*International Journal of Mathematics and Statistics Invention (IJMSI)*
*E-ISSN: 2321 – 4767 P-ISSN: 2321 - 4759*
*www.ijmsi.org Volume 7 Issue 1 || January, 2019 || PP-07-11*

# Some Algorithms for Minimum Cost Flow Problems

Mobin Ahmad
*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Jazan University, Jazan 45142, Saudi Arabia*

***ABSTRACT:*** *Another firmly polynomial time calculation for the base cost stream issue, in view of a refinement of the Edmonds-Karp scaling procedure. Our calculation explains the incapacitated least cost stream issue as a succession of O(n log n) most limited way issues on systems with n hubs and m circular segments and keeps running in O(n log n (m + n log n)) time. Utilizing a standard change, thjis approach yields an O(m log n (m + n log n)) calculation for the capacitated least cost stream issue. This calculation enhances the best past firmly polynomial time calculation, because of Z. Galil and E. Tardos, by a factor of n 2/m.*
***KEYWORDS:*** *arrange streams; least cost streams; productive calculations*

---

Date of Submission: 03-02-2019 Date Of Acceptance: 19-02-2019

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

The minimum-cost flow (MCF) issue assumes a crucial part inside the territory of system enhancement. It is to locate a base cost transportation of a predefined measure of spill out of an arrangement of supply hubs to an arrangement of interest hubs in a coordinated system with limit imperatives and direct cost capacities characterized on the curves. This issue has a surprisingly extensive variety of uses in different fields, for example, media transmission; organize outline, transportation, steering, booking, asset arranging, and assembling. Besides, it regularly emerges as a subtask of more unpredictable enhancement issues. Extensive investigations of system stream hypothesis and calculations can be found in, for instance. Ongoing overviews identified with least cost arrange streams are introduced in.

A past paper displays our executions of a few MCF calculations alongside a test assessment. This investigation enhances that work by concentrating on the speediest calculations and giving a more far reaching computational examination including three extra MCF solvers and more test occasions. The commitment of the exhibited comes about is twofold. Initial, an extraordinary number of executions are looked at inside a similar benchmark structure utilizing a wide assortment of test occurrences. Second, we consider bigger systems than that in past investigations, which ended up being fundamental to reach suitable inferences. The creator doesn't know about other ongoing works that give an exact investigation of this degree. Fourteen MCF solvers are assessed in this paper. Seven executions are because of the creator: three cycle-dropping calculations; usage of the progressive most brief way and limit scaling techniques; a cost-scaling calculation; and a primal system simplex code. Every one of them are accessible with full source code as a major aspect of the LEMON enhancement library under lenient permit terms. These codes are contrasted with seven other openly accessible solvers: CS2 code of Goldberg and Cherkassky the relating capacity of the LEDA library MCF solver of L¨obel the NETOPT segment of the IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimization Studio [25]; MCFSimplex code of Bertolini, Frangioni, and Gentile [9]; RelaxIV [9], a C++ interpretation of the first Fortran code because of Bertsekas and Tseng and PDNET solver of Portugal et al.. The benchmark tests were directed on a broad gathering of extensive scale systems. These examples were made utilizing standard generators NETGEN, GRIDGEN, GOTO, and GRIDGRAP, or in light of systems emerging, all things considered, issues least cost stream issue is the most principal of all system stream issues. Least cost stream issues emerge in all ventures, including correspondences, horticulture, fabricating, transportation, social insurance, retailing, training, vitality and medication. The issue is anything but difficult to state: we wish to decide a minimum cost shipment of an item through a system keeping in mind the end goal to fulfill requests at specific hubs from accessible supplies at different hubs. This model has number of recognizable and less well-known applications: the dissemination of an item from plants to distribution centers, or from product houses to clients; the directing vechicles through a road arrange and so forth.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Malhotra and Puri (1984) give a speculation of the out-of-kilter strategy to fathom BMCF with a uniform limit with respect to all circular segments, i.e., uij = u for all bends (I, j) ∈ A. As the creators express, this thought can be altered to address general BMCF. The productive wilderness is worked in a left-to-right mold, beginning with the lexicographical least for the principal objective (see Figure 1). Because of the meaning of a lexicographical negligible stream, all bends are in-kilter regarding the principal objective. Be that as it may, since by our general presumption BMCF does not have a perfect bring up curves are out-of-kilter for the second goal.

