


# From Chinese Postman to Salesman and Beyond: Shortest Tour $\delta$ -Covering All Points on All Edges

Fabian Frei ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken

Ahmed Ghazy ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security and Saarland University, Saarbrücken

Tim A. Hartmann ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken

Florian Hörsch ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken

Dániel Marx ✉ 

CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken

---

## Abstract

---

A well-studied continuous model of graphs, introduced by Dearing and Francis [Transportation Science, 1974], considers each edge as a continuous unit-length interval of points. For  $\delta \geq 0$ , we introduce the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR, where the objective is to find the shortest tour that comes within a distance of  $\delta$  of every point on every edge. It can be observed that 0-TOUR is essentially equivalent to the Chinese Postman Problem, which is solvable in polynomial time. In contrast, 1/2-TOUR is essentially equivalent to the graphic Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP), which is NP-hard but admits a constant-factor approximation in polynomial time. We investigate  $\delta$ -TOUR for other values of  $\delta$ , noting that the problem's behavior and the insights required to understand it differ significantly across various  $\delta$  regimes. On the one hand, we first examine the approximability of the problem for every fixed  $\delta > 0$ :

- (1) For every fixed  $0 < \delta < 3/2$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a constant-factor approximation and is APX-hard, while for every fixed  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , the problem admits an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation in polynomial time and has no polynomial-time  $o(\log n)$ -approximation, unless  $P = NP$ .

Our techniques also yield a new APX-hardness result for graphic TSP on cubic bipartite graphs. When parameterizing by the length of a shortest tour, it is relatively easy to show that 3/2 is the threshold of fixed-parameter tractability:

- (2) For every fixed  $0 < \delta < 3/2$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) when parameterized by the length of a shortest tour, while it is W[2]-hard for every fixed  $\delta \geq 3/2$ .

On the other hand, if  $\delta$  is considered to be part of the input, then an interesting nontrivial phenomenon appears when  $\delta$  is a constant fraction of the number of vertices:

- (3) If  $\delta$  is part of the input, then the problem can be solved in time  $f(k)n^{O(k)}$ , where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ ; however, assuming the Exponential-Time Hypothesis (ETH), there is no algorithm that solves the problem and runs in time  $f(k)n^{o(k/\log k)}$ .

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Mathematics of computing → Approximation algorithms; Theory of computation → Parameterized complexity and exact algorithms

**Keywords and phrases** Chinese Postman Problem, Traveling Salesman Problem, Continuous Graphs, Approximation Algorithms, Inapproximability, Parameterized Complexity


## 1 Introduction

We consider a well-studied continuous model of graphs introduced by Dearing and Francis [8]. Each edge is seen as a continuous unit interval of points with its vertices as endpoints. For any given graph  $G$ , this yields a compact metric space  $(P(G), d)$  with a point set  $P(G)$  and a distance function  $d: P(G)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ .

A prototypical problem in this setting is  $\delta$ -COVERING, introduced by Shier [38] for any positive real  $\delta$ . The task is to find in  $G$  a minimum set  $S$  of points that  $\delta$ -covers the entire graph, in the sense that each point in  $P(G)$  has distance at most  $\delta$  to some point in  $S$ . This problem, which is also often referred to as the continuous  $p$ -CENTER problem has been extensively studied; we cite only a few examples: [21, 3, 32]. Observe that the problem differs from typical discrete graph problems in two ways: the solution has to  $\delta$ -cover every point of every edge (not just the vertices) and the solution may (and for optimality sometimes must) use points inside edges. How does the complexity of this problem depend on the distance  $\delta$ ? First, the problem is polynomial-time solvable when  $\delta$  is a unit fraction, i.e., a rational with numerator 1, and NP-hard for all other rational and irrational  $\delta$  [15, 19]. One can show that VERTEXCOVER is reducible to  $2/3$ -COVERING and DOMINATINGSET is reducible to  $3/2$ -COVERING. Thus  $\delta$ -COVERING behaves very differently for different values of  $\delta$  and can express problems of different nature and complexity: for example, while vertex cover is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) when parameterized by the solution size, dominating set is W[2]-hard. This is reflected also in the complexity of  $\delta$ -COVERING: at the threshold of  $\delta = 3/2$ , the parameterized complexity of the problem, parameterized by the size of the solution, jumps from FPT to W[2]-hard [19]. Similarly,  $\delta$ -COVERING allows a constant factor approximation for  $\delta < 3/2$  and becomes log-APX-hard for  $\delta \geq 3/2$  [16, 17]. The problem dual to  $\delta$ -COVERING is  $\delta$ -DISPERSION, as studied for example by Shier and Tamir [38, 39]. The task is to place a maximum number of points in the input graph such that they pairwise have distance at least  $\delta$  from each other. For this problem,  $\delta = 2$  marks the threshold where the parameterized complexity for the solution size as the parameter jumps from FPT to W[1]-hard [18]. Furthermore, the problem is polynomial-time solvable when  $\delta$  is a rational with numerator 1 or 2, and NP-hard for all other rational and irrational  $\delta$  [14, 18]. With  $\delta$ -COVERING being the continuous version of VERTEXCOVER and DOMINATINGSET, and  $\delta$ -DISPERSION being a continuous version of INDEPENDENTSET, we now turn to the natural continuous variant of another famous problem.

We study the graphic Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) with a positive real covering range  $\delta$  in the continuous model, which we call  $\delta$ -TOUR. A  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  is a tour that may make U-turns at arbitrary points of the graph, even inside edges, and is  $\delta$ -covering, that is, every point in the graph is within distance  $\delta$  from a point  $T$  passes by. The task in our problem  $\delta$ -TOUR is to find a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. See Figure 1 for two examples of  $\delta$ -tours that cannot be described as graph-theoretic closed walks. Note that computing a shortest 0-tour is equivalent to computing a shortest Chinese Postman tour (a closed walk going through every edge), which is known to be polynomial-time solvable [36, Chapter 29]. Moreover, one can observe that if every vertex of the input graph has degree at least two, then there is a shortest  $1/2$ -tour that visits every vertex and, conversely, any tour visiting every vertex is a  $1/2$ -tour. Thus, finding a shortest  $1/2$ -tour is essentially equivalent to solving a TSP problem on a graph, with some additional careful handling of degree-1 vertices.

**Our Results** It turns out that finding a shortest  $\delta$ -tour is NP-hard for all  $\delta > 0$ ; hence, we present approximation algorithms. As is standard, an  $\alpha$ -approximation algorithm is one



(a) A graph and a  $\delta$ -tour for  $\delta = 1$ . The tour  $\delta$ -covers the inner part of this graph by peeking into three edges up to the midpoint. These three peek points are highlighted as the thick dots. The depicted tour (the thick dashed line) has length 18, which is shortest.

(b) The depicted shortest  $\delta$ -tour for  $\delta = 5/3$  of length  $2 \cdot 1/6$  travels between the two points on edge  $vx$  at distances  $1/3$  and  $1/6$  from  $x$ .

■ **Figure 1** Two examples of a  $\delta$ -tour in a graph. On the right, see the special case of a tour fully contained in an edge.

that runs in polynomial time and finds a solution of value within a factor  $\alpha$  of the optimum. As our main approximation result, for every fixed  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$ , we give constant-factor approximation algorithms for finding a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. We list our results in Table 1 and plot the approximation ratio against  $\delta$  in Figure 3. As the complementing lower bound, we prove APX-hardness for every fixed  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$ . Theorem 1.1 summarizes the general behavior; more details follow.

► **Theorem 1.1 (Constant-Factor Approximation).** *For every fixed  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a constant-factor approximation algorithm and is APX-hard.*

The problem behaves very differently in the various regimes of  $\delta$ , even within the range of  $(0, 3/2)$ , and we exploit connections to different problems for different values of  $\delta$ :

**Case  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ .** There is a close relation between our problem and the CHINESEPOSTMAN-PROBLEM in this range, which gives a good approximation ratio. When  $\delta$  approaches 0, our approximation ratio approaches 1. See Theorem 3.3.

**Case  $\delta \in (1/6, 33/40)$ .** When  $1/6 < \delta < 1/2$ , the problem can be reduced to solving TSP on metric instances, for which we can use Christofides'  $3/2$ -approximation algorithm [5] to obtain the same approximation ratio for our problem. See Theorem 3.4.

A simplification of this approach for  $\delta = 1/2$  allows us to use the better  $7/5$ -approximation for Graphic TSP due to Sebő and Vygen [37]. See Theorem 3.5.

Finally, for  $1/2 < \delta < 33/40$ , it turns out that a  $1/2$ -tour is a good approximation of a  $\delta$ -tour. See Theorem 3.6.

**Case  $\delta \in [33/40, 3/2)$ .** The problem here is closely related to a variation of the VERTEX-COVER problem, some results on which we exploit in our approximation algorithms [2, 29]. See Theorems 3.8 and 3.9.

The APX-hardness results are most challenging for small values of  $\delta$ , where we first prove a lower bound for a family of cycle-covering type of problems, which we call  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION; see Section 3.2. Our reduction developed for  $\delta$ -TOUR further directly implies a new result for graphic TSP, namely APX-hardness on cubic bipartite graphs. To the best of our knowledge, even for graphic TSP restricted to cubic graphs without the added restriction to bipartiteness, there is only one APX-hardness result that unfortunately happens to be flawed [26, Thm. 5.4]. In particular, the proposed tour reconfiguration argument appears to split the original TSP tour into two disjoint ones. The issue seems to affect results in a series of other papers [12, 13, 24, 25, 23, 22]. Fortunately, our separate approach closes the gap and yields an even stronger hardness result.

► **Theorem 1.2.** *TSP is APX-hard even on cubic bipartite graphs.*

Once  $\delta$  reaches  $3/2$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR suddenly changes character: it becomes similar to DOMINATINGSET, where only a logarithmic-factor approximation is possible, unless  $P = NP$ ; see Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.15.

► **Theorem 1.3 (Logarithmic Approximation).** *For every fixed  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR admits an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm and has no  $o(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm unless  $P = NP$ .*

The above approximation ratio in fact depends on  $\delta$ , which the big- $O$  notation hides. Thus, if  $\delta$  is not fixed and is rather given as an input, this approximation guarantee can be arbitrarily bad. We show that a polylogarithmic-factor approximation is fortunately still possible in that setting.

► **Theorem 1.4 (Polylogarithmic Approximation).** [See p. 46.] *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given  $\delta > 0$  and a graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , computes a  $64(\log n)^3$ -approximation of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$ .*

Furthermore, we study the problem parameterized by the solution size, which is the length of the  $\delta$ -tour. As mentioned above, when  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , then  $\delta$ -COVERING becomes similar to DOMINATINGSET and is W[2]-hard. Therefore, it is not very surprising that  $\delta = 3/2$  marks the threshold for the parameterized complexity of  $\delta$ -tour as well; see Section 3.4.

► **Theorem 1.5 (Natural Parameterization).** *Computing a shortest length  $\delta$ -tour, parameterized by the length of the tour, is FPT for every fixed  $0 < \delta < 3/2$ , and W[2]-hard for every fixed  $\delta \geq 3/2$ .*

It is much more surprising what happens when  $\delta$  is really large, comparable to the number of vertices. For this to make sense, we have to again consider the problem of computing a shortest  $\delta$ -tour when  $\delta$  is part of the input. In this regime, the problem becomes somewhat similar to covering the whole graph with  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$  balls of radius  $\delta$ , suggesting the problem to be solvable in large part by guessing  $k$  centers in  $n^{O(k)}$  time. Indeed, we give an algorithm for computing a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in this runtime, and show the exponent to be essentially optimal.

► **Theorem 1.6 (XP Algorithm for Parameter  $n/\delta$ ).** [See p. 65.] *There is an algorithm, which, given a connected  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$ , computes a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  in  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(k)}$  time where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ .*

► **Theorem 1.7 (Hardness for Parameter  $n/\delta$ ).** [See p. 71.] *There are constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $k_0$  such that, unless ETH fails, for every  $k \geq k_0$ , there is no algorithm that, given an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , decides whether  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $O(n^{\alpha k / \log k})$  time where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ . Moreover, the problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by  $k$ .*

Section 2 begins with formal notions including a thorough definition of a  $\delta$ -tour. Then Section 3 gives an extended overview of our results.

## 2 Formal Definitions

**General Definitions** For a positive integer  $n$ , we denote the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  by  $[n]$ . All graphs in this article are undirected, unweighted and do not contain parallel edges or loops. Let  $G$  be a graph. For a subset of vertices  $V' \subseteq V(G)$ , we denote by  $G[V']$  the subgraph induced by  $V'$ . The neighborhood of a vertex  $u$  is  $N_G(u) := \{v \in V(G) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$ . We write  $uv$  for an edge  $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ . We denote by  $\ln$  the natural logarithm and by  $\log$  the binary logarithm.

**Problem Related Definitions** For a graph  $G$ , we define a metric space whose point set  $P(G)$  contains, somewhat informally speaking, all points on the continuum of each edge, which has unit length. We use the word *vertex* for the elements in  $V(G)$ , whereas we use the word *point* to denote elements in  $P(G)$ . Note however, that each vertex of  $G$  is also a point of  $G$ .

The set  $P(G)$  is the set of points  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$  and every  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  where  $p(u, v, \lambda) = p(v, u, 1 - \lambda)$ ;  $p(u, v, 0)$  coincides with  $u$  and  $p(u, v, 1)$  coincides with  $v$ . The *distance* of points  $p, q$  on the same edge  $uv$ , say  $p = p(u, v, \lambda_p)$  and  $q = p(u, v, \lambda_q)$ , is  $d(p, q) = |\lambda_q - \lambda_p|$ . The *edge segment*  $P(pq)$  of  $p$  and  $q$  then is the subset of points  $\{p(u, v, \mu) \mid \min\{\lambda_p, \lambda_q\} \leq \mu \leq \max\{\lambda_p, \lambda_q\}\}$ . A *pq-walk*  $T$  between points  $p_0 := p$  and  $p_z := q$  is a finite sequence of points  $p_0 p_1 \dots p_z$  where every two consecutive points are distinct and lie on the same edge, that is, formally, for every  $i \in [z]$  there are an edge  $u_i v_i \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in [0, 1]$  such that  $p_{i-1} = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  and  $p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \mu_i)$ . When  $p$  and  $q$  are not specified, we may simply write *walk* instead of *pq-walk*. The *length*  $\ell(T)$  of a walk  $T$  is  $\sum_{i \in [z]} d(p_{i-1}, p_i)$ . A *pq-walk*  $T$ , whose length is minimum among all *pq-walks*, is called *shortest*. The points in the sequence defining a walk are called its *stopping points*. The point set of  $T$  is  $P(T) = \bigcup_{i \in [z]} P(p_{i-1}, p_i)$ . For some  $p \in P(T)$ , we say that  $T$  *passes*  $p$ . The *distance between two points*  $p, q \in P(G)$ , denoted as  $d(p, q)$ , is the length of a shortest *pq-walk*, and  $\infty$  if no such walk exists. Further, let  $d(p, Q) = \min\{d(p, q) \mid q \in Q\}$  for  $p \in P(G)$  and  $Q \subseteq P(G)$ .

A *tour*  $T$  is a  $p_0 p_z$ -walk with  $p_0 = p_z$ . For a real  $\delta > 0$ , a  $\delta$ -*tour* is a tour where  $d(p, P(T)) \leq \delta$  for every point  $p \in P(G)$ . We study the following minimization problem.


■ **Optimization Problem**  $\delta$ -TOUR, where  $\delta \geq 0$

**Instance** A connected simple graph  $G$ .

**Solution** Any  $\delta$ -tour  $T$ .

**Goal** Minimize the length  $\ell(T)$ .

Further, we use the following notions for a tour  $T = p_0 p_1 \dots p_z$ . A *tour segment* of  $T$  is a walk given by a contiguous subsequence of  $p_0 p_1 \dots p_z$ . The tour  $T$  *stops* at a point  $p \in P(G)$



■ **Figure 2** The four ways a nice  $\delta$ -tour defined by at least 3 points can interact with an edge  $uv$ .

if  $p \in \{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_z\}$  and *traverses* an edge  $uv$  if  $uv$  or  $vu$  is a tour segment of  $T$ . The *discrete length* of a tour is  $z$ , that is, the length of the finite sequence of points representing it. We denote the discrete length of a tour  $T$  by  $\alpha(T)$ .

A point  $p \in P(G)$  is *integral* if it coincides with a vertex. Similarly,  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  is *half-integral* if  $\lambda \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ . A tour is *integral* (*half-integral*) if all its stopping points are integral (half-integral).

The *extension* of a tour  $T = p_0p_1 \dots p_z$ , denoted as  $\lceil T \rceil$ , is the integral tour where, for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$  and every  $\lambda < 1$ , every tour segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  is replaced by  $uvu$ . Further, the *truncation* of a tour  $T$ , denoted as  $\lfloor T \rfloor$ , is the integral tour where for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$ ,  $\lambda < 1$ , every tour segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  in  $T$  is replaced by  $u$ . We note that  $P(\lfloor T \rfloor) \subseteq P(T) \subseteq P(\lceil T \rceil)$ .

### 3 Overview of Results

Section 3.1 provides key technical insights. We present our approximation algorithms in Section 3.2 and our hardness results in Section 3.3. Finally we turn to the parameterized complexity results in Section 3.4. All details are provided in the full version.

#### 3.1 Structural Results

Because TSP in the continuous model of graphs is studied in this paper for the first time, we need to lay a substantial amount of groundwork. Due to the continuous nature of the problem, it is not clear a priori how to check if a solution is a valid  $\delta$ -tour, or whether it is possible to compute a shortest  $\delta$ -tour by a brute force search over a finite set of plausible tours. We clarify these issues in this section. While some of the arguments are intuitively easy to accept, the formal proofs (presented in Appendix A) are delicate with many corner cases to consider; the reader might want to skip these proofs at first reading.

Sometimes, a  $\delta$ -tour has to make U-turns inside edges to be shortest; see Figure 1a. Indeed, it can be checked that an optimal 1-tour for the graph in Figure 1a must look exactly as depicted. Except for a single case, it is unnecessary for a tour to make more than one U-turn inside an edge. Indeed, the only case where a shortest tour is forced to make two U-turns in an edge is when the tour remains entirely within a single edge; see Figure 1b for an example. Note also that there exist degenerate cases in which a shortest  $\delta$ -tour consists of a single point.

However, unless a tour is completely contained in a single edge, we can see that there are only four reasonable ways for a  $\delta$ -tour to interact with the interior of any given edge, illustrated in Figure 2:

- (a) completely avoiding the interior,
- (b) peeking into the edge from one side,
- (c) fully traversing the edge exactly once from one vertex to the other, or
- (d) traversing the edge exactly twice.

■ **Table 1** Approximation upper bounds (UB) and lower bound (LB) for  $\delta$ -TOUR.

$\delta$	(0, 1/6]	(1/6, 1/2)	1/2	(1/2, 33/40)	[33/40, 1)	[1, 3/2)	[3/2, $\infty$ )
<b>UB</b>	$1/(1-2\delta)$ Thm. 3.3	1.5 Thm. 3.4	1.4 Thm. 3.5	$1.4/(2-2\delta)$ Thm. 3.6	4 Thm. 3.9	$3/(3-2\delta)$ Thm. 3.8	$\min\{2\delta, 64 \log^2 n\} \log n$ Thms. 1.4 and 3.11
<b>LB</b>	APX-hard Thm. 3.12			APX-hard Thm. 3.14		$\Omega(\log n)$ Thm. 3.15	

We call a tour that restricts itself to this reasonable behavior a *nice* tour. The following result allows us to restrict our search space to nice tours.

► **Lemma 3.1 (Nice Tours).** [See p. 20.] *Let  $G$  be a connected graph. Further, let a tour  $T$  in  $G$  be given. Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$ , such that,  $T'$  is either nice or has at most two stopping points, and if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

Despite the continuous nature of  $\delta$ -TOUR, we show that we can actually study the problem in a discrete setting instead. More precisely, we prove that there is a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  defined by points whose edge positions  $\lambda$  come from a small explicitly defined set. To show this, the idea is that there are only three scenarios for the edge position of a non-vertex stopping point  $p$  of  $T$ .

