

The asymmetric traveling salesman path LP has constant integrality ratio

Anna Köhne Vera Traub Jens Vygen

Research Institute for Discrete Mathematics, University of Bonn
{koe hne, traub, vygen}@or.uni-bonn.de

Abstract

We show that the classical LP relaxation of the asymmetric traveling salesman path problem (ATSP) has constant integrality ratio. If ρ_{ATSP} and ρ_{ATSPP} denote the integrality ratios for the asymmetric TSP and its path version, then $\rho_{\text{ATSPP}} \leq 4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$.

We prove an even better bound for node-weighted instances: if the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances is $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}}$, then the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances is at most $2\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} - 1$.

Moreover, we show that for ATSP node-weighted instances and unweighted digraph instances are almost equivalent. From this we deduce a lower bound of 2 on the integrality ratio of unweighted digraph instances.

1 Introduction

In the asymmetric traveling salesman path problem (ATSP), we are given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, two vertices $s, t \in V$, and weights $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. We look for a sequence $s = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k = t$ that contains every vertex at least once (an s - t -tour); the goal is to minimize $\sum_{i=1}^k c(v_{i-1}, v_i)$. Equivalently, we can assume that G is complete and the triangle inequality $c(u, v) + c(v, w) \geq c(u, w)$ holds for all $u, v, w \in V$, and require the sequence to contain every vertex exactly once.

The special case $s = t$ is known as the asymmetric traveling salesman problem (ATSP). In a recent breakthrough, Svensson, Tarnawski and Végh [2018] found the first constant-factor approximation algorithm for ATSP, and they also proved that its standard LP relaxation has constant integrality ratio.

Feige and Singh [2007] showed that any α -approximation algorithm for ATSP implies a $(2\alpha + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for ATSP (for any $\varepsilon > 0$). Hence ATSP also has a constant-factor approximation algorithm. In this paper we prove a similar relation for the integrality ratios. This answers an open question by Friggstad, Gupta and Singh [2016].

Given that the upper bound on the integrality ratio by Svensson, Tarnawski and Végh [2018] is a large constant that will probably be improved in the future, such a black-box result seems particularly desirable. Any improved upper bound on the integrality ratio for ATSP then immediately implies a better bound for the path version.

1.1 The linear programming relaxation

The classical linear programming relaxation for ATSP (for $s \neq t$) is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min c(x) \\
 & \text{s.t. } x(\delta^-(s)) - x(\delta^+(s)) = -1 \\
 & \quad x(\delta^-(t)) - x(\delta^+(t)) = 1 \\
 & \quad x(\delta^-(v)) - x(\delta^+(v)) = 0 \quad \text{for } v \in V \setminus \{s, t\} \\
 & \quad x(\delta(U)) \geq 2 \quad \text{for } \emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\} \\
 & \quad x_e \geq 0 \quad \text{for } e \in E
 \end{aligned} \tag{ATSP LP}$$

Here (and henceforth) we write $c(x) := \sum_{e \in E} c(e)x_e$, $x(F) := \sum_{e \in F} x_e$, $\delta^+(U) := \{(u, v) \in E : u \in U, v \in V \setminus U\}$, $\delta^-(U) := \delta^+(V \setminus U)$, $\delta(U) := \delta^-(U) \cup \delta^+(U)$, $\delta^+(v) := \delta^+(\{v\})$, and $\delta^-(v) := \delta^-(\{v\})$. For an instance \mathcal{I} we denote by $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the value of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP) and by $\text{OPT}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the value of an optimum integral solution. If the instance is clear from the context, we will sometimes simply write LP and OPT. Note that the integral solutions of (ATSP LP) are precisely the incidence vectors of multi-digraphs (V, F) that become connected and Eulerian by adding one edge (t, s) . Hence they correspond to walks from s to t that visit all vertices, in other words: s - t -tours.

The integrality ratio of (ATSP LP), denoted by ρ_{ATSP} , is the maximal ratio of an optimum integral solution and an optimum fractional solution; more precisely $\sup_{\mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}_{\mathcal{I}}}{\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}}}$, where the supremum goes over all instances $\mathcal{I} = (G, c, s, t)$ with $s \neq t$ for which the denominator is nonzero and finite. Nagarajan and Ravi [2008] proved that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} = O(\sqrt{n})$, where $n = |V|$. This bound was improved to $O(\log n)$ by Friggstad, Salavatipour and Svitkina [2013] and to $O(\log n / \log \log n)$ by Friggstad, Gupta and Singh [2016]. In this paper we prove that the integrality ratio of (ATSP LP) is in fact constant.

Let ρ_{ATSP} denote the integrality ratio of the classical linear programming relaxation for ATSP:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min c(x) \\
 & \text{s.t. } x(\delta^-(v)) - x(\delta^+(v)) = 0 \quad \text{for } v \in V \\
 & \quad x(\delta(U)) \geq 2 \quad \text{for } \emptyset \neq U \subsetneq V \\
 & \quad x_e \geq 0 \quad \text{for } e \in E
 \end{aligned} \tag{ATSP LP}$$

Svensson, Tarnawski and Vég h [2018] proved that ρ_{ATSP} is a constant. By an infinite sequence of instances, Charikar, Goemans and Karloff [2006] showed that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \geq 2$. It is obvious that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \geq \rho_{\text{ATSP}}$: split an arbitrary vertex of an ATSP instance into two copies, one (called s) inheriting the outgoing edges, and one (called t) inheriting the entering edges; add an edge (t, s) of cost zero and with $x_{(t,s)} := x(\delta^+(s)) - 1$. Figure 1 displays a simpler family of examples, due to Friggstad, Gupta and Singh [2016], showing that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \geq 2$.




