approach to the constrained assortment problem under the mixed multinomial logit model. *Operations Research* 66(4):994–1003.
- Stanley RP (1986) Two poset polytopes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 1(1):9–23.
- Statista (2022) Quick Commerce - Worldwide. <https://www.statista.com/outlook/dmo/online-food-delivery/grocery-delivery/quick-commerce/worldwide>.

- Sumida M, Gallego G, Rusmevichientong P, Topaloglu H, Davis J (2021) Revenue-utility tradeoff in assortment optimization under the multinomial logit model with totally unimodular constraints. *Management Science* 67(5):2845–2869.
- Talluri K, Van Ryzin G (2004) Revenue management under a general discrete choice model of consumer behavior. *Management Science* 50(1):15–33.
- Tawarmalani M, Richard JPP, Chung K (2010) Strong valid inequalities for orthogonal disjunctions and bilinear covering sets. *Mathematical Programming* 124(1-2):481–512.
- Tawarmalani M, Richard JPP, Xiong C (2013) Explicit convex and concave envelopes through polyhedral subdivisions. *Mathematical Programming* 138(1-2):531–577.
- Teo CP, Sethuraman J (1998) The geometry of fractional stable matchings and its applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 23(4):874–891.
- Tserenjigmid G (2021) The order-dependent luce model. *Management Science* 67(11):6915–6933.
- van Ryzin GJ (2005) Future of revenue management: Models of demand. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management* 4(2).
- Vielma JP (2015) Mixed integer linear programming formulation techniques. *SIAM Review* 57(1):3–57.
- Wang R (2012) Capacitated assortment and price optimization under the multinomial logit model. *Operations Research Letters* 40(6):492–497.

Appendix A: Proofs

A.1. Proof of Proposition 1

Before proving this result, we introduce few notations. Let \mathbf{x}^{QAP} be an *maximal* element, with respect to the ordering associated with the nonnegative orthant, of the optimal solution set of (QAP), and let \mathbf{x}^{RO} be an solution satisfying (2-STEP-RO). Consider the expected revenue from the offline channel of (2-STEP-RO) and (QAP), that is, $\pi_0^{\text{RO}} = R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}})$ and $\pi_0^{\text{QAP}} = R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}})$, respectively. It follows readily that $\pi_0^{\text{RO}} \geq \pi_0^{\text{QAP}}$ since \mathbf{x}_0^{RO} is obtained by solely maximizing the offline channel's revenue. Next, given that the offline channel assortment is $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}$, consider the online assortment optimization problem

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}_i} \left\{ R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid \mathbf{x}_i \leq \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}, \mathbf{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n \right\} \quad \text{for } i \in M, \quad (4)$$

where the optimal value is denoted as π_i^{QAP} . Since \mathbf{x}^{QAP} is optimal, it follows readily that $\pi_i^{\text{QAP}} = R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}})$, that is, $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}}$ is an optimal solution of (4). In other words, $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}}$ is obtained via the revenue-ordered policy. Last, for each $i \in M$, let $\pi_i^{\text{RO}} = R_i^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{RO}})$.

First, we prove $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}} \leq \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}$ by contradiction. Suppose that there exists product k such that $\mathbf{x}_{0k}^{\text{RO}} = 1$ and $\mathbf{x}_{0k}^{\text{QAP}} = 0$. We will show that adding product k into the offline assortment $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}$ will not reduce the total revenue. This contradicts that \mathbf{x}^{QAP} is an maximal element of the optimal solution set of (QAP). Let S_0^{QAP} be the assortment for offline channel corresponding to the solution \mathbf{x}^{QAP} , and let $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP} \cup \{k\}}$ be the binary vector corresponding to the $S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} R_0^{\text{MNL}}(\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP} \cup \{k\}}) &= \frac{\sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j} r_{0j}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j}} \\ &= \frac{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}}} u_{0j}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j}} \frac{\sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}}} u_{0j} r_{0j}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}}} u_{0j}} + \frac{u_{0k}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j}} r_{0k} \\ &= \frac{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}}} u_{0j}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j}} \pi_0^{\text{QAP}} + \frac{u_{0k}}{u_{00} + \sum_{j \in S_0^{\text{QAP}} \cup \{k\}} u_{0j}} r_{0k} \\ &\geq \pi_0^{\text{QAP}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from $r_{0k} \geq \pi_0^{\text{RO}} \geq \pi_0^{\text{QAP}}$. Thus, we obtain a feasible solution $(\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP} \cup \{k\}}, \mathbf{x}_1^{\text{QAP}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m^{\text{QAP}})$ of (QAP), whose objective value is at least the optimal value of (QAP).

Next, we argue that $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{RO}} \leq \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}}$ for each $i \in M$. Since $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{RO}} \leq \mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}$, it follows that for each $i \in M$, $\pi_i^{\text{QAP}} \geq \pi_i^{\text{RO}}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}}$ and \mathbf{x}_i^{RO} can be obtained using revenue-ordered argument on $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{QAP}}$ and \mathbf{x}_0^{RO} , respectively. Therefore, by the same price rank assumption and the maximality of \mathbf{x}^{QAP} , we conclude that $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{RO}} \leq \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{QAP}}$. \square

A.2. Proof of Proposition 2

The proof of this proposition draws inspiration from the proof technique used in Theorem 1 of [Rusmevichientong et al. \(2014\)](#), where a reduction from the Partition problem is employed. In this proof, we will use $[n]$ to denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and for a given vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $S \subseteq [n]$ we will use $c(S)$ to denote $\sum_{j \in S} c_j$. We will prove that a special case of (QAP) is NP-hard, which is defined as follows. Given a set of n products, a revenue vector $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$, two utility vectors $u \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, and define

$$R_0(S) = \frac{\sum_{j \in S} r_j u_j}{1 + \sum_{j \in S} u_j} \quad \text{and} \quad R_1(T) = \frac{\sum_{j \in T} r_j v_j}{1 + \sum_{j \in T} v_j},$$

we consider the following maximization problem

$$\max\{R_0(S) + R_1(T) \mid T \subseteq S \subseteq [n]\}. \quad (\text{QAP-SEPCIAL})$$

To prove the NP-hardness of (QAP-SEPCIAL), we map an arbitrary instance of PARTITION problem to an equivalent (QAP-SEPCIAL) problem. The PARTITION problem is defined as follows. Consider a set of n items and each item i has a size of $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Is there a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $c(S) = c([n] \setminus S)$? Let $C = c([n])/2$. Note that $c(S) = c([n] \setminus S)$ if and only if $c(S) = C$. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $C \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Given an instance of the PARTITION problem, n items, a vector $c \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and a $C \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we construct an instance of (QAP-SEPCIAL) by assuming that there are $n + 1$ products, and letting

$$r_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \in [n] \\ 1 + \frac{3}{14C} & \text{if } j = n + 1 \end{cases} \quad u_j = \begin{cases} 2c_j & \text{if } j \in [n] \\ 6C & \text{if } j = n + 1 \end{cases} \quad v_j = \begin{cases} 4c_j & \text{if } j \in [n] \\ 4C & \text{if } j = n + 1 \end{cases}. \quad (5)$$