1. It has distance exactly  $\delta$  to a vertex  $u$ . An example is that  $G$  is a long path with an end vertex  $u$ , and  $p$  is the closest point of  $P(T)$  to  $u$ . Then  $p$  has an edge position  $\lambda$  that is the fractional part of  $\delta$ .
2. It has distance exactly  $\delta$  to a half-integral point  $p(u, v, \frac{1}{2})$ . An example is that  $G$  is a long  $ww'$ -path with a triangle  $uvw$  attached to  $w$ , and  $p$  is a closest point of  $P(T)$  to  $p(u, v, \frac{1}{2})$ . Then  $p$  has an edge position  $\lambda$  which is the fractional part of  $\delta + \frac{1}{2}$ .
3. It has distance exactly  $2\delta$  to a vertex  $u$ . An example is that  $G$  contains a long  $uv$ -path  $P$ ,  $p$  is the closest point of  $P(T) - \{u\}$  on the path  $P$  to  $u$ , and  $T$  stops at  $u$ . Then  $p$  has an edge position  $\lambda$  which is the fractional part of  $2\delta$ .


Any  $\delta$ -tour can efficiently be modified into one that is nice and has only such edge positions. Our technical proof uses some theory of linear programming, in particular some results on the vertex cover polytope.

► **Lemma 3.2 (Discretization Lemma).** [See p. 26.] *For every  $\delta \geq 0$  and every connected graph  $G$ , there is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour that is either nice or contains at most two stopping points and such that each stopping point of the tour can be described as  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  with  $\lambda \in S_\delta$  where  $S_\delta = \{0, \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor, \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + \delta \rfloor, 2\delta - \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor\}$ .*

As a consequence, we can find a shortest  $\delta$ -tour by a brute-force algorithm. Using some related arguments, we can check whether a given tour actually is a  $\delta$ -tour in polynomial time.

### 3.2 Approximation Algorithms

Here, we overview the approximation algorithms we design for different ranges of  $\delta$ . Most of our algorithms follow a general paradigm; our approach is to design a collection of *core* approximation algorithms for certain key values of  $\delta$  and rely on one of the following two ideas to extrapolate the approximation ratios we get to previous and subsequent intervals. The first main idea uses the simple fact that a  $\delta$ -tour is also  $(\delta + x)$ -tour where  $x > 0$ . Having an



■ **Figure 3** The approximation ratio of our algorithms for  $\delta$ -TOUR plotted against  $\delta$ .

approximation algorithm for  $\delta$ -TOUR, if we are able to reasonably bound the ratio between the lengths of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour and a shortest  $(\delta + x)$ -tour, we obtain an approximation algorithm for  $(\delta + x)$ -TOUR essentially for free. The second main idea is complementary to the first. Namely, we show that we may also extend a given  $\delta$ -tour to obtain a  $(\delta - x)$ -tour where  $x > 0$ . Again, having an approximation algorithm for the  $\delta$ -TOUR, if we have a good bound on the total length of the extensions we add, we obtain an approximation algorithm for  $(\delta - x)$ -TOUR.

**Approximation for  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ .** The main idea is that a shortest Chinese Postman tour, that is, a tour which traverses every edge, is a good approximation of a  $\delta$ -tour. Let us denote the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of a given graph by  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  and the length of a shortest Chinese Postman tour by  $\text{OPT}_{\text{CP}}$ . To bound the ratio  $\text{OPT}_{\text{CP}}/\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ , we observe that there is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour that, for every edge  $uv$ , either traverses  $uv$  or contains the segment of the form  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  for some  $\lambda \in \{1 - \delta, 1 - 2\delta\}$ . We obtain a Chinese Postman tour by replacing every such segment by a tour segment  $uvu$ . This bounds  $\text{OPT}_{\text{CP}}/\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  by  $1/(1 - 2\delta)$ . Hence, outputting a shortest Chinese Postman tour, which can be computed in polynomial time [9], yields an approximation ratio of  $1/(1 - 2\delta)$ .

► **Theorem 3.3.** [See p. 35.] *For every  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $1/(1 - 2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ .** In this range, we rely on shortest  $\delta$ -tours that satisfy certain desirable discrete properties. In the following more precise description, we focus on the case  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , the construction needing to be slightly altered if  $\frac{1}{4} < \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Here, we prove the existence of a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  such that

- (P1)  $T$  contains the tour segment  $up(u, v, 1 - \delta)u$  for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$  incident to a leaf vertex  $v$  (that is,  $\deg_G(v) = 1$ ) and
- (P2) for every edge  $uv$  not incident to a leaf, either  $T$  traverses  $uv$  or the interaction of  $T$  with  $uv$  consists of one of the segments  $up(u, v, 1 - 2\delta)u$  or  $vp(v, u, 1 - 2\delta)v$ .

We construct an auxiliary graph  $G'$  on the above listed points with edge weights corresponding to their distance in  $G$ . It turns out that TSP tours in  $G'$  are in a one-to-one correspondence



with  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  satisfying properties (P1–P2). More precisely, we prove that an  $\alpha$ -approximate TSP tour  $T'$  of  $G'$  can be efficiently turned into a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G$  of at most the same length which yields  $\ell(T) \leq \ell(T') \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  denotes the length of a shortest TSP tour of  $G'$ . Then, noting that a given  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  satisfying properties (P1) and (P2) can be converted to a TSP tour of  $G'$  of at most the same length, we get that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour with  $\ell(T) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ . The first part, that is, proving that a TSP tour  $T'$  of  $G'$  can be turned into a  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  of the same length, is based on the fact that there is a limited number of ways a reasonable TSP tour interacts with the points corresponding to a certain edge. More precisely, any TSP tour in  $G'$  can easily be transformed into one which is not longer and whose interaction with the points in any edge is in direct correspondence with the interaction of a certain  $\delta$ -tour with this edge in  $G$ .

This lets us transfer known positive approximation results for metric TSP to  $\delta$ -tour. We may use the Christofides algorithm [5], yielding the following theorem.

► **Theorem 3.4.** [See p. 36.] *For every  $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $3/2$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta = 1/2$ .** Even though the idea from the previous section still applies when  $\delta = 1/2$ , interestingly, we obtain a better approximation ratio observing that the problem further reduces to computing a graphic TSP tour on the non-leaf vertices, which admits a 1.4-approximation algorithm due to Sebő and Vygen [37].

► **Theorem 3.5.** [See p. 37.]  *$1/2$ -TOUR admits a 1.4-approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$ .** In this range, we show that computing a  $1/2$ -tour via Theorem 3.5 is a good approximation of a  $\delta$ -tour. To that end, we characterize  $\delta$ -tours for  $\delta \in [1/2, 1]$ , showing that, in particular, the existence of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  such that one of the following conditions hold for every edge  $uv$ .

- (P1)  $T$  stops at both  $u$  and  $v$ , or
- (P2)  $T$  stops at one of the endpoints, say  $u$ , and additionally stops at the point  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ , or  $T$  stops at the two points  $p(u, v, \lambda_1)$  and  $p(x, v, \lambda_2)$  for some  $x \in N_G(v)$  where  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 2 - 2\delta$ , or
- (P3)  $T$  stops at neither  $u$  nor  $v$  but stops at two points  $p(x, v, \lambda_1)$  and  $p(y, u, \lambda_2)$  for some  $x \in N_G(v)$  and  $y \in N_G(u)$  where  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 3 - 2\delta$ .

Let  $\text{OPT}_{1/2}$  and  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  be the lengths of a shortest  $1/2$ -tour and  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , respectively. To bound the ratio  $\text{OPT}_{1/2}/\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ , we observe that a given  $\delta$ -tour  $T_\delta$  can be transformed into a  $1/2$ -tour  $T_{1/2}$  by an appropriate replacement of every tour segment of  $T_\delta$  corresponding to one of the cases (P1-3).

It can be shown that these modifications then result in a tour  $T_{1/2}$  visiting every non-leaf vertex of  $G$  and covering leaves by tour segments of length 1, so  $T_{1/2}$  is a  $1/2$ -tour. These modifications increase the tour length by at most a multiplicative factor of  $\max\{\frac{1}{2(1-\delta)}, \frac{2}{3-2\delta}\} = 1/(2 - 2\delta)$ , so we have the following theorem.

► **Theorem 3.6.** [See p. 39.] *For every  $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $1.4/(2 - 2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta \in (33/40, 3/2)$ .** Here we show that a 1-tour provides constant-factor approximations for  $\delta$ -tours in this range. For  $\delta > 1$ , as in the previous range, due to a similar characterization of  $\delta$ -tours, we can show an  $\alpha$ -approximation algorithm for 1-TOUR to imply an  $\frac{\alpha}{3-2\delta}$ -approximation algorithm. For  $\delta < 1$ , we show that starting from a 1-tour and augmenting it with some tour segments results in a  $\delta$ -tour of a bounded length. The 3-approximation algorithm for a 1-TOUR works as follows. We exploit a connection to the problem of computing a shortest *vertex cover tour*, which is a closed walk in a graph such that the vertices this tour stops at form a vertex cover. This problem, introduced in [2], admits a 3-approximation algorithm using linear programming (LP) techniques [29]. It is easy to see that a vertex cover tour forms a 1-tour; however, a shortest 1-tour can be shorter than a shortest vertex cover tour (e.g., this is the case in Figure 1a). Thus, the 1-tour we get from an arbitrary 3-approximation for vertex cover tour is in general not a 3-approximate 1-tour. Instead, we closely examine the LP formulated by Könemann et al. [29], showing the optimum for this LP to be a lower bound on the length of a 1-tour, which means that the vertex cover tours we get using this approach yield 3-approximate 1-tours.

Given a connected graph  $G$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  be the set of subsets  $F$  of  $V(G)$  such that both  $G[F]$  and  $G[V(G) - F]$  induce at least one edge. For a set  $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ , let  $C_G(F)$  denote the set of edges in  $G$  with exactly one endpoint in  $F$ . The LP can then be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Minimize} & \sum_{e \in E(G)} z_e \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{e \in C_G(F)} z_e \geq 2 \quad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}(G) \text{ and} \\ & 0 \leq z_e \leq 2 \quad \text{for all } e \in E(G). \end{array}$$

Denoting the optimal objective value of the above LP defined for a fixed graph  $G$  by  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ , the corollary below follows from [29].

► **Theorem 3.7 (Consequence of [29, Thms. 2 and 3]).** [See p. 39.] *Given a connected graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , in polynomial time, we can compute a vertex cover tour  $T$  of  $G$  with  $\ell(T) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ .*

It remains to show that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}$  lower-bounds  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$ , the length of a shortest 1-tour. Let  $T_{1\text{-tour}} = p_0 \dots p_k p_k = p_0$  be a nice 1-tour of  $G$ . For every edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , we define  $\Lambda_{uv} := \sum_{i \in [k]: P(p_{i-1}, p_i) \subseteq P(u, v)} d_G(p_{i-1}, p_i)$ , indicating how much the tour  $T_{1\text{-tour}}$  spends inside every edge  $uv$ . The vector  $(\min(2, \Lambda_e))_{e \in E(G)}$  can then be shown to be feasible for the above LP. We observe the length of  $T_{1\text{-tour}}$  to be at least  $\sum_{e \in E(G)} \Lambda_e$ , yielding  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}} \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$  and with Theorem 3.7, we obtain the following theorem.

► **Theorem 3.8.** [See p. 41.] *For any  $\delta \in [1, 3/2)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $3/(3-2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

For the remaining range  $\delta \in (33/40, 1)$ , our algorithm first uses Theorem 3.8 to obtain a 3-approximate 1-tour  $T$  that is a vertex cover tour. Then, for every vertex  $v \notin V(T)$ , we choose an arbitrary neighbor  $u$ . Observe that  $u \in V(T)$ . Then we extend  $T$  into a tour  $T'$  by replacing an arbitrary occurrence of  $u$  in  $T$  by the segment  $up(u, v, 1 - \delta)u$  if  $v$  is a leaf vertex and by the segment  $up(u, v, (1 - \delta))u$ , otherwise. As  $T'$  fulfills the characterizing properties of a  $\delta$ -tour,  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. To bound its length, using our characterization, we observe that, given an arbitrary  $\delta$ -tour  $T''$ , each non-leaf vertex  $v$  of  $G$  can be associated to a segment of

$T''$  of cost at least  $4(1 - \delta)$  as  $T''$  either stops at  $v$  by traversing an edge, incurring a cost of at least 1, or makes two non-vertex stops that can be associated to  $v$  with a total cost of at least  $2(2 - \delta)$ . The previous observation can be used to show that the  $\delta$ -tour we construct achieves an approximation ratio of 4.

► **Theorem 3.9.** [See p. 42.] *For any  $\delta \in [33/40, 1)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a 4-approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta > 3/2$ .** Here we design polylog( $n$ )-approximation algorithms. We consider two different settings: one where  $\delta$  is fixed and another where  $\delta$  is part of the input. We show that each of the two problems can be reduced to an appropriate dominating set problem in an auxiliary graph. Recall that the discretization lemma (Lemma 3.2) shows, at a high-level, that there is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G$  whose stopping points on every edge come from a constant-sized set. Let  $P_\delta(G)$  be the set of all such points in  $G$ .

In order to define our auxiliary graph, we first describe a collection  $\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  of edge segments of  $G$ . Namely,  $\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  is the collection of minimal edge segments each of whose endpoints is either a vertex of  $V(G)$  or is of distance exactly  $\delta$  to a point in  $P_\delta(G)$  in  $G$ . This definition is suitable due to three properties of  $\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$ :

- (P1) If  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  whose stopping points are all contained in  $P_\delta(G)$ , then every  $I \in \mathcal{I}_\delta(G)$  is fully covered by one stopping point of  $T$ ,
- (P2) every point in  $P(G)$  is contained in some  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$ , and
- (P3) the number of segments in  $\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  is polynomial in  $n$ .

We are now ready to describe the auxiliary graph  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . We let  $V(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  consist of  $P_\delta(G)$  and a vertex  $x_I$  for every  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$ . We further let  $E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  contain edges such that  $\Gamma(G, \delta)[P_\delta(G)]$  is a clique and let it contain an edge  $px_I$  for  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  and  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  whenever  $p$  covers all the points in  $I$ . The main connection between  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  and dominating sets in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  is due to the following lemma, which we algorithmically exploit in both settings, when  $\delta \geq 3/2$  is fixed and when  $\delta$  is part of the input.

► **Lemma 3.10.** [See p. 44.] *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $\delta > 1$ . Further, let  $T$  be a tour in  $G$  whose stopping points are all in  $P_\delta(G)$ . Then  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  if and only if the stopping points of  $T$  are a dominating set in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ .*

**Approximation for fixed  $\delta > 3/2$ .** By computing a dominating set  $Y$  in the auxiliary graph  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  using a standard log  $n$ -approximation algorithm and connecting it into a tour of length  $O(\delta|Y|)$ , we obtain the main result in this setting.

► **Theorem 3.11.** [See p. 45.] *For any  $\delta \geq 3/2$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Approximation for  $\delta$  as Part of the Input:** The approach from the previous section does not yield any non-trivial approximation guarantee in this setting mainly because we get an additional factor of roughly  $\delta$  when connecting the dominating set into a tour. However, we are able to show that a polylog( $n$ )-approximation is attainable when  $\delta$  is part of the input. The algorithm for this is based on a reduction to another problem related to dominating sets. Namely, a dominating tree  $U$  of a given graph  $H$  is a subgraph of  $H$  which is a tree and such that  $V(U)$  is a dominating set of  $H$ . Kutiel [30] proves that given an edge-weighted graph  $H$ , we can compute a dominating tree of  $H$  of weight at most  $\log^3 n$  times the minimum weight of a dominating tree of  $H$ .

In order to make use of this result, we now endow  $E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  with a weight function  $w$ . For all  $p, p' \in P_\delta(G)$ , we set  $w(pp') = d_G(p, p')$ , and all other edges get a very large weight. We now compute an approximate dominating tree  $U$  of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  with respect to  $w$ . By the definition of  $w$ , we obtain that  $U$  does not contain any vertex of  $V(\Gamma(G, \delta)) - P_\delta(G)$ . It follows that we can obtain a tour  $T$  from  $U$  that visits all points of  $V(U)$  and whose weight is at most  $2w(U)$ . By Lemma 3.10, we obtain that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

Finally, in order to determine the quality of  $T$ , consider a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T^*$  in  $G$ . It follows from Lemma 3.10 that the set  $P_{T^*}$  of points of  $P_\delta(G)$  passed by  $T^*$  forms a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Further, we can easily find a tree in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  spanning  $P_{T^*}$  whose weight is at most the length of  $T^*$ . Hence, this tree is a dominating tree in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , and Theorem 1.4 follows.

### 3.3 Inapproximability Results

Having presented our approximation algorithms providing a constant-factor approximation for every  $\delta > 0$ , we now rule out the existence of a PTAS by showing APX-hardness for every  $\delta > 0$ . The main challenge is to show the hardness for the range  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ . A simple subdivision argument then allows us to extend the hardness result to any  $\delta > 0$ . Further, we describe a stronger inapproximability result for  $\delta \geq 3/2$ .

**APX-Hardness for Covering Range  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ .** As the first step towards the APX-hardness of  $\delta$ -TOUR in the range  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ , we introduce a new family of optimization problems called  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION, that is also interesting on its own.

■ **Optimization Problem**  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION, where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$

---

<b>Instance</b>	A simple graph $G$ .
<b>Solution</b>	Any set $\mathcal{C}$ of pairwise vertex-disjoint cycles in $G$ .
<b>Goal</b>	Minimize $\alpha \mathcal{C}  + \beta V(G) - \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)  + \gamma V(G)  + \kappa$ .

---

This bi-objective problem asks us, roughly speaking, for any given graph, to cover as many vertices as possible with a family of as few vertex disjoint cycles as possible. The precise balance between the two opposed optimization goals is tuned by the problem parameters. In particular,  $\alpha$  specifies the cost for each cycle in the solution and  $\beta$  for each vertex left uncovered. Disallowing uncovered vertices (or making them prohibitively expensive), yields the classical APX-hard minimization problem CYCLEPARTITION [35, Thm 3.1, Prob. (iv)].

The two remaining parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\kappa$  may appear artificial since their only immediate effect is to make any solution for a given graph  $G$  more expensive by the same cost  $\gamma|V(G)| + \kappa$ . They will prove meaningful, however, for our main goal of this section. Namely, we first establish APX-hardness for  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION for cubic graphs in the entire parameter range of  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$  and then show that on cubic graphs, for every  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ , we have that  $\delta$ -TOUR coincides with this problem for an appropriate choice of the parameters  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , and  $\kappa$ . The proof uses a reduction from VERTEXCOVER on cubic graphs, which is known to be APX-hard [26, Thm. 5.4].

For some fixed  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ , given an instance  $G$  of cubic VERTEXCOVER, we create a cubic graph  $H$  which we view as an instance of  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION. It is not difficult to obtain a packing of cycles in  $H$  with the appropriate properties from

a vertex cover in  $G$ . The other direction, that is, obtaining a vertex cover in  $G$  from a cycle packing in  $H$  is significantly more delicate. A collection of careful reconfiguration arguments is needed to transform an arbitrary cycle cover in  $H$  into one that is of a certain particular shape and not more expensive. Having a cycle cover of this shape at hand, a corresponding vertex cover in  $G$  can easily be found. As mentioned above, we now easily obtain APX-hardness of  $\delta$ -TOUR for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$  and even the previously unknown APX-hardness for cubic bipartite graphic TSP.

► **Theorem 3.12.** [See p. 13.] *On cubic bipartite graphs,  $\delta$ -TOUR is APX-hard for  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ .*

► **Corollary 3.13.** [See p. 13.] *TSP is APX-hard even on cubic bipartite graphs.*

With Theorem 3.12 at hand, we further easily obtain a hardness result for larger values of  $\delta$ . Namely, observe that for any nonnegative integer  $k$ , any constant  $\delta$  and any connected graph  $G$ , there is a direct correspondence between the  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  and the  $k\delta$ -tours in the graph obtained from  $G$  by subdividing every edge  $k - 1$  times, yielding the following result.

