

The Solution of Potential-Driven, Steady-State Nonlinear Network Flow Equations via Graph Partitioning

Shriram Srinivasan[†], Kaarthik Sundar[†]

Abstract—The solution of potential-driven steady-state flow in large networks is required in various engineering applications, such as transport of natural gas or water through pipeline networks. The resultant system of nonlinear equations depends on the network topology, and its solution grows more challenging as the network size increases. We present an algorithm that utilizes a given partition of a network into tractable sizes to compute a global solution for the full nonlinear system through local solution of smaller subsystems induced by the partitions. When the partitions are induced by interconnects or transfer points corresponding to networks owned by different operators, the method ensures data is shared solely at the interconnects, leaving network operators free to solve the network flow system corresponding to their own domain in any manner of their choosing. The proposed method is shown to be connected to the Schur complement and the method’s viability demonstrated on some challenging test cases.

Index Terms—Networked control systems; Fluid flow systems; Network analysis and control; partitioning; vertex separator; Schur complement; Kron reduction

I. INTRODUCTION

In the control of networked flow systems, one of the most fundamental and frequently performed tasks is the simulation of steady-state network flow under given control actions. When control parameters produce states that stray into regimes far from normal operating conditions, the subsequent contingency analysis must be done over as large a scale as possible to be useful. However, the gas pipeline network in the continental US viewed on a national scale is a patchwork of multiple regional and local networks, owned and operated individually but held together as a single connected network through interconnects or transfer points. A simulation of network flow contingencies over the national scale is difficult due to two disparate reasons.

On one hand, there are concerns of privacy and issues with data sharing which make it difficult to perform simulations and study contingency scenarios over regions of the US grid where multiple operators are involved. On the other hand, the mathematical problem is difficult due to the sheer size and scale of the network. The standard Newton-Raphson iterative scheme for the nonlinear system faces challenges as the

network size increases. Even the solution of the linear system in each Newton step becomes expensive with direct methods like LU decomposition, but indirect or iterative methods based on Krylov subspace solvers seem to perform poorly [1].

A remedy for both these ills would be to partition the network into tractable sizes and devise a method to compute a global solution for the full nonlinear system through local solution of smaller subsystems induced by the partitions. There have only been a couple of relevant efforts in this direction. An early attempt [2] had unsubstantiated assumptions and was narrow in scope. More recently, a solution technique was devised based on an hierarchical partitioning of the network [3] that utilizes the presence of special junctions called *articulation points*. While useful in its own right, the hierarchical solution technique proposed in [3] is still limited in its ability to handle the interconnects or transfer points at the interface between multiple regional and local gas networks since these interconnects are typically not articulation points.

The more general solution method proposed in this article relates to the Schur complement which insinuates itself into well-known techniques known in different areas of research. Depending on the reader’s persuasion [4], our method could be said to share similarities with domain decomposition methods and the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for the solution of PDEs, or the Kron reduction for circuits [5]. However, it differs from both in there being no explicit elimination of any degrees of freedom. The method proposed allows for data sharing solely at the interconnects or transfer points between individual subnetworks with network operators free to use their own solvers or software to solve the network flow system for their own domain. In that context, we present a method that utilizes a general partition of the network, is in the spirit of the suggested remedy, and avoids the limitations of the solution technique [3] that was based on hierarchical partitioning.

II. GOVERNING EQUATIONS

We stick to the same notation as in [3] to describe the potential-driven steady-state flow equations on a network. Even though the equations and concepts are identical, it was necessary to include them for completeness.