Lee and Pulat (1991) actualize a changed form of the out-of-kilter technique. At first uniform weights are put on the two goals and the subsequent single target least cost stream issue, min{(c 1+c 2 )x : x ∈ Pflow} is fathomed by the out-of-kilter strategy after which the stream is changed in accordance with be essential by a rerouting methodology or hub value alteration system. At that point from this trade off arrangement the outskirts is sought to one side by considering curves that are out-of-kilter as for the main goal and to one side by considering circular segments that are out-of-kilter for the second target

Pulat, Huarng, and Lee (1992) is adroitly the same as the one by Malhotra and Puri, since it again uses nearness comes about for looking through the boondocks in a left-to-right mold. Aside from the expansion of a second arrangement of hub costs another qualification is that Pulat et al. utilize the system simplex strategy to understand BMCF in its parametric programming plan P(λ).

Sede˜no-Noda and Gonz'alez-Mart'ın (2000) expand on the thoughts of the three going before papers. P(λ) is explained in a left-to-right design utilizing the system simplex technique for the single rule enhancements. The coveted yield of the calculation is the arrangement of extraordinary non dominated target vectors. In every emphasis from a rundown S of circular segments yielding the insignificant proportion of the diminished costs one bend is entered the fundamental tree of the current productive essential attainable stream x

Ruhe [Ruh88a] demonstrates that the correct calculation of the proficient boondocks is, all in all, immovable, since there may exist an exponential number of extraordinary non dominated target vectors. In this manner, a few methodologies are proposed to discover delegate subsets of the productive outskirts. Every one of these methodologies go for the improvement of computationally engaging calculations.

Hamacher, and Rote (1991) for approximating univariate arched capacities f : R → [a, b]. We accordingly display next this thought in its general system It is accepted that for any t ∈ [a, b] the left and right subsidiaries f −(t) and f +(t) are possible. Let a = t1 < t2 • < tn = b be a limited parcel of the interim [a, b]. We allude to ti , I = 1, . . . , n, as breakpoints. Two piecewise direct capacities l(t) and u(t) surmised f(t) from above and from underneath, where

$$u(t) := f(t_i) + \frac{f(t_{i+1}) - f(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i}(t - t_i)$$

$$l(t) := \max\{f(t_i) + f^+(t_i)(t - t_i),\ f(t_{i+1}) + f^-(t_{i+1})(t - t_{i+1})\}$$

for ti ≤ t ≤ ti+1, I = 1, 2, . . . , n − 1. At any phase of the calculation, l(t) and u(t) fulfill l(t) ≤ f(t) ≤ u(t) for all t ∈ [a, b].

The blunder of the present estimate is estimated in (1991) by max{u(t) − l(t) : t ∈ [a, b]}. Give tl and tr a chance to be two back to back breakpoints in the present segment fulfilling t ∗ ∈ [tl , tr] where t ∗ = arg max{u(t) − l(t) : t ∈ [a, b]}. Therefore, [tl , tr] is an interim with the biggest blunder. Another breakpoint tnew := tr−tl 2 is added to the present, limited parcel of the interim [a, b] and the esteem f(tnew) is found. This decision of the new breakpoint is alluded to as the interim division run the show. The approximating capacities l(t) and u(t) are refreshed because of Equations (1) and (2). This plan is iteratively rehashed until the point that the mistake of the guess falls beneath an endorsed esteem. It is demonstrated that the approximating capacities l(t) and u(t) join consistently to f(t).