► **Theorem 3.14.** [See p. 59.] *The problem  $\delta$ -TOUR is APX-hard for any real  $\delta > 0$ .*

**Stronger Inapproximability for Covering Range  $\delta \geq 3/2$ .** For  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , we give a lower bound of roughly  $\ln n$  on the approximation ratio, asymptotically matching our upper bound. Like for all our inapproximability results, we prove hardness for the decision version of the problem.

► **Theorem 3.15.** [See p. 61.] *Unless  $P = NP$ , for every  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , there exists an absolute constant  $\alpha_\delta$  such that there is no P-time algorithm that, given a connected graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $\alpha_\delta \log(|V(G)|)K$ .*

We start from the inapproximability of DOMINATINGSET on split graphs, implicitly given by Dinur and Steurer [10, Corollary 1.5]. Given a split graph  $G$  satisfying some nontriviality condition, we can construct a graph  $G'$  such that the minimum size of a dominating set of  $G$  and the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G'$  are closely related.

### 3.4 Parameterized Complexity

We examine the problem’s parameterized complexity for two parameters: tour length and  $n/\delta$ .

**Parameterization by Tour Length.** For  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , W[2]-hardness follows by a reduction from DOMINATINGSET on split graphs, namely the same as used to show inapproximability for  $\delta \geq 3/2$ . We complement this result by giving an FPT-algorithm when  $\delta < 3/2$ . In fact, we give an algorithm which allows  $\delta$  to be part of the input and that is fixed-parameter tractable for  $\delta$  and maximum allowed tour length  $K$  combined.

► **Theorem 3.16.** [See p. 61.] *There is an algorithm that, given a graph  $G$  and reals  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$  and  $K \geq 0$ , decides whether  $G$  has a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $f(K, \delta) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time, for some computable function  $f$ .*

Our algorithm is based on a kernelization: we either correctly conclude that  $G$  has no  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ , or output an equivalent instance of size at most  $f(K, \delta)$  for a computable function  $f$ . The key insight is a bound on the vertex cover size of  $f(K, \delta)$  for a

computable function, assuming there exists a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ . Hence we may compute an approximation  $C$  of a minimum vertex cover, and reject the instance if  $C$  is too large. We partition the vertices in  $V(G) - C$  by their neighborhood in the vertex cover  $C$ . Now if a set  $S$  of the partition has size larger than  $f(K, \delta)$  for a computable function  $f$ , then deleting a vertex of  $S$  yields an equivalent instance.

**XP Algorithm for Large Covering Range.** We here give an overview of the proof of Theorem 1.6. The crucial idea is that, if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, then, while the length of  $T$  can be linear in  $n$ , there exists a set of points stopped at by this tour that covers all the points in  $P(G)$  and whose size is bounded by a function depending only on  $k$  where  $k = \frac{n}{\delta}$ . Intuitively speaking, the remainder of the tour is needed to connect the points in this set, but not to actually cover points in  $P(G)$ . Therefore, these segments connecting the points in the set can be chosen to be as short as possible. These observations can be subsumed in the following lemma, crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.6.

► **Lemma 3.17.** [See p. 65.] *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$ ,  $\delta$  a positive real,  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$  and suppose that  $n \geq 12k$ . Further, let  $T$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Then there exists a set  $Z \subseteq P(G)$  of points stopped at by  $T$  with  $|Z| \leq 12k$  such that for every point  $p \in P(G)$ , we have  $d_G(p, Z) \leq \delta$ .*

With Lemma 3.17 at hand, Theorem 1.6 follows easily. Assuming that the minimum size requirement in Lemma 3.17 is met, due to the discretization lemma (Lemma 3.2), there exists a shortest tour only stopping at points from a set of size  $O(n^2)$ . We then enumerate all subsets of size at most  $12k$  and for each of these sets, compute a shortest tour passing through its elements and check whether it is a  $\delta$ -tour. It follows from Lemma 3.17 that the shortest tour found during this procedure is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. In the proof of Lemma 3.17, we define  $Z$  as the union of two sets  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$ . The set  $Z_1$  is an inclusion-wise minimal set of points stopped at by  $T$  that covers all points in  $P(G)$  whose distance to  $T$  is at least  $\frac{n}{2k}$ . For each  $z \in Z_1$ , by definition, there exists such a point  $p_z$  for which  $d_G(p_z, z') > \delta$  holds for all  $z' \in Z - z$ . Now for every  $z \in Z_1$ , we choose a shortest walk from  $p_z$  to  $z$ . It turns out that these walks do pairwise not share vertices of  $V(G)$  and each of them contains  $O(\frac{n}{k})$  vertices of  $V(G)$ . It follows that  $|Z_1| = O(k)$ . We now walk along  $\lfloor T \rfloor$  and, roughly speaking, create  $Z_2$  by adding every  $\frac{n}{3k}$ -th vertex stopped at by  $\lfloor T \rfloor$ . It turns out that  $Z_2$  covers all points in  $P(G)$  whose distance to  $T$  is at most  $\frac{n}{2k}$ . Further, as the length of  $\lfloor T \rfloor$  is bounded by  $2n$ , we have  $|Z_2| = O(k)$ .

**W[1]-Hardness for Large Covering Range.** Given the XP-time algorithm running in time  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(k)}$  designed for the regime  $\delta = \Omega(n)$ , it is natural to ask whether there is an FPT-time algorithm for the same parameter  $k := \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$ . The answer is no. We show W[1]-hardness and the running time of our algorithm for Theorem 1.6 to be close to optimal under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH). The hardness is based on the fact that BINARYCSP on cubic constraint graphs cannot be solved in time  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(k/\log k)}$  under ETH; see [28, 31]. (The exact formulation we use is stronger and gives a lower bound for every fixed  $k$ .) An instance of BINARYCSP is a graph  $G$  with  $k$  edges, where the nodes represent variables taking values from a domain  $\Sigma = [n]$ , and every edge is associated with a constraint relation  $C_{i,j} \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$  over the two variables  $i$  and  $j$ . The instance is *satisfiable* if there is an assignment to the variables  $\mathcal{A} : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $(\mathcal{A}(i), \mathcal{A}(j)) \in C_{i,j}$  for every constraint relation  $C_{i,j}$ .

In our reduction, we construct  $k$  gadgets corresponding to the constraints, with each gadget having some number of portals. Each gadget has multiple possible states corresponding

to the satisfying assignments of its two constrained variables. If two constraints share a variable, then the corresponding gadgets are connected by paths between appropriate portals. These connections ensure that the selected states of the two gadgets agree on the value of the variable. It is now easy to find a tour in the auxiliary graph given a satisfying assignment for the formula. On the other hand, the construction is designed so that all tours in the auxiliary graph are in a certain shape, allowing to obtain an assignment from them.

## References

- 1 Paola Alimonti and Viggo Kann. Hardness of approximating problems on cubic graphs. In *CIAC*, volume 1203 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 288–298. Springer, 1997.
- 2 Esther M. Arkin, Magnús M. Halldórsson, and Refael Hassin. Approximating the tree and tour covers of a graph. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 47(6):275–282, 1993. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(93)90072-H.
- 3 Ramaswamy Chandrasekaran and Arie Tamir. An  $o((n \log p)^2)$  algorithm for the continuous  $p$ -center problem on a tree. *SIAM J. Algebraic Discret. Methods*, 1(4):370–375, 1980. doi:10.1137/0601043.
- 4 Nicos Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. Technical Report 388, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie Mellon University, 1976.
- 5 Nicos Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. *Operations Research Forum*, 3(1):20, Mar 2022. doi:10.1007/s43069-021-00101-z.
- 6 Vincent Cohen-Addad, Éric Colin de Verdière, Dániel Marx, and Arnaud de Mesmay. Almost tight lower bounds for hard cutting problems in embedded graphs. *J. ACM*, 68(4):30:1–30:26, 2021.
- 7 Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Fourth Edition*. MIT Press, 2022.
- 8 Perino M. Dearing and Richard Lane Francis. A minimax location problem on a network. *Transportation Science*, 8(4):333–343, 1974.
- 9 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer, 5th edition, 2017.
- 10 Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *STOC*, pages 624–633. ACM, 2014.
- 11 Jack Edmonds and Ellis L. Johnson. Matching, euler tours and the chinese postman. *Math. Program.*, 5(1):88–124, 1973. doi:10.1007/BF01580113.
- 12 Lars Engebretsen and Marek Karpinski. Approximation hardness of TSP with bounded metrics. In Fernando Orejas, Paul G. Spirakis, and Jan van Leeuwen, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 28th International Colloquium, ICALP 2001, Crete, Greece, July 8-12, 2001, Proceedings*, volume 2076 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 201–212. Springer, 2001. doi:10.1007/3-540-48224-5\_17.
- 13 Lars Engebretsen and Marek Karpinski. TSP with bounded metrics. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(4):509–546, 2006. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000005001285>, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2005.12.001.
- 14 Alexander Grigoriev, Tim A. Hartmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Dispersing obnoxious facilities on a graph. *Algorithmica*, 83(6):1734–1749, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-021-00800-3>, doi:10.1007/S00453-021-00800-3.
- 15 Tim A. Hartmann. *Facility location on graphs*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 2022. URL: <https://publications.rwth-aachen.de/record/951030>, doi:10.18154/RWTH-2023-01837.
- 16 Tim A. Hartmann and Tom Janßen. Approximating  $\delta$ -covering. *CoRR*, abs/2408.04517, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.04517>, arXiv:2408.04517, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2408.04517.
- 17 Tim A. Hartmann and Tom Janßen. Approximating  $\delta$ -covering. In *Approximation and Online Algorithms - 22nd International Workshop (to appear), WAOA 2024, Egham, United Kingdom, September 5-6, 2024, Proceedings*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2024.
- 18 Tim A. Hartmann and Stefan Lendl. Dispersing obnoxious facilities on graphs by rounding distances. In Stefan Szeider, Robert Ganian, and Alexandra Silva, editors, *Proceeding of the 47th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2022)*, volume 241 of *LIPICs*, pages 55:1–55:14. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2022.55>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2022.55.



- 19 Tim A. Hartmann, Stefan Lendl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Continuous facility location on graphs. *Math. Program.*, 192(1):207–227, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-021-01646-x>, doi:10.1007/S10107-021-01646-X.
- 20 David S. Johnson. Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 9(3):256–278, 1974. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000074800449>, doi:10.1016/S0022-0000(74)80044-9.
- 21 Oded Kariv and S. Louis Hakimi. An algorithmic approach to network location problems. I: The  $p$ -centers. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 37(3):513–538, 1979.
- 22 Marek Karpinski. Towards better inapproximability bounds for TSP: A challenge of global dependencies. In Adrian Kosowski and Igor Walukiewicz, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Symposium on Fundamentals of Computation Theory (FCT 2015)*, volume 9210 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–11. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-22177-9\_1.
- 23 Marek Karpinski and Richard Schmieid. Improved inapproximability results for the shortest superstring and the bounded metric TSP. <https://theory.cs.uni-bonn.de/ftp/reports/cs-reports/2013/85339-CS.pdf>. Accessed: 2024-04-01.
- 24 Marek Karpinski and Richard Schmieid. On approximation lower bounds for TSP with bounded metrics. *CoRR*, abs/1201.5821, 2012. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5821>, arXiv:1201.5821.
- 25 Marek Karpinski and Richard Schmieid. Improved inapproximability results for the shortest superstring and related problems. In Anthony Wirth, editor, *Nineteenth Computing: The Australasian Theory Symposium, CATS 2013, Adelaide, Australia, February 2013*, volume 141 of *CRPIT*, pages 27–36. Australian Computer Society, 2013. URL: <http://crpit.scem.westernsydney.edu.au/abstracts/CRPITV141Karpinski.html>.
- 26 Marek Karpinski and Richard Schmieid. Approximation hardness of graphic TSP on cubic graphs. *RAIRO – Operations Research*, 49(4):651–668, 2015. URL: <http://www.numdam.org/articles/10.1051/ro/2014062/>, doi:10.1051/ro/2014062.
- 27 Karthik C. S., Bundit Laekhanukit, and Pasin Manurangsi. On the parameterized complexity of approximating dominating set. *J. ACM*, 66(5):33:1–33:38, 2019. doi:10.1145/3325116.
- 28 Karthik C. S., Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Uéverton S. Souza. Conditional lower bounds for sparse parameterized 2-CSP: A streamlined proof. *CoRR*, abs/2311.05913, 2023.
- 29 Jochen Könemann, Goran Konjevod, Ojas Parekh, and Amitabh Sinha. Improved approximations for tour and tree covers. *Algorithmica*, 38(3):441–449, 2004. doi:10.1007/s00453-003-1071-0.
- 30 Gilad Kutiel. Hardness results and approximation algorithms for the minimum dominating tree problem. *CoRR*, abs/1802.04498, 2018.
- 31 Dániel Marx. Can you beat treewidth? In *FOCS*, pages 169–179. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.
- 32 Nimrod Megiddo and Arie Tamir. New results on the complexity of  $p$ -center problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(4):751–758, 1983. doi:10.1137/0212051.
- 33 George L. Nemhauser and Leslie E. Trotter Jr. Vertex packings: Structural properties and algorithms. *Math. Program.*, 8(1):232–248, 1975. doi:10.1007/BF01580444.
- 34 Venkatesh Raman and Saket Saurabh. Short cycles make  $W$ -hard problems hard: FPT algorithms for  $W$ -hard problems in graphs with no short cycles. *Algorithmica*, 52(2):203–225, 2008.
- 35 Sartaj Sahni and Teofilo F. Gonzalez. P-complete approximation problems. *J. ACM*, 23(3):555–565, 1976. doi:10.1145/321958.321975.
- 36 Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization – Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, 2003.
- 37 András Sebő and Jens Vygen. Shorter tours by nicer ears:  $7/5$ -approximation for the graph-TSP,  $3/2$  for the path version, and  $4/3$  for two-edge-connected subgraphs. *Combinatorica*, pages 1–34, 2014.

- 38 Douglas R. Shier. A min-max theorem for  $p$ -center problems on a tree. *Transportation Science*, 11(3):243–252, 1977. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25767877>.
- 39 Arie Tamir. Obnoxious facility location on graphs. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 4(4):550–567, 1991. doi:10.1137/0404048.

## A Structural Results

In this section, we provide a collection of structural results on shortest  $\delta$ -tours, which will be used several times throughout the main proofs of our algorithmic results in Appendices B–D. In Appendix A.1, we give some simple results preliminary to the ones in later sections. In Appendix A.2 we then show that, when finding shortest  $\delta$ -tours, we can restrict our search space to tours satisfying certain non-degeneracy conditions, more precisely nice tours. Appendix A.3 gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a given tour to be a  $\delta$ -tour. These conditions are of local nature and can be checked efficiently. Next, in Section A.4, we use the results from Appendix A.3 to show that there are shortest  $\delta$ -tours satisfying some more restrictive conditions. Namely, we show that we can find a shortest  $\delta$ -tour whose stopping points all come from a small set. Finally, we give in Appendix A.5 some simple algorithmic corollaries of the previous results. While the results in Appendix A.4 rely on a connection to the vertex cover polytope, the proofs in the remaining sections are conceptually transparent albeit somewhat technical.

### A.1 General Observations

We first give a well-known result of Euler, that will be used several times throughout the article. A multigraph  $G$  is called *Eulerian* if  $\deg_G(v)$  is even for all  $v \in V(G)$ . An *Euler tour* of  $G$  is an integral tour  $v_0, \dots, v_z$  in  $G$  such that for each pair  $u, v \in V(G)$ , the number of indices  $i \in [z]$  with  $\{v_{i-1}, v_i\} = \{u, v\}$  is exactly the number of edges in  $E(G)$  linking  $u$  and  $v$ .

► **Proposition A.1** (Euler's Theorem). *A multigraph  $G$  admits an Euler tour if and only if it is connected and Eulerian. Moreover, if an Euler tour exists, it can be computed in polynomial time.*

We begin with two simple results. As a little warm-up, we start with a simple observation giving an upper bound on the maximum length of  $\delta$ -tours if  $\delta$  is not too small.

► **Proposition A.2.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $\delta \geq 1/2$  a constant. Then  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $2n - 2$  and this tour can be found in polynomial time.*

**Proof.** Let  $U$  be an arbitrary spanning tree of  $G$  and let  $U'$  be obtained from  $U$  by doubling every edge. Observe that  $d_{U'}(v) = 2d_U(v)$  is even for all  $v \in V(G)$ , hence by Proposition A.1, there is an Euler tour  $T$  of  $U'$ . Observe that  $\ell(T) = |E(U')| = 2n - 2$ . Further, let  $p = (u, e, \lambda) \in P(G)$  for some  $e = uv \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . As  $u$  and  $v$  are visited by  $T$ , we have  $d_G(p, T) \leq \min\{d_G(p, u), d_G(p, v)\} = \min\{\lambda, 1 - \lambda\} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + (1 - \lambda)) = \frac{1}{2} \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . It follows from Proposition A.1 that  $T$  can be computed in polynomial time. ◀

We next give one proposition that will be helpful in several places throughout this section.

► **Proposition A.3.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $T$  a tour in  $G$  and  $p \in P(G)$  a point which is not passed by  $T$ . Then  $d_G(p, T) = d_G(p, q)$  for some point  $q \in P(G)$  which  $T$  stops at.*

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise, so there exists some  $q^* = (u, v, \lambda) \in P(G)$  which is passed by  $T$  and such that  $d_G(p, q) > d_G(p, q^*)$  for every point  $q \in P(G)$  which  $T$  stops at. As  $q^*$  is passed but not visited by  $T$ , we obtain that  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and that there exists  $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\lambda_0 < \lambda < \lambda_1$ , the point  $(u, v, \lambda')$  is passed by  $T$  for all  $\lambda' \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$  and  $T$  stops at  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  where  $q_i = (u, v, \lambda_i)$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . First suppose that  $p$  is also on the edge  $uv$ ,

so  $p = (u, v, \lambda_p)$  for some  $\lambda_p \in [0, 1]$ . As  $p$  is not passed by  $T$  and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $\lambda_p < \lambda_0$ . This yields  $d_G(p, q_0) = \lambda_0 - \lambda_p < \lambda - \lambda_p = d_G(p, q^*)$ , a contradiction to the assumption. Now suppose that  $p$  is not on  $uv$ . Then, by symmetry, we may suppose that  $d_G(p, q^*) = d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, q^*)$ . It follows that  $d_G(p, q_0) \leq d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, q_0) = d_G(p, u) + \lambda_0 < d_G(p, u) + \lambda' = d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, q^*) < d_G(p, q^*)$ , again a contradiction to the assumption.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## A.2 Making a Tour Nice

This section proves the niceness of any shortest  $\delta$ -tour. Recall that a tour  $T = p_0 p_1 \dots p_z$  in a connected graph  $G$  with  $z \geq 3$  is *nice* if

- $\{p_{i-1}, p_i\} \cap V(G) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $i \in [z]$  (i.e.,  $T$  has no two consecutive stopping points inside an edge),
- for every  $i \in [z]$  with  $p_i \notin V(G)$ , we have  $p_{i-1} = p_{(i+1) \bmod z}$  (i.e., whenever  $T$  stops inside an edge, the previous and next stopping points are the same)
- every edge  $uv \in E(G)$  has at most one index  $i \in [z]$  with  $p_i \in \{p(u, v, \lambda) \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$  (i.e.,  $T$  stops at most once inside any given edge),
- if  $T$  traverses an edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , there is no index  $i \in [z]$  with  $p_i \in \{p(u, v, \lambda) \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$  (i.e.,  $T$  does not stop inside traversed edges), and
- every edge  $uv \in E(G)$  is traversed at most twice by  $T$ .