Let G denote the graph of the network, where $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ are the corresponding sets of *nodes* and *edges* of the network. For each node $i \in V(G)$, we let $\pi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the

[†] Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA.
E-mail: {shrirams,kaarthik}@lanl.gov

nodal value of the potential while $q_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is the nodal injection or supply. We let $f_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the steady flow through the edge $(i, j) \in E(G)$ that connects nodes $i, j \in V(G)$. In order to ensure the uniqueness of the potentials satisfying the equations, it is sufficient (but not always necessary, see [3] for details) that the potential be known or fixed at certain nodes. Hence, each node $i \in V(G)$ is assigned to one of two mutually disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ consisting of so-called slack nodes N_s and non-slack nodes N_{ns} respectively, depending on whether the potential π_i^* or injection q_i^* at the node is specified. Thus $V(G) = N_s \cup N_{ns}$ and one writes the system of network flow equations consisting of balance of flows at each node, potential-driven flow on each edge, and the specified potential at the slack nodes in the general form (* superscript indicates given data)

$$\mathcal{NF}(G) : \begin{cases} \gamma_{ij}^* \pi_i - \pi_j = g_{ij}^*(f_{ij}) \quad \forall (i, j) \in E(G), & (1a) \\ \sum_{(i,j) \in E(G)} f_{ij} - \sum_{(j,i) \in E(G)} f_{ji} = q_i^* \quad \forall i \in N_{ns}, & (1b) \\ \pi_i = \pi_i^* \quad \forall i \in N_s. & (1c) \end{cases}$$

Remark 1. Note that if $|N_s| > 1$, then $\forall i \in N_s$, q_i is unknown and can be determined only once the edge flows f_{ij} are known for all $(i, j) \in E(G)$, i.e., after solving the system (1). However, if $|N_s| = 1$, the steady state condition that the sum of all the nodal injections must be zero is enough to determine the injection at the slack node.

In this general form, $g_{ij}^* : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a monotonic function, $q_i^* \in \mathbb{R}$ while $\gamma_{ij}^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$. In network flow applications, different types of active or passive edge elements can be modelled through various choices and specifications of g_{ij}^* and γ_{ij}^* . In order to model the flow of fluid in pipeline networks, the pipes are modelled as edge elements by setting $\gamma_{ij}^* = 1$ and the nonlinear resistance function $g_{ij}^*(f_{ij}) \propto f_{ij}|f_{ij}|$ [6]. Additionally, for compressible fluids such as natural gas or hydrogen [7], the choice $g_{ij}^* = 0$ corresponds to pressure regulators or compressors depending on whether γ_{ij}^* is less than or equal to unity [8]. In contrast, for incompressible liquids such as water, pumps are modelled as edges where $\gamma_{ij}^* = 1$ and g_{ij}^* is some positive constant or a monotonic function of f_{ij} [9].

When certain assumptions on the network topology are valid, the solution to (1) is known to be unique (when it exists). However, these assumptions also eliminate certain impractical but pathological network instances [6], and are stated as follows :

- (A1) There is at least one slack node, i.e., $|N_s| \geq 1$.
- (A2) When $|N_s| \geq 2$, a path connecting two slack nodes must consist of at least one edge with $g_{ij}^* \neq 0$
- (A3) Any cycle must consist of least one edge with $g_{ij}^* \neq 0$.

We already mentioned that (A1) ensures that the values of the potential satisfying equation (1) are unique, but (A2) and (A3) are required to ensure uniqueness of the flows satisfying (1) [6], [10], [11]. The existence of a solution to (1) will be assumed in this article, but the proof of existence of a solution for a specific case can be found in [12].

For any *nonlinear* edge relation, including the aforementioned case of fluid flow in pipeline networks, (1) is a nonlinear

system of algebraic equations in $|V(G)| + |E(G)|$ variables whose solution becomes more challenging as the network size grows larger. Moreover, whatever the solution algorithm used for the nonlinear system, it is necessary to solve a linear system specified by the Jacobian of (1) at each iteration, but direct methods (such as LU decomposition) do not scale well with system size. However, their indirect counterparts (iterative linear solvers) with good scaling properties perform poorly [1]. Thus, there is a strong motivation to develop a solution technique that can utilize network partitioning to solve the system (1) on smaller subnetworks. While [3] proposed such a method, it has severe limitations imposed by the network structure and the placement of slack nodes (which will be discussed subsequently), but the method we propose overcomes most of those deficiencies.

As a preamble to it, we present a reformulation of the system (1) as a bi-level nonlinear system. The reformulation will also yield useful insights for the subsequent network partitioning.

