

Authors are encouraged to submit new papers to INFORMS journals by means of a style file template, which includes the journal title. However, use of a template does not certify that the paper has been accepted for publication in the named journal. INFORMS journal templates are for the exclusive purpose of submitting to an INFORMS journal and should not be used to distribute the papers in print or online or to submit the papers to another publication.

Online Supplement to the paper: Modeling Two-Dimensional Guillotine Cutting Problems via Integer Programming

Fabio Furini

LAMSADE, Université Paris-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny,
75775 Paris, France fabio.furini@dauphine.fr

Enrico Malaguti, Dimitri Thomopulos

DEI, Università di Bologna, Viale Risorgimento 2, 40136 Bologna, Italy
enrico.malaguti@unibo.it, dimitri.thomopulos@unibo.it

1. Redundant-Cut reduction

Conditions 1 and 2 of Remark 3 are checked during the enumeration of plates and variables through Procedure 1. In order to check these conditions, we associate four flags to each plate. The flags can assume values -1 , 0 , 1 (denoting that the plate is obtained through a trim cut only, it is not obtained through a trim cut with the same orientation, and it is obtained without a trim cut, respectively):

- Flag sh indicates the status of the plate with respect to a cut with orientation h ;
- Flag sv indicates the status of the plate with respect to a cut with orientation v ;
- Flag fh indicates the status of flags sh for all the father plates of the plate;
- Flag fv indicates the status of flags sv for all the father plates of the plate.

At step 3 of Procedure 1 we select plate j , and check if it can be eventually obtained (again) by further cuts from plates in J . If this is the case, we cannot safely remove redundant cuts, otherwise, at step 6:

- if one (or more) of the flags of plate j has value -1, do not perform trim cuts on j in the flag orientation.

At step 7, if a *new* plate $j_1 \notin J$ is obtained from j through a trim cut with orientation h :

- set the flag sh of j_1 to -1;
- set the flag sv of j_1 to 0;
- set the flags fh and fv equal to flags sh and sv of j ;

if a *new* plate $j_1 \notin J$ is obtained from j through a trim cut with orientation v :

- set the flag sv of j_1 to -1;
- set the flag sh of j_1 to 0;
- set the flags fh and fv equal to flags sh and sv of j ;

if an *existing* plate $j_1 \in J$ is obtained from j through a trim cut:

- if sh of j is larger than -1, set the flag fh of j_1 to 1;
- if sv of j is larger than -1, set the flag fv of j_1 to 1;

if a plate (new or existing) j_1 is obtained from j without a trim cut:

- set all flags of j_1 to 1.

2. Computational experiments - additional results

Table 1 reports the features for the small-size instances, i.e., those instances having less than 200,000 variables in the *Complete PP-G2KP Model*.

Table 2 reports the results obtained by applying the proposed solution procedure to the small-size instances.

<i>name</i>	<i>instance features</i>				<i>Complete PP-G2KP Model</i>			
	<i>opt</i>	<i>n</i>	\bar{n}	ρ	<i>vars</i>	<i>plates</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>gap</i>
<i>cgcut1</i>	244	7	16	10.0	801	140	0.1	0.0
<i>CHL5</i>	390	10	18	20.0	2,858	345	0.6	0.0
<i>Hchl8s</i>	911	10	18	49.0	13,997	896	<i>tl</i>	1.8
<i>OF2</i>	2,690	10	24	10.0	37,261	2,110	66.0	0.0
<i>cgcut3</i>	1,860	19	62	6.4	38,485	1,860	58.6	0.0
<i>wang20</i>	2,721	19	42	6.4	38,485	1,860	60.7	0.0
<i>3</i>	1,860	20	62	6.4	38,485	1,860	81.6	0.0
<i>3s</i>	2,721	20	62	6.4	38,485	1,860	60.7	0.0
<i>W</i>	2,721	20	62	6.4	38,485	1,860	56.5	0.0
<i>OF1</i>	2,737	10	23	10.0	38,608	2,098	53.9	0.0
<i>gcut1</i>	48,368	10	10	3.8	39,896	4,429	8.8	0.0
<i>A1</i>	2,020	20	62	5.6	45,333	2,040	85.4	0.0
<i>A1s</i>	2,950	20	62	5.6	45,333	2,040	82.3	0.0
<i>cgcut2</i>	2,892	10	23	10.0	52,590	2,017	58.4	0.0
<i>2</i>	2,892	10	23	10.0	52,590	2,017	55.2	0.0
<i>2s</i>	2,778	10	23	10.0	52,590	2,017	57.2	0.0
<i>CHL2</i>	2,326	10	19	6.1	57,567	2,348	104.1	0.0
<i>CHL2s</i>	3,279	10	19	6.1	57,567	2,348	110.4	0.0
<i>A2</i>	2,505	20	53	5.0	61,047	2,276	236.6	0.0
<i>A2s</i>	3,535	20	53	5.0	61,047	2,276	131.0	0.0
<i>STS2</i>	4,620	30	78	8.5	118,036	3,383	289.8	0.0
<i>STS2s</i>	4,653	30	78	8.5	118,036	3,383	385.7	0.0
<i>Hchl9</i>	5,240	35	76	7.6	130,738	3,666	612.5	0.0
<i>A3</i>	5,451	20	46	5.7	134,164	3,752	435.5	0.0
<i>HH</i>	11,586	5	18	7.5	141,167	5,486	<i>tl</i>	4.5
<i>A4</i>	6,179	20	35	10.0	179,759	4,860	1,259.0	0.0