Figure 1: Example with integrality ratio approaching 2 as the number of vertices increases. Setting $x_e := \frac{1}{2}$ for all shown edges defines a feasible solution of (ATSP LP). If the $2k$ curved edges have cost 1 and the dotted edges have cost 0, we have $\text{LP} = c(x) = k$, but any s - t -tour costs at least $2k - 1$. (In the figure, $k = 4$.) Setting $y_U = \frac{1}{2}$ for the vertex sets indicated by the ellipses and a_v as shown in blue defines an optimum solution of (ATSP DUAL).

1.2 Our results and techniques

Our main result says that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \leq 4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$. Together with Svensson, Tarnawski and Vég h [2018], this implies a constant integrality ratio for (ATSP LP).

Similarly as Feige and Singh [2007], we transform our ATSP instance to an ATSP instance by adding a feedback path from t to s and work with an integral solution to this ATSP instance. This may use the feedback path several times and hence consist of several s - t -walks in the original instance. We now merge these to a single s - t -walk that contains all vertices. In contrast to Feige and Singh [2007], the merging procedure cannot use an optimum s - t -tour, but only an LP solution. Our merging procedure is similar to one step of the approximation algorithm for ATSP by Svensson, Tarnawski and Vég h [2018], but our analysis is more involved. The main difficulty is that the reduction of ATSP to so-called “laminarly-weighted” instances used by Svensson, Tarnawski and Vég h [2018] does not work for the path version.

In Section 3, we describe our merging procedure and obtain a first bound on the cost of our single s - t -walk that contains all vertices. However, this bound still depends on the difference of two dual LP variables corresponding to the vertices s and t . In Section 4 we give a tight upper bound on this value, which will imply our main result $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \leq 4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$.

The main lemma that we use to prove this bound essentially says that adding an edge (t, s) of cost equal to the LP value does not change the value of an optimum LP solution. Note that using the new edge (t, s) with value one or more is obviously pointless, but it is not clear that this edge will not be used at all.

For node-weighted instances we obtain a better result: if the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances is $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}}$, then the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances is at most $2\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} - 1$. Svensson [2015] showed that $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} \leq 13$.

Boyd and Elliott-Magwood [2005] gave a family of node-weighted instances that

shows $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} \geq 2$. In Section 5 we observe that for ATSP node-weighted instances behave in the same way as unweighted instances. Hence for ATSP there is a family of unweighted digraphs whose integrality ratio tends to 2. Therefore such a family exists also for ATSP.

2 Preliminaries

Given an instance (G, c, s, t) and an optimum solution x^* to (ATSP LP), we may assume that $G = (V, E)$ is the support graph of x^* ; so $x_e^* > 0$ for all $e \in E$. (This is because omitting edges e with $x_e^* = 0$ does not change the optimum LP value and can only increase the cost of an optimum integral solution.) We consider the dual LP of (ATSP LP):

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & a_t - a_s + \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2y_U \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a_w - a_v + \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} y_U \leq c(e) \quad \text{for } e = (v, w) \in E \\ & y_U \geq 0 \quad \text{for } \emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{ATSP DUAL})$$

The *support* of y is the set of nonempty subsets U of $V \setminus \{s, t\}$ for which $y_U > 0$. We denote it by $\text{supp}(y)$. We say that a dual solution (a, y) has *laminar support* if for any two nonempty sets $A, B \in \text{supp}(y)$ we have $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $A \subseteq B$, or $B \subseteq A$. See Figure 1 for an example. We recall some well-known properties of primal and dual LP solutions (cf. Svensson, Tarnawski and Végé [2018]) and sketch proofs for sake of completeness:

Proposition 1. *Let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL). Then there is a vector y' such that (a, y') is an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) and has laminar support.*

Proof: Among all y' such that (a, y') is an optimum dual solution, choose y' so that $\sum_U y'_U |U|$ is minimum. Then (a, y') has laminar support: suppose $y'_A > 0$ and $y'_B > 0$ and $A \cap B, A \setminus B, B \setminus A \neq \emptyset$, then we could decrease y'_A and y'_B and increase $y'_{A \setminus B}$ and $y'_{B \setminus A}$ while maintaining dual feasibility. \square

Proposition 2. *Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution x^* to (ATSP LP). Let (a, y) be an optimum solution of (ATSP DUAL). Let $U \in \{V\} \cup \text{supp}(y)$. Then the strongly connected components of $G[U]$ can be numbered U_1, \dots, U_l such that $\delta^-(U) = \delta^-(U_1)$, $\delta^+(U) = \delta^+(U_l)$, and $\delta^+(U_i) = \delta^-(U_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \dots, l-1$. If $U = V$, then $s \in U_1$ and $t \in U_l$.*

Proof: By complementary slackness, $y_U > 0$ implies $x^*(\delta(U)) = 2$ and hence $x^*(\delta^-(U)) = 1$. We prove the statement of the Proposition for $U = V$ and every set $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s\}$ with $x^*(\delta^-(U)) = 1$. Let U_1, \dots, U_l be a topological order of the strongly connected components of $G[U]$. If $U = V$, we have $s \in U_1$ and $t \in U_l$ because for every vertex v in G , v is reachable from s , and t is reachable from v .