III. A BI-LEVEL REFORMULATION

Let \mathbf{A} be the edge incidence matrix of the graph G of size $|V(G)| \times |E(G)|$. Each element of \mathbf{A} is defined as follows:

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E(G), \\ +1 & \text{if } (j, i) \in E(G), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Define a weighted edge incidence matrix \mathbf{B} as:

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } (i, j) \in E(G), \\ +\gamma_{ij}^* & \text{if } (j, i) \in E(G), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We already know that $V(G) = N_{ns} \cup N_s$. Let us divide the nonslack vertices in N_{ns} into two disjoint, non-empty subsets, $N_{ns} = N_{\text{int}} \cup N_{\text{dep}}$, with the subscripts mean to stand for *interface* nodes and *dependent* nodes, respectively. Typically, $|N_{\text{int}}| \ll |N_{\text{dep}}|$. The nodes can be ordered such that the following partitioning of \mathbf{A} into *dependent*, *interface* and *slack* makes sense:

$$\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{A}_{\text{dep}} \quad \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}} \quad \mathbf{A}_s]^T \quad (4)$$

An analogous partition of \mathbf{B} will be assumed. In the same vein, we define

$$\text{nodal potentials: } \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V(G)|} = [\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{dep}} \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\text{int}} \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}_s]^T,$$

$$\text{edge flows: } \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{|E(G)|}, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{non-slack nodal injections: } \mathbf{q}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{|N_{ns}|} = [\mathbf{q}_{\text{dep}}^* \quad \mathbf{q}_{\text{int}}^*]^T.$$

Finally, we let $\mathbf{g}^*(\mathbf{f})$ the vector of edge-functions $g_{ij}^*(f_{ij})$ for each $(i, j) \in E(G)$. In this notation, with the aid of (4), one can rewrite the system (1) equivalently as

$$h_{\text{edge}}(\mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \triangleq \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\pi} - \mathbf{g}^*(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5a)$$

$$h_{\text{dep}}(\mathbf{f}) \triangleq \mathbf{A}_{\text{dep}} \mathbf{f} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{dep}}^* = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5b)$$

$$h_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{f}) \triangleq \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}} \mathbf{f} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{int}}^* = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5c)$$

$$h_{\text{slack}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \triangleq \boldsymbol{\pi}_s - \boldsymbol{\pi}^* = \mathbf{0}. \quad (5d)$$

In order to express the flows \mathbf{f} and the potentials π_{dep} in the system (5) as functions of π_{int} and π_s , we define

$$\mathbf{y} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f} \\ \pi_{\text{dep}} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi_s) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} h_{\text{edge}}(\mathbf{f}, \pi) \\ h_{\text{dep}}(\mathbf{f}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

If we assume the Jacobian $D_{\mathbf{y}}H$ is non-singular (this holds under standard regularity and non-zero flows [6]), then for a small enough neighbourhood around π_{int} and π_s , the implicit function theorem asserts the existence of a smooth mapping $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ such that

$$\mathbf{y} = \hat{\mathbf{y}}(\pi_{\text{int}}, \pi_s), \quad (7a)$$

$$H(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\pi_{\text{int}}, \pi_s), \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi_s) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (7b)$$

$$D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} \hat{\mathbf{y}} = -[D_{\mathbf{y}}H]^{-1} D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} H. \quad (7c)$$

Remark 2. It will be useful to regard the formula for the derivative in equation (7c) as expressing the *sensitivities* of the solution $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ with respect to the parameters π_{int} . Thus the computation of the sensitivity is straightforward (solution of a linear system) once the solution of the nonlinear system $H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi_s) = \mathbf{0}$ is known.