We prove Lemma 3.1, which we restate here:

► **Lemma 3.1 (Nice Tours).** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph. Further, let a tour  $T$  in  $G$  be given. Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$ , such that,  $T'$  is either nice or has at most two stopping points, and if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

We prove Lemma 3.1 by showing how to transform any given tour lacking any of the niceness properties stated in Lemma 3.1 into one of shorter or equal length that has fewer stopping points. We do this for all niceness properties listed.

► **Proposition A.4.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  be a tour in  $G$  for some  $z \geq 3$  such that  $\{p_{i-1}, p_i\} \cap V(G) = \emptyset$  for some  $i \in [z]$ . Then we can compute in polynomial time a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and such that if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

**Proof.** By symmetry, we may suppose that there exists some  $k \geq 1$  such that  $p_0 \dots p_k$  is a segment of  $T$  that contains the maximum number of points among all those that are disjoint from  $V(G)$ . Hence there exist some  $u, v \in V(G)$  with  $uv \in E(G)$  and for all  $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$  a  $\lambda_i \in (0, 1)$  such that  $p_i = p(u, v, \lambda_i)$ .

First suppose that  $k = z$ ; that is, the entire tour is contained inside the edge  $uv$ . We now choose some  $i_1, i_2 \in [z]$  such that  $\lambda_{i_1} = \min\{\lambda_i : i \in [z]\}$  and  $\lambda_{i_2} = \max\{\lambda_i : i \in [z]\}$ . Let  $T' = p_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_1}$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we have  $\ell(T') = 2 d_G(p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}) \leq \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') = 2 < 3 \leq \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. If a point  $p \in P(G)$  is passed by  $T$ , then we have  $p = (u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$  and hence  $p$  is also passed by  $T'$ . It follows that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

Now suppose that  $k < z$ . As  $p_0 = p_z$  and by the maximality of  $k$ , we obtain that  $k < z - 1$ . By the choice of the segment  $p_0 \dots p_k$  and as  $T$  is a tour, we obtain that  $\{p_{z-1}, p_{k+1}\} \subseteq \{u, v\}$ .

First suppose that  $p_{z-1} = p_{k+1}$ , say  $p_{z-1} = p_{k+1} = u$ . We then choose some  $i_0 \in [k] \cup \{0\}$  such that  $\lambda_{i_0} = \max\{\lambda_i : i \in [z]\}$ . Now let  $T' = p_{i_0}p_{k+1} \dots p_{z-1}p_{i_0}$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we have  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') = z - k < z = \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . If a point  $p \in P(G)$  not on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then it clearly is also passed by  $T'$ . If a point  $p \in P(G)$  on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then either  $p$  is also passed by  $T'$  by construction or we have  $p = (u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{i_0}]$  and hence  $p$  is also passed by  $T'$ . It follows that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

Now suppose that  $\{p_{z-1}, p_{k+1}\} = \{u, v\}$ , say  $p_{z-1} = u$  and  $p_{k+1} = v$ . Let  $T' = p_{z-1}p_{k+1} \dots p_{z-1}$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we have  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') = z - (k + 1) < z = \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . If a point  $p \in P(G)$  which is not on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then it clearly is also passed by  $T'$ . If a point  $p \in P(G)$  on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then we have  $p = (u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  and hence  $p$  is also passed by  $T'$ . It follows that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

Note that applying Proposition A.4 repeatedly to a given tour yields a tour that is not longer but either contains at most two stopping points or satisfies the first niceness property.

► **Proposition A.5.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph, and  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  be a tour in  $G$  for some  $z \geq 3$  such that either there exists some  $i \in [z - 1]$  with  $p_i \notin V(G)$  and  $p_{i-1} \neq p_{i+1}$  or  $p_0 \notin V(G)$  and  $p_1 \neq p_{z-1}$ . Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and such that if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

**Proof.** By symmetry, we may suppose that  $p_0 \notin V(G)$  and  $p_1 \neq p_{z-1}$ . Further, by Proposition A.4, we may suppose that  $p_{z-1} = u, p_0 = p(u, v, \lambda)$ , and  $p_1 = v$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $T' = p_1 \dots p_{z-1}p_1$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we have  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') = \alpha(T) - 1 < \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. If a point  $p \in P(G)$  not on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then it clearly is also passed by  $T'$ . If a point  $p \in P(G)$  on  $uv$  is passed by  $T$ , then, as  $T'$  traverses  $uv$ , it is also passed by  $T'$ . It follows that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

We now show how to transform a tour into one with only two stopping points or one that has the third niceness property without increasing its length.

► **Proposition A.6.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  be a tour in  $G$  for some  $z \geq 3$  that stops at least twice in the interior of  $uv$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$ . Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$  and such that if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $uv \in E(G)$  and suppose, by symmetry, that there exist distinct  $i, j \in [z - 1]$  such that  $p_i = p(u, v, \lambda_1)$  and  $p_j = p(u, v, \lambda_2)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, 1)$ . By Propositions A.4 and A.5, we obtain that  $p_{i-1} = p_{i+1}, p_{j-1} = p_{j+1}$  and  $\{p_{i-1}, p_{j-1}\} \subseteq \{u, v\}$ .

First suppose that  $p_{i-1} = p_{j-1}$ , say  $T$  contains the two segments  $up(u, v, \lambda_1)u$  and  $up(u, v, \lambda_2)u$ . Further, by symmetry, we may suppose that  $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1$ . We now obtain  $T'$  by replacing the segment  $up(u, v, \lambda_1)u$  by  $u$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Next, we have  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and  $\ell(T') \leq \ell(T)$ . Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . As every point that is passed by  $T$  is also passed by  $T'$ , we obtain that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

It hence suffices to consider the case that  $p_{i-1} \neq p_{j-1}$ , say  $p_{i-1} = u$  and  $p_{j-1} = v$ . We obtain that  $T$  contains the segments  $up_iu$  and  $vp_jv$ . By the above argument, we have that  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  are the only points in the interior of  $uv$  that  $T$  stops at.

First suppose that  $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ . Then, let  $T'$  be obtained from replacing the segment  $up_i i$  by  $uvu$  and the segment  $vp_j v$  by  $v$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we have  $\ell(T') = \ell(T) - 2(\lambda_1 + (1 - \lambda_2)) + 2 < \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') \leq \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Observe that every point passed by  $T$  is also passed by  $T'$ , so  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour.

We may hence suppose that  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ . Now let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by replacing the segment  $up_i u$  by  $up(u, v, 1 - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))u$  and replacing the segment  $vp_j v$  by  $v$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. As  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)$ , we have that  $\ell(T') - \ell(T) = 2(1 - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)) - 2(\lambda_1 + (1 - \lambda_2)) = 0$ . Further, it holds  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. Let  $q_0 = p(u, v, \lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour and  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  are the only points in the interior of  $uv$  stopped at by  $T$ , we obtain that  $\delta \geq d_G(q_0, T) = \min\{d_G(q_0, p_i), d_G(q_0, p_j)\} = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)$ . In order to see that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, consider some  $q \in P(G)$  not passed by  $T'$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour and by Proposition A.3, there exists a point  $p$  stopped at by  $T$  with  $d_G(p, q) \leq \delta$ . If  $p \notin \{p_i, p_j\}$ , we obtain  $d_G(q, T') \leq d_G(q, p) \leq \delta$ . We may hence suppose that  $p \in \{p_i, p_j\}$ . Next, if  $q$  is not on  $uv$ , we obtain  $\delta \geq d_G(q, p) = \min\{d_G(q, u) + d_G(u, p), d_G(q, v) + d_G(v, p)\} \geq \min\{d_G(q, u), d_G(q, v)\} \geq d_G(q, T')$ . We may hence suppose that  $q = (u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . As  $q$  is not passed by  $T'$   $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)$  and construction, we obtain  $\lambda \geq 1 - 2\delta$ . This yields  $d_G(q, T') \leq \min\{d_G(q, p(u, v, 1 - 2\delta)), d_G(q, v)\} = \min\{\lambda - (1 - 2\delta), 1 - \lambda\} \leq \frac{1}{2}((\lambda - (1 - 2\delta)) + (1 - \lambda)) = \delta$ . Hence  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

► **Proposition A.7.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  be a tour in  $G$  that stops at an edge  $uv \in E(G)$  that it traverses. Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and  $\ell(T') < \ell(T)$  and such that if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

**Proof.** By Propositions A.4 and A.5 and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $T$  contains the segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $T'$  be obtained by replacing  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  by  $u$ . Clearly,  $T'$  can be computed in polynomial time. Further, we clearly have  $\ell(T') < \ell(T)$  and  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$ .

Now consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. As  $T$  traverses  $uv$ , so does  $T'$ . It follows that every point passed by  $T$  is also passed by  $T'$ . Hence  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. ◀

► **Proposition A.8.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  a tour in  $G$  that traverses an edge  $uv \in E(G)$  at least 3 times. Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T'$  in  $G$  with  $\alpha(T') < \alpha(T)$  and  $\ell(T') < \ell(T)$  and such that if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour for some  $\delta \geq 0$ , then so is  $T'$ .*

**Proof.** We create a multigraph  $H$  in the following way: We let  $V(H)$  consist of the points in  $P(G)$  which were stopped at at least once by  $T$  and we let  $E(H)$  contain an edge linking two points  $p, p' \in V(H)$  for every  $i \in [z]$  with  $\{p_{i-1}, p_i\} = \{p, p'\}$ . Observe that  $H$  can be computed in polynomial time. By construction,  $T$  is an Euler tour in  $H$ , so by Proposition A.1 and as  $H$  clearly does not contain isolated vertices, we have that  $H$  is Eulerian and connected. Further, by assumption and construction, we have that  $H$  contains at least three parallel edges linking  $u$  and  $v$ . Now let  $H'$  be obtained from  $H$  by deleting two of the edges linking  $u$  and  $v$ . We have  $\deg_{H'}(u) = \deg_H(u) - 2$ ,  $\deg_{H'}(v) = \deg_H(v) - 2$ , and  $\deg_{H'}(w) = \deg_H(w)$  for all  $w \in V(H) - \{u, v\}$ . Hence  $H'$  is Eulerian. Further, as  $H$  is connected, so is  $H'$ . It hence follows by Proposition A.1 that  $H'$  has an Euler tour  $T' = p'_0 \dots p'_{z-2}$  and  $T'$  can be

computed in polynomial time. Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \ell(T') &= \sum_{i \in [z-2]} d_G(p'_{i-1}, p'_i) \\
 &= \sum_{pp' \in E(H')} d_G(p, p') \\
 &< \sum_{pp' \in E(H)} d_G(p, p') \\
 &= \sum_{i \in [z]} d_G(p_{i-1}, p_i) \\
 &= \ell(T).
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have  $\alpha(T') = z - 2 < z = \alpha(T)$ .

Finally, consider some  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . We will show that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . First observe that  $T'$  is a tour in  $G$ . Let  $q \in P(G)$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , there exists some  $p^* \in P(G)$  that  $T$  passes and that satisfies  $d_G(q, p^*) \leq \delta$ . By construction, we obtain that  $T'$  also passes  $p^*$ . This yields  $d_G(q, T') \leq d_G(q, p^*) \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.1.

**Proof.** Let a tour  $T$  in  $G$  be given. As long as  $T$  is not nice, we can recursively apply one of Propositions A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, and A.8 and update  $T$ . In the end of this procedure, we obtain a tour  $T'$  which is either nice or contains at most two stopping points. Also, for any  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, we have that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. Further, in every iteration, the modifications can be executed in polynomial time. Finally, as the discrete length of the tour is decreased in every iteration, we obtain that the algorithm terminates after at most  $\alpha(T)$  iterations. ◀

### A.3 Characterization

In this section, we give a collection of results allowing to decide whether a given tour is actually a  $\delta$ -tour for a certain  $\delta$ . More precisely, we describe when a tour covers all points on a certain edge. The result is cut into three parts: one for the case that the tour stops at no vertex of the edge, one for the case that it stops at exactly one vertex of the edge and for the case that it stops at both vertices of the edge. In the following, we say that a tour  $\delta$ -covers an edge if it covers all the points on the edge. We speak about *covering* when  $\delta$  is clear from the context. We first deal with the case that the tour stops at no vertex of the edge.

► **Lemma A.9.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta \geq 0$  a real,  $T$  a tour in  $G$  and  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  such that  $T$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . Then  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$  if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i) *for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , there exist stopping points  $p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  of  $T$  with  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$  holds,*
- (ii)  *$T$  stops at points  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)$  and  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_2)$  for some  $\lambda_1 \in (0, \delta]$  and some  $\lambda_2 \in [1 - \delta, 1)$ .*

**Proof.** First suppose that (i) holds. Consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d_G(T, p) &\leq \min\{d_G(p, x_1) + d_G(x_1, T), d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, T)\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(d_G(p, x_1) + d_G(x_1, T) + d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, T)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(1 + d_G(x_1, p_1) + d_G(x_2, p_2)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(v_1, p_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + d_G(v_2, p_2)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(1 + d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + (1 - \lambda_1) + (1 - \lambda_2)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(3 + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 2\delta - 3) - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)) \\
&= \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $x_1x_2$  is covered by  $T$ .

Now suppose that (ii) holds. Consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_2$ , then, as  $T$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , we obtain that  $T$  passes  $p$ . Next suppose that  $\lambda < \lambda_1$ . Then we have  $d_G(p, T) \leq d_G(p, p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)) = \lambda_1 - \lambda \leq \lambda_1 \leq \delta$ . A similar argument shows that  $d_G(p, T) \leq \delta$  if  $\lambda > \lambda_2$ . It follows that  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ .

Now suppose that  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ . First suppose that  $T$  does not stop at any point on  $x_1x_2$  and for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  be a stopping point of  $T$  with  $d_G(p_i, x_i) = d_G(p_i, T)$ . As  $T$  visits none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , we may choose the labeling of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  such that  $\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} < 1$  holds. Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$ . Consider the point  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \frac{1}{2}(1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_1)))$ . By the choice of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  and as  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_1) &\geq 1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_2) \\
&\geq 1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - (d_G(x_1, x_2) + d_G(x_2, p_2)) \\
&= 1 - d_G(x_1, x_2) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_1) &\leq 1 + d_G(x_2, p_1) - d_G(x_1, p_1) \\
&\leq 1 + (d_G(x_1, p_1) + d_G(x_1, x_2)) - d_G(x_1, p_1) \\
&= 1 + d_G(x_1, x_2) \\
&= 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $p$  is well-defined.

As  $T$  stops at no point on  $x_1x_2$  and by assumption, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d_G(p, T) &= \min\{d_G(p, x_1) + d_G(x_1, T), d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, T)\} \\
&= \min\{(1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_1))/2 + d_G(x_1, p_1), \\
&\quad 1 - ((1 + d_G(x_2, p_2) - d_G(x_1, p_1)))/2 + d_G(x_2, p_2)\} \\
&= (1 + d_G(x_1, p_1) + d_G(x_2, p_2))/2 \\
&= (1 + (d_G(x_1, v_1) + 1 - \lambda_1) + (d_G(x_2, v_2) + 1 - \lambda_2))/2 \\
&= (3 + d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2))/2 \\
&> \delta,
\end{aligned}$$



a contradiction to  $p$  being covered by  $T$ . We hence obtain  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$  and so (i) holds.

Finally suppose that  $T$  stops at some point on  $x_1x_2$ . Let  $p_1 = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)$  and  $p_2 = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_2)$  be stopping points of  $T$  on  $x_1x_2$  which are chosen so that  $\lambda_1$  is minimized and  $\lambda_2$  is maximized. As  $T$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and  $T$  is a tour, we obtain that all stopping points of  $T$  are on  $x_1x_2$ . As  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ , this yields  $\delta \geq d_G(x_1, T) = d_G(x_1, p_2) = \lambda_1$ . A similar argument shows that  $\lambda_2 \leq 1 - \delta$ . Hence (ii) holds. ◀

We next deal with the case that the tour stops at exactly one vertex of the edge.

► **Lemma A.10.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta \geq 0$  a real,  $T$  a tour in  $G$  and  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  such that  $T$  stops at  $x_1$  but not at  $x_2$ . Then  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$  if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i) *There exist stopping points  $p_1 = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)$  and  $p_2 = p(x_2, \lambda_2)$  of  $T$  with  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$  and  $v \in N_G(x_2)$  such that  $d_G(x_2, p_2) = d_G(x_2, T)$  and  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 2 - 2\delta$  holds.*
- (ii)  *$T$  stops at the point  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ .*

**Proof.** First suppose that (i) holds. Consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ , then, as  $T$  does not stop at  $x_2$ , we have that  $T$  passes  $p$ . If  $\lambda > \lambda_1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_G(T, p) &\leq \min\{d_G(p, p_1), d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, p_2)\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(d_G(p, p_1) + d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, p_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}((\lambda - \lambda_1) + (1 - \lambda) + (1 - \lambda_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(2 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)) \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $x_1x_2$  is covered by  $T$ .

Next suppose that (ii) holds. Consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ , then, as  $T$  does not stop at  $x_2$ , we have that  $T$  passes  $p$ . If  $\lambda > \lambda_1$ , we have  $d_G(p, T) \leq d_G(p, p_1) = \lambda - \lambda_1 \leq 1 - \lambda \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ .

Now suppose that  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ . Let  $\lambda_1$  be the greatest real such that  $T$  stops at  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)$ . If  $\lambda_1 \geq 1 - \delta$ , then (ii) holds, so there is nothing to prove. We may hence suppose that  $\lambda_1 < 1 - \delta$ , so in particular  $\delta < 1$ . Now let  $p_2 = p(x_2, \lambda_2)$  be a point stopped at by  $T$  with  $d_G(x_2, p_2) = d_G(x_2, T)$ . If  $x_2 \notin \{u, v\}$ , we obtain  $d_G(x_2, T) = d_G(x_2, p_2) \geq 1 > \delta$ , a contradiction. We may hence suppose that  $u = x_2$ . If  $\lambda_2 < 1 - \delta$ , we have  $d_G(x_2, T) = d_G(x_2, p_2) = 1 - \lambda_2 > \delta$ , a contradiction to  $T$  covering  $x_1x_2$ . We may hence suppose that  $\lambda_2 > 1 - \delta$ . Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 2 - 2\delta$ . We now consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2))$ . Observe that  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \geq -\lambda_2 \geq -1$  and  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \leq (1 - \delta) - (1 - \delta) = 0$ , so  $p$  is well-defined and, by the choice of  $\lambda_1$ , we have that  $T$  does not pass  $p$ . Next, by assumption, we have  $d_G(p, p_1) = 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) - \lambda_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) > 1 - \frac{1}{2}(2 - 2\delta) = \delta$ . Further, by assumption, we have  $d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, p_2) = 1 - (1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)) + (1 - \lambda_2) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) > 1 - \frac{1}{2}(2 - 2\delta) = \delta$ . By construction and the choice of  $p_2$ , this yields  $d_G(p, T) = \min\{d_G(p, p_1), d_G(p, x_2) + d_G(x_2, p_2)\} > \delta$ . This contradicts  $T$  covering  $x_1x_2$ . We obtain that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 2 - 2\delta$ , so (i) holds. ◀

We finally handle the case that the tour stops at both vertices of the edge.

► **Lemma A.11.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta \geq 0$  a real,  $T$  a nice tour in  $G$  and  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  such that  $T$  stops at both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . Then  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$  if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i)  $T$  traverses  $x_1x_2$ ,
- (ii)  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , and
- (iii)  $T$  contains the segment  $x_1p(x_i, x_{3-i}, \lambda)x_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and some  $\lambda \geq 1 - 2\delta$ .

**Proof.** If (i) holds, then  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$  by construction. Next suppose that (ii) holds and let  $p = (x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . We obtain  $d_G(p, T) \leq \min\{d_G(p, x_1), d_G(p, x_2)\} = \min\{\lambda, 1 - \lambda\} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + (1 - \lambda)) = \frac{1}{2} \leq \delta$ . Finally suppose that (iii) holds. By symmetry, we may suppose that  $T$  contains the segment  $x_1p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)x_1$  for some  $\lambda \geq 1 - 2\delta$ . Consider  $p = (x_1, x_2, \lambda')$  for some  $\lambda' \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\lambda' < \lambda$ , then  $T$  passes  $p$ . If  $\lambda' \geq \lambda$ , we have  $d_G(p, T) \leq \min\{d_G(p, p(u, v, \lambda)), d_G(p, x_2)\} = \min\{\lambda' - \lambda, 1 - \lambda'\} \leq \frac{1}{2}((\lambda' - \lambda) + (1 - \lambda')) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda) \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ .

Now suppose that  $T$  covers  $x_1x_2$ . If  $T$  traverses  $x_1x_2$  or  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then (i) or (ii) holds, so there is nothing to prove. We may hence suppose that  $T$  does not traverse  $x_1x_2$  and  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ . If  $T$  does not stop at any point of the form  $p(x_i, x_{3-i}, \lambda)$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , then, as  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ , for  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \frac{1}{2})$ , we obtain  $d_G(p, T) = \min\{d_G(p, x_1), d_G(p, x_2)\} = \frac{1}{2} > \delta$ , a contradiction. Hence, as  $T$  is nice and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $T$  contains the subsequence  $x_1p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)x_1$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and  $T$  does not stop at any other points on  $x_1x_2$ . If  $\lambda < 1 - 2\delta$ , then consider  $p = p(x_1, x_2, \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda))$ . By construction, we have  $d_G(p, T) = \min\{d_G(p, p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)), d_G(p, x_2)\} = \min\{(\frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda)) - \lambda, 1 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda)\} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda) > \delta$ , a contradiction to  $T$  covering  $x_1x_2$ . It follows that (iii) holds. ◀

## A.4 Discretization

We now show that we can restrict ourselves to tours whose stopping points come from a small set of points. In particular, we aim to prove Lemma 3.2, which we restate below for convenience.

► **Lemma 3.2 (Discretization Lemma).** *For every  $\delta \geq 0$  and every connected graph  $G$ , there is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour that is either nice or contains at most two stopping points and such that each stopping point of the tour can be described as  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  with  $\lambda \in S_\delta$  where  $S_\delta = \{0, \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor, \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \lfloor \frac{1}{2} + \delta \rfloor, 2\delta - \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor\}$ .*

Again, we distinguish two domains of values for  $\delta$ . For the main proof, we need some polyhedral results related to the vertex cover polytope. Given a graph  $G$ , potentially containing loops, we consider the vertex cover LP of  $G$ :

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq 1 \text{ for all } e = uv \in E(G), \\ z_v \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } v \in V(G). \end{array} \quad (\diamond)$$

Observe that, if  $e$  is a loop at a vertex  $v$  of  $G$ , then the corresponding inequality is  $2z_v \geq 1$ . We use that there is a half-integral solution to the vertex-cover LP.

► **Proposition A.12 ([33]).** *For every graph  $G$ , there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v : v \in V(G))$  of  $(\diamond)$  with  $z_v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .*

We further consider the following LP for some graph  $G$  and some nonnegative constant  $\gamma$ :

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma \text{ for all } e = uv \in E(G), \\ z_u \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } u \in V(G). \end{array} \quad (\diamond\circ)$$

We next show that for all reasonable values of  $\gamma$  for which  $(\diamond\circ)$  has a solution, this LP has a feature similar to  $(\diamond)$ , namely that it has an optimal solution all of whose values come from a small set.

► **Proposition A.13.** *For every graph  $G$  and every  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v : v \in V(G))$  of  $(\diamond\circ)$  with  $z_v \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, \gamma\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $(z_v^1 : v \in V(G))$  be an optimal solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$  and let  $(z_v^2 : v \in V(G))$  be defined by  $z_v^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma}z_v^1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Observe that, as  $(z_v^1 : v \in V(G))$  is an optimal solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$ , we have  $z_v^1 \leq \gamma$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . This yields  $z_v^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma}z_v^1 \leq 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Further, we have  $z_u^2 + z_v^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma}z_u^1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}z_v^1 = \frac{1}{\gamma}(z_u^1 + z_v^1) \geq 1$ . Hence  $(z_v^2 : v \in V(G))$  is a feasible solution for  $(\diamond)$ .

Next, by Proposition A.12, there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v^3 : v \in V(G))$  for  $(\diamond)$  with  $z_v^3 \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Let  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  be defined by  $z_v^4 = \gamma z_v^3$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Observe that  $z_v^4 \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, \gamma\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Next, we have  $z_v^4 = \gamma z_v^3 \geq 0$  and  $z_v^4 = \gamma z_v^3 \leq \gamma \leq 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Finally, for every  $e = uv \in E(G)$ , we have  $z_u^4 + z_v^4 = \gamma z_u^3 + \gamma z_v^3 = \gamma(z_u^3 + z_v^3) \geq \gamma$ . Hence  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  is a feasible solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$ .

We further have  $\sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^4 = \gamma \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^3 \leq \gamma \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^2 = \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^1$ . Hence  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  is an optimal solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$ . ◀

► **Proposition A.14.** *For every graph  $G$  without isolated vertices and every  $\gamma \in (1, 2]$ , there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v : v \in V(G))$  of  $(\diamond\circ)$  with  $z_v \in \{\gamma - 1, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .*

**Proof.** If  $\gamma = 2$ , it is easy to see that the only feasible optimal solution is obtained by setting  $z_v = 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . We may hence suppose that  $\gamma < 2$ . Let  $(z_v^1 : v \in V(G))$  be an optimal solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$  and let  $(z_v^2 : v \in V(G))$  be defined by  $z_v^2 = \frac{z_v^1 - (\gamma - 1)}{2 - \gamma}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Observe that, as  $(z_v^1 : v \in V(G))$  is a feasible solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$  and  $G$  does not have any isolated vertex, every  $v \in V(G)$  is incident to an edge  $uv \in E(G)$ . Hence we have  $z_v^1 \geq \gamma - z_u^1 - 1 \geq \gamma - 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . This yields  $z_v^2 = \frac{z_v^1 - (\gamma - 1)}{2 - \gamma} \geq 0$ . We further have  $z_v^2 = \frac{z_v^1 - (\gamma - 1)}{2 - \gamma} \leq \frac{2 - \gamma}{2 - \gamma} = 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Finally, for every  $e = uv \in E(G)$ , we have  $z_u^2 + z_v^2 = \frac{z_u^1 + z_v^1 - 2(\gamma - 1)}{2 - \gamma} \geq \frac{\gamma - 2(\gamma - 1)}{2 - \gamma} \geq 1$ . Hence  $(z_v^2 : v \in V(G))$  is a feasible solution for  $(\diamond)$ .

Next, by Proposition A.12, there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v^3 : v \in V(G))$  for  $(\diamond)$  with  $z_v^3 \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Let  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  be defined by  $z_v^4 = (2 - \gamma)z_v^3 + (\gamma - 1)$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Observe that  $z_v^4 \in \{\gamma - 1, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Next, we have  $z_v^4 = (2 - \gamma)z_v^3 + (\gamma - 1) \geq 0$  and  $z_v^4 = (2 - \gamma)z_v^3 + (\gamma - 1) \leq (2 - \gamma) + (\gamma - 1) \leq 1$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Finally, for every  $e = uv \in E(G)$ , we have  $z_u^4 + z_v^4 = (2 - \gamma)(z_u^3 + z_v^3) + 2(\gamma - 1) \geq (2 - \gamma) + 2(\gamma - 1) = \gamma$ . Hence  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  is a feasible solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$ .

We further have  $\sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^4 = (2 - \gamma) \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^3 + (\gamma - 1)|V(G)| \leq (2 - \gamma) \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^2 + (\gamma - 1)|V(G)| = \sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v^1$ . Hence  $(z_v^4 : v \in V(G))$  is an optimal solution for  $(\diamond\circ)$ . ◀

We now extend this result to a somewhat more general polyhedron with two different kinds of equations. Namely, for two graphs  $G_1, G_2$  on a common vertex set  $V$  and some  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ , we define the following polyhedron.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma + 1 \text{ for all } e = uv \in E(G_1), \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma \text{ for all } e = uv \in E(G_2), \\ z_u \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } u \in V. \end{array} \quad (\clubsuit)$$

► **Lemma A.15.** *Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be graphs on a common vertex set  $V$  and let  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ . Then there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v : v \in V)$  of  $(\clubsuit)$  with  $z_v \in S_\gamma$  for all  $v \in V$  where  $S_\gamma = \{0, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, \gamma, \frac{1}{2}\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ .*

**Proof.** Clearly, we may suppose that every  $v \in V$  is incident to at least one edge in  $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$ . Let  $E'_2$  be the set of edges  $uv \in E(G_2)$  such that none of  $u$  and  $v$  is incident to an edge of  $E(G_1)$ . We next consider the following LP:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma + 1 \text{ for all } e = uv \in E(G_1), \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma \text{ for all } e = uv \in E'_2, \\ z_f \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } v \in V. \end{array} \quad (\clubsuit\clubsuit)$$

▷ **Claim A.16.** A vector  $(z_v : v \in V)$  is a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  if and only if it is a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit)$ .

**Proof.** As the constraints in  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  are a subset of the constraints in  $(\clubsuit)$ , a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit)$  is also feasible for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ . Now let  $(z_v : v \in V)$  be a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ . In order to show that  $(z_v : v \in V)$  is feasible for  $(\clubsuit)$ , it suffices to prove that  $z_u + z_v \geq \gamma$  holds for all  $uv \in E(G_2) - E'_2$ . Let  $uv \in E(G_2) - E'_2$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that  $u$  is incident to an edge in  $E(G_1)$ , so there exists some  $w \in V$  such that  $uw \in E(G_1)$ . As  $(z_v : v \in V)$  is feasible for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ , we obtain  $z_u + z_v \geq z_u \geq (\gamma + 1) - z_w \geq (\gamma + 1) - 1 = \gamma$ . ◁

In the following, we define  $V_1$  to be the vertices which are incident to at least one edge in  $E(G_1)$  and we set  $V_2 = V - V_1$ . We further consider the following two LPs.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V_1} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma + 1 \text{ for all } uv \in E(G_1), \\ z_v \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } v \in V_1. \end{array} \quad (\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } \sum_{v \in V_2} z_v, \text{ subject to the following:} \\ z_u + z_v \geq \gamma \text{ for all } uv \in E'_2, \\ z_v \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } v \in V_2. \end{array} \quad (\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$$

▷ **Claim A.17.** A vector  $(z_v : v \in V)$  is a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  if and only if  $(z_v : v \in V_1)$  is a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  and  $(z_v : v \in V_2)$  is a feasible solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ .

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of the fact that the constraints in  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  are exactly the constraints imposed on  $(z_v : v \in V_1)$  in  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  and the constraints in  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  are exactly the constraints imposed on  $(z_v : v \in V_2)$  in  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ . ◁

We are now ready to finish the proof of Lemma A.15. By Proposition A.14, there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v^* : v \in V_1)$  of  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  such that  $z_v^* \in \{\gamma, \frac{1}{2}\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  for all  $v \in V_1$ . By Proposition A.13, there exists an optimal solution  $(z_v^* : v \in V_2)$  of  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit)$  such that  $z_v^* \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\gamma, \gamma\}$  for all  $v \in V_2$ . By Claim A.17, we obtain that  $(z_v^* : v \in V)$  is an optimal solution for  $(\clubsuit\clubsuit)$ . Next, by Claim A.16, we obtain that  $(z_v^* : v \in V)$  is an optimal solution for  $(\clubsuit)$ . This finishes the proof. ◀

We are now ready to prove our main results. We first give the result for  $\delta \geq 1/2$ , relying on a connection to the vertex cover polytope. Given a graph  $G$  and a tour  $T$  in  $G$ , we use  $V_T$  for the set of vertices in  $V(G)$  that  $T$  stops at.

► **Lemma A.18.** *For every  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and every connected graph  $G$ , there exists a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  such that all stopping points of  $T$  are of the form  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  for some  $\lambda \in S'_\delta$  where  $S'_\delta = \{0, \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 1 - 2\delta), \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 1 - 2\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 2 - 2\delta)\}$ . Moreover, either  $\alpha(T) \leq 2$  or  $T$  is nice and for every stopping point of the form  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  of  $T$  with  $\lambda \in S'_\delta - \{0, 1\}$ , we have that  $T$  contains the segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $T_0$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Further, let  $k = \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor$ . For technical reasons, we need to distinguish two cases, the latter one of which is degenerate.

► **Case 1.**  $T_0$  stops at a vertex of  $V(G)$ .

By Lemma 3.1, we may suppose that  $T_0$  is nice. For  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $E_j$  be the set of edges  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  with  $d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) - k = j$ . Now consider some  $e = x_1x_2 \in E_0 \cup E_1$ . Further, for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  be a stopping point of  $T_0$  such that  $d_G(x_i, p_i) = d_G(x_i, T_0)$ . First suppose that  $T_0$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . By Lemma A.9, we may suppose that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$  hold and that  $T_0$  stops at none of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  by the choice of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ . We say that  $(f_1, f_2)$  is associated to  $e$  where  $f_i = u_i v_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Now suppose that  $T_0$  stops at exactly one of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , say  $x_1$ . We obtain by Lemma A.10 that one of (i) and (ii) of Lemma A.10 holds. First suppose that (i) holds, so  $T_0$  stops at some points  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda_1)$  and  $p(v, x_2, \lambda_2)$  with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 2 - 2\delta$ . We say that  $(f_1, f_2)$  is associated to  $e$  where  $f_1 = e$  and  $f_2 = vx_2$ . We use  $F$  for the set of edges contained in a pair associated to some  $e \in E_0 \cup E_1$  and for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ , we use  $F_j$  for the set of edges contained in a pair associated to some  $e \in E_j$ . Further, let  $F^*$  be the set of edges in  $E_0 \cup E_1$  exactly one of whose endpoints is stopped at by  $T_0$  and for which (ii) of Lemma A.10 holds. Observe that for every  $f \in F \cup F^*$ , exactly one of its vertices is contained in  $V_{T_0}$ . We now consider the following linear program. For some  $f = uv \in F \cup F^*$  with  $u \in V_{T_0}$ , we refer by  $\lambda_f$  to the largest value such that  $T_0$  stops  $(u, v, \lambda_f)$ . Observe that  $\lambda_f$  is uniquely defined as  $T_0$  is nice. We consider the following linear program.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{Minimize } \sum_{f \in F \cup F^*} z_f, \text{ subject to the following:} \\
2z_f \geq 2 - 2\delta \text{ if } f \in F^*, \\
z_{f_1} + z_{f_2} \geq k + 1 - 2\delta \text{ if } (f_1, f_2) \text{ is associated to some } e \in E_0, \\
z_{f_1} + z_{f_2} \geq k + 2 - 2\delta \text{ if } (f_1, f_2) \text{ is associated to some } e \in E_1, \\
z_f \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } f \in F \cup F^*.
\end{array} \tag{*}$$

▷ **Claim A.19.**  $(\lambda_f : f \in F)$  is a feasible solution for (\*).

*Proof.* By definition, we have  $\lambda_f \in [0, 1]$  for all  $f \in F$ . Now let  $(f_1, f_2)$  be a pair associated to some  $e \in E_j$  for some  $j \in \{0, 1\}$  with  $f_i = u_i v_i$  with  $u_i \in V_{T_0}$ . By the choice of  $(f_1, f_2)$ , we have  $\lambda_{f_1} + \lambda_{f_2} \geq d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta \geq d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) + 1 - 2\delta = (k + j + 1) - 2\delta$ . Finally, for every  $f \in F^*$ , we have  $z_f \geq 1 - \delta$  by definition. ◁

In the following, for every  $f = uv \in F \cup F^*$  with  $u \in V_{T_0}$ , let  $S_f$  be defined by  $up(u, v, \lambda_f)u$  if  $\lambda_f > 0$  and by  $S_f = u$  if  $\lambda_f = 0$ . Observe that  $S_f$  is a segment of  $T_0$  for all  $f \in F \cup F^*$  as  $T_0$  is nice. Now let  $z = (z_f : f \in F \cup F^*)$  be a vector in  $[0, 1]^{F \cup F^*}$ . We let  $S_f^z$  be defined by  $S_f^z = up(u, v, z_f)u$  if  $z_f > 0$  and by  $S_f^z = u$  if  $z_f = 0$ . We further let the tour  $T^z$  be the tour obtained from  $T_0$  by, for all  $f = uv \in F \cup F^*$  with  $u \in V_{T_0}$ , replacing the sequence  $S_f$  by  $S_f^z$ .

▷ **Claim A.20.** Let  $(z_f : f \in F \cup F^*)$  be a feasible solution for (\*). Then  $T^z$  is a nice  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

*Proof.* As  $T_0$  is nice and visits at most one vertex of every  $f \in F \cup F^*$  and by construction, we obtain that  $T^z$  is nice.

Let  $e = x_1 x_2 \in E(G)$ . First suppose that  $T_0$  stops at both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . Then  $T^z$  stops at both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . As  $T_0$  is nice, so is  $T^z$ . Hence, by Lemma A.11, we obtain that  $e$  is covered by  $T^z$ . We may hence in the following suppose that  $T_0$  stops at at most one of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . Let  $j = d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) - k$ .

First suppose that  $j \geq 2$ . As  $k \geq 0$ , we have  $d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) \geq 2$ , so in particular, we obtain that  $T_0$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  be stopping points of  $T_0$  with  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$ . We then have  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 2 \leq d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) - k < d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$ . By Lemma A.9, this contradicts  $T_0$  being a  $\delta$ -tour.

Now suppose that  $j \leq -1$ . If  $T_0$  stops at one of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , say  $x_1$ , we have  $k \geq d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) + 1 = 2$ . As  $k = \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor$ , we obtain that  $\delta \geq 1$  and hence  $0 \geq 1 - \delta$ . Since  $T^z$  stops at  $x_1$ , it follows that (ii) of Lemma A.10 holds, so  $e$  is covered by  $T^z$ . Now suppose that  $T_0$  stops at none of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $v_i \in V_{T_0}$  with  $d_G(v_i, x_i) = d_G(x_i, V_{T_0})$  and observe that  $T$  stops at  $v_i$ . Further, let  $w_i$  be the first vertex on a shortest  $v_i x_i$ -path in  $G$ . We have  $0 + 0 = 0 = d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) - (k + j) \geq d_G(x_1, w_1) + d_G(x_2, w_2) + 3 - k \geq d_G(x_1, w_1) + d_G(x_2, w_2) + 3 - 2\delta$ . As  $T^z$  stops at  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , it follows that  $e$  is covered by  $T^z$  by Lemma A.9.

We may hence suppose that  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $e \in F^*$ , we obtain  $z_e \geq 1 - \delta$ , so  $e$  is covered by  $T^z$  by Lemma A.10 (ii). Otherwise, let  $(f_1, f_2)$  be the pair associated to  $e$  such that  $f_i = u_i v_i$  with  $u_i \in V_{T_0}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . As  $(z_f : f \in F)$  is a feasible solution for (\*), we have  $z_{f_1} + z_{f_2} \geq k + j + 1 - 2\delta = d_G(x_1, V_{T_0}) + d_G(x_2, V_{T_0}) + 1 - 2\delta = d_G(x_1, v_1) + d_G(x_2, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$ . We now obtain that  $T^z$  is a  $\delta$ -tour by Lemmas A.9, A.10, and A.11. ◁

We are now ready to conclude Case 1. By Lemma A.15, there exists an optimal solution  $z^* = (z_f^* : f \in F \cup F^*)$  of  $(*)$  such that  $z_f^* \in S'_\delta$  for all  $f \in F \cup F^*$ . By Claim A.20, it follows that  $T^{z^*}$  is a nice  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . It then follows from Claim A.19 that  $T^{z^*}$  is a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

► **Case 2.**  $T_0$  does not stop at a vertex in  $V(G)$ .

As  $T_0$  is a nice tour, we obtain that  $T_0$  has at most two stopping points and there exists a unique edge  $uv \in E(G)$  such that all stopping points of  $T$  are on  $uv$ .