We now use induction on l . For $l = 1$, the statement is trivial. Now assume $l > 1$. If $U \neq V$, we have $s \notin U$ and thus $1 \leq x^*(\delta^-(U_1)) \leq x^*(\delta^-(U)) = 1$. Thus, in any case (also if $U = V$) $\delta^-(U_1) = \delta^-(U)$. This implies $\delta^-(U \setminus U_1) \subseteq \delta^+(U_1)$.

If $U = V$, we have $s \in U_1$, $t \notin U_1$, and $x^*(\delta^-(U_1)) = 0$; therefore we have $x^*(\delta^+(U_1)) = 1$. Otherwise, (for $U \neq V$) we have $s \notin U$ and thus $x^*(\delta^+(U_1)) \leq x^*(\delta^-(U_1)) = 1$. So in both cases $\delta^-(U \setminus U_1) \subseteq \delta^+(U_1)$ and $x^*(\delta^+(U_1)) \leq 1 \leq x^*(\delta^-(U \setminus U_1))$. Thus, we have $\delta^-(U \setminus U_1) = \delta^+(U_1)$ and $x^*(\delta^-(U \setminus U_1)) = 1$. Hence, applying the induction hypothesis to $U \setminus U_1$ completes the proof. \square

Proposition 3. *Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). Let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) with laminar support. Let $\bar{U} \in \{V\} \cup \text{supp}(y)$ and $v, w \in \bar{U}$. If v is reachable from w in the induced subgraph $G[\bar{U}]$, then there is a v - w -path in $G[\bar{U}]$ that enters and leaves every set $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ at most once.*

Proof: Let P be a path from v to w in $G[\bar{U}]$. Repeat the following. Let U be a maximal set with $y_U > 0$ that P enters or leaves more than once. If P enters U more than once, let v' be the vertex after entering the first time and w' the vertex after entering the last time. By Proposition 2, v' and w' are in the same strongly connected component of $G[U]$. We replace the v' - w' -subpath of P by a path in $G[U]$. Proceed analogously if P leaves U more than once. \square

3 Bounding the integrality ratio

We first transform an instance and a solution to (ATSP LP) to an instance and a solution to (ATSP LP) and work with an integral solution of this ATSP instance. The following lemma is essentially due to Feige and Singh [2007]. For completeness, we prove it here again for our setting.

Lemma 4. *Let $d \geq 0$ be a constant. Then $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \leq (d + 1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - d$ if the following condition holds for every instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, c, s, t)$ of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP): If there are s - t -walks P_1, \dots, P_k ($k > 0$) of total cost L in G , there is a single s - t -walk P in G with cost $c(P) \leq L + d(k - 1) \cdot \text{LP}$ which contains all vertices of P_1, \dots, P_k .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = (G, c, s, t)$ be an instance of ATSP and x^* be an optimum solution to (ATSP LP); so $\text{LP} = c(x^*)$. We may assume that G is the support graph of x^* . Consider the instance $\mathcal{I}' = (G', c')$ of ATSP that arises from \mathcal{I} as follows. We add a new vertex v to G and two edges (t, v) and (v, s) with weights $c'(t, v) = d \cdot \text{LP}$ and $c'(v, s) = 0$. Then there is a valid solution of the subtour LP for \mathcal{I}' with cost $(d + 1) \cdot \text{LP}$ (extend x^* by setting $x_{(t,v)}^* = x_{(v,s)}^* = 1$). Hence there is a solution to ATSP for \mathcal{I}' with cost at most $(d + 1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \cdot \text{LP}$. Let R be such a solution. Then R has to use (t, v) and (v, s) at least once, since it has to visit v . By deleting all copies of (t, v) and (v, s) from R , we get $k > 0$ s - t -walks in G with total cost at most $(d + 1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \cdot \text{LP} - dk \cdot \text{LP}$ such that every vertex of G is visited by at least one of them. Our assumption now guarantees the existence of a single s - t -walk P with cost

$c(P) \leq (d+1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \cdot \text{LP} - dk \cdot \text{LP} + d(k-1) \cdot \text{LP} = ((d+1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - d) \cdot \text{LP}$ in G , which contains every vertex of G . This walk is a solution of ATSP for \mathcal{I} and thus we have $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \leq (d+1)\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - d$ as proposed. \square

The following procedure is similar to one step (“inducing on a tight set”) of the approximation algorithm for ATSP by Svensson, Tarnawski and Vég h [2018].

Lemma 5. *Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). Let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) with laminar support.*

Let $k > 0$ and P_1, \dots, P_k be s - t -walks in G with total cost L . Then there is a single s - t -walk P in G which contains every vertex of P_1, \dots, P_k and has cost at most $L + (k-1)(\text{LP} + 2(a_s - a_t))$.

Proof. Let V_1, \dots, V_l be the vertex sets of the strongly connected components of G in their topological order. Let P_i^j be the section of P_i that visits vertices in V_j (for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, l$). By Proposition 2 applied to $U = V$, none of these sections of P_i is empty. (Such a section might consist of a single vertex and no edges, but it has to contain at least one vertex.)