Let us define an appropriate projection $\mathbb{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{f}.$$

Then, using (7) and the equation (5d), we can rewrite (5c) as

$$h(\pi_{\text{int}}) \triangleq h_{\text{int}}(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{y}}(\pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) - \mathbf{q}_{\text{int}}^* = \mathbf{0} \quad (8)$$

The inference is that we can solve (8) (a small system with $|N_{\text{int}}|$ variables), in order to find a solution to (5). However, a single step of the Newton-Raphson algorithm applied to (8) is

$$[D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} h] \Delta \pi_{\text{int}} = -h(\pi_{\text{int}}), \quad (9)$$

where the Jacobian $D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} h$ on using (7c) is

$$D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} h = -\mathbf{A}_{\text{int}} \mathbb{P} [D_{\mathbf{y}}H]^{-1} [D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} H], \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{where, } H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10b)$$

Hence, every iteration in the solution of (8) involves the solution of $H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}$ justifying the

Definition 1 (Bi-level formulation). The vector π_{int} that solves (8) through a sequence of Newton steps (9) is a bi-level formulation of (5), as depicted in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Newton Raphson for the bi-level formulation

- 1: **input:** $\pi_{\text{int}}^{(0)}$, $i \leftarrow 0$ ▷ Initialization
 - 2: **repeat**
 - 3: Solve $H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}^{(i)}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}$ ▷ See (6)
 - 4: Compute $D_{\pi_{\text{int}}} h$ and $h(\pi_{\text{int}})$ at $\pi_{\text{int}} = \pi_{\text{int}}^{(i)}$
 - 5: Update $\pi_{\text{int}}^{(i+1)}$ using (8) and set $i \leftarrow i + 1$
 - 6: **until** Termination condition is met
 - 7: **output:** $\pi_{\text{int}}^{(i+1)}$
-

Remark 3. The system of equations solved at the i^{th} iteration in Step 3 of Algorithm 1 can be thought of as the network flow

equations in (1) for the graph G with slack nodes $N_s \cup N_{\text{int}}$ and non-slack nodes N_{dep} with potentials $\pi_{\text{int}}^{(i)}$ for the additional slack nodes N_{int} .

At this juncture, it would appear from Remark 3 that the reformulation has exacerbated the problem, since we have exchanged the task of solving a large nonlinear system for that of solving a bi-level nonlinear system where a modified nonlinear system of the same size as the original system is required to be solved *in every iteration* (see Step 3 of Algorithm 1). However, if the Jacobian $D_{\mathbf{y}}H$ were block-diagonal, then the solution of $H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}^{(i)}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}$ could be decoupled and split into the solution of similar but smaller nonlinear subsystems corresponding to each of the blocks. If network topology can be exploited to engineer the choice of the interface nodes that result in decoupled, smaller subsystems, then it confers a major computational advantage on Algorithm 1. However, before proceeding on that front, we illustrate the connection our bi-level problem has to the Schur complement [13].

A. Relation to Schur complement

A Newton-Raphson step for the full system (5) will lead to $\Delta \pi_s = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, we substitute $\pi_s = \pi^*$ and simplify the Newton step to

$$\begin{bmatrix} -D_{\mathbf{f}} g^* & B_{\text{dep}}^T & B_{\text{int}}^T \\ \mathbf{A}_{\text{dep}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathbf{f} \\ \Delta \pi_{\text{dep}} \\ \Delta \pi_{\text{int}} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} h_{\text{edge}}(\mathbf{f}, \pi) \\ h_{\text{dep}}(\mathbf{f}) \\ h_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{f}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

We rewrite (11) with respect to \mathbf{y} defined in (6) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathbf{y}}H & D_{\pi_{\text{int}}}H \\ \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}}\mathbb{P} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathbf{y} \\ \Delta \pi_{\text{int}} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) \\ h(\pi_{\text{int}}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

If we eliminate $\Delta \mathbf{y}$, the eliminant can be written using the Schur complement of $D_{\mathbf{y}}H$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathbf{A}_{\text{int}}\mathbb{P} [D_{\mathbf{y}}H]^{-1} [D_{\pi_{\text{int}}}H] \Delta \pi_{\text{int}} \\ & + h(\pi_{\text{int}}) - \mathbf{A}_{\text{int}}\mathbb{P} [D_{\mathbf{y}}H]^{-1} H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

We know from (10) that the iterations of the bi-level problem satisfy $H(\mathbf{y}, \pi_{\text{int}}, \pi^*) = \mathbf{0}$ at every Newton step. Hence, (13) simplifies and becomes identical to equation (9) for $\Delta \pi_{\text{int}}$. Thus, the Newton step for the bi-level problem (8) is equivalent to that induced by the Schur complement of the Newton step (11) for the full problem (5).