First, we show that the product $n + 1$ must be selected in an optimal solution of the instance of (QAP-SEPCIAL) specified as in (5). Assume that (S^*, T^*) is an optimal assortment but $n + 1 \notin S^*$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} R_0(S^* \cup \{n + 1\}) &= \frac{1 + u(S^*) + r_{n+1}u_{n+1}}{1 + u(S^*) + u_{n+1}} \\ &= \frac{1 + u(S^*)}{1 + u(S^*) + u_{n+1}} \cdot \frac{u(S^*)}{1 + u(S^*)} + \frac{u_{n+1}}{1 + u(S^*) + u_{n+1}} r_{n+1} \\ &= \frac{1 + u(S^*)}{1 + u(S^*) + u_{n+1}} \cdot R_0(S^*) + \frac{u_{n+1}}{1 + u(S^*) + u_{n+1}} r_{n+1} \\ &> R_0(S^*), \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds since for each $j \in [n]$, $r_{n+1} > r_j \geq R_0(S^*)$. Therefore, we obtain a feasible solution $(S^* \cup \{n + 1\}, T^*)$ with an objective value $R_0(S^* \cup \{n + 1\}) + R_1(T^*) > R_0(S^*) + R_1(T^*)$, contradicting to the optimality of (S^*, T^*) . Similarly, assume that (S^*, T^*) is an optimal solution with $n + 1 \in S^*$ but $n + 1 \notin T^*$. Then,

$$R_1(T^* \cup \{n + 1\}) = \frac{1 + v(T^*)}{1 + v(T^*) + v_{n+1}} R_1(T^*) + \frac{v_{n+1}}{1 + v(T^*) + v_{n+1}} r_{n+1} > R_1(T^*).$$

Again, we obtain a feasible solution $(S^*, T^* \cup \{n + 1\})$ which has a larger objective value than $R_0(S^*) + R_1(T^*)$, a contradiction.

Next, we argue that $S^* = T^*$ for any optimal solution (S^*, T^*) to the instance of (QAP-SEPCIAL) specified as in (5). Suppose that $T^* \subset S^*$, that is there exists k such that $k \in S^*$ but $k \notin T^*$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(T^* \cup \{k\}) - R_1(T^*) &= \frac{v_k + v(T^* \setminus \{n + 1\}) + r_{n+1}v_{n+1}}{1 + v(T^*) + v_k} - \frac{v(T^* \setminus \{n + 1\}) + r_{n+1}v_{n+1}}{1 + v(T^*)} \\ &= \frac{v_k(1 + v(T^*)) - v_k \cdot (v(T^* \setminus \{n + 1\}) + r_{n+1}v_{n+1})}{(1 + v(T^*))(1 + v(T^*) + v_k)} \\ &= \frac{v_k + v_k v_{n+1} - v_k r_{n+1} v_{n+1}}{(1 + v(T^*))(1 + v(T^*) + v_k)} \\ &= \frac{2}{14} \frac{v_k}{(1 + v(T^*))(1 + v(T^*) + v_k)} \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(S^*, T^* \cup \{k\})$ is a feasible solution whose objective value is larger than $R_0(S^*) + R_1(T^*)$, a contradiction.

Last, let K denote the target revenue $K = (16C + 15/7)/(1 + 8C)$, we show the PARTITION problem has a solution if and only if the optimal value of the instance of (QAP-SEPCIAL) specified as in (5) is K . Let

$$F(z) := \frac{6C(1 + \frac{3}{14C}) + 2z}{1 + 6C + 2z} + \frac{4C(1 + \frac{3}{14C}) + 4z}{1 + 4C + 4z}.$$

Then, we obtain that

$$\max\left\{R_0(S) + R_1(T) \mid T \subseteq S \subseteq [n+1]\right\} = \max\left\{F(z) \mid z = c(S), S \subseteq [n]\right\}.$$

The derivative of F is given as follows,

$$F'(z) = \frac{4}{7} \frac{(2C - 2z)(2 + 10C + 8z)}{(1 + 6C + 2z)^2(1 + 4C + 4z)^2},$$

which is strictly positive over $[0, C)$ and strictly negative over (C, ∞) . Therefore, F has a unique maximum at C , that is,

$$F(z) \leq F(C) = \frac{16C + \frac{15}{7}}{1 + 8C} \quad \text{for } z \in [0, C) \cup (C, \infty).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\max\left\{R_0(S) + R_1(T) \mid T \subseteq S \subseteq [n+1]\right\} = \max\left\{F(c(S)) \mid S \subseteq [n]\right\} \leq F(C) = K.$$

In other words, there exist a pair of assortments (S, T) with $T \subseteq S \subseteq [n+1]$ whose objective value is K if and only if the inequality holds as equality, where the latter is equivalent to that there exists a subset S of $[n]$ such that $c(S) = C$. \square

A.3. Proof of Theorem 1

To simplify the following presentation, we will use $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i$ to denote the vector $(r_{i0} \cdot u_{i0}, \dots, r_{in} \cdot u_{in})$. Let v_{QAP} and v_{CONV} denote the optimal objective value of (QAP) and (QAP-RLX), respectively. Let

$$v_{\text{MIBP}} := \max\left\{\sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \mathbf{y}_i) \mid (\text{CHOICE-PROB}), (\text{OFF-BI}) \text{ and } (\text{LINK-BI})\right\}.$$

Clearly, it follows readily from the discussion before Theorem 1 that $v_{\text{QAP}} = v_{\text{MIBP}}$. On the other side, letting $\Pi := \prod_{i=1}^m \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$, the value v_{CONV} is equal to v'_{CONV} , where

$$v'_{\text{CONV}} := \max\left\{\sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \mathbf{y}_i) \mid (\mathbf{y}_{00}, \mathbf{y}_0) \in \text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}_0)), (\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{conv}(\Pi), (\text{OFF-BI}) \text{ and } (\text{LINK-BI})\right\},$$

and $\mathbf{y}_0 := (\mathbf{y}_{10}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{m0})$ and $\mathbf{y} := (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m)$. This holds since $\prod_{i=1}^m \text{conv}(\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)) = \text{conv}(\prod_{i=1}^m \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)) = \text{conv}(\Pi)$.