We consider paths R_i^j in G for $j = 1, \dots, l$ that we will use to connect the walks P_1^j, \dots, P_k^j to a single walk visiting all vertices in V_j . See Figure 3. If j is odd, let R_i^j (for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$) be a path from the last vertex of P_i^j to the first vertex of P_{i+1}^j . If j is even, let R_i^j (for $i = 2, \dots, k$) be a path from the last vertex of P_i^j to the first vertex of P_{i-1}^j . (Such paths exist because $G[V_j]$ is strongly connected.) By Proposition 3 we can choose the paths R_i^j such that they do not enter or leave any element of $\text{supp}(y)$ more than once.

We now construct our s - t -walk P that will visit every vertex of P_1, \dots, P_k . We start by setting $P = s$ and then add for $j = 1, \dots, l$ all the vertices in V_j to P as follows. If j is odd, we append P_i^j and R_i^j for $i = 1$ to $i = k-1$ and at last P_k^j . If j is even, we append P_i^j and R_i^j for $i = k$ to $i = 2$ and at last P_1^j . Note that when moving from one connected component V_i to the next component V_{i+1} , we use an edge from either P_1 (if i is even) or P_k (if i is odd). Then P is, indeed, an s - t walk in G and contains every vertex of P_1, \dots, P_k . We now bound the cost of the walk P . For every edge $e = (v, w)$ of P we have by complementary slackness

$$c(e) = a_w - a_v + \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} y_U.$$

For an s - t -walk R in G we have

$$c(R) = \sum_{(v,w) \in E(R)} \left(a_w - a_v + \sum_{U: (v,w) \in \delta(U)} y_U \right) = a_t - a_s + c^y(R), \quad (1)$$

where the cost function c^y is defined as $c^y(e) := \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} y_U$. Hence, to bound the cost of the s - t -walk P , we can bound $c^y(P)$ and then subtract a_s and add a_t .

P is constructed from pieces of P_1, \dots, P_k and the paths R_i^j . Each of the paths R_i^j can only contain vertices of V_j . Two paths R_i^j and $R_{i'}^{j'}$, such that $j \neq j'$, can




Figure 2: Construction of P . The s - t -walks P_1, \dots, P_k are shown with solid lines. (Here, P_1 is the topmost walk and P_k is shown in the bottom.) The vertex sets V_1, \dots, V_l of the strongly connected components are indicated by the dashed lines. The red, blue, and green solid paths show the walks P_i^j , i.e. the sections of the walks P_i within the strongly connected components of G . The dotted arrows indicate the paths R_i^j .

never both enter or both leave the same element of $\text{supp}(y)$: otherwise they would contain vertices of the same strongly connected component of G by Proposition 2. Thus every element of $\text{supp}(y)$ is entered at most $k - 1$ times and left at most $k - 1$ times on all the paths R_i^j used in the construction of P , and the total c^y cost of these paths is at most $(k - 1) \sum_U 2y_U = (k - 1)(\text{LP} + a_s - a_t)$. The c^y cost of the edges of P_1, \dots, P_k is

$$\sum_{i=1}^k c^y(P_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k (c(P_i) - a_t + a_s) = L + k \cdot a_s - k \cdot a_t.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(P) &= a_t - a_s + c^y(P) \\ &\leq a_t - a_s + L + k \cdot a_s - k \cdot a_t + (k - 1)(\text{LP} + a_s - a_t) \\ &= L + (k - 1)(\text{LP} + 2(a_s - a_t)) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

Svensson, Tarnawski and Végé [2018] reduced ATSP to so-called laminarly-weighted instances. In a laminarly-weighted instance we have $a = 0$ (and (a, y) has laminar support). For such instances Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 would immediately imply our main result (even with better constants). However, the reduction to laminarly-weighted instances for ATSP does not yield an analogous statement for the path version. Instead, we will prove that $a_s - a_t \leq \text{LP}$ for some optimum dual LP solution (Section 4).

Let us first consider a simpler special case.

Definition 6. An instance (G, c, s, t) of ATSP or an instance (G, c) of ATSP is called *node-weighted* if there are nonnegative node weights $(c_v)_{v \in V}$ such that $c(v, w) = c_v + c_w$ for every edge (v, w) .

Note that node-weighted instances are not necessarily symmetric because it might happen that an edge (v, w) exists, but (w, v) does not exist. Since $x(\delta(s)) \geq 1$, $x(\delta(t)) \geq 1$ and $x(\delta(v)) \geq 2$ for $v \notin \{s, t\}$ for every LP solution x , we have $\text{LP} \geq c_s + c_t + \sum_{v \in V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2c_v$.

Theorem 7. Let $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}}$ be the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances and $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}}$ be the integrality ratio for ATSP on node-weighted instances. Then

$$\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} \leq 2\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{NW}} - 1.$$

Proof. First we show how to modify the proof of Lemma 4 for node-weighted instances and $d = 1$. For a node-weighted instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, c)$, let $\mathcal{I}' = (G', c')$ result from \mathcal{I} by adding a vertex v with weight $c_v = \frac{1}{2}(\text{LP} - c_s - c_t)$ and two edges (t, v) and (v, s) . Note that $\text{LP} \geq c_s + c_t$ and hence $c_v \geq 0$. Then continuing with the node-weighted instance \mathcal{I}' as in the proof of Lemma 4 yields the following: It suffices to show that for node-weighted instances of ATSP, we can get an s - t -walk P as in Lemma 5, but with $c(P) \leq L + (k - 1)\text{LP}$.