Ruhe (1988) presents the Hausdorff separate between the lower and upper estimate to gauge the blunder of the guess. For L := {(t, l(t)) | t ∈ [a, b]} and U := {(t, u(t)) | t ∈ [a, b]} the Hausdorff remove amongst L and U is

$$d(L, U) := \max\{\sup_{x\in L}\inf_{y\in U} ||y - x||_2, \sup_{y\in U}\inf_{x\in L} ||y - x||_2\}.$$

As opposed to the mistake measure in the Hausdorff separate is invariant under pivot and does not support one target work over the other.

Fruhwirth, Burkard, and Rote (1989) present two new standards, the point separation and the incline division run for producing breakpoints. As in the harmony administer, the new breakpoint is tnew := arg min(f(t) − k • t), however the principles differ in the decision of the parameter k. For the point division run, k breaks even with the slant of the bisector of the external edge of the triangle framed by the charts (t, u(t)) and (t, l(t)), t ∈ [tl , tr]. If there should be an occurrence of the incline separation govern, k is the mean of the slants of the two piecewise direct capacities that decide u(t) in [tl , tr].

Yang and Goh (1997) A subsidiary free alteration of the sandwich estimation approach was proposed. For every interim [ti , ti+1], the upper approximating capacity is figured as in Equation (1). The lower approximating capacity comprises of a piecewise straight capacity that is parallel to the upper estimate. New breakpoints are figured with the harmony run the show. The calculation is connected to bicriteria quadratic least cost stream issues.

Ruhe and Fruhwirth (1990) the sandwich calculation is utilized as a part of request to process a ε-ideal estimation for BMCF. Here, a subset S ⊂ Pflow is called ε-ideal if for all x ∈ Pflow there is an answer ˆx ∈ S with the end goal that c ixˆ ≤ (1+ε)c ix for I = 1, 2. In their pseudopolynomial time calculation Ruhe and Fruhwirth adjust the lead for deciding extra breakpoints. Rather than tackling just a single MCF as in all past sandwich calculations, two MCFs are fathomed in every emphasis. Two general inquiries are tended to: Given an esteem ε, a ε-ideal arrangement of little cardinality is resolved, and, given the cardinality of S, a ε-ideal set having an abnormal state of precision is registered. Ruhe and Fruhwirth look at two acknowledge of their calculation numerically. Systems are produced with n = 600 and m = 6000, 9000, 12000 and n = 900 and m = 9000, 18000, individually. The outcomes are arrived at the midpoint of more than twenty cases for every one of the five system sizes.

Guisewite, G.M., and Pardalos, P.M.,( 1991) nearby ideal (least) curved MCNFP arrangements are not really worldwide ideal (least) arrangements. In spite of the fact that this issue is NP-hard notwithstanding for single source uncapacitated MCNFP with settled charge bend costs,

Fontes et al.( 2006) displayed a dynamic programming approach keeping in mind the end goal to acquire an ideal answer for the singlesource uncapacitated MCNFPs with general inward costs, free of the kind of cost capacities and the quantity of nonlinear circular segment costs considered.

Edmonds and Giles (1977). The MCNFP is firmly identified with a few other system stream issues. For instance, the MCNFP is a unique instance of the sub modular stream issue presented

Edmonds and Karp(1972) Computational calculations for discovering answer for organize stream issues are of incredible commonsense essentialness. The main polynomial time calculation for MCNFP was produced.

**The Mcf Problem**

System stream hypothesis and standard documentations we talk about just the most essential definitions and results.

Let G = (V, A) be a pitifully associated coordinated diagram comprising of n = |V | hubs and m = |A| bends. We connect with each circular segment ij ∈ An a limit (upper bound) uij ≥ 0 and a cost cij . Every hub I ∈ V has a marked supply esteem bi . The single-ware, direct least cost organize stream (MCF) issue is characterized as

$$\min \sum_{ij \in A} c_{ij} x_{ij},$$

$$\sum_{j:ij \in A} x_{ij} - \sum_{j:ji \in A} x_{ji} = b_i \qquad \forall i \in V,$$

$$0 \leq x_{ij} \leq u_{ij} \qquad \forall ij \in A.$$

We allude to (1b) as stream protection imperatives and (1c) as limit limitations. We expect that all information are whole number and wish to discover a whole number esteemed ideal arrangement. Without loss of sweeping statement, we may additionally expect that all circular segment limits are limited, all bend costs are nonnegative, and the issue has a doable arrangement. It likewise suggests that P i∈V bi = 0.