If  $\delta < 1$ , then for any  $w \in V(G) - \{u, v\}$ , we have  $d_G(w, T_0) > d_G(w, \{u, v\}) \geq 1 > \delta$ . It hence follows that  $V(G) = \{u, v\}$ . We obtain that the tour consisting of  $p(u, v, \frac{1}{2})$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  which is obviously a shortest one. In the following, we may hence suppose that  $\delta \geq 1$ .

For  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $E_j$  be the set of edges  $xy \in E(G)$  with  $d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k = j$ . Let  $\lambda_u$  be the largest real such that  $p_u = p(u, v, \lambda_u)$  is a stopping point of  $T_0$  and let  $\lambda_v$  be the largest real such that  $p_v = p(v, u, \lambda_v)$  is a stopping point of  $T_0$ . For every  $w \in V(G) - \{u, v\}$ , we define  $\alpha(w) = u$  if  $d_G(w, T_0) = d_G(w, p_u)$  and  $\alpha(w) = v$ , otherwise. We now consider the following linear program.

Minimize $z_u + z_v$ , subject to the following: $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq k + 1 - 2\delta$ for every $xy \in E_{-2}$ , $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq k + 2 - 2\delta$ for every $xy \in E_{-1}$ , $z_u, z_v \in [0, 1]$ .	(□)
---	-----

► **Claim A.21.**  $(\lambda_u, \lambda_v)$  is a feasible solution for (□).

Proof. By definition, we have  $\lambda_u, \lambda_v \in [0, 1]$ . Now consider some  $e = xy \in E_j$  for some  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ . By the definition of  $\alpha$  and Lemma A.9, we have  $\lambda_{\alpha(x)} + \lambda_{\alpha(y)} \geq d_G(x, \alpha(x)) + d_G(y, \alpha(y)) + 3 - 2\delta = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) + 3 - 2\delta = (k + j + 3) - 2\delta$ . ◁

► **Claim A.22.** Let  $(z_u, z_v)$  be a feasible solution for (□) with  $z_u + z_v \leq 1$ . Then the tour  $T$  consisting of  $p(u, v, z_u)$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

Proof. Let and  $z'_u = z_u$  and  $z'_v = 1 - z_u$ . Let  $xy \in E(G)$  and let  $j = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k$ . If  $T$  stops at one of  $x$  and  $y$ , we have that Lemma A.10 (ii) holds as  $0 \geq 1 - \delta$ . We may hence suppose that  $T$  stops at none of  $x$  and  $y$ . First suppose that  $j \geq 0$ . This yields  $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \leq 2 \leq j + 2 = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k + 2 < d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) + 3 - 2\delta$ , a contradiction to  $T_0$  being a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  by Lemma A.9. We may hence suppose that  $j \leq -1$ . If  $j \leq -3$ , we have  $z'_{\alpha(x)} + z'_{\alpha(y)} \geq z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq 0 + 0 = 0 \geq j + 3 = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k + 3 \geq d_G(x, \alpha(x)) + d_G(y, \alpha(y)) + 3 - 2\delta$ , so  $e$  is covered by  $T$  by Lemma A.9. We may hence suppose that  $j \in \{-2, -1\}$ .

As  $z$  is feasible for (□), we obtain  $z'_{\alpha(x)} + z'_{\alpha(y)} \geq z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq k + (j + 3) - 2\delta \geq d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) + 3 - 2\delta$ . It follows by Lemma A.9 that  $e$  is covered by  $T$ . ◁

► **Claim A.23.** Let  $(z_u, z_v)$  be a feasible solution for (□) with  $z_u + z_v \geq 1$ . Then the tour  $p(u, v, z_u)p(v, u, z_v)p(u, v, z_u)$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

Proof. Let  $xy \in E(G)$  and let  $j = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k$ . If  $T$  stops at one of  $x$  and  $y$ , we have that Lemma A.10 (ii) holds as  $0 \geq 1 - \delta$ . We may hence suppose that  $T$  stops at none of  $x$  and  $y$ . First suppose that  $j \geq 0$ . This yields  $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \leq 2 \leq j + 2 = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k + 2 < d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) + 3 - 2\delta$ , a contradiction to  $T_0$  being a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  by Lemma A.9. We may hence suppose that  $j \leq -1$ .

If  $j \leq -3$ , we have  $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq 0 + 0 = 0 \geq j + 3 = d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) - k + 3 \geq d_G(x_1, \alpha(x)) + d_G(y, \alpha(y)) + 3 - 2\delta$ , so  $e$  is covered by  $T$  by Lemma A.9. We may hence suppose that  $j \in \{-2, -1\}$ .

As  $z$  is feasible for  $(\square)$ , we obtain  $z_{\alpha(x)} + z_{\alpha(y)} \geq k + (j + 3) - 2\delta \geq d_G(x, \{u, v\}) + d_G(y, \{u, v\}) + 3 - 2\delta$ . It follows that  $e$  is covered by  $T$ .  $\triangleleft$

We are now ready to finish the proof of Case 2. By Lemma A.15, we have that there exists an optimal solution  $z^* = (z_u^*, z_v^*)$  of  $(\square)$  with  $z_u^*, z_v^* \in S'_\delta$ . If  $z_u^* + z_v^* \leq 1$ , let  $T^*$  be the tour consisting of  $p(u, v, z_u^*)$ . By Claim A.22, it follows that  $T^*$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Clearly, it follows that  $T^*$  is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

If  $z_u^* + z_v^* > 1$ , let  $T^* = p(u, v, z_u^*)p(v, u, z_v^*)p(u, v, z_u^*)$ . By Claim A.23, we obtain that  $T^*$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . It follows by Claim A.21 that  $T^*$  is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

We finally give a somewhat stronger result for  $\delta < 1/2$ . Its proof is elementary.

► **Lemma A.24.** *Let  $\delta \in [0, 1/2]$  and let  $G$  be a connected graph. Then there is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  that either consists of only two stopping points or is nice and such that for every  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$ , one of the following holds:*

(a)  $V(G) = \{x_1, x_2\}$  and

$$T = \begin{cases} p(x_1, x_2, \delta)p(x_1, x_2, 1 - \delta)p(x_1, x_2, \delta), & \text{if } \delta < \frac{1}{2} \\ p(x_1, x_2, \frac{1}{2}), & \text{if } \delta = \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

(b)  $\deg(x_i) = 1$  and  $\deg(x_{3-i}) \geq 2$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and  $T$  contains the tour segment  $x_{3-i}p(x_{3-i}, x_i, 1 - \delta)x_{3-i}$  and does not stop at any other points on  $x_1x_2$ ,

(c)  $\min\{\deg(x_1), \deg(x_2)\} \geq 2$  and  $T$  traverses  $x_1x_2$ ,

(d)  $\min\{\deg(x_1), \deg(x_2)\} \geq 2$  and  $T$  contains the two tour segments  $x_{3-i}$  and ( $\delta$ -dependent)  $\begin{cases} x_i p(x_i, x_{3-i}, 1 - 2\delta)x_i, & \text{if } \delta < \frac{1}{2} \\ x_i, & \text{if } \delta = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$ , and  $T$  does not stop at any other points on  $x_1x_2$ .

**Proof.** First suppose that  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  that consists of at most two stopping points. It follows directly from Lemmas A.10 and A.11 and the fact that  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$  that  $E(G)$  consists of a single edge  $uv$ . It is easy to see that (a) holds for this edge when  $T$  is a shortest tour.

We may hence suppose that every  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  consists of at least 3 stopping points. Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. It follows that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ . Among all nice shortest tours of  $G$ , we choose  $T$  to be one which minimizes the number of edges for which none of (a), (b), (c), and (d) hold. We will show that one of (a), (b), (c), and (d) holds for  $T$  for every edge in  $E(G)$ .

First consider an edge  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  with  $\deg(x_1) = 1$  and  $\deg(x_2) \geq 2$ . By Lemma A.9 and as  $T$  is a tour, we obtain that  $T$  stops at  $x_2$ . We obtain, as  $\deg(x_1) = 1$  and as  $T$  is nice tour that Lemma A.10 (ii) with  $i = 2$  holds for  $x_1x_2$ . Hence  $T$  contains the segment  $x_2p(x_2, x_1, \lambda)x_2$  for some  $\lambda \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ . If  $\lambda > 1 - \delta$ , let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by replacing  $p(x_2, x_1, \lambda)$  by  $p(x_2, x_1, 1 - \delta)$ . It follows that  $x_1x_2$  satisfies Lemma A.10 (ii) for  $T'$ . Further, clearly every  $e \in E(G) - x_1x_2$  satisfies one of (a), (b), (c), and (d) for  $T'$ . As  $T$  is nice, so is  $T'$ . It follows by Lemma A.11 that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . As  $\ell(T') < \ell(T)$ , we obtain a contradiction to the choice of  $T$ .

Next suppose for the sake of a contradiction that there exists some  $x \in V(G)$  with  $\deg_G(x) \geq 2$  that is not stopped at by  $T$ . Let  $Y = N_G(x)$ . By the above, we obtain that  $\deg_G(y) \geq 2$  for all  $y \in Y$ . We obtain by Lemma A.10 that  $yx$  satisfies one of (i) and (ii) for  $T$  for all  $y \in Y$ . This yields that  $T$  contains the segment  $yp_yy$  for every  $y \in Y$  where



$p_y = p(y, x, \lambda_y)$  for some  $\lambda_y \in (0, 1)$ . We now choose  $y_1 \in Y$  such that  $\lambda_{y_1} = \max\{\lambda_y : y \in Y\}$  and some arbitrary  $y_2 \in Y - y_1$ . Observe that  $y_2$  is well-defined as  $\deg(x) \geq 2$ . If  $y_2x$  satisfies (i) for  $T$ , we obtain that  $\lambda_{y_1} + \lambda_{y_2} \geq 2 - 2\delta$  by the choice of  $y_1$ . If  $y_2x$  satisfies (ii) for  $T$ , by the choice of  $y_1$ , we obtain  $\lambda_{y_1} \geq \lambda_{y_2} \geq 1 - \delta$ . In either case, we have  $\lambda_{y_1} + \lambda_{y_2} \geq 2 - 2\delta$ . Now let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by replacing  $p_{y_1}$  by  $x$  and replacing  $p_{y_2}$  by  $p(y_2, x, 1 - 2\delta)$  if  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and by  $y_2$  if  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ . Observe that  $xy_1$  satisfies Lemma A.11 (i) for  $T'$  and  $xy_2$  satisfies Lemma A.11 (ii) or (iii) for  $T'$ . Now consider some  $y_3 \in Y - \{y_1, y_2\}$ . If  $y_3x$  satisfies Lemma A.10 (ii) for  $T$ , we have  $\lambda_{y_3} \geq 1 - \delta \geq 1 - 2\delta$ . If  $y_3x$  satisfies Lemma A.10 (i) for  $T$ , by the choice of  $y_1$  and  $\lambda_{y_1} < 1$ , we have  $\lambda_{y_3} \geq 2 - 2\delta - \lambda_{y_1} \geq 1 - 2\delta$ . This yields that  $y_3x$  satisfies Lemma A.11 (iii) for  $T'$ . Finally, clearly any  $e \in E(G)$  which is not incident to  $x$  is covered by  $T'$ . Further, as  $T$  is nice, so is  $T'$ . It hence follows by Lemma A.11 that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Further, we have  $\ell(T') - \ell(T) = 2(1 - \lambda_{y_1}) - 2(\lambda_{y_2} - (1 - 2\delta)) = 2(2 - 2\delta - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)) \leq 0$ , so  $T'$  is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. Finally,  $y_1x$  satisfies (b) for  $T'$  and none of (a), (b), (c), and (d) for  $T$ . As every  $e \in E(G)$  that satisfies one of (a), (b), (c), and (d) for  $T$ , also satisfies one of (a), (b), (c), and (d) for  $T'$ , we obtain a contradiction to the choice of  $T$ . Hence  $T$  stops at every  $x \in V(G)$  with  $\deg(x) \geq 2$ .

In particular, by Lemma A.11, every  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  with  $\min\{\deg(x_1), \deg(x_2)\} \geq 2$  satisfies (i), (ii) or (iii). Consider some  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$  with  $\min\{\deg(x_1), \deg(x_2)\} \geq 2$ . If  $x_1x_2$  satisfies (i), it also satisfies (c), so there is nothing to prove. If  $x_1x_2$  satisfies (ii) and not (iii), then, as  $T$  is nice, we obtain that  $T$  stops at  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and at no other points on  $x_1x_2$ . Then (d) holds. We may hence suppose that  $x_1x_2$  satisfies (iii). By symmetry, we may suppose that  $T$  contains the segments  $x_1p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)x_1$  for some  $\lambda \in [1 - 2\delta, 1)$  and  $x_2$ . If  $\lambda > 1 - 2\delta$ , then let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by replacing  $p(x_1, x_2, \lambda)$  by  $p(x_1, x_2, 1 - 2\delta)$ . Clearly,  $x_1x_2$  satisfies Lemma A.11 (iii). Further, as  $T$  is nice, so is  $T'$ . Hence, as  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour and by Lemma A.11, we have that  $T'$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . As  $\ell(T') < \ell(T)$ , we obtain a contradiction to the choice of  $T$ . It hence follows that  $\lambda = 1 - 2\delta$  and so  $x_1x_2$  satisfies (c).

We hence obtain that every  $e \in E(G)$  satisfies one of (a), (b), (c), and (d) and so the statement holds for  $T$ . ◀

We are now ready to conclude Lemma 3.2.

**Proof.** (of Lemma 3.2) Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $\delta \geq 0$  a constant. Further, let  $S_{G,\delta}$  be the set of points that can be expressed as  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda \in S_\delta$ . It suffices to prove that there exists a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  all of whose stopping points are in  $S_{G,\delta}$ .

First suppose that  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . It follows from Lemma A.18 that there exists a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  that is either nice or contains at most two stopping points and such that all stopping points of  $T$  can be expressed in the form  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda \in S'_\delta$ .

Let  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  be a stopping point of  $T$  with  $\lambda \in S'_\delta$ . If  $\lambda = 0$ , we clearly have  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . If  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 1 - 2\delta)$  and  $\delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \frac{1}{2}\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \lfloor \delta + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . If  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 1 - 2\delta)$  and  $\delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - \frac{1}{2}\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - (\lfloor \delta \rfloor + \frac{1}{2}) = \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ .

If  $\lambda = \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 1 - 2\delta$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = 2\delta - \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ .

If  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 2 - 2\delta)$  and  $\delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = \delta - \frac{1}{2}\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . If  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor + 2 - 2\delta)$  and  $\delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = \delta - \frac{1}{2}\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = \delta - (\lfloor \delta \rfloor + \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - (\lfloor \delta \rfloor + 1) = \frac{1}{2} + \delta - (\lfloor \delta + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor)$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ .

Now suppose that  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ . It follows from Lemma A.24 that there exists a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  that is either nice or contains at most 2 stopping points and such that all stopping points of  $T$  can be expressed in the form  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda \in \{\delta, 1 - \delta, 1 - 2\delta\}$ .

Let  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  be a stopping point of  $T$  with  $\lambda \in S'_\delta$ . If  $\lambda = \delta$ , we have  $\lambda = \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . If  $\lambda = 1 - \delta$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = \delta - \lfloor \delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . If  $\lambda = 1 - 2\delta$ , we have  $1 - \lambda = 2\delta = 2\delta - \lfloor 2\delta \rfloor$ , so  $p \in S_{G,\delta}$ . ◀

## A.5 Immediate Consequences

In this section, we conclude Appendix A with a couple of useful algorithmic corollaries. The following result is an immediate consequence of Lemmas A.9, A.10, Lemma 3.1 and A.11.

► **Corollary A.25.** *Given a graph  $G$ , a constant  $\delta$  and a tour  $T$  in  $G$ , we can decide in polynomial time whether  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour.*

We further obtain the following result.

► **Corollary A.26.** *Given a graph  $G$  and a constant  $\delta > 0$ , there exists an algorithm that computes a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  and runs in  $f(n)$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.2, it suffices to consider tours all of whose stopping points are contained in  $S_{G,\delta}$  where  $S_{G,\delta} = \{p(u, v, \lambda) : uv \in E(G), \lambda \in S_\delta\}$ . As a nice tour traverses every edge at most twice and stops at every point at most once, we obtain that it stops at most  $\alpha(T) \leq \alpha n^2$  times for an absolute constant  $\alpha$ . We now enumerate all possible sequences of points in  $S_{G,\delta}$  of length at most  $\alpha n^2$ . For each of these sequences, we first check whether it is a tour which is clearly possible in linear time. We next check whether it is a  $\delta$ -tour which is possible by Corollary A.25. If this is the case, we compute its length. We output the shortest  $\delta$ -tour we obtain during this procedure, which is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. ◀

## B Approximation Algorithms

In this section, we deal with finding approximation algorithms for shortest  $\delta$ -tours. The behavior of this problem is strongly influenced by the range  $\delta$  comes from.

The simplest case is when  $\delta = 0$ .

For a 0-tour  $T$  of a connected graph  $G$ , we have  $d(p, P(T)) = 0$  for every  $p \in P(G)$ . That is,  $P(T) = P(G)$ . Such a tour is equivalent to

a Chinese Postman tour, which is a closed walk in  $G$  traversing every edge at least once, of the same length. Since a shortest Chinese Postman tour can be found in polynomial time (see, e.g., [11]), the 0-tour problem is also polynomial-time solvable.

► **Observation B.1.** *A graph has a Chinese Postman tour of length  $L$  if and only if it has a 0-tour of length  $L$ .*

**Proof.** The forward direction is immediate; a Chinese Postman tour given by a sequence  $T_{CP} = v_1 \dots v_{L+1}v_1$  of adjacent vertices traversing every edge is a 0-tour of the same length.

Conversely, it follows directly from Lemma A.24 that there exists a shortest 0-tour that is a Chinese Postman tour. ◀

For any  $\delta > 0$ , the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR unfortunately becomes NP-hard and even APX-hard as we later show in Appendix C. We, therefore, resort to the design of approximation algorithms for each  $\delta > 0$ .

We consider the ranges in increasing order. More concretely, in Sections B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4 and B.5, we consider the cases  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ ,  $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta = 1/2$ ,  $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$ , and  $\delta \in [33/40, 3/2)$ , respectively. The remaining part of this section is dedicated to dealing with large  $\delta$ . In Section B.6, we give the construction of an auxiliary graph which will be helpful

for this purpose. We exploit this in Section B.6.1, where we give an approximation result for fixed, large  $\delta$  and in Section B.6.2, where we deal with the case that  $\delta$  is part of the input.

### B.1 Covering Range $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$

We start with the smallest covering range, that is,  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ . It turns out that in this range, a shortest Chinese Postman Tour is a good approximation of a  $\delta$ -tour. That is, our algorithm consists of computing a shortest Chinese Postman tour. Intuitively speaking, for this small  $\delta$ , there exists a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour that stops at every vertex and passes large parts of every edge. We can hence show that a shortest Chinese Postman Tour is only larger by small factor than such a  $\delta$ -tour. Observe that the approximation ratio of our algorithm approaches 1 when  $\delta$  goes to 0. More precisely, we prove Theorem B.1, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.3.** *For every  $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $1/(1-2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph. By Corollary A.26, we may suppose that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ . We compute and output a shortest Chinese Postman Tour  $T_{\text{CP}}$  of  $G$ . This is possible in polynomial time, see for example [9]. Let  $\text{OPT}_{\text{CP}}$  be the length of  $T_{\text{CP}}$ , and let  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  be the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour.

By definition,  $T_{\text{CP}}$  traverses every edge and hence is a  $\delta$ -tour. It remains to bound its length.