We construct P as in the proof of Lemma 5. Again we first bound the cost of the paths R_i^j . For $1 \leq j \leq l$ each vertex in V_j can only be contained in the paths R_i^j (and not in a path $R_i^{j'}$ for $j' \neq j$). Hence every vertex can be used in at most $(k - 1)$ paths R_i^j . Furthermore, the vertices s and t are only used as the last or first vertices of paths R_i^j . Hence the total cost of all paths R_i^j can be bounded from above by

$$(k - 1) \left(c_s + c_t + \sum_{v \in V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2c_v \right) \leq (k - 1)\text{LP}.$$

This shows $c(P) \leq L + (k - 1)\text{LP}$ and completes the proof. \square

4 Bounding the difference of a_s and a_t

The goal of this section is to bound the difference of the dual variables a_s and a_t by LP. Using Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, this will imply our main result $\rho_{\text{ATSP}} \leq 4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$.

First, we give an equivalent characterization of the minimum value of $a_s - a_t$ in any optimum dual solution. This will not be needed to prove our main result, but might help to get some intuition.

Lemma 8. Let $\mathcal{I} = (G, c, s, t)$ be an instance of ATSP and let $\Delta \geq 0$. Now consider the instance $\mathcal{I}' = (G + e', c, s, t)$, where we add an edge $e' = (t, s)$ with $c(e') := \Delta$. Then $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}} \geq \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'}$. Moreover, $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ if and only if there exists an optimum solution (a, y) of (ATSP DUAL) for the instance \mathcal{I} with $a_s - a_t \leq \Delta$.

Proof: Every feasible solution x of (ATSP LP) for \mathcal{I} can be extended to a feasible solution of (ATSP LP) for \mathcal{I}' by setting $x_{e'} := 0$. This shows $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}} \geq \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'}$.

The dual LPs for the two instances are identical, except for the constraint corresponding to e' , which is

$$\Delta = c(e') \geq a_s - a_t + \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s,t\}, e' \in \delta(U)} y_U = a_s - a_t. \quad (2)$$

Suppose $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'}$. Let (a, y) be an optimum dual solution for \mathcal{I}' . Then, (2) is satisfied and (a, y) is also feasible for the dual LP for the instance \mathcal{I} . Moreover, since $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'}$, the dual solution (a, y) is also optimum for the instance \mathcal{I} .

For the reverse direction, let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) for the instance \mathcal{I} with $a_s - a_t \leq \Delta$. Then (a, y) satisfies (2) and thus is also feasible for (ATSP DUAL) for \mathcal{I}' . Hence, $\text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}'} \geq \text{LP}_{\mathcal{I}}$. \square

We will need the following variant of Menger's Theorem.

Lemma 9. *Let G be a directed graph and $s, t \in V(G)$ such that t is reachable from s in G . Let $U \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{s, t\}$ such that for every vertex $u \in U$, there exists an s - t -path in $G - u$. Then there exist two s - t -paths P_1 and P_2 in G such that no vertex $u \in U$ is contained in both P_1 and P_2 .*

Proof: We construct a graph G' that arises from G as follows. We split every vertex $u \in U$ into two vertices u^- and u^+ that are connected by an edge $e_u := (u^-, u^+)$. Every edge (v, u) is replaced by an edge (v, u^-) and every edge (u, v) is replaced by an edge (u^+, v) . In the graph G' we now define integral edge capacities. Every edge e_u for $u \in U$ has capacity one. All other edges, i.e. all edges corresponding to edges of G , have capacity infinity.

Since for every vertex $u \in U$, there exists an s - t -path in $G - u$, for every $u \in U$ there exists an s - t -path in $G' - e_u$. Thus, the minimum capacity of an s - t -cut in G' is at least two. Hence, there exists an integral s - t -flow of value two in G' with the defined edge capacities. This flow can be decomposed into two s - t -paths P'_1 and P'_2 . By the choice of the edge capacities no edge e_u for $u \in U$ occurs in both paths. Since this edge e_u is the only outgoing edge of u^- and the only incoming edge of u^+ , an s - t -path using u^- or u^+ must use e_u , and at most one of P'_1 and P'_2 can do so.

Hence, contracting the edges e_u (for $u \in U$) yields two s - t -paths P_1 and P_2 in G such that no vertex $u \in U$ is contained in both P_1 and P_2 . \square

We will now work with an optimum dual solution (a, y) with $a_s - a_t$ minimum. Note that this minimum is attained because for every feasible dual solution (a, y) we have $a_s - a_t \geq -\text{LP}$.

Lemma 10. *Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). Let (a, y) be an optimum solution of (ATSP DUAL) such that $a_s - a_t$ is minimum. Let $\bar{U} \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}$ such that every s - t -path in G enters (and leaves) \bar{U} at least once. Then $y_{\bar{U}} = 0$.*




Figure 3: Modifying the dual solution in the proof of Lemma 10. The green and blue numbers in the bottom indicate the change of the dual node variables. In red the change of the variable $y_{\bar{U}}$ is indicated. There is no edge from R to $V \setminus (R \cup \bar{U})$.

Proof: Suppose $y_{\bar{U}} > 0$ and let $\varepsilon := y_{\bar{U}}$. Let R be the set of vertices reachable from s in $G - \bar{U}$. We define a dual solution (\bar{a}, \bar{y}) as follows:

$$\bar{y}(U) := \begin{cases} y_U - \varepsilon & \text{if } U = \bar{U} \\ y_U & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\bar{a}_v := \begin{cases} a_v - 2\varepsilon & \text{if } v \in R \\ a_v - \varepsilon & \text{if } v \in \bar{U} \\ a_v & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

See Figure 3. We claim that (\bar{a}, \bar{y}) is an optimum (and feasible) solution to (ATSP DUAL). Note that $t \in V \setminus (R \cup \bar{U})$ and thus $\bar{a}_t = a_t$. Since $s \in R$, we have $\bar{a}_s - \bar{a}_t < a_s - a_t$. Thus, if (\bar{a}, \bar{y}) is indeed optimum (and feasible), we obtain a contradiction to our choice of the dual solution (a, y) .