IV. NETWORK PARTITIONING WITH THE BI-LEVEL FORMULATION

The method of solution with a bi-level formulation has already been explained in detail in the previous section, so our aim is to illustrate how a judicious choice of interface nodes can result in much smaller subsystems in the bi-level formulation. Before turning to a mathematical construction that demonstrates our point, we first present an intuitive description.

A. Intuitive description

Consider the solution of (1) specialized for flow of natural gas with the topology implied by GasLib-40 [8] whose graph




Fig. 1: The GasLib-40 network is shown with interface nodes coloured black, while S_1, S_2 are shown in different colors with the interface nodes belonging to both. With the interface nodes as slack, can solve two subsystems corresponding to S_1 and S_2 respectively.

is depicted in Figure 1. From the visual depiction in Figure 1, it is clear that the two nodes colored in black (interface nodes) allow us to identify two sub-networks (designated S_1, S_2) that contain the interface nodes in common.

The solution of the bi-level formulation (Definition 1) involves the solution of (1) for the full network with the interface nodes now designated as additional slack nodes. However, identification of S_1, S_2 allows us to instead solve the network flow systems $\mathcal{NF}(S_1), \mathcal{NF}(S_2)$. These observations in turn raise several questions:

- (Q1) How to identify interface nodes for large networks?
- (Q2) Are there any restrictions on the number of subnetworks or the topology of their interconnections?
- (Q3) Are we guaranteed that this method will be successful? The mathematical development described in the next section will answer these questions, among others.

B. Mathematical description

Once again, we denote the graph of the network by G , and the edge and vertex sets by $E(G)$ and $V(G)$, respectively. We denote the number of vertices and edges by $|V(G)|$ and $|E(G)|$ respectively. Note that the removal of a set of vertices (the set can be a singleton) implies the removal of all edges incident on that set of vertices. We define the following preliminary notions for subsequent use.

Definition 2. A *cut-point* or *articulation point* of a connected graph is a vertex whose removal increases the number of connected components.

The existence of graphs which are *biconnected*, i.e., possess no articulation points, leads to the less restrictive concept of

Definition 3 (Vertex Separator). A *vertex separator* $C_V \subset V(G)$ is a non-empty set of vertices whose removal increases

the number of connected components. A vertex separator is also known as a *vertex cut* of a graph.

Definition 4 (Permissible vertex separator). For the purpose of this article, we shall consider a vertex separator C_V of graph G to be *permissible* if there is no edge in $E(G)$ that connects any two vertices of $C_V \subset V(G)$.

An articulation point forms the smallest possible vertex separator. In general, finding optimal vertex separators in graphs is computationally difficult; however, various heuristics [14] have been developed to compute them efficiently in practice. Thus, one can always expect to be able to determine C_V with $|C_V| \ll V(G)$. Sometimes, it is possible that no permissible vertex separator exists. For example, consider the square with four vertices and one diagonal edge. While a vertex separator exists in this instance, it is not permissible. However, for practical networks, such a case is unlikely.

Remark 4. Instead of vertex separators, some graph partitioning algorithms might yield a set of *edge separators*, i.e., a set of edges C_E whose removal would disconnect the network. If the subgraph of the network induced by C_E contains no cliques (complete subgraphs), there exists a *permissible vertex separator* consisting of an appropriate choice of vertices that are associated with the edges of C_E .

Definition 5 (Vertex removal). We use the notation $G - C_V$ to indicate the (possibly disconnected) graph constructed by removal of the vertices in $C_V \subset V(G)$.

The next set of results will formalize the construction of the subnetworks that were illustrated in Figure 1 by using vertex separators that are permissible as in Definition 4.