Table 1 Small-size instances.

<i>name</i>	<i>t_{tot}</i>	<i>t_{gen}</i> (%)	<i>t_{LB}</i> (%)	<i>linear relaxation</i>		<i>Priced PP-G2KP Model</i>	
				<i>t_{LIP}</i> (%)	<i>gap_{LIP}</i>	<i>t</i> (%)	<i>gap</i>
<i>cgcut1</i>	0.6	0.0	96.8	1.6	0.2	1.6	0.0
<i>CHL5</i>	1.4	0.7	86.2	5.1	8.3	8.0	0.0
<i>Hchl8s</i>	3,638.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	22.0	98.9*	0.8
<i>OF2</i>	4.3	0.7	69.7	27.7	7.8	1.8	0.0
<i>cgcut3</i>	13.9	0.3	53.8	7.6	13.5	38.3	0.0
<i>wang20</i>	1.9	2.7	58.9	37.3	5.0	1.1	0.0
<i>3</i>	16.3	0.2	63.2	7.0	14.5	29.6	0.0
<i>3s</i>	1.9	2.6	58.1	38.7	5.0	0.5	0.0
<i>W</i>	1.8	2.2	43.1	53.6	3.6	1.1	0.0
<i>OF1</i>	2.1	2.3	34.6	58.9	1.5	4.2	0.0
<i>gcut1</i>	0.3	3.1	78.1	9.4	4.7	9.4	0.0
<i>A1</i>	9.8	0.4	84.8	14.5	15.1	0.3	0.0
<i>A1s</i>	1.5	3.4	33.1	62.8	0.0	0.7	0.0
<i>cgcut2</i>	10.0	0.5	78.6	20.7	12.5	0.2	0.0
<i>2</i>	9.2	0.4	84.4	14.9	12.5	0.3	0.0
<i>2s</i>	9.6	0.5	79.2	19.2	13.0	1.0	0.0
<i>CHL2</i>	65.7	0.1	10.0	3.1	6.8	86.8	0.0
<i>CHL2s</i>	23.9	0.2	23.7	6.3	6.6	69.8	0.0
<i>A2</i>	47.9	0.1	19.8	3.2	15.7	76.9	0.0
<i>A2s</i>	2.4	2.9	45.0	50.4	3.4	1.7	0.0
<i>STS2</i>	41.7	0.9	47.7	31.2	3.0	20.3	0.0
<i>STS2s</i>	29.1	1.2	52.1	45.7	1.8	1.0	0.0
<i>Hchl9</i>	121.6	0.4	75.4	21.4	9.9	2.7	0.0
<i>A3</i>	25.1	0.8	28.1	22.4	2.4	48.7	0.0
<i>HH</i>	3,654.0	0.0	1.5	0.1	12.1	98.5*	4.4
<i>A4</i>	297.9	0.2	43.2	9.0	5.8	47.6	0.0

Table 2 Solution of the small-size instances.