Next, we will prove that $v_{\text{MIBP}} = v'_{\text{CONV}}$. Clearly, $v_{\text{MIBP}} \leq v'_{\text{CONV}}$ since two problems maximize the same objective function but the feasible region of the left one is contained in that of the right one. To show the opposite direction $v_{\text{MIBP}} \geq v'_{\text{CONV}}$, we consider an optimal solution $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_{00}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of the right problem. Due to the constraint (OFF-BI), the offline choice probability vector $(\bar{y}_{00}, \bar{y}_0)$ belongs to $\Pi_0(\mathcal{F}_0)$. The next step is to perform a decomposition on the online choice probability vector $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$. Let $J := \{j \in N \mid \bar{x}_j = 0\}$ and define

$$F := \text{conv}(\Pi) \cap \left\{(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid y_{ij} = 0 \text{ for } i \in M \text{ and } j \in J\right\},$$

and

$$\Pi' := \Pi \cap \{(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid y_{ij} = 0 \text{ for } i \in M \text{ and } j \in J\}.$$

Now, Lemma 1 can be recursively invoked to obtain $\text{conv}(\Pi') = F$ since, for every $i \in M$ and $j \in J$, the inequality $y_{ij} \geq 0$ is valid for Π . This implies that the point $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$, which lies on F , is expressible as a convex combination of points $(\mathbf{y}_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in T}$ of Π' , that is $(\mathbf{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t (\mathbf{y}_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t)$, where $\sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t = 1$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. The proof is complete by observing

$$v'_{\text{CONV}} = \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i) = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t \left(\sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^t) \right) \leq \sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t v_{\text{MIBP}} = v_{\text{MIBP}},$$

where the inequality holds because λ^t is nonnegative and for each t the point $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_{00}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0, \mathbf{y}_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t)$ is a feasible solution to the underlying maximization problem of v_{MIBP} , the last equality holds as $\sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t = 1$. \square

A.4. Proof of Lemma 2

We start with proving the first statement in part 1. Clearly, the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ is contained in $H \cap \text{conv}(K)$ since the latter set is a convex relaxation of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$. To show the reverse containment, we consider a point (y_0, \mathbf{y}) in $H \cap \text{conv}(K)$. Clearly, $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in H$, where H is a hyperplane not passing 0, implies that $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \neq 0$. Besides, $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{conv}(K) \setminus \{0\}$ implies that there exist a set of points $(y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t)_{t \in T} \subseteq K \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t = 1$ such that

$$(y_0, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t \cdot (y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t),$$

For $t \in T$, let $\beta^t := u_0 y_0^t + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j^t$. Then, $(y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \geq 0$ and $(y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \neq 0$ imply $\beta^t > 0$ for every $t \in T$. Moreover, we obtain that

$$\sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t \beta^t = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda^t \cdot \left(u_0 y_0^t + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j^t \right) = u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1,$$

where the last equality holds due to $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in H$. It turns out that

$$(y_0, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{t \in T} (\lambda^t \beta^t) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\beta^t} (y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\beta^t} (y_0^t, \mathbf{y}^t) \in K \cap H \text{ for } t \in T.$$

In other words, (y_0, \mathbf{y}) in $\text{conv}(K \cap H)$, showing $H \cap \text{conv}(K) \subseteq \text{conv}(K \cap H)$.

Next, letting $R := \{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \text{conv}(\mathcal{F}), y_0 > 0\}$, we prove that $R = \text{conv}(K)$. Clearly, $\text{conv}(K) \subseteq R$ since $K \subseteq R$ and R is convex. To show the reverse containment, we consider a point $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in R$. Then, $(y_1/y_0, \dots, y_n/y_0)$ belongs to $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$, and thus is expressible as a convex combinations of points $\{\mathbf{x}^t\}_{t \in T}$ in \mathcal{F} . Therefore, (y_0, \mathbf{y}) is a convex combination of points $\{(y_0, y_0 \cdot \mathbf{x}^t)\}_{t \in T}$, which is a subset of the cone K . This shows that $(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \text{conv}(K)$.

Last, we prove the statement in part 2. Namely, the vertices of $\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F}))$ is given by

$$V := H \cap \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \text{vert}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})), y_0 > 0 \right\}.$$

The vertices of the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ are contained in V by observing that

$$\text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F})) = H \cap \left\{ (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in y_0 \cdot \text{conv}(\mathcal{F}), y_0 > 0 \right\} = \text{conv}(V),$$

where the first equality holds part 1, and the second equality follows from part 1 and $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{conv}(\text{vert}(\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})))$. To prove the reverse containment, we consider a point $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of V , and assume that it is not a vertex of the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$. Then, it can be expressed as a convex combination of distinct points in $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$. Therefore, $(\bar{y}_1/\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n/\bar{y}_0)$ can be expressed as a convex combination of distinct points in \mathcal{F} , contradicting with the fact that $(\bar{y}_1/\bar{y}_0, \dots, \bar{y}_n/\bar{y}_0)$ is a vertex of \mathcal{F} . \square

A.5. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is complete by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{conv}(\Pi(\mathcal{F})) &= \{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in H, A\mathbf{y} + B\mathbf{z} \leq by_0, y_0 > 0\} \\ &= \{(y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in H, A\mathbf{y} + B\mathbf{z} \leq by_0, y_0 \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds due to the extended formulation of \mathcal{F} and part 1 of Lemma 2. To see the second equality, we assume that there exists a point $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of the last set with $\bar{y}_0 = 0$. Since $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ is a subset of $[0, 1]^n$ it follows readily that for each j $y_j \leq y_0$ is implied by the system of inequalities $A\mathbf{y} + B\mathbf{z} \leq by_0$. Thus, we obtain $\bar{y}_j \leq \bar{y}_0 = 0$. Therefore, $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = 0$. This contradicts with $(\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in H$ as H does not contain 0. \square

A.6. Proof of Proposition 3

In this proof, we only argue that the separation problem for \mathcal{B}^\leq is NP-hard, and remark that the hardness result for \mathcal{B} follows from a similar argument by dropping the non-positivity requirement on c . Consider an assortment optimization with product costs

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\sum_{j \in N} r_j u_j x_j}{u_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j x_j} + c^\top \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n \right\}, \quad (\text{MNL-COST})$$

where $u_0 > 0$, u and r are positive vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , and c is non-positive in \mathbb{R}^n . Kunnumkal and Martínez-de Albéniz (2019) has shown that (MNL-COST) is NP-hard. On the other hand, by introducing variables $y_j = x_j / (u_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j x_j)$ and $y_0 = 1 / (u_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j x_j)$, solving an instance of (MNL-COST) reduces to optimizing a linear function over \mathcal{B}^\leq , that is,

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{j \in N} r_j u_j y_j + c^\top \mathbf{x} \mid (\mathbf{x}, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{B}^\leq \right\},$$

which is equivalent to optimizing a linear function over $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^\leq)$ (see Lemma 1.3 in Conforti et al. 2014). In other words, optimization a linear function over the convex hull of \mathcal{B}^\leq is NP-hard. Thus, by the equivalence of separation and optimization, (see Theorem 6.49 in Grötschel et al. 2012), the separation problem for \mathcal{B}^\leq is NP-hard. \square