First, we observe that (\bar{a}, \bar{y}) and (a, y) have the same objective value since

$$\bar{a}_t - \bar{a}_s + \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2\bar{y}_U = a_t - (a_s - 2\varepsilon) + \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2y_U - 2\varepsilon.$$

By our choice of ε , the vector \bar{y} will be non-negative. Now consider an edge $e = (v, w) \in E(G)$. We need to show that

$$\bar{a}_w - \bar{a}_v + \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} \bar{y}_U \leq c(e). \quad (3)$$

To prove this we will show that

$$\bar{a}_w - a_w - \bar{a}_v + a_v + \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} (\bar{y}_U - y_U) \leq 0. \quad (4)$$

Since (a, y) is a feasible dual solution, this will imply (3). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{a}_w - a_w &:= \begin{cases} -2\varepsilon & \text{if } w \in R \\ -\varepsilon & \text{if } w \in \bar{U} \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ -\bar{a}_v + a_v &:= \begin{cases} 2\varepsilon & \text{if } v \in R \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } v \in \bar{U} \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \sum_{U:e \in \delta(U)} (\bar{y}_U - y_U) &:= \begin{cases} -\varepsilon & \text{if } (v, w) \in \delta(\bar{U}) \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{a}_w - a_w \leq 0$ and $\sum_{U:e \in \delta(U)} (\bar{y}_U - y_U) \leq 0$, it suffices to consider the cases $v \in R$ and $v \in \bar{U}$. If $v \in R$, we have by definition of R , either $w \in R$ or $w \in \bar{U}$. In both cases (3) holds, because if $w \in \bar{U}$, we have $(v, w) \in \delta(\bar{U})$. Now let $v \in \bar{U}$. Then if $(v, w) \in \delta(\bar{U})$, we have $\sum_{U:e \in \delta(U)} (\bar{y}_U - y_U) = -\varepsilon$, implying (4). Otherwise, $w \in \bar{U}$ and $\bar{a}_w - a_w - \bar{a}_v + a_v = 0$.

This shows that (\bar{a}, \bar{y}) is an optimum dual solution and $\bar{a}_s - \bar{a}_t < a_s - a_t$, a contradiction. Hence, $y_{\bar{U}} = 0$. \square

We will now continue to work with a dual solution (a, y) that minimizes $a_s - a_t$. By Proposition 1, we can assume in addition that (a, y) has laminar support.

Lemma 11. *Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). Let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) that has laminar support and minimum $a_s - a_t$.*

Then G contains two s - t -paths P_1 and P_2 such that for every set $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ we have $|E(P_1) \cap \delta(U)| + |E(P_2) \cap \delta(U)| \leq 2$.

Proof: By Lemma 10, for every set $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ there is an s - t -path in G that visits no vertex in U . We contract all maximal sets $U \in \text{supp}(y)$. Using Lemma 9, we can find two s - t -paths in G such that each vertex arising from the contraction of a set $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ is visited by at most one of the two paths.

Now we revert the contraction of the sets $U \in \text{supp}(y)$. We complete the edge sets of the two s - t -paths we found before (which are not necessarily connected anymore after undoing the contraction), to paths P_1 and P_2 with the desired properties. To see that this is possible, let v be the end vertex of an edge entering a contracted set $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ and let w be the start vertex of an edge leaving U . Then by Proposition 2, the vertex w is reachable from v in $G[U]$ and by Proposition 3, we can choose a v - w -path in $G[U]$ that enters and leaves every set $U' \in \text{supp}(y)$ with $U' \subsetneq U$ at most once. \square

We finally show our main lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{I} = (G, c, s, t)$ be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). Then there is an optimum solution (a, y) of (ATSP DUAL) with laminar support and $a_s - a_t \leq \text{LP}$.*




Figure 4: The paths P_1 and P_2 as in Lemma 11. In black the vertex sets $U \in \text{supp}(y)$ are shown. The paths P_1 and P_2 are not necessarily disjoint but they never both cross the same set U with $y_U > 0$.




Figure 5: Example with no optimum dual solutions with $a_s - a_t < \text{LP}$: The numbers next to the arcs denote their cost. For this instance we have $\text{LP} = 1$. However adding an edge (t, s) with cost $\gamma < 1$ would result in an instance with $\text{LP} = \gamma$. By Lemma 8 there cannot be an optimum dual solution where $a_s - a_t < 1 = \text{LP}$.