Lemma 1. For a connected graph G , a *permissible* vertex separator $C_V \subset V(G)$ can be used to construct $N(C_V) \geq 2$ subnetworks of G , $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{N(C_V)}$ such that

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq N(C_V)} E(S_k) = E(G), \quad (14a)$$

$$V(S_i) \cap V(S_j) \subseteq C_V \quad \forall i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq N(C_V) \quad (14b)$$

Proof. Since C_V is a vertex separator, $G - C_V$ will have more than two connected components. The total number will be finite, but will depend on the graph as well as the chosen vertex separator. Let us designate this number as $N(C_V)$, and the connected components as $S_1^-, S_2^-, \dots, S_{N(C_V)}^-$. By their very definition, is clear that

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq N(C_V)} E(S_k^-) = E(G - C_V), \quad (15a)$$

$$V(S_i^-) \cap V(S_j^-) = \emptyset \quad \forall i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq N(C_V) \quad (15b)$$

The subnetworks with the desired properties follow via the following construction that adds selected edges to the connected components $S_1^-, S_2^-, \dots, S_{N(C_V)}^-$ as follows: for each $v_1 \in C_V$, if there is any edge in $E(G)$ that connects it to some $v_2 \in V(S_k^-)$, then S_k^- is augmented by adding the edge (v_1, v_2) . Once this process is complete and all valid edges have been added, we now have $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{N(C_V)}$ whose vertices and edges satisfy the stated properties in the lemma. Since the vertex separator is permissible, the case of edges between vertices in C_V does not arise. \square

The construction of the subnetworks corresponding to a permissible vertex separator subtly modifies our proposed method for solving the bi-level formulation (8) due to

Theorem 1. Given a network G with a permissible vertex separator C_V , the computation in Step 3 of Algorithm 1 within each iteration of a bi-level formulation (Definition 1) defined on C_V can be split into smaller subsystems whose number and size depends on the network topology.

Proof. For simplicity, let us assume that $C_V \cap V_s = \emptyset$. The vertices in C_V serve the same role as N_{int} defined in Section IV. According to Lemma 1, the permissible vertex separator C_V partitions the graph G into $N(C_V)$ subnetworks, denoted $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{N(C_V)}$. The system $\mathcal{NF}(G)$ can be interpreted as being decomposed into $N(C_V)$ independent subnetwork systems, each associated with one of the subnetworks S_k , consistent with (14). As explained in Remark 3, each subnetwork system corresponding to S_k includes additional slack nodes given by the set $C_V \cap V(S_k)$. \square

Theorem 1 can be exploited to gain computational efficiency in Algorithm 1. Instead of a single solve (see Remark 3) corresponding to Step 3, for each $1 \leq k \leq N(C_V)$, we solve the smaller subsystems $\mathcal{NF}(S_k)$; this computation can be parallelized, if desired. Similarly, in Step 4, the sensitivity or Jacobian contribution is also assembled from each subnetwork as follows: For the interface nodes in $C_V \cap V(S_k)$, the sensitivity of the solution with respect to the corresponding components of π_{int} is calculated as stated in Remark 2. However, for interface nodes in $C_V \setminus V(S_k)$, the corresponding sensitivities are zero.

Remark 5. While there are no restrictions on the number of subnetworks $N(C_V)$, or the topology of the intersections of the subnetworks S_k , it is necessary to have $V(S_k) > 2$. This is because, if $V(S_k) = 2$, both vertices are interface nodes with potentials known but if $g_{ij}^* = 0$ as for compressors or pressure regulators, then the edge flow is indeterminate. This is also the reason behind Definition 4.

Remark 6. Since we expect that $|C_V| \ll V(G)$, and each subnetwork problem $\mathcal{NF}(S_k)$ is much smaller than $\mathcal{NF}(G)$, this method has traded the complexity of iterative solution of a large nonlinear system $\mathcal{NF}(G)$ for the iterative solution of a collection of smaller nonlinear subsystems. While there can be no guarantees that this method will converge (any more than there is any guarantee that we will be able to solve the original system), there are two clear advantages. The smaller nonlinear subsystems $\mathcal{NF}(S_k)$ are easier to solve, and since the central system (8) is much smaller, it is possible to contemplate the use of advanced methods with better convergence [15], [16].