A pseudo flow is a capacity x characterized on the curves that fulfills the limit limitations (1c), however may disregard (1b). A plausible stream is additionally a pseudo flow. The overabundance estimation of a hub I as for a pseudo flow x is characterized as

$$e_i = b_i + \sum_{j:ji \in A} x_{ji} - \sum_{j:ij \in A} x_{ij}.$$

Hub I is alluded to as an abundance hub if ei > 0 and as a deficiency hub if ei < 0. Note that P i∈V ei = P i∈V bi = 0.

Given a pseudo flow x, the relating lingering system Gx = (V, Ax) is characterized as takes after. For every unique curve ij ∈ A, compares a forward circular segment ij ∈ Ax with lingering limit rij = uij − xij and cost cij if rij > 0; and a retrogressive bend ji ∈ Ax with leftover limit rji = xij and cost −cij if rji > 0.

The direct programming double arrangement of the MCF issue is spoken to by hub possibilities πi (I ∈ V ). The decreased cost of a circular segment ij, as for a potential capacity π, is characterized as c π ij = cij + πi − πj . Optimality criteria can be characterized for the MCF issue as takes after.

**Theorem 1** (Negative cycle optimality conditions). An achievable arrangement x of the MCF issue is ideal if and just if the lingering system Gx contains no coordinated cycle of negative aggregate cost.

An equal definition can be expressed utilizing hub possibilities and decreased expenses

**Theorem 2** (Reduced cost optimality conditions). A doable arrangement x of the MCF issue is ideal if and if for some hub potential capacity π, c π ij ≥ 0 holds for each circular segment ij in the remaining system Gx
The idea of inexact optimality is additionally fundamental for a few calculations. For a given ≥ 0, a pseudoflow x is called - ideal if for some hub potential capacity π, c π ij ≥ − holds for each bend ij in the lingering system Gx. In the event that the circular segment costs are whole number and < 1/n, at that point a - ideal achievable stream is to be sure ideal. Moreover, for a non-ideal doable arrangement x, the littlest ≥ 0 for which x is - ideal equivalents to the negative of the base mean cost of a coordinated cycle in the lingering system Gx
The MCF issue and its answer strategies have been the question of concentrated research for over fifty years. Dantzig was the first to understand an extraordinary instance of the issue, the purported transportation issue, by practicing his notable simplex strategy. Afterward, he likewise connected this approach straightforwardly to the MCF issue and conceived the system simplex calculation. Portage and Fulkerson built up the main combinatorial calculations by summing up Kuhn's astounding Hungarian Method
Different calculations were proposed in the following couple of years, however they don't keep running in polynomial time. Edmonds and Karp presented the scaling system and built up the main pitifully polynomial-time calculation. The principal emphatically polynomial strategy is because of Tardos . These outcomes were trailed by numerous different calculations of enhanced running time limits, a large portion of which depend on the scaling strategy

## III. CONCLUSION

Proficient execution and significant computational assessment of MCF calculations have additionally been of high intrigue. The system simplex calculation turned out to be very well known while traversing tree marking strategies were produced to enhance its useful execution. Afterward, executions of unwinding and cost-scaling calculations additionally ended up being exceedingly productive.