A.7. Proof of Theorem 3

We start with introducing the vertices of Y . It follows readily from Lemma 2 that vertices of Y can be characterized using subsets of N . Namely, for each subset $S \subseteq N$, we denote as $\text{ext}(S)$ the vertex of Y associated with S , where each coordinate is given as follows:

$$\text{ext}_i(S) = \begin{cases} \alpha(S) & \text{for } i \in 0 \cup S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Next, we establish the validity of inequality (UNDER). For a given $j \in N$ and a given subset S of $N \setminus j$. For every point $(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{B}_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &= x_j \cdot y_0 \\ &= x_j \cdot \max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\} + x_j \cdot (y_0 - \max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\}) \\ &\geq x_j \cdot \alpha(S \cup j) + y_0 - \max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds since the right hand side telescopes to the left hand side. The relaxation step is done by replacing $\max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\}$ with its lower bound $\alpha(S \cup j)$, and x_j with its upper bound 1, whose

validity is due to the non-negativity of x_j and the non-positivity of $\max\{y_0, \alpha(N)\} - \max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\}$. Now, we interpret the difference term as a function on the polytope Y , that is,

$$D(y_0, \mathbf{y} \mid S) := y_0 - \max\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\} \quad \text{for } (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in Y.$$

The function $D(\cdot \mid S)$ is concave, and is further relaxed to a linear function by affinely interpolating $D(\cdot \mid S)$ over the following vertices of Y

$$\text{ext}(S \cup j) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ext}(S \cup j \cup t) \quad \text{for } t \notin S \cup j.$$

In particular, we obtain a linear function

$$L(y_0, \mathbf{y} \mid S) := - \sum_{t \notin S \cup j} (u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot y_t \quad \text{for } (y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in Y.$$

To show $L(\cdot \mid S)$ is a valid underestimator of $D(\cdot \mid S)$ over the polytope Y , it suffices to verify that $D(y_0, \mathbf{y} \mid S) \geq L(y_0, \mathbf{y} \mid S)$ for every vertex (y_0, \mathbf{y}) of Y due to the concavity of $D(\cdot \mid S)$ and the linearity of $L(\cdot \mid S)$. To complete this, we discuss three cases.

- For $T \subseteq S \cup j$, $D(\text{ext}(T) \mid S) = 0 = L(\text{ext}(T) \mid S)$.
- For T with $S \cup j \subseteq T$,

$$D(\text{ext}(T) \mid S) = \alpha(T) - \alpha(S \cup j) = \left(- \sum_{t \in T \setminus (S \cup j)} u_t \right) \alpha(S \cup j) \alpha(T) = L(\text{ext}(T) \mid S).$$

- For T containing elements in both $S \cup j$ and its complement,

$$D(\text{ext}(T) \mid S) \geq D(\text{ext}(S \cup j \cup T) \mid S) = L(\text{ext}(S \cup j \cup T) \mid S) \geq L(\text{ext}(T) \mid S),$$

where the first inequality holds since $D(\text{ext}(A) \mid S) \geq D(\text{ext}(B) \mid S)$ for $A \subseteq B \subseteq N$, the equality follows from the second case, and the last inequality holds by the non-negativity of u_t and of $\text{ext}_t(T) - \text{ext}_t(S \cup j \cup T)$ for every $t \notin S \cup j$.

Last, we show the validity of inequality (OVER) by using a similar two step procedure. For a given $j \in N$ and a given subset S of $N \setminus j$. For every point $(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{B}_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_j = x_j \cdot y_0 &= x_j \cdot \min\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\} + x_j \cdot y_0 - x_j \cdot \min\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\} \\ &\leq \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \min\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the difference term $y_0 - \min\{y_0, \alpha(S \cup j)\}$ is convex, and the second relaxation step affinely interpolates it over the following vertices of Y

$$\text{ext}(S \cup j) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ext}(S \cup j \setminus t) \quad \text{for } t \in S.$$

This yields a linear function $(1 - (u_0 + u_j) \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot y_0 + \sum_{t \in S} (-u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot y_t$, completing the proof of validity. \square

A.8. Proof of Corollary 1

For $S = N \setminus j$, (**UNDER**) yields $y_j \geq \alpha(N) \cdot x_j$. For $S = \emptyset$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &\geq \alpha(j) \cdot x_j - \sum_{t \in N \setminus j} \alpha(j) u_t \cdot y_t \\ &= \alpha(j) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \frac{U(j)}{U(j)} y_0 - \sum_{t \in N \setminus j} \frac{u_t}{U(j)} \cdot y_t \\ &= \alpha(j) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \frac{u_j y_0 - u_j y_j + 1}{U(j)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (**UNDER**). Therefore, $(u_0 + u_j)y_j \geq x_j + (u_0 + u_j)y_0 - (u_j y_0 - u_j y_j + 1)$.

This yields $y_j \geq \alpha(\emptyset)x_j + y_0 - \alpha(\emptyset)$.

For $S = \emptyset$, (**OVER**) yields $y_j \leq \alpha(j) \cdot x_j$. For $S = N \setminus j$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &\leq \alpha(N) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(N)(u_0 + u_j) \cdot y_0 - \alpha(N) \sum_{t \in N \setminus j} u_t y_t \\ &= \alpha(N) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(N)u_j y_0 - \alpha(N)(1 - u_j y_j) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (**OVER**). This shows that $U(N)y_j \leq x_j + U(N)y_0 - u_j y_0 - 1 + u_j y_j$, thus yielding $U(N \setminus j)y_j \leq x_j + U(N \setminus j)y_0 - 1$.

Last, we argue that inequalities (**McCORMICK**) are implied. Clearly, $y_j \leq \alpha(j)x_j \leq \alpha(\emptyset)x_j$ as $x_j \geq 0$ and $\alpha(\emptyset) \geq \alpha(j)$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &\leq \alpha(N) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(N)u_j y_0 - \alpha(N)(1 - u_j y_j) \\ &\leq \alpha(N) \cdot x_j + y_0 - \alpha(N), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since $\alpha(N)u_j(y_j - y_0) \leq 0$. \square

A.9. Proof of Proposition 4

First, we argue that $\dim(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}) = n + 1$. Clearly, $\dim(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}) \geq n + 1$ since \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} belongs to the hyperplane $\{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \mid u_0 y_0 + \sum_{j \in N} u_j y_j = 1\}$ defined in \mathbb{R}^{n+2} . To see that $\dim(\mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}) \geq n + 1$, we observe that \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} contains the following $n + 2$ affinely independent points

$$((0, \text{ext}(\emptyset)), (0, \text{ext}(\{1\})), \dots, (0, \text{ext}(\{n\}))) \quad \text{and} \quad (1, \text{ext}(\{j\})).$$

Now, let S be a given subset of $N \setminus \{j\}$. To show that (**UNDER**) corresponding to S is facet-defining for the convex hull of \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq} , we observe that the inequality is tight at the following points of \mathcal{B}_j^{\geq}

$$\left\{ (0, \text{ext}(T)) \mid T \subseteq S \right\} \cup \left\{ (1, \text{ext}(W)) \mid S \cup \{j\} \subseteq W \right\}$$

which contains $n + 1$ affinely independent points.