By Lemma A.24 and as  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ , there is a minimum length nice  $\delta$ -tour  $T = p_0 p_1 \dots p_z$  which, for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , either traverses  $uv$  or contains the segment  $u'p(u', v, \lambda)u'$

for some  $u', v'$  with  $\{u', v'\} = \{u, v\}$  and some  $\lambda \geq 1 - 2\delta$ . It follows that the extension  $[T]$  of  $T$  is a Chinese Postman tour and that  $\ell([T]) \leq \frac{1}{1-2\delta} \ell(T_{\text{CP}})$  holds. Hence  $\ell(T_{\text{CP}}) = \text{OPT}_{\text{CP}} \leq \ell([T]) \leq \ell(T)/(1-2\delta) = \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}/(1-2\delta)$ . ◀

### B.2 Covering Range $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$

We next consider the case that  $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ . It turns out that if  $\delta$  is in this range, we can benefit from a close connection to a deeply studied related algorithmic problem, namely METRICTSP (where TSP stand for Traveling Salesman Problem). Formally, this problem can be defined as follows. Given a weighted graph  $(H, w)$  and a tour  $T = p_0 \dots p_z$  in  $H$  such that  $p_i \in V(H)$  for all  $i \in [z]$ , we define  $\ell(T) = \sum_{i \in [z]} w(p_{i-1} p_i)$ . We acknowledge that

#### ■ Optimization Problem METRICTSP

**Instance** A connected graph  $H$  with a weight function  $w : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ .

**Solution** Any tour in  $H$  stopping at all vertices of  $V(H)$ .

**Goal** Minimize the total weight of such a the tour.

METRICTSP is often defined in a slightly different form where  $H$  is restricted to be complete,  $w$  is required to be metric and a Hamiltonian cycle is sought rather than an arbitrary tour stopping at all vertices. However, both versions are easily seen to be equivalent and so we use the above version which is more convenient for our purpose.

We heavily rely on a well-known result of Christofides stating the existence of 1.5-approximation algorithm for metric TSP. We use the following more formal restatement of the result of Christofides.

► **Lemma B.2** ([4, 5]). *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a TSP tour  $T$  of a given weighted connected graph  $(H, w)$  such that  $\ell(T) \leq 1.5 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  is the length of a shortest TSP tour of  $(H, w)$ .*

We are now ready to describe our algorithm which is based on a reduction to an instance of METRICTSP and applying Lemma B.2. Some results from Section A will be convenient in the analysis of the quality of the algorithm. Formally, we prove Theorem 3.4, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.4.** *For every  $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $3/2$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** Let a connected graph  $G$  and  $\delta \in (\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$  be given. By Corollary A.26, we may suppose that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ . Let  $V_1$  be the vertices  $v \in V(G)$  with  $d_G(v) = 1$  and let  $V_{\geq 2} = V(G) - V_1$ . We now construct an auxiliary weighted graph  $(H, w)$ . First, we let  $V(H)$  contain  $V_{\geq 2}$ . Next, for every  $uv \in E(G)$  with  $u \in V_{\geq 2}$  and  $v \in V_1$ , we let  $V(H)$  contain the point  $p(u, v, 1 - \delta)$  and we let  $E(H)$  contain the edge  $up(u, v, 1 - \delta)$ . For the remaining description of  $H$ , we need to make a finer distinction of the range  $\delta$  comes from. First suppose that  $\delta < \frac{1}{4}$ . For every  $uv \in E(G)$  with  $\{u, v\} \subseteq V_{\geq 2}$ , we let  $V(H)$  contain  $p(u, v, 2\delta)$  and  $p(v, u, 2\delta)$  and we let  $E(H)$  contain  $up(u, v, 2\delta)$ ,  $p(u, v, 2\delta)p(v, u, 2\delta)$ , and  $p(v, u, 2\delta)v$ . Now suppose that  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$  and let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_q\}$  be an arbitrary ordering of  $V_{\geq 2}$ . For every  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $i < j$  and  $v_i v_j \in E(G)$ , we let  $V(H)$  contain  $p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)$  and we let  $E(H)$  contain  $v_i p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)$  and  $p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)v_j$ . Finally, we define  $w : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by  $w(pp') = d_G(p, p')$  for all  $pp' \in E(H)$ . This finishes the description of  $(H, w)$ .

The tight relationship between  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  and TSP-tours in  $H$  is described in the following two claims.

▷ **Claim B.3.** Let  $T$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Then there exists a TSP-tour  $T_0$  in  $H$  with  $\ell(T_0) \leq \ell(T)$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma A.24 and the assumption that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ , we may suppose that one of Lemma A.24(b), (c), and (d) holds for every  $uv \in E(G)$  for  $T$ , so in particular  $T$  is nice. We now obtain a tour  $T_0$  from  $T$  in the following way. If  $\delta < \frac{1}{4}$ , for all edges  $uv \in E(G)$  for which (c) holds, we replace all segments  $uv$  and  $vu$  of  $T$  by  $up(u, v, 2\delta)p(v, u, 2\delta)v$  and  $vp(v, u, 2\delta)p(u, v, 2\delta)u$ , respectively. If  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$ , for all edges  $v_i v_j \in E(G)$  with  $i < j$  for which (c) holds, we replace all segments  $v_i v_j$  and  $v_j v_i$  of  $T$  by  $v_i p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)v_j$  and  $v_j p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)v_i$ , respectively. If  $\delta < \frac{1}{4}$  and (d) holds for an edge  $uv$  of  $G$ , say  $T$  contains the segment  $up(v, u, 2\delta)u$ , we replace the segment  $up(v, u, 2\delta)u$  by  $up(u, v, 2\delta)p(v, u, 2\delta)p(u, v, 2\delta)u$ . Finally, if  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$  and for some  $v_i v_j \in E(G)$  with  $i < j$ , (d) holds and  $T$  contains the segments  $v_i p(v_j, v_i, 2\delta)v_i$  and  $v_j$ , then we replace these segments by  $v_i$  and  $v_j p(v_i, v_j, 2\delta)v_j$ , respectively. This finishes the description of  $T_0$ . By construction, we have  $\ell(T_0) = \ell(T)$ . Observe that, as  $T$  is nice, so is  $T_0$ . Further, by Lemmas A.10 and A.11 and construction, we obtain that  $T_0$  is a TSP-tour in  $H$ . ◁

▷ **Claim B.4.** Let  $T_0$  be TSP-tour in  $H$ . Then  $T_0$  is a  $\delta$ -tour of the same length in  $G$ .

**Proof.** It follows directly by construction that  $T_0$  is a tour of the same length in  $G$ . In order to see that  $T_0$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , it suffices to prove that for every  $p \in P(G)$  which is not passed by  $T$ , there exists some  $q \in V(H)$  with  $d_G(p, q) \leq \delta$ . First suppose that  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $u \in V_{\geq 2}$  and  $v \in V_1$  with  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . As  $\deg_H(p(u, v, 1 - \delta)) = 1$ , we obtain that  $T_0$  contains the segment  $up(u, v, 1 - \delta)u$ . Hence, as  $p$  is not passed by  $T_0$ , it follows that  $\lambda > 1 - \delta$ . Therefore,  $d_G(p, p(u, v, 1 - \delta)) \leq \delta$  holds. Now suppose that

$p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $u, v \in V_{\geq 2}$  with  $uv \in E(G)$ . First suppose that  $\delta < \frac{1}{4}$ . If  $\lambda \leq \delta$ , we have  $d_G(p, u) \leq \delta$ . If  $\lambda \in (\delta, \frac{1}{2})$ , as  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{6}$ , we have  $d_G(p, p(u, v, 2\delta)) \leq \delta$ . If  $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \delta)$ , as  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{6}$ , we have  $d_G(p, p(v, u, 2\delta)) \leq \delta$ . If  $\lambda \geq 1 - \delta$ , we have  $d_G(p, v) \leq \delta$ . Now suppose that  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$ . By symmetry we may suppose that  $u = v_i$  and  $v = v_j$  for some  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $i < j$ . If  $\lambda \leq \delta$ , we have  $d_G(p, u) \leq \delta$ . If  $\lambda \geq \delta$  and  $\lambda \leq 1 - \delta$ , as  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}$ , we have  $d_G(p, p(u, v, 2\delta)) \leq \delta$ . Finally, if  $\lambda \geq 1 - \delta$ , we have  $d_G(p, v) \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T_0$  is a  $\delta$ -tour.  $\triangleleft$

We are now ready to conclude Theorem 3.4. Let  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  be the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . By Lemma B.2, in polynomial time, we can compute a TSP tour  $T$  of  $H$  such that  $\ell(T) \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  is the length of a shortest TSP tour of  $(H, w)$ . By Claim B.4, we have that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Moreover, by Claim B.3, we have  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}} \leq \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ . This yields  $\ell(T) \leq \frac{3}{2} \text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}} \leq \frac{3}{2} \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

### B.3 Covering Range $\delta = 1/2$

In this section, we show that for  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ , we can give an approximation algorithm with a slightly better bound. This is due to an approximation result on a more restricted version of METRICTSP. Namely, we denote by *Graphic TSP* the restriction of METRICTSP to instances  $(H, w)$  in which  $w$  is the unit weight function. Throughout this section, when we speak of a TSP tour of a certain length, we refer to the unit weight functions. We rely on the following result of Sebő and Vygen.

► **Lemma B.5** ([37]). *There is a P-time algorithm that computes a TSP tour  $T$  of a given connected graph  $H$  such that  $\ell(T) \leq 1.4 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  is the length of a shortest TSP tour of  $H$ .*

We are now ready to give an approximation algorithm for  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour which attains the same approximation ratio as the algorithm in Lemma B.5. More formally, we prove Theorem 3.5, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.5.** *1/2-TOUR admits a 1.4-approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph. By Corollary A.26, we may suppose that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$ . We denote by  $V_1$  the set of vertices  $v \in V(G)$  with  $d_G(v) = 1$  and we use  $V_{\geq 2} = V(G) - V_1$ . Further, we set  $H = G[V_{\geq 2}]$ . The idea of our proof is that every  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$  consists of a TSP tour in  $H$  together with some detours for the vertices in  $V_1$ . We can efficiently approximate the first part by Lemma B.5 while the detours result in an additive constant. In the following two claims, this relation is proven more formally.

▷ **Claim B.6.** Let  $T$  be a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ . Then there exists a TSP-tour  $T_0$  in  $H$  with  $\ell(T_0) = \ell(T) - |V_1|$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma A.24, we may suppose that  $T$  stops at every vertex in  $V_{\geq 2}$  and that for every  $v \in V_1$ , we have that  $T$  contains the segment  $x_v p(x_v, v, \frac{1}{2}) x_v$  where  $x_v$  is the unique neighbor of  $v$  in  $G$ . We now obtain  $T_0$  from  $T$  by recursively replacing the segment  $x_v p(x_v, v, \frac{1}{2}) x_v$  by  $x_v$  for all  $v \in V_1$ . As  $T$  stops at every vertex of  $V_{\geq 2}$ , we obtain that  $T_0$  is a TSP tour in  $H$ . Further, by construction, we have  $\ell(T_0) = \ell(T) - |V_1|$ .  $\triangleleft$

▷ **Claim B.7.** Let a TSP tour  $T_0$  in  $H$  be given. Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$  with  $\ell(T) = \ell(T_0) + |V_1|$ .

*Proof.* Clearly, we may suppose that all stopping points of  $T_0$  are vertices in  $V(G)$ . For every  $v \in V_1$ , let  $x_v$  be the unique neighbor of  $v$  in  $G$ . As  $T_0$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $H$ , we know that  $T_0$  stops at  $x_v$  for all  $v \in V_1$ . We now obtain  $T$  from  $T_0$  by, for every  $v \in V_1$  choosing an arbitrary occurrence of  $x_v$  and replacing it by  $x_v p(x_v, v, \frac{1}{2})x_v$ . We do this recursively for an arbitrary ordering of  $V_1$ . Clearly,  $T$  can be computed in polynomial time given  $T_0$ . Further, as all stopping points of  $T_0$  are in  $V(G)$ , we obtain that  $T$  is nice. It follows from Lemmas A.10 and A.11 that  $T$  is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ . Further, we clearly have  $\ell(T) = \ell(T_0) + |V_1|$ .  $\triangleleft$

We are now ready to conclude Theorem 3.5. First, by Lemma B.5, we can compute a TSP tour  $T_0$  in  $H$  which satisfies  $\ell(T_0) \leq \frac{7}{5}\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  where  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}}$  is the length of a shortest TSP tour in  $H$ . Then by Claim B.7, in polynomial time, we can compute a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$  which satisfies  $\ell(T) = \ell(T_0) + |V_1|$ . Finally, by Claim B.6, we have  $\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}} \leq \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}} - |V_1|$  where  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  is the length of a shortest  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ . We obtain  $\ell(T) = \ell(T_0) + |V_1| \leq \frac{7}{5}\text{OPT}_{\text{TSP}} + |V_1| \leq \frac{7}{5}(\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}} - |V_1|) + |V_1| \leq \frac{7}{5}\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ . This finishes the proof.  $\blacktriangleleft$

#### B.4 Covering Range $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$

Here we show that computing a  $1/2$ -tour using Theorem 3.5, yields a good approximation of a  $\delta$ -tour.

We first need the following result relating the lengths of  $\delta$ -tours and  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tours.

**► Proposition B.8.** *Let  $T_\delta$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in a connected graph  $G$ . Then there exists a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  of  $G$  that satisfies  $\ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)} \ell(T_\delta)$ .*

**Proof.** If  $\alpha(T_\delta) \leq 2$ , we obtain by Lemmas A.9 and A.10 that  $|V(G)| \leq 2$ . In that case, there clearly exists a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour of length 0 in  $G$  and so the statement follows. We may hence suppose that  $\alpha(T_\delta) \geq 3$ . Therefore, by Lemma A.18, we may suppose that  $T_\delta$  is nice and, as  $\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = 1$ , that for all stopping points  $p$  of  $T_\delta$  with  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \notin \{0, 1\}$ , we have that  $T_\delta$  contains the segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  and  $\lambda \in \{1 - \delta, 2 - 2\delta, \frac{3}{2} - \delta\}$ . We obtain  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  from  $T_\delta$  by replacing every segment of  $T_\delta$  of the form  $up(u, v, 1 - \delta)u$  for some  $u, v \in V(G)$  by  $up(u, v, \frac{1}{2})u$  and replacing every segment of  $T_\delta$  of the form  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  for some  $u, v \in V(G)$  and some  $\lambda \in \{2 - 2\delta, \frac{3}{2} - \delta\}$  by  $uvw$ . Clearly,  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  is a tour in  $G$  and  $\ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)} \ell(T_\delta)$ . We still need to prove that  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ . First observe that, as  $T_\delta$  is nice, so is  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Let  $uv \in E(G)$ . If  $T_\delta$  stops at both  $u$  and  $v$ , then  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  stops at both  $u$  and  $v$ , and so  $uv$  is covered by  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Lemma A.11. Next suppose that  $T_\delta$  stops at exactly one of  $u$  and  $v$ , say  $u$ . By Lemma A.10, one of Lemma A.10 (i), and (ii) holds for  $T_\delta$ . If Lemma A.10(ii) holds, then  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  stops at  $u$  and  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ . It follows from Lemmas A.10 and A.11 that  $uv$  is covered by  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . If Lemma A.10(i) holds and (ii) does not hold, we obtain that  $T_\delta$  contains the segment  $wp(w, v, \lambda)w$  for some  $w \in N_G(v)$  and some  $\lambda \in \{2 - 2\delta, \frac{3}{2} - \delta\}$ . By construction, it follows that  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  stops at  $u$  and  $v$  and so  $uv$  is covered by  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by Lemma A.11. Finally, suppose that  $T_\delta$  stops at none of  $u$  and  $v$ . By Lemma A.9, there exist stopping points  $p(u', u, \lambda_u)$  and  $p(v', v, \lambda_v)$  of  $T_\delta$  with  $\lambda_u + \lambda_v \geq 3 - 2\delta$ . By assumption, we obtain that  $\lambda_u = \lambda_v = \frac{3}{2} - \delta$ . It follows by construction that  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  stops at  $u$  and  $v$ . We obtain by Lemma A.11 that  $uv$  is covered by  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . It follows that  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, which is Theorem 3.6. It is restated here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.6.** *For every  $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $1.4/(2 - 2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** We use Theorem 3.5 to compute a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  of  $G$  which satisfies  $\ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{7}{5} \ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}^*)$  where  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}^*$  is a shortest  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour in  $G$ . Observe that  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$  is in particular a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . In order to prove the quality of  $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , let  $T_\delta^*$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . By Proposition B.8, there exists a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T'_{\frac{1}{2}}$  with  $\ell(T'_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)} \ell(T_\delta^*)$ . We obtain  $\ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{7}{5} \ell(T_{\frac{1}{2}}^*) \leq \frac{7}{5} \ell(T'_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{7}{5} \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)} \ell(T_\delta^*)$ , so the statement follows. ◀

## B.5 Covering Range $\delta \in [33/40, 3/2)$

As mentioned in Section 3, in this range, we use a different approach based on a linear program (LP) first considered by Könemann et al. [29] for computing a shortest vertex cover tour, which is a tour such that the vertices this tour stops at form a vertex cover of the input graph. We first review the LP formulation and then show how it can be used to obtain approximation algorithms for  $\delta$ -TOUR in this range.

Given a graph  $G$ , we let  $\mathcal{F}(G)$  be the set of subsets of  $V(G)$  such that both  $G[S]$  and  $G[V(G) - S]$  contain at least one edge. For some  $F \subseteq V(G)$ , let  $C_G(F)$  denote the set of edges in  $G$  with exactly one endpoint in  $F$ . The LP is then formulated in [29] as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{Minimize} & \sum_{e \in E(G)} z_e \\
 \text{subject to} & \sum_{e \in C_G(F)} z_e \geq 2 \quad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}(G) \text{ and} \\
 & 0 \leq z_e \leq 2 \quad \text{for all } e \in E(G).
 \end{array} \tag{1}$$

For some graph  $G$ , we denote by  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$  the optimum value of 1 defined with respect to  $G$ . We heavily rely on Theorem 3.7 which was proven by Könemann et al. in [29], which we restate below for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.7 (Consequence of [29, Thms. 2 and 3]).** *Given a connected graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , in polynomial time, we can compute a vertex cover tour  $T$  of  $G$  with  $\ell(T) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ .*

To show that the vertex cover tour computed via Theorem 3.7 yields a 3-approximation for 1-TOUR, the main observation is that for a given connected graph  $G$ , we have that the length of any 1-tour in  $G$  is at least  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ . More precisely, we obtain the following lemma.

► **Lemma B.9.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $T_1$  a 1-tour in  $G$ . Then  $\ell(T_1) \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $T_1 = (p_0, \dots, p_k)$ . If  $k = 0$ , we obtain that  $G$  contains a single vertex that dominates  $V(G)$ . In that case, the all-zeros vector is a feasible solution for (1) and so the statement clearly follows. If  $k = 2$  and  $G$  does not contain a vertex that dominates  $V(G)$ , as  $T_1$  is a 1-tour, we obtain that  $T_1 = uvu$  for an edge  $uv \in E(G)$  such that  $\{u, v\}$  is a dominating set of  $G$ . It follows that the vector defined by  $x_{uv} = 2$  and  $x_e = 0$  for all  $e \in E(G) - uv$  is a feasible solution for (1). As  $\ell(T_1) = 2$ , the statement follows.

We may hence suppose that  $k \geq 3$  and hence, by Lemma 3.1, that  $T_1$  is nice.

For every edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , we define

$$\Lambda_e := \sum_{i \in [k]: P(p_{i-1}, p_i) \subseteq P(u, v)} d_G(p_i, p_{i+1}).$$

▷ **Claim B.10.** Let  $z \in [0, 2]^{E(G)}$  be the vector defined by  $z_e = (\min(2, \Lambda_e))$  for all  $e \in E(G)$ . Then  $z$  is feasible for (1).

*Proof.* By construction, we have  $z \in [0, 2]^{E(G)}$ .

Now fix an arbitrary  $F \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ . We make a distinction between two cases:

► **Case 1.**  $T_1$  traverses an edge  $uv \in C_G(F)$ .

By symmetry, we may suppose that  $u \in F$  and  $v \notin F$ . Then, as  $T_1$  is a tour,  $T_1$  either traverses  $uv$  twice or traverses some edge  $u'v' \in C_G(F) - uv$ . In the first case, we have  $z_{uv} = 2$  and in the second case, we have  $\min\{z_{uv}, z_{u'v'}\} \geq 1$ . In either case, we obtain

$$\sum_{e \in C_G(F)} z_e \geq 2.$$

► **Case 2.**  $T_{1\text{-tour}}$  does not traverse any edge of  $C_G(F)$ .