Proof: Let (a, y) be an optimum solution to (ATSP DUAL) that has laminar support and minimum $a_s - a_t$. Note that such an optimum dual solution exists by Proposition 1. We again define the c^y cost of an edge e to be $c^y(e) = \sum_{U: e \in \delta(U)} y_U$. By Lemma 11, G contains two s - t -paths P_1 and P_2 such that $c^y(P_1) + c^y(P_2) \leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2 \cdot y_U$. Then, using (1),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq c(P_1) + c(P_2) \\ &= c^y(P_1) - (a_s - a_t) + c^y(P_2) - (a_s - a_t) \\ &\leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2 \cdot y_U - 2(a_s - a_t), \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$a_s - a_t \leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}} 2 \cdot y_U - (a_s - a_t) = \text{LP}.$$

□

We remark (although we will not need it) that Lemma 12 also holds for general instances. To adapt the proof, work with the subgraph G' of G that contains all edges of G for which the dual constraint is tight. Now G' plays the role of G in the proof, and by choosing ε small enough in the proof of Lemma 10 we maintain dual feasibility also for the edges that are not in G' .

By Lemma 8, this also shows that adding an edge (t, s) of cost equal to the LP value does not change the value of an optimum LP solution.

The instance in Figure 5 shows that the bound $a_s - a_t \leq \text{LP}$ is tight. Note that the bound is also tight for the instance in Figure 1 in which $x_e^* > 0$ for all edges e , and in which the integrality ratio is arbitrarily close to the best known lower bound of 2.

We will now prove our main result.

Theorem 13. *Let ρ_{ATSP} be the integrality ratio of (ATSP LP). Then the integrality ratio $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{LP}}$ of (ATSP LP) is at most $4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$.*

Proof: Let (G, c, s, t) be an instance of ATSP, where G is the support graph of an optimum solution to (ATSP LP). By Lemma 12, there is an optimum dual solution (a, y) with laminar support and $a_s - a_t \leq \text{LP}$. Using Lemma 5, this implies that the condition of Lemma 4 is fulfilled for $d = 3$. This shows $\rho_{\text{ATSP}}^{\text{LP}} \leq 4\rho_{\text{ATSP}} - 3$. \square

5 Node-weighted and unweighted instances

Here we observe that, for ATSP, node-weighted instances are not much more general than unweighted instances. We call an LP solution x minimal if there is no feasible solution $x' \neq x$ with $x' \leq x$ componentwise.

Lemma 14. *For every minimal solution x of (ATSP LP), we have $x(E(G)) \leq n^2$, where $n = |V(G)|$.*

Proof: Choose an arbitrary root $r \in V$ and let $P = \{y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{E(G)} : y(\delta^-(U)) \geq 1 \text{ for } \emptyset \neq U \subseteq V \setminus \{r\}\}$. A vector is feasible for (ATSP LP) if and only if it is a circulation that belongs to P . Let $y \leq x$ be a minimal vector in P . The minimal vectors in P are the convex combinations of incidence vectors of spanning arborescences rooted at r (Edmonds [1967]); hence $y(E(G)) = n - 1$. There are cycles C_j and edge sets $S_j \subseteq C_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, l$) such that $x = \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \chi^{C_j}$ and $y = \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \chi^{S_j}$ for some positive coefficients λ_j . Note that none of the sets S_j can be empty because otherwise $x' = x - \lambda_j \chi^{C_j}$ would be a circulation that belongs to P , contradicting the minimality of x . We conclude $x(E(G)) = \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j |C_j| \leq \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j \cdot n |S_j| = n \cdot y(E(G)) = n(n-1)$. \square

Lemma 15. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let (G, c) be a node-weighted instance of ATSP with n vertices. Then we can find in polynomial time a constant $M > 0$ and an unweighted digraph G' with $O(\frac{n^2}{\varepsilon})$ vertices such that*

$$(i) \text{ LP}_{(G,c)} \leq M \cdot \text{LP}_{G'} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \text{LP}_{(G,c)},$$

$$(ii) \text{ OPT}_{(G,c)} \leq M \cdot \text{OPT}_{G'} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \text{OPT}_{(G,c)}, \text{ and}$$

(iii) *for every tour F' in the unweighted digraph G' there is a corresponding tour F in G such that $c(F) \leq M|F'|$ and F can be obtained from F' in polynomial time.*

Proof: Let $c_v \geq 0$ ($v \in V(G)$) be the node weights, i.e., $c(v, w) = c_v + c_w$ for all $(v, w) \in E$. Let $c(V(G)) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} c_v$ denote the sum of all node weights. If $c(V(G)) = 0$, the instance is trivial, we can choose G' to consist of a single vertex.

Otherwise let $n = |V(G)|$, $M := \frac{2\varepsilon \cdot c(V(G))}{n^2}$ and $\bar{c}_v := \lfloor \frac{2c_v}{M} \rfloor$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Replace every vertex v of G with $\bar{c}_v > 0$ by two vertices v^- and v^+ , such that v^- inherits the entering edges and v^+ inherits the outgoing edges, and add a path P_v of \bar{c}_v edges from v^- to v^+ . This defines G' . Note that $|V(G')| = n + \sum_{v \in V(G)} \bar{c}_v \leq n + \frac{n^2}{\varepsilon}$.