## REFERENCES


[1]. R.K. Ahuja, T.L. Magnanti, and J.B. Orlin. Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1993.
[2]. Bertolini, A. Frangioni, and C. Gentile. The MCFClass Project. 2011.
[3]. D.P. Bertsekas. Network Optimization Codes. 1994.
[4]. D.P. Bertsekas and P. Tseng. RELAX-IV: A faster version of the relax code for solving minimum cost flow problems. Technical Report LIDS-P-2276, Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1994.
[5]. IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimization Studio, V12.4, 2011.
[6]. A.V. Goldberg. An efficient implementation of a scaling minimum-cost flow algorithm. J. Algorithms, 22:1–29, 1997.
[7]. DIMACS. Network Flows and Matching: First DIMACS Implementation Challenge. 1990-1991.
[8]. Z. Kir´aly and P. Kov´acs. Efficient implementations of minimum-cost flow algorithms. Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Informatica, 4:67–118, 2012.
[9]. B. Korte and J. Vygen. Combinatorial Optimization: Theory and Algorithms. Algorithms and Combinatorics, Vol. 21. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 5th edition, 2012.
[10]. The LEDA library, Version 5.0, 2004. Algorithmic Solutions Software GmbH.
[11]. LEMON – Library for Efficient Modeling and Optimization in Networks, 2012.
[12]. A.L¨obel. Solving large-scale real-world minimum-cost flow problems by a network simplex method. Technical Report SC 96-7, Zuse Institute Berlin (ZIB), Berlin, Germany, 1996.
[13]. L¨obel. MCF Version 1.3 – A network simplex implementation. 2004.
[14]. L.F. Portugal, M.G.C. Resende, G. Veiga, J. Patr´ıcio, and J.J. J´udice. PDNET – Software for network flow optimization using an interior point method. 2004.
[15]. L.F. Portugal, M.G.C. Resende, G. Veiga, J. Patr´ıcio, and J.J. J´udice. Fortran subroutines for network flow optimization using an interior point algorithm. Pesquisa Operacional, 28:243–261, 2008.
[16]. Schrijver. Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency. Algorithms and Combinatorics, Vol. 24. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2003.
[17]. Sifaleras. Minimum cost network flows: Problems, algorithms, and software. Yugosl. J. Oper. Res., 23:3–17, 2013.
[18]. R. Malhotra and M.C. Puri. Bi-criteria network problem. Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes Recherche Op´erationelle ´ , 26(1/2):95–102, 1984.
[19]. H. Lee and P.S. Pulat. Bicriteria network flow problems: Continuous case. European Journal of Operational Research, 51:119–126, 1991.
[20]. P.S. Pulat, F. Huarng, and H. Lee. Efficient solutions for the bicriteria network flow problem. Computers and Operations Research, 19(7):649–655, 1992.
[21]. Sede˜no-Noda and C. Gonz´alez-Mart´ın. The biobjective minimum cost flow problem. European Journal of Operational Research, 124:591–600, 2000.
[22]. G. Ruhe. Complexity results for multicriterial and parametric network flows using a pathological graph of Zadeh. Zeitschrift f¨ur Operations Research, 32(1):9–27, 1988.
[23]. R.E. Burkard, H.W. Hamacher, and G. Rote. Sandwich approximation of univariate convex functions with an application to separable convex programming. Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 38(6):911–924, 1991.
[24]. G. Ruhe. Fl¨usse in Netzwerken - Komplexit¨at und Algorithmen. PhD thesis, Technische Hochschule Leipzig, Sektion Mathematik und Informatik, 1988.
[25]. B. Fruhwirth, R.E. Burkard, and G. Rote. Approximation of convex curves with application to the bicriterial minimum cost flow problem. European Journal of Operational Research, 42:326–338, 1989.
[26]. X.Q. Yang and C.J. Goh. A method for convex curve approximation. European Journal of Operational Research, 97:205–212, 1997.

[27]. G. Ruhe and B. Fruhwirth. ε-optimality for bicriteria programs and its application to minimum cost flows. Computing, 44:21–34, 1990.

[28]. Guisewite, G.M., and Pardalos, P.M., “Minimum concave-cost network flow problems: applications, complexity, and algorithms”, Annals of Operations Research 25 (1) (1991) 75– 100

[29]. Fontes, D.B., Hadjiconstantinou, E., and Christofides, N., “A dynamic programming approach for solving single-source uncapacitated concave minimum cost network flow problems”, European Journal of Operational Research, 174 (2) (2006) 1205–1219

[30]. Edmonds, J., and Giles, R., “A min-max relation for submodular functions on graphs”, Annals of Discrete Mathematics, 1 (1977) 185–204.