We obtain that the set of vertices in  $V(G)$  which are stopping points of  $T_1$  is fully contained in one of  $F$  and  $V(G) - F$ . Without loss of generality, we may suppose that the former is the case. Fix some edge  $uv \in E(G[V(G) - F])$ , which exists by definition of  $\mathcal{F}$ . It follows from Lemma A.9 that  $T_1$  stops at points  $p(u', u, \lambda_1)$  and  $p(v', v', \lambda_2)$  for some  $u' \in N_G(u), v' \in N_G(v)$  such that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 1$ . Thus,  $\Lambda_{u'u} + \Lambda_{v'v} = 2$ , so  $\sum_{e \in C_G(F)} z_e \geq \min(2, \Lambda_{u'u}) + \min(2, \Lambda_{v'v}) \geq 2$ . ◀

Finally, observe that  $\ell(T_1) = \sum_{i \in [k]} d_G(p_{i-1}, p_i) \geq \sum_{e \in C_G(F)} \Lambda_e \geq \sum_{e \in C_G(F)} z_e \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ . ◀

We are now ready to prove our result for  $\delta = 1$ . This result will be the crucial ingredient for the proof of Theorems 3.8 and 3.9.

► **Lemma B.11.** *There is a 3-approximation algorithm for 1-TOUR.*

**Proof.** Let a connected graph  $G$  be given. By Theorem 3.7, in polynomial time, we can compute a vertex cover tour  $T$  of  $G$  that satisfies  $\ell(T) \leq 3\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G)$ . Clearly, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. It follows directly from Lemmas A.10 and A.11 that  $T$  is a 1-tour in  $G$ . Moreover, by Lemma B.9, we have that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G) \leq \text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$  is the length of a shortest 1-tour in  $G$ . This yields  $\ell(T) \leq 3\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}(G) \leq 3\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$ . ◀

In order to generalize Lemma B.11 for  $\delta > 1$ , we prove the following relation between shortest 1-tours and shortest  $\delta$ -tours for more general  $\delta$ .

► **Lemma B.12.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta \in (1, 3/2)$  be a real, and  $T_\delta$  be a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour in a  $G$  with  $\alpha(T_\delta) \geq 3$ . Then, there exists a 1-tour  $T_1$  of  $G$  of length  $\ell(T_1) \leq \ell(T_\delta)/(3 - 2\delta)$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma A.18, and since  $\lfloor 2\delta \rfloor = 2$ , we may assume that for all stopping points  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  of  $T_\delta$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \notin \{0, 1\}$ ,  $T_\delta$  contains a segment  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  with  $\lambda \in \{\frac{3}{2} - \delta, 3 - 2\delta, 2 - \delta\}$ . We obtain  $T_1$  from  $T_\delta$  by replacing every segment of  $T_\delta$  of the form  $up(u, v, \frac{3}{2} - \delta)u$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  by  $up(u, v, \frac{1}{2})u$  and replacing every segment of  $T_\delta$  of the form  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  where  $\lambda \in \{3 - 2\delta, 2 - \delta\}$  by  $uvu$ . Note that  $\ell(T_1) \leq \max\{1/(3 - 2\delta), 1/(2 - \delta)\} \ell(T_\delta) = \ell(T_\delta)/(3 - 2\delta)$ , where the last inequality is due to  $\delta > 1$ .

It remains to show that the tour  $T_1$  is a 1-tour. Fix an arbitrary edge  $uv \in E(G)$ . If  $T_\delta$  stops at  $u$  or  $v$ , then  $uv$  is covered as  $\delta > 1$ . Suppose then that  $T_\delta$  stops at neither  $u$  nor  $v$ . By Lemma A.9, as  $\alpha(T_\delta) \geq 3$ , for all  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , there exist stopping points



$p_i = p(u_i, v_i, \lambda_i)$  on  $T_\delta$  with  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1)$  and  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq d_G(u, v_1) + d_G(v, v_2) + 3 - 2\delta$ . Observe that  $d_G(u, v_1) + d_G(v, v_2) \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 3 + 2\delta < 2$  as  $\delta < \frac{3}{2}$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that one of the following two cases occurs:

1.  $d_G(u, v_1) = d_G(v, v_2) = 0$ , so  $u = v_1$  and  $v = v_2$ . In this case,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 3 - 2\delta$ . Since  $\lambda_i \in \{\frac{3}{2} - \delta, 3 - 2\delta, 2 - \delta\}$ ,  $T_1$  stops at points  $p'_1 = p(u_1, u, \lambda'_1)$  and  $p'_2 = p(u_2, v, \lambda'_2)$ , where  $(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2) \in \{(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ . If  $\lambda'_1 = \lambda'_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $uv$  is covered by Lemma A.9 (i) as  $\lambda'_1 + \lambda'_2 \geq 1$ . In all other cases,  $T_1$  stops at  $u$  or  $v$ , covering  $uv$  as  $\delta > 1$ .
2.  $d_G(u, v_1) = 0$  and  $d_G(v, v_2) = 1$ , so  $u = v_1$ . In this case,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 4 - 2\delta$ . Since  $\max(\frac{3}{2} - \delta, 3 - 2\delta, 2 - \delta) = 2 - \delta$ , we have  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2 - \delta$ . Thus,  $T_1$  stops at  $u$ , covering the edge  $uv$ .

It follows that  $T_1$  covers  $uv$  and is, hence, a 1-tour of  $G$ . ◀

This yields the following theorem.

► **Theorem 3.8.** *For any  $\delta \in [1, 3/2)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $3/(3 - 2\delta)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** Given a connected graph  $G$ , let  $T_\delta$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  all of whose stopping points are in  $S_\delta$  whose existence is implied by Lemma A.18.

If  $\alpha(T_\delta) \leq 2$ , then there exists an edge  $uv \in E(G)$  and points  $p_0 = p(u, v, \lambda_0)$  and  $p_1 = p(u, v, \lambda_1)$  with  $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 \in S_\delta$  such that the tour  $T_\delta = (p_0, p_1, p_0)$ . Hence, we can check if such a tour exists and, if this is the case, compute one in  $O(|E| \cdot |S_\delta|^2) = O(|E|)$ .

We may hence assume that  $\alpha(T_\delta) \geq 3$ . By Lemma B.11, we can hence compute and output a 1-tour  $T$  such that  $\ell(T) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$ , where  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$  is the length of a shortest 1-tour in  $G$ . By Lemma B.12, we have that  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}} \leq \ell(T_\delta)/(3 - 2\delta)$ . As  $\delta \geq 1$ , clearly,  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, which is of length  $\ell(T) \leq 3/(3 - 2\delta) \cdot \ell(T_\delta)$ . ◀

For  $\delta \in [33/40, 1)$ , the idea, roughly speaking, is to use a 1-tour computed by Lemma B.11 and add a collection of short tour segments to complete it into a  $\delta$ -tour for the desired  $\delta \in [30/40, 1)$ . The following result will be used to bound the cost of these detours in comparison to the cost of the whole tour.

► **Lemma B.13.** *Let  $\delta \in [33/40, 1)$ , let  $G$  be a connected graph, let  $V_1$  be the vertices of degree 1 in  $G$ , and let  $T$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  with  $\alpha(T) \geq 3$ . Then  $\ell(T) \geq 2(1 - \delta)|V_1| + 4(1 - \delta)(|V(G)| - |V_1|)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $T = p_0 \dots p_k$ . By Lemma 3.1, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. For every  $v \in V(G)$ , we define a real  $\Lambda_v$  as follows. We initialize  $\Lambda_v$  by 0. Then, for every tour segment of  $T$  of the form  $uv$  for some  $u \in N_G(v)$ , we add 1 to  $\Lambda_v$  and for every segment of the form  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  for some  $u \in N_G(v)$ , we add  $2\lambda$  to  $\Lambda_v$ . We do this for every  $v \in V(G)$ .

▷ **Claim B.14.** We have  $\Lambda_v \geq 2(1 - \delta)$  for all  $v \in V_1$  and  $\Lambda_v \geq 4(1 - \delta)$  for all  $v \in V(G) - V_1$ .

**Proof.** Let  $v \in V(G)$ . If  $T$  stops at  $v$ , then, as  $\alpha(T) \geq 3$ , we have that  $T$  contains the segment  $uv$  for some  $u \in N_G(v)$ . As  $\delta \geq \frac{3}{4}$ , this yields  $\Lambda_v \geq 1 \geq 4(1 - \delta)$ . We may hence suppose that  $T$  does not stop at  $v$ . If  $v \in V_1$ , let  $u$  be the unique vertex in  $N_G(v)$ . By Lemma A.10 and Lemma A.11 and as  $T$  is a nice tour with  $\alpha(T) \geq 3$ , we have that  $u \notin V_1$ , so  $T$  contains a segment of the form  $up(u, v, \lambda)u$  for some  $\lambda \geq 1 - \delta$ . By construction, we obtain that  $\Lambda_v \geq 2\lambda \geq 2(1 - \delta)$ . We may in the following suppose that  $v \in V(G) - V_1$ .

First suppose that there exists some  $u \in N_G(v)$  such that  $T$  does not stop at  $u$ . By Lemma A.9, as  $\alpha(T) \geq 3$  and as  $\delta < 1$ , there exist  $u' \in N_G(u)$ ,  $v' \in N_G(v)$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1)$  with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 3 - 2\delta$  such that  $T$  contains the segments  $u'p(u', u, \lambda_1)u'$  and  $vp(v', v, \lambda_2)v'$ . We obtain that  $\Lambda_v \geq 2\lambda_2 \geq 2(3 - 2\delta - \lambda_1) \geq 2(3 - 2\delta - 1) = 4(1 - \delta)$ . Now suppose that

$T$  stops at  $u$  for all  $u \in N_G(v)$  and for all  $u \in N_G(v)$ , let  $\lambda_u$  be the largest real such that  $T$  stops at  $p(u, v, \lambda_u)$ . By Lemma A.10, we obtain that one Lemma A.10 (i) and (ii) holds for every  $u \in N_G(v)$ . If Lemma A.10 (i) holds for  $uv$  for some  $u \in N_G(v)$ , then there exists some  $u' \in N_G(v) - u$  such that  $\lambda_u + \lambda_{u'} \geq 2 - 2\delta$ . We obtain  $\Lambda_v \geq 2(\lambda_u + \lambda_{u'}) = 4(1 - \delta)$ . Otherwise, Lemma A.10 (ii) holds for  $uv$  for every  $u \in N_G(v)$ . As  $v \notin V_1$ , we obtain  $\Lambda_v \geq 2(1 - \delta)|N_G(v)| \geq 4(1 - \delta)$ .

◁

By construction and Claim B.14, we obtain  $\ell(T) = \sum_{i \in [k]} d_G(p_i, p_{i+1}) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \Lambda_v \geq 2(1 - \delta)|V_1| + 4(1 - \delta)(|V(G)| - |V_1|)$ . ◀

We can now prove that  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a 4-approximation algorithm for  $\delta \in [33/40, 1)$ .

► **Theorem 3.9.** *For any  $\delta \in [33/40, 1)$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a 4-approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph and let  $V_1$  be the set of vertices of degree 1 of  $G$ . By Corollary A.26, we may suppose that  $|V(G)| \geq 3$  and hence, that every  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  is of discrete length at least 3. Let  $\text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$  and  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$  denote the length of a shortest 1-tour and a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , respectively. By Lemma B.11, in polynomial time, we can compute a vertex cover tour  $T$  in  $G$  that satisfies  $\ell(T) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}}$ . By Lemma Lemma 3.1, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. Let  $V_0 \subseteq V(G)$  be the set of vertices which are not stopping points of  $T$ , let  $v_1, \dots, v_q$  be an arbitrary ordering of  $V_0$ , and for  $i \in [q]$ , let  $w_i$  be an arbitrary neighbor of  $v_i$  in  $G$ . As  $T$  stops at vertices forming a vertex cover, we obtain that  $T$  stops at  $w_i$  for all  $i \in [q]$ . We now recursively construct a sequence of tours  $T^0, \dots, T^q$  in  $G$  all of which stop at all points of  $V(G) - V_0$ . First we set  $T^0 = T$ . Then, for any  $i \in [q]$ , if  $v_i \in V_1$ , we construct  $T_i$  from  $T_{i-1}$  by choosing an arbitrary occurrence of  $(w_i)$  in  $T$  and replacing it by the segment  $w_i p(w_i, v_i, 1 - \delta) w_i$ . Otherwise, we construct  $T_i$  from  $T_{i-1}$  by choosing an arbitrary occurrence of  $(w_i)$  in  $T$  and replacing it by the segment  $w_i p(w_i, v_i, 2(1 - \delta)) w_i$ . We let  $T_\delta = T^q$ .

▷ **Claim B.15.**  $T_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ .

**Proof.** As  $T$  is nice, so is  $T_\delta$ . Let  $xy \in E(G)$ . If  $T_\delta$  stops at both  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $xy$  is covered by  $T_\delta$  by Lemma A.11. By construction and symmetry, we may hence suppose that  $y \in V_0$ . If  $y \in V_1$ , by construction, we obtain that  $T_\delta$  contains the segment  $x p(x, y, 1 - \delta) x$ , so  $xy$  is covered by  $T_\delta$  by Lemma A.10. Otherwise, we obtain by construction that there exists some  $w \in N_G(y)$  such that  $T_\delta$  contains the segment  $w p(w, y, 2(1 - \delta)) w$ . It follows by Lemma A.10 that  $xy$  is covered by  $T_\delta$ . ◁

From the definition of  $T$ , the fact that every  $\delta$ -tour is in particular a 1-tour, the construction and Lemma B.13, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(T_\delta) &= \ell(T) + 2(1 - \delta)|V_0 \cap V_1| + 4(1 - \delta)|V_0 - V_1| \\ &\leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{1\text{-tour}} + 2(1 - \delta)|V_1| + 4(1 - \delta)|V(G) - V_1| \\ &\leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}} + \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}} = 4 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}. \end{aligned}$$

◀

## B.6 Covering Range $\delta > 3/2$

In this section, we consider the problem of finding approximation algorithms for  $\delta$ -TOUR if  $\delta$  is large. We move away from the design of constant-factor approximation algorithms and instead give approximation algorithms with polylog( $n$ )-factor guarantees. In Appendix C.3, these results will be complemented by a lower bound showing that, assuming  $P \neq NP$ , an  $o(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm for  $\delta$ -TOUR does not exist, even for fixed  $\delta \geq \frac{3}{2}$ .

We consider two different settings: In the first one, we wish to compute a shortest  $\delta$ -tour for some fixed  $\delta \geq \frac{3}{2}$  and in the second one, we let  $\delta$  be part of the input. Note that in the latter case,  $\delta$  may be linear in  $n$ ; thus, approximations factors of the form  $O(f(\delta) \log n)$ , which yield the desired result in the first setting may be worthless in the second setting.

We now give a construction which is the crucial ingredient for the proofs of Theorems 3.11 and 1.4. Namely, for a connected graph  $G$  and a constant  $\delta$ , we construct an auxiliary graph  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . We then show that there is a close relationship among  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  and dominating sets in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . In Section B.6.1, we exploit this directly by designing an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm for arbitrary fixed  $\delta$  using an approximation algorithm for computing a smallest dominating set in a given graph with a similar guarantee for the solution quality. While this approach does not work for  $\delta$  being part of the input, in Section B.6.2, we obtain an  $O(\log^3 n)$ -approximation for this setting by relying on previous results on a slightly different problem, called *Minimum Dominating Tree*.

We now detail the construction of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . We fix a connected graph  $G$  and some  $\delta > 0$ . We first need some intermediate definitions. Let  $S_\delta$  be the set of edge positions defined in Lemma A.18; recall that  $|S_\delta| = O(1)$ . Let  $P_\delta(G) := \{p(u, v, \lambda) \mid uv \in E(G), \lambda \in S_\delta\}$ .

Further, we define  $Q_\delta(G)$  to consist of  $V(G)$  and the set of points  $q \in P(G)$  for which there exists some  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  such that  $d_G(p, q) = \delta$ .

Now for some  $uv \in E(G)$ , let  $\Lambda^{uv} = \{0, \lambda_1^{uv}, \dots, \lambda_{k^{uv}}^{uv}, 1\}$  be the collection of reals, in increasing order, such that  $p(u, v, \lambda) \in Q_\delta(G)$  if and only if  $\lambda \in \Lambda^{uv}$ . We now let  $\mathcal{I}_{G, \delta}^{uv}$  be the set of segments consisting of  $P(uv)$  if  $\Lambda^{uv} = \{0, 1\}$  and otherwise of the segments  $P(up(u, v, \lambda_1^{uv}))$  and  $P(p(u, v, \lambda_i^{uv})p(u, v, \lambda_{i+1}^{uv}))$  for  $i \in [k^{uv} - 1]$ , and  $P(p(u, v, \lambda_{k^{uv}}^{uv})v)$ . We further define  $\mathcal{I}_{G, \delta} = \bigcup_{uv \in E(G)} \mathcal{I}_{G, \delta}^{uv}$ .

We are now ready to give the definition of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . We let  $V(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  consist of  $P_\delta(G)$  and a vertex  $x_I$  for every  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G, \delta}$ . We next let  $E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  contain an edge linking  $p$  and  $p'$  for all distinct  $p, p' \in P_\delta(G)$ . Finally, we let  $E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$  contain an edge linking some  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  and  $x_I$  for some  $I = P(q_1 q_2) \in \mathcal{I}_{G, \delta}$  if  $d_G(p, q_i) < \delta$  holds for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . This finishes the description of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ .

In order to algorithmically make use of this construction, we need the following easy result.

► **Proposition B.16.** *We can compute  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  in polynomial time given  $G$  and  $\delta > 1$  and we have  $|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))| = O(n^4)$ .*

**Proof.** As the set  $S_\delta$  is given explicitly in Lemma A.18, we can compute  $P_\delta(G)$  in polynomial time and we have  $|P_\delta(G)| = O(n^2)$ . Now consider some  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  and some  $uv \in E(G)$ . If  $p$  is on  $uv$ , then, as  $\delta > 1$ , there is no point  $q$  on  $uv$  with  $d_G(p, q) = \delta$ . It follows that every point  $q$  on  $uv$  with  $d_G(p, q) = \delta$  satisfies  $d_G(q, u) = \delta - d_G(p, u)$  or  $d_G(q, v) = \delta - d_G(p, v)$ . It follows that  $P(uv)$  contains at most 2 points which are of distance exactly  $\delta$  to  $p$  and that they can be computed in polynomial time. We now execute this computation for every  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  and every  $uv \in E(G)$ . By this procedure, we can compute  $Q_\delta(G)$  in polynomial time and we obtain  $|Q_\delta(G)| \leq |V(G)| + 2|P_\delta(G)||E(G)| = O(n^4)$ . From this, we can clearly

compute  $\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  in polynomial time and we obtain  $|\mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}| \leq |Q_\delta(G)| = O(n^4)$ . Finally, we can compute the edge set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  by some shortest walk computations. ◀

We now prove the key lemma, which is Lemma 3.10 and restated here for convenience. It shows that there is a close relationship between  $\delta$ -tours in  $G$  and dominating sets in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ .

► **Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $\delta > 1$ . Further, let  $T$  be a tour in  $G$  whose stopping points are all in  $P_\delta(G)$ . Then  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  if and only if the stopping points of  $T$  are a dominating set in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ .*

**Proof.** First suppose that the set  $P_T$  of stopping points of  $T$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . In order to see that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, let  $p = p(u, v, \lambda) \in P(G)$ . Then, by construction, there exist some  $p_0, p_1 \in Q_\delta(G)$  such that  $p \in P(p_0 p_1)$  and  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  where  $I = P(p_0, p_1)$ . As  $P_T$  is a dominating set in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , there exists some  $q \in P_T$  such that  $qx_I \in E(G)$ . By the definition of