Every solution x to (ATSP LP) for (G, c) corresponds to a solution x' to (ATSP LP) for G' , simply by setting $x'_e := x(\delta^+(v))$ for all edges e of P_v . Then

$$\begin{aligned} x'(E(G')) &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} (1 + \bar{c}_v) x(\delta^+(v)) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2c_v}{M} \right\rfloor \right) x(\delta^+(v)) \\ &= \delta \cdot x(E(G)) + \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{2c_v}{M} x(\delta^+(v)) \\ &= \delta \cdot x(E(G)) + \frac{1}{M} c(x) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Hence

$$c(x) \leq Mx'(E(G)),$$

and for minimal solutions we have $x(E(G)) \leq n^2$ by Lemma 14, which implies $\delta \cdot x(E(G)) \leq n^2 = \varepsilon \frac{2c(V(G))}{M} \leq \varepsilon \frac{c(x)}{M}$ and thus

$$Mx'(E(G)) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)c(x).$$

Because tours are integral LP solutions, and optimum LP solutions and optimum tours can be assumed to be minimal, this completes the proof of (i) and (ii). To prove (iii), observe that contracting the paths P_v in a tour F' yields a tour F as claimed. \square

This immediately implies:

Theorem 16. *The integrality ratio of (ATSP LP) is the same for unweighted and for node-weighted instances. For any constants $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a polynomial-time $(\alpha + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for node-weighted instances if there is a polynomial-time α -approximation algorithm for unweighted instances.*

Proof: The equality of the integrality ratio for unweighted and for node-weighted instances follows from Lemma 15 (i) and (ii). Now suppose we have a polynomial-time α -approximation algorithm for unweighted instances. Then for a node-weighted instance (G, c) we apply Lemma 15 with $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha}$ and apply our α -approximation algorithm to the resulting digraph G' . Let F' be the resulting tour in G' . By (iii) of Lemma 15, this tour corresponds to a tour F in G such that

$$c(F) \leq M|F'| \leq \alpha \cdot M \text{OPT}_{G'} \leq (1 + \varepsilon')\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_{(G,c)} = (\alpha + \varepsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}_{(G,c)}.$$

\square




Figure 6: Constructing a family of digraphs with integrality ratio arbitrary close to 2 for ATSP with unit weights. For a fixed even number $l \geq 4$ we define graphs G_0, G_1, \dots . The graph G_0 consists of a bidirected path of length l . Then we construct G_i from G_{i-1} as in the picture. The picture shows the construction for $l = 4$; in general, there are l copies of the graph G_{i-1} (shown in green). The blue wiggly paths indicate paths of length d_i , where $d_0 = 0$ and $d_i = l^i - d_{i-1} - 2$. Let G'_i be the graph arising from G_i by identifying the blue v_i - v'_i -path with the blue w_i - w'_i -path. Then for $i \rightarrow \infty$, the integrality ratio of G'_i converges to $2 - \frac{2}{l}$ (Boyd and Elliott-Magwood [2005]).




Figure 7: The graph G'_1 for $l = 6$. An optimum LP solution has value 1 on the blue edges and value $\frac{1}{2}$ on all other edges and hence we have $LP = |V(G'_1)|$.

In particular, this implies that the node-weighted instances from Boyd and Elliott-Magwood [2005] can be transformed to unweighted instances whose integrality ratio tends to 2. For convenience we show these instances in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Figure 6 shows the general construction of the family of instances, Figure 7 a concrete example. To obtain these instances we have replaced every vertex v in the node-weighted instances with node-weight c_v by a path of length $2c_v - 1$ similar to the proof of Lemma 15. So, contracting the blue paths of length d_i in Figure 6 and setting the node-weight of the resulting vertex to $\frac{d_i+1}{2}$ and node-weights in G_0 to $\frac{1}{2}$ results in the instances from Boyd and Elliott-Magwood [2005]. Then, LP solutions (and tours) in the node-weighted instance correspond to LP solutions (and tours) of the same cost in the unweighted instance. It seems that previously only unweighted instances with integrality ratio at most $\frac{3}{2}$ were known (e.g. Gottschalk [2013]).

By splitting an arbitrary vertex into two copies s and t , both inheriting all incident edges, this also yields a family of unweighted digraph instances of ATSP whose integrality ratio tends to two. We summarize:

Corollary 17. *The integrality ratio for unweighted digraph instances is at least two, both for (ATSP LP) and (ATSP LP).*

References

- Boyd, S., and Elliott-Magwood, P. [2005]: Computing the integrality gap of the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 19 (2005), 241–247
- Charikar, M., Goemans, M.X., and Karloff, H. [2006]: On the integrality ratio for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 31 (2006), 245–252
- Edmonds, J. [1967]: Optimum branchings. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards B* 71 (1967), 233–240
- Feige, U., and Singh, M. [2007]: Improved approximation algorithms for traveling salesperson tours and paths in directed graphs. *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems; LNCS 4627* (M. Charikar, K. Jansen, O. Reingold, J.D.P. Rolim, eds.), Springer, Berlin 2007, pp. 104–118
- Friggstad, Z., Gupta, A., and Singh, M. [2016]: An improved integrality gap for asymmetric TSP paths. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 41 (2016), 745–757
- Friggstad, Z., Salavatipour, M.R., and Svitkina, Z. [2013]: Asymmetric traveling salesman path and directed latency problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 42 (2013), 1596–1619
- Gottschalk, C. [2013]: *Approximation Algorithms for the Traveling Salesman Problem in Graphs and Digraphs*. Master’s Thesis, Research Institute for Discrete Mathematics, University of Bonn, 2013.

- Nagarajan, V., and Ravi, R. [2008]: The directed minimum latency problem. Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems; LNCS 5171 (A. Goel, K. Jansen, J.D.P. Rolim, R. Rubinfeld, eds.), Springer, Berlin 2008, pp. 193–206
- Svensson, O. [2015]: Approximating ATSP by relaxing connectivity. Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2015), 1–19
- Svensson, O., Tarnawski, J., and Vég h, L. [2018]: A constant-factor approximation algorithm for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2018), pp. 204–213