[31]. Edmonds, J., and Karp, R.M., “Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems”, Journal of the ACM, 19 (2) (1972) 248–264.

[32]. L.R. Ford and D.R. Fulkerson. Flows in Networks. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1962.

[33]. A.V. Goldberg, E. Tardos, and R.E. Tarjan. Network flow algorithms. In B. Ko- ´ rte, L. Lov´asz, H.J. Pr¨omel, and A. Schrijver, editors, Paths, Flows and VLSILayout, pages 101–164, Berlin, Germany, 1990. Springer-Verlag.

[34]. A Frank. Connections in Combinatorial Optimization. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 38. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2011.

[35]. R.D. Armstrong, D. Klingman, and D. Whitman. Implementation and analysis of a variant of the dual method for the capacitated transshipment problem. European J. Oper. Res., 4:403–420, 1980.

[36]. D.P. Bertsekas and P. Tseng. Relaxation methods for minimum cost ordinary and generalized network flow problems. Oper. Res., 36:93–114, 1988.

[37]. R.G. Bland, J. Cheriyan, D. Jensen, and L. Lad´anyi. An empirical study of min cost flow algorithms. In D.S. Johnson and C.C. McGeoch, editors, Network Flows and Matching: First DIMACS Implementation Challenge, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 12, pages 119– 156, Providence, RI, 1993. American Mathematical Society

[38]. R.G. Bland and D.L. Jensen. On the computational behavior of a polynomialtime network flow algorithm. Technical Report 661, School of Operations Research and Industrial Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1985.

[39]. ] R.G. Bland and D.L. Jensen. On the computational behavior of a polynomialtime network flow algorithm. Math. Program., 54:1–39, 1992.

[40]. G. Bradley, G. Brown, and G. Graves. Design and implementation of large scale primal transshipment algorithms. Manag. Sci., 24:1–34, 1977.

[41]. U. B¨unnagel, B. Korte, and J. Vygen. Efficient implementation of the GoldbergTarjan minimum-cost flow algorithm. Opt. Methods and Software, 10:157–174, 1998.

[42]. Frangioni and A. Manca. A computational study of cost reoptimization for min-cost flow problems. INFORMS J. Comput., 18:61–70, 2006.

[43]. F. Glover, D. Karney, D. Klingman, and A. Napier. A computation study on start procedures, basis change criteria, and solution algorithms for transportation problems. Manag. Sci., 20:793–813, 1974

[44]. A.V. Goldberg and M. Kharitonov. On implementing scaling push-relabel algorithms for the minimum-cost flow problem. In D.S. Johnson and C.C. McGeoch, editors, Network Flows and Matching: First DIMACS Implementation Challenge, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 12, pages 157–198, Providence, RI, 1993. American Mathematical Society.

[45]. R.V. Helgason and J.L. Kennington. An efficient procedure for implementing a dual simplex network flow algorithm. AIEE Transactions, 9:63–68, 1977.

[46]. L.F. Portugal, M.G.C. Resende, G. Veiga, J. Patr´ıcio, and J.J. J´udice. Fortran subroutines for network flow optimization using an interior point algorithm. Technical Report TD-5X2SLN, AT&T Labs Research, 2004.

[47]. M.G.C. Resende and G. Veiga. An efficient implementation of a network interior point method. In D.S. Johnson and C.C. McGeoch, editors, Network Flows and Matching: First DIMACS Implementation Challenge, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 12, pages 299– 348, Providence, RI, 1993. American Mathematical Society.

[48]. E. Tardos. A strongly polynomial minimum cost circulation algorithm. ´ Combinatorica, 5:247–255, 1985.

[49]. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.89.9632&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[50]. (PDF) Application of Minimum Cost Flow Problem:.... Available from:

[51]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313861666_Application_of_Minimum_Cost_Flow_Problem_A_Case_Study_of_Crown_Distributors_in_Kegalle_Sri_Lanka


Mobin Ahmad" Some Algorithms for Minimum Cost Flow Problems" International Journal of Mathematics and Statistics Invention (IJMSI), vol. 07, no. 01, 2019, pp. 07-11