Remark 7. While the proof assumed that $C_V \cap V_s = \emptyset$, the proof would hold even if some of the vertices in C_V were originally specified to be slack nodes in G . With some of the potentials known, the dimension of the system (8) would be less than $|C_V|$.

We now have answers to the questions (Q1), (Q2), and (Q3) that were posed at the conclusion of section IV-A. It is clear that there are graph-theoretic algorithms and software that can be used to identify vertex separators for use in this problem,




Fig. 2: Partitioning of Texas network with 2451 vertices [17] into 9 subnetworks, all of size less than 500 vertices. The 25 interface nodes are coloured black.

answering (Q1). Moreover, Remarks 5 and 6 address (Q2) and (Q3) respectively.

C. Observations and Comments

The method described here uses a general network partition (GNP) with very mild restrictions and complements the hierarchical network partitioning (HNP) method [3]. As the underlying philosophy (to split a network and solve the problem) is identical, it is helpful to critically analyze the proposed method in comparison with [3] to elucidate the major advantages and the few minor disadvantages.

Vertex separator: The vertex separator in HNP consists solely of articulation points. Hence, cycles (biconnected subnetworks) cannot be broken up further. However GNP does not suffer from this limitation and hence balanced partitions can be obtained. For instance, with GNP, the Texas network [17] with 2451 vertices (which has a biconnected subnetwork with 882 vertices) is partitioned into 9 subnetworks (with no more than 500 vertices) by means of 25 interface nodes. (see Fig 2).

Subnetwork size: While partitions that yield subnetworks with two nodes are allowed in HNP, they are forbidden in GNP. The reason for this difference is that in HNP, an initial flow solve is possible that determines the flow in two node subnetworks, but as Remark 5 explains, flow in such two-node subnetworks could be indeterminate in GNP.

Slacks: In HNP, all the slack nodes must be contained within the same subnetwork, which could severely constrain the size of subnetworks. However, GNP has no such restrictions and the number and position of slack nodes do not affect the type or size of the subnetworks.

Complexity: HNP terminates after one solve for all subnetworks. However, GNP is solved in a bi-level formulation that requires all subnetworks to be solved once per iteration of the outer problem. Thus while the solution technique that uses

HNP is definitely more efficient, network structure could easily render it inapplicable. One can look at it from the viewpoint that if we accept the restrictions imposed by the network structure in designing an HNP, we are rewarded with an algorithm that requires exactly one solve for each subsystem. On the other hand, if we want the freedom to choose a general vertex separator, the price we must pay is that of solving the bi-level formulation with repeated solves for the subsystems. **Underlying physics:** HNP was predicated on the fact that for any edge, if the flow has a certain magnitude and sign relative to one end, then it must have the same magnitude but a reversed sign relative to the other end. However, this property, termed “lossless flow”, has no bearing for GNP. While it is beyond the scope of this article, if we consider AC power flow with *lossy* transmission [18], it may be possible to use GNP for solving the system of AC power flow equations but HNP is clearly inapplicable.

Beyond these parameters of comparison, the utility of the method proposed here will be most apparent in the consideration of gas pipeline networks in the continental US with transfer points connecting various regional and local networks as mentioned earlier in Section I. Due to the requirement of redundancy, these transfer points are never articulation points (Definition 2), but they are natural vertex separators (Definition 3). Thus while hierarchical network partitioning may not be possible, the method we propose is still a viable candidate as it allows for data sharing solely at the vertex separators or interfaces between individual, with network operators free to use their own solvers or software to solve the network flow system for their own domain.