Similarly, we can argue $\dim(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq}) = n + 1$. To see that (**OVER**) is facet-defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq})$, we observe that it is tight at the following points of \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq}

$$\left\{ (0, \text{ext}(T)) \mid S \subseteq T \subseteq N \setminus \{j\} \right\} \cup \left\{ (1, \text{ext}(W \cup j)) \mid W \subseteq S \right\},$$

which contains $n + 1$ affinely independent points. \square

A.10. Proof of Theorem 4

We start with proving the correctness of Algorithm 1 on solving the separation problem for (**UNDER**). Let \mathcal{R}^* be the optimal value of (**SEP-UNDER**). Clearly, $(u_0 + U(N) - \sum_{t \notin S \cup \{j\}} u_t) \mathcal{R}^* = (u_0 + u_j + U(S)) \mathcal{R}^* \geq \bar{x}_j - \sum_{t \notin S \cup j} u_t \cdot \bar{y}_t$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$ with equality holding at optimal S . Therefore, $(u_0 + U(N)) \cdot \mathcal{R}^* \geq \bar{x}_j + \sum_{t \notin S \cup j} (\mathcal{R}^* - \bar{y}_t) \cdot u_t$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$. It follows readily that an optimal solution can be recovered by solving

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{s \notin S \cup j} (\mathcal{R}^* - \bar{y}_s) u_s \mid S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\} \right\}.$$

It is optimal to offer each product whose revenue \bar{y}_s exceeds \mathcal{R}^* . Therefore, an optimal solution is $\{s \in N \setminus \{j\} \mid \bar{y}_s \geq \mathcal{R}^*\}$. Let σ be a permutation of $N \setminus \{j\}$ such that $\bar{y}_{\sigma(1)} \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(n-1)}$. It follows that an optimal solution is one of the nested sets

$$E_0^\sigma := \emptyset \quad E_1^\sigma := \{\sigma(1)\} \quad E_2^\sigma := \{\sigma(1), \sigma(2)\} \quad \dots \quad \text{and} \quad E_{n-1}^\sigma := \{\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \dots, \sigma(n-1)\}.$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\bar{y}_j \geq \mathcal{R}^*$ if and only if $\bar{y}_j \geq \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot \bar{x}_j - \sum_{t \notin S \cup j} u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot \bar{y}_t$ for every $S \in \{E_k^\sigma \mid k = 0, \dots, n-1\}$. The latter condition is equivalent to

$$\bar{x}_j \leq \min \left\{ U(S \cup j) \cdot \bar{y}_j + \sum_{t \notin S \cup j} u_t \bar{y}_t \mid S \in \{E_0^\sigma, \dots, E_{n-1}^\sigma\} \right\}.$$

Now, this minimization problem achieve its optimal at $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k) \mid \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \geq \bar{y}_j\}$, which coincides with S^* used in Algorithm 1, completing the proof.

Next, we prove the correctness of Algorithm 1 on solving the separation problem for (**OVER**). Let \mathcal{C}^* be the optimal value of (**SEP-OVER**). Clearly, $(u_0 + u_j + U(S)) \cdot \mathcal{C}^* \leq \bar{x}_j + \bar{y}_0 \cdot (u_0 + u_j + U(S)) - (u_0 + u_j) \cdot \bar{y}_0 - \sum_{t \in S} u_t \cdot \bar{y}_t$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$. Therefore, $(u_0 + u_j) \mathcal{C}^* \leq \bar{x}_j + \sum_{t \in S} (\bar{y}_0 - \mathcal{C}^* - \bar{y}_t) \cdot u_t$ for all $S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\}$. It follows readily that an optimal solution can be recovered by solving

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{s \in S} (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_s - \mathcal{C}^*) \cdot u_s \mid S \subseteq N \setminus \{j\} \right\}.$$

It is optimal to offer each product whose revenue \bar{y}_s exceeds $\bar{y}_0 - \mathcal{C}^*$. Therefore, an optimal solution is $\{s \in N \setminus \{j\} \mid \bar{y}_s \geq \bar{y}_0 - \mathcal{C}^*\}$. It follows that it is one of the nested sets $E_0^\sigma, \dots, E_{n-1}^\sigma$. Thus, we can conclude that $\bar{y}_j \leq \mathcal{C}^*$ if and only if $\bar{y}_j \leq \alpha(S \cup j) \cdot \bar{x}_j + (1 - (u_0 + u_j) \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot \bar{y}_0 + \sum_{t \in S} (-u_t \cdot \alpha(S \cup j)) \cdot \bar{y}_t$ for every $S \in \{E_0^\sigma, \dots, E_{n-1}^\sigma\}$. The latter condition is equivalent to

$$\bar{x}_j \geq \max \left\{ u_j \bar{y}_j + \sum_{t \in S} (\bar{y}_t - (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_j)) u_t \mid S \in \{E_0^\sigma, \dots, E_{n-1}^\sigma\} \right\}.$$

Now, this maximization problem achieves its optimal at $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k) \mid \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \geq \bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_j\}$, which coincides with the set T^* used in Algorithm 1, completing the proof. \square

A.11. Proof of Lemma 3

Let L (resp. R) denote the set in the left hand side (resp. the right hand side). Clearly, $L \subseteq R$. To show $R \subseteq L$, we consider a point $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ in R . Then, there exists $w \in \mathcal{B}_j^< \cap \{x_j = 0\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{B}_j^< \cap \{x_j = 1\}$ such that $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = (1 - \bar{x}_j) \cdot w + \bar{x}_j \cdot r$. Moreover, it can be verified that w and r are in $\mathcal{B}_j^>$, showing that $w \in \mathcal{B}_j \cap \{x_j = 0\}$ and $r \in \mathcal{B}_j \cap \{x_j = 1\}$. This establishes that $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a convex combination of points in \mathcal{B}_j . In other words, it belongs to L , completing the proof. \square

A.12. Proof of Theorem 5

First, we show that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\geq) = R_j^\geq$, where $R_j^\geq := \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, 1] \times Y \mid (\text{UNDER})\}$. It follows readily that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\geq) \subseteq R_j^\geq$ since by Theorem 3 the latter set is a convex relaxation of \mathcal{B}_j^\geq . To prove the reverse containment $R_j^\geq \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\geq)$, we consider an extreme point $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of the polytope R_j^\geq and will express it as a convex combination of points in \mathcal{B}_j^\geq . It follows readily that $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfies one of the inequalities in (UNDER) with equality due to its extremality. Let σ be a permutation of N such that $\bar{y}_{\sigma(1)} \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(n)}$, and let σ^{-1} be its inverse. For $k \in N$, define $S_k := \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\}$ and $S_0 := \emptyset$. By Theorem 4, the inequality (UNDER) corresponding with $S = S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1}$ is tight at $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Next, we use the nested sets to construct $n+1$ points in \mathcal{B}_j^\geq given as follows,

$$(0, \text{ext}(S_0)), \dots, (0, \text{ext}(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1})), (1, \text{ext}(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)})), \dots, (1, \text{ext}(S_n)),$$

and a multiplier $(\lambda_k)_{k=0}^n$ given as follows,

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_{\sigma(1)}}{\alpha(\emptyset)} \quad \lambda_k = \frac{\bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \bar{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}}{\alpha(S_k)} \text{ for } k \in N \setminus \{n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_n = \frac{\bar{y}_{\sigma(n)}}{\alpha(N)}.$$

This λ is a convex multiplier since $\lambda \geq 0$ and

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_k = \frac{\bar{y}_0}{\alpha(\emptyset)} + \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha(S_k)} - \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{k-1})} \right) = u_0 \bar{y}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n u_{\sigma(k)} \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} = 1, \quad (6)$$

where the last equality holds since $y \in Y$. Therefore, we can conclude that $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\geq)$ since

$$(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{k \leq \sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \lambda_k \cdot (0, \text{ext}(S_k)) + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)} \lambda_k \cdot (1, \text{ext}(S_k)).$$

To see the convex combination decomposition, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_k \text{ext}(S_k) &= (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_{\sigma(1)}) \frac{\text{ext}(\emptyset)}{\alpha(\emptyset)} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \bar{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) \frac{\text{ext}(S_k)}{\alpha(S_k)} + \bar{y}_{\sigma(n)} \frac{\text{ext}(N)}{\alpha(N)} \\ &= (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_{\sigma(1)}) \cdot (1, \chi(\emptyset)) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \bar{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) \cdot (1, \chi(S_k)) + \bar{y}_{\sigma(n)} \cdot (1, \chi(S_n)) \\ &= (\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where for $S \subseteq N$, $\chi(S)$ is the characteristic vector of S , that is $\chi_k(S) = 1$ if $k \in S$ and $\chi_k(S) = 0$ otherwise.

Moreover, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \leq \sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \lambda_k \cdot 0 + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)} \lambda_k \cdot 1 &= \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)})} \bar{y}_j + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)+1} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha(S_k)} - \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{k-1})} \right) \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)})} \bar{y}_j + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)+1} u_{\sigma(k)} \bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)})} \bar{y}_j + \sum_{k \notin S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)}} u_k \bar{y}_k \\ &= \bar{x}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the last equality holds since, by Theorem 4, the inequality (UNDER) with $S = S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1}$ is tight at $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$.

Now, we show that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\leq) = R_j^\leq$, where $R_j^\leq := \{(x_j, y_0, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, 1] \times Y \mid (\text{OVER})\}$. Clearly, $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^\leq) \subseteq R_j^\leq$. To prove the reverse containment, we consider a point $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ of R_j^\leq and express it as a convex

combination of points in \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} . Clearly, $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfies one of the inequalities (OVER) with equality. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ be a vector such that $\tilde{y}_t = \bar{y}_t$ for $t \neq j$ and $\tilde{y}_t = \bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_t$ for $t = j$. Let σ be a permutation of N such that $\tilde{y}_{\sigma(1)} \geq \tilde{y}_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq \tilde{y}_{\sigma(n)}$, and let σ^{-1} be its inverse. For $k \in N$, define $S_k := \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\}$, and $S_0 := \emptyset$. Now, we consider the following $n+1$ points in \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq}

$$(1, \text{ext}(S_0 \cup j)), \dots, (1, \text{ext}(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \cup j)), (0, \text{ext}(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)} \setminus j)), \dots, (0, \text{ext}(S_n \setminus j)),$$

and a vector $(\lambda)_{k=0}^n$ defined as follows:

$$\lambda_k = \frac{\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}}{\alpha(S_k \cup j)} \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, \dots, \sigma^{-1}(j) - 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_k = \frac{\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}}{\alpha(S_k \setminus j)} \quad \text{for } k \in \{\sigma^{-1}(j), \dots, n\},$$

where $\tilde{y}_{\sigma(0)}$ denote \bar{y}_0 and $\tilde{y}_{\sigma(n+1)}$ denote 0. Here, λ is a convex multiplier since $\lambda \geq 0$ and

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_k = (u_0 + u_j) \bar{y}_0 - u_j (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_j) + \sum_{k \in N \setminus j} u_k \bar{y}_k = 1.$$

We can conclude that $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq})$ since $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ can be expressed as a convex combination of points in \mathcal{B}_j^{\leq} , that is,

$$(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{k \leq \sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \lambda_k (1, \text{ext}(S_k \cup j)) + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)} \lambda_k (0, \text{ext}(S_k \setminus j)).$$

To see this, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \lambda_k \text{ext}(S_k \cup j) + \sum_{k=\sigma^{-1}(j)}^n \lambda_k \text{ext}(S_k \setminus j) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1} (\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) \frac{\text{ext}(S_k \cup j)}{\alpha(S_k \cup j)} \\ &+ \sum_{k=\sigma^{-1}(j)}^n (\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) \frac{\text{ext}(S_k \setminus j)}{\alpha(S_k \setminus j)} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1} (\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) (1, \chi(S_k \cup j)) + \sum_{k=\sigma^{-1}(j)}^n (\tilde{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \tilde{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}) (1, \chi(S_k \setminus j)) \\ &= (\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1} 1 \cdot \lambda_k + \sum_{k=\sigma^{-1}(j)}^n 0 \cdot \lambda_k = (u_0 + u_j) \cdot \bar{y}_0 + \left(u_0 + u_j + \frac{1}{\alpha(S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1})} \right) \cdot (\bar{y}_j - \bar{y}_0) + \sum_{t \in S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1}} u_t \bar{y}_t = \bar{x}_j,$$

where the last equality holds since by Theorem 4, the inequality (OVER) with $S = S_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1}$ is tight at $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Therefore, $(\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\leq})$. \square

A.13. Proof of Theorem 6

We start with showing that (QAP-IDM-LP) is polynomial-time solvable. Notice that (QAP-IDM-LP) has a linear objective function, and the separation problem of its feasible region can be solved using Algorithm 1. Therefore, due to the equivalence of separation and optimization (see Theorem 6.4.9 in Grötschel et al. 2012), (QAP-IDM-LP) is polynomial time solvable.

Next, we present a proof that (QAP-IDM-LP) is a linear programming formulation of (QAP-IDM). The main idea is to use the optimal solution obtained from (QAP-IDM-LP) to construct a feasible random assortment that satisfies the constraints of (QAP-IDM). Because (QAP-IDM-LP) is a relaxation

of (QAP-IDM), the average revenue of such randomized assortments should be no larger than the optimal objective value of (QAP-IDM-LP). If the average revenue of the constructed randomized assortments is exactly equal to the optimal objective value of (QAP-IDM-LP), then any possible realization of our constructed randomized assortments is the optimal assortment for (QAP-IDM). Therefore, it follows that (QAP-IDM-LP) can indeed serve as a linear programming formulation of (QAP-IDM-LP) because their optimal objectives are the same.

Let $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ be an optimal solution of (QAP-IDM-LP) and let r^* be the optimal value. First, it is evident that for each $j \in N$, at least one of the inequalities (UNDER) are tight. Suppose not, that is, there exists $j \in N$ such that none of inequalities (UNDER) is tight at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Then, we can increase \bar{x}_j by some $\epsilon > 0$ without violating any constraint in (UNDER). Thus, the objective value of (QAP-IDM-LP) increases by $\sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i r_{ij} \theta_{ij} \epsilon$, contradicting with the optimality of $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$.

Second, we construct a randomized assortment based on $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ that satisfies the constraints of (QAP-IDM). In particular, let σ be a permutation of N such that $\bar{y}_{\sigma(1)} \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq \bar{y}_{\sigma(n)}$. Let σ^{-1} be the inverse of σ , that is, $\sigma^{-1}(j)$ denote the index τ such that $\sigma(\tau) = j$. Define

$$C_0 := \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad C_j := \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\} \text{ for } j \in N.$$

Theorem 4 implies that for each $j \in N$, the inequality (UNDER) with $S = C_{\sigma^{-1}(j)-1}$ is tight at $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$. Then, we construct a random assortment \tilde{S} as follows:

$$\tilde{S} = \begin{cases} C_0 & \text{w.p. } \lambda_0 := \frac{\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_{\sigma(1)}}{\alpha(\emptyset)} \\ C_j & \text{w.p. } \lambda_k := \frac{\bar{y}_{\sigma(k)} - \bar{y}_{\sigma(k+1)}}{\alpha(S_k)} \text{ for } j \in N \setminus \{n\} \\ C_n & \text{w.p. } \lambda_n := \frac{\bar{y}_{\sigma(n)}}{\alpha(N)}. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\lambda \geq 0$, and by (6) in the proof of Theorem 5, $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$. Moreover, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, C_j satisfies the pre-order given by the graph G because of the definition of σ and $y_j \geq y_k$ for $(j, k) \in E$. Let $X(\tilde{S})$ be a random vector with $x_j(\tilde{S}) = 1$ if $j \in \tilde{S}$. It is clear that $X(\tilde{S})$ is feasible to (QAP-IDM). Moreover, based on the definition of C_k , we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[x_j(\tilde{S})] = \Pr(x_j(\tilde{S}) = 1) = \sum_{k \leq \sigma^{-1}(j)-1} \lambda_k \cdot 0 + \sum_{k \geq \sigma^{-1}(j)} \lambda_k \cdot 1 = \bar{x}_j,$$

where the second equality holds since product j does not belong to C_k if and only if $k \leq \sigma^{-1}(j) - 1$, and the last equality holds due to (8) in the proof of Theorem 5. In addition, we define another random variable $Y(\tilde{S}) = \text{ext}(C_k)$ with probability λ_k , and obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(\tilde{S})] = \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda_k \text{ext}(C_k) = (\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}),$$

where the second equality follows from (7) in the proof of Theorem 5.

Last, we compute the expected revenue of the random assortment. Let $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_0 = (0, u_{01}r_{01}, \dots, u_{0n}r_{0n})$ and, for $i \in M$, let $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i := (\theta_{i1}r_{i1}, \dots, \theta_{in}r_{in})$. Now, the proof is complete by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\alpha_0 R_0^{\text{MNL}}(X(\tilde{S})) + \sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i R_i^{\text{IDM}}(X(\tilde{S}))] &= \alpha_0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_0^\top \mathbb{E}[Y(\tilde{S})] + \sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \mathbb{E}[X(\tilde{S})] \\ &= \alpha_0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_0^\top (\bar{y}_0, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) + \sum_{i \in M} \alpha_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}_i^\top \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= r^*, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds by linearity of expectation, the second equality follows from the expectation of $X(\tilde{S})$ and $Y(\tilde{S})$ derived above, and the last equality holds since $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_0, \bar{y})$ is optimal. \square

A.14. Proof of Corollary 2

Consider a relaxation of (MIXTURE) given as follows,

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{i \in N} r_i \left(\alpha \frac{v_i x_i}{v_0 + \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i} + (1 - \alpha) \theta_i z_i \right) \mid \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n, \mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^n \right\}. \quad (\text{MIXTURE-RLX})$$

If \mathcal{F} is defined by precedence constraints then (MIXTURE-RLX) is a special case of (QAP-IDM). Thus, by Theorem 6, inequalities (UNDER) yield a polynomial time solvable LP formulation for (MIXTURE-RLX). The proof is complete if we show that the objective value of (MIXTURE), denoted as R , equals to the objective value of (MIXTURE-RLX), denoted as R' . Clearly, $R' \geq R$. To argue $R' \leq R$, we consider an optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)$ of (MIXTURE-RLX), and observe that

$$R' = \sum_{i \in N} r_i \left(\alpha \frac{v_i x_i^*}{v_0 + \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^*} + (1 - \alpha) \theta_i z_i^* \right) \leq \sum_{i \in N} r_i \left(\alpha \frac{v_i x_i^*}{v_0 + \sum_{i \in N} v_i x_i^*} + (1 - \alpha) \theta_i x_i^* \right) \leq R,$$

where the first inequality holds due to $\mathbf{x}^* \geq \mathbf{z}^*$ and the non-negativity of r_i , $1 - \alpha$ and θ_i , and the second inequality holds since \mathbf{x}^* is an feasible solution to (MIXTURE). \square

Appendix B: Integer programming formulations for (QAP)

B.1. Formulation Conic

Here, we consider a special case of (QAP) where $\mathcal{F}_i = \{0, 1\}^n$ for each $i \in M^+$ and use ideas in Sen et al. (2018) to derive formulation Conic for (QAP). First, using the algebraic property of C-C transformation, we obtain an mixed-integer bilinear reformulation of (QAP), that is

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (y_{i0}, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i) \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \mathbf{y}_i = y_{i0} \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and } \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{F}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M^+ \\ & \mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{for } i \in M. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we use the McCormick inequalities (McCormick 1976) to linearize the product of a continuous variable and a binary variable $y_{i0} x_j$ for each $i \in M^+$, with estimations about the lower bound y_{i0}^L and the upper bound y_{i0}^U on variable y_{i0} . More specifically, we define $y_{i0}^L := 1 / \sum_{j=0}^n u_{ij}$ and $y_{i0}^U := 1 / u_{i0}$. Third, following the approach in Sen et al. (2018), conic constraints corresponding to the bilinear terms $y_{ij} = y_{i0} x_j, \forall i \in M^+$ are also imposed, while the objective function needs to be rewritten. Thus, letting $\tilde{r}_i = \max_{j \in N} r_{ij}, \forall i \in M^+$, we give the conic integer formulation (CONIC) for (QAP) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} (r_{ij} - \tilde{r}_i) u_{ij} y_{ij} + \tilde{r}_i (1 - u_{i0} y_{i0}) \right) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& u_{i0} y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} \geq 1 && \text{for } i \in M^+ \\
& 0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{i0} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& w_i = u_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} x_{ij} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \\
& w_i y_{i0} \geq 1 && \text{for } i \in M^+ \tag{CONIC} \\
& w_i y_{ij} \geq x_{ij}^2 && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& x_{0j} \geq x_{ij} && \text{for } i \in M \text{ and } j \in N \\
& y_{ij} \geq y_{i0}^L \cdot x_{ij} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& y_{ij} \geq y_{i0} + y_{i0}^U \cdot x_{ij} - y_{i0}^U && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& y_{ij} \leq y_{i0} + y_{i0}^L \cdot x_{ij} - y_{i0}^L && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& y_{ij} \leq y_{i0}^U \cdot x_{ij} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second constraint is obtained by relaxing the constraint $u_{i0} y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} = 1$ in $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$, $\forall i \in M^+$, which combined with the third constraint describes the convex hull of the choice probability set $\Pi_i(\mathcal{F}_i)$ for the case $\mathcal{F}_i = \{0, 1\}^n$; it is sufficient to only use lower bounds on y_{ij} and y_{i0} since the objective coefficients are nonpositive; the fourth through the sixth constraints are obtained from the conic quadratic relaxation of $y_{ij} = y_{i0} x_j$, $\forall i \in M^+$ as the approach introduced in Sen et al. (2018), and the last four constraints are derived using the McCormick inequalities.

B.2. Formulation MILP

Here, we continue with the special case mentioned in Section B.1 and give a mixed-integer linear formulation MILP following the approach in (Bront et al. 2009, Méndez-Díaz et al. 2014). The bilinear terms $y_{ij} = y_{i0} x_j$, $\forall i \in M^+$ can be linearized using the standard big-M approach. That is, for any bilinear term $y_{ij} = y_{i0} x_j$, where y_{i0} is continuous and nonnegative and x_j is binary, the following linear inequalities model a relaxation for the bilinear term: $0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{i0}$, $y_{i0} - y_{ij} \leq (1 - x_j)U$ and $y_{ij} \leq U x_j$, where U is a sufficiently large upper bound on y_{i0} and can be selected as $y_{i0}^U = 1/u_{i0}$. The mixed-integer linear formulation is given as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in M^+} \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j \in N} r_{ij} u_{ij} y_{ij} \right) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& u_{i0} y_{i0} + \sum_{j \in N} u_{ij} y_{ij} = 1 && \text{for } i \in M^+ \tag{MILP} \\
& 0 \leq y_{ij} \leq y_{i0} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& u_{i0} y_{ij} \leq x_{ij} && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N \\
& u_{i0} (y_{i0} - y_{ij}) \leq (1 - x_{ij}) && \text{for } i \in M^+ \text{ and } j \in N.
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix C: Generation of the data

C.1. Generation of the revenue and preference weight

Here, we introduce the generation of the data about revenue and preference weight of each product across the offline and online consumer segments.

Firstly, the price of each product for the offline consumer segment is generated randomly from a uniform distribution $U(10, 20)$. The online segments are divided into two groups: the regular group and the VIP group. In the regular group, the price of all products is the same as that for the offline consumer segment. However, for the VIP group, we offer consumers a price discount. We assume that the discounted price is equal to the original price multiplied by a random variable drawn from the uniform distribution $U(0.8, 1)$.

Secondly, the preference weight of all products for the offline segment is randomly drawn from a uniform distribution $U(0, 1)$. For the online segments, we assume that each segment has its own most preferred product, and its preference weight is set to 1. Subsequently, all the remaining products for each online segment are assigned a preference weight randomly drawn from a uniform distribution $U(0, 1)$. Throughout this section, we assume that the number of segments does not exceed the number of products. This allows us to set the most preferred product of each online segment to be unique. Furthermore, the preference weight for the no-purchase option are set to be 1 for the offline consumer segment. However, for the online consumer segments, the preference weight for the no-purchase option varies, specifically set to 2, 5, and 10. This difference is based on the observation that people from the offline channel tend to have a higher probability of making a purchase compared to those from the online channel.

C.2. Generation of the data about the dominance relationship

Here we give a detailed description about the generation of the directed acyclic graph for the 2SLM. Algorithm 3 generates m random directed acyclic graphs and each graph indicates the dominance relationships among the products in each online consumer segment. For each online consumer segment, we assume that total $s := \lfloor 0.25 \cdot n \rfloor$ products are involved in the 2SLM. The remaining products are not influenced even if the consumer's behavior follows the 2SLM. Specifically, a subset of s products is firstly sampled from N , then a random permutation is given for the selected products. Following the permutation, arcs are constructed by joining a product with at most three products from its w successors. Each arc indicates the dominating relationship between its two vertices. In Algorithm 3, we also set some conditions that help to construct the graph structure we want. That is, for each of the first $w = 6$ products, at least one arc starts from it, while for each of the last w products, only the arcs arriving at it are allowed. This guarantees that at least w dominance relationships and at most w dominated products exist for each online consumer segment. Algorithm 3 generates for each online consumer segment the directed graph without cycles. As a result, each pair of products has at most one arc joining them while may have multi distinct paths through them. Moreover, the more products involved, the more complex the directed acyclic graph.

For a given directed acyclic graph, by the graph theory, the reachability matrix defining the partial orders and the matrix defining the cover relation among the nodes can be obtained by graph manipulation on the adjacent matrix. The set of minimal elements is just composed of nodes with positive in-degree and zero

Algorithm 3: Generation of the directed graph for the 2SLM**Data:** products set N and products number $n = |N|$; involved products numer $s := \lfloor 0.25 \cdot n \rfloor$; dominating width $w = 6$.**Result:** Directed acyclic graph $G(N, E^i)$, $\forall i \in M$;

```

for  $i$  in  $M$  do
   $E^i \leftarrow \emptyset$  and  $l \leftarrow \lfloor 0.5 \cdot w \rfloor$ ;
   $\{\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_s\} \leftarrow$  sorting of a random subset  $\text{sample}(N, s)$ ;
  for  $v$  in  $\{1, \dots, s - w\}$  do
    if  $v < w$  then
       $k \leftarrow U[1, l]$ ;
    else
       $k \leftarrow U[0, l]$ ;
    end
     $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow$  random subset  $\text{sample}(\{\mathcal{V}_{v+1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{v+w}\}, k)$ ;
     $E^i \leftarrow E^i \cup \{(\mathcal{V}_v, \mathcal{V}_{v'})\}_{v' \in \mathcal{S}}$ ;
  end
end

```

out-degree. Then, we can formulate the convex hull of $\Pi(\mathcal{F})$ for CH-Chain as in Eq. (3) (in Section 6.1). We use the Python package NetworkX⁵ to help us tackle the necessary graph manipulations.

⁵ <https://networkx.org/>