D. Results

Given the fundamental premise of this article to solve the network flow system via partitioned subsystems, computational experiments that demonstrate the viability of the method are of most interest. The approach was tested successfully on the GasLib networks [8] with 11, 24, 40, 134 and 582 vertices but we shall not belabour the point with unnecessary computational statistics. The only exception made is to mention that with the 9 subnetwork partitions for the Texas network [17], the solution was found with a residual of order 10^{-8} and maximum relative error with respect to the “true solution” of the order of 10^{-4} , allowing us to assert the validity and effectiveness of the method.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented an algorithm that utilizes a given partition of the network into tractable sizes to compute a global solution for the full nonlinear system through local solution of smaller subsystems induced by the partitions. When the partitions are induced by interconnects or transfer points corresponding to networks owned by different operators, the method ensures data sharing occurs solely at the interconnects, leaving network operators free to solve the network flow system corresponding to their own domain in any manner of their choosing. The connection between the proposed method and the Schur complement was clarified and the method’s viability demonstrated

on some challenging test cases. Future work could look to adapt this method to the solution of the single-phase AC power flow equations.

REFERENCES

- [1] B.-V. Nguyen, J. Romate, and C. Vuik, “Performance of krylov solvers for gas networks,” in *E-Energy '25: Proceedings of the 16th ACM International Conference on Future and Sustainable Energy System*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Jun. 2025, pp. 489–494.
- [2] R. Z. Ríos-Mercado, S. Wu, L. R. Scott, and E. A. Boyd, “A reduction technique for natural gas transmission network optimization problems,” *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 117, no. 1, pp. 217–234, Nov. 2002.
- [3] S. Srinivasan and K. Sundar, “Hierarchical network partitioning for solution of potential-driven, steady-state, nonlinear network flow equations,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 8, pp. 3368–3373, January 2025.
- [4] A. Levitt, “The many disguises of the Schur complement,” <https://www.imo.universite-paris-saclay.fr/~antoine.levitt/schur.pdf>, Accessed: 9 Nov 2025.
- [5] A. van der Schaft, B. Besselink, and A.-M. Huijzer, “Kron reduction of nonlinear networks,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 8, pp. 556–561, May 2024.
- [6] S. Srinivasan, K. Sundar, V. Gyrya, and A. Zlotnik, “Numerical solution of the steady-state network flow equations for a non-ideal gas,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2022.
- [7] S. R. Kazi, K. Sundar, S. Srinivasan, and A. Zlotnik, “Modeling and optimization of steady flow of natural gas and hydrogen mixtures in pipeline networks,” *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 54, pp. 14–24, 2024.
- [8] M. Schmidt, D. Aßmann, R. Burlacu, J. Humpola, I. Joormann, N. Kanelakis, T. Koch, D. Oucherif, M. E. Pfetsch, L. Schewe *et al.*, “Gaslib—a library of gas network instances,” *Data*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 40, 2017.
- [9] M. K. Singh and V. Kekatos, “Optimal scheduling of water distribution systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 711–723, 2019.
- [10] —, “Natural gas flow equations: Uniqueness and an MI-SOCP solver,” in *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2114–2120.
- [11] —, “Natural gas flow solvers using convex relaxation,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1283–1295, 2020.
- [12] S. Srinivasan, N. Panda, and K. Sundar, “On the existence of steady-state solutions to the equations governing fluid flow in networks,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- [13] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [14] G. Karypis and V. Kumar, “A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs,” *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 359–392, 1998.
- [15] W. Haijun, “New third-order method for solving systems of nonlinear equations,” *Numerical Algorithms*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 271–282, Mar. 2009.
- [16] H. Okawa, K. Fujisawa, Y. Yamamoto, R. Hirai, N. Yasutake, H. Nagakura, and S. Yamada, “The W4 method: A new multi-dimensional root-finding scheme for nonlinear systems of equations,” *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 183, pp. 157–172, Jan. 2023.
- [17] A. B. Birchfield and Y. Abu-Khalifa, “Structural characterisation for the synthesis of large-scale combined electric–gas networks,” *IET Energy Systems Integration*, 2024.
- [18] C. Coffrin, H. Hijazi, and P. Van Hentenryck, “Network flow and copper plate relaxations for ac transmission systems,” in *2016 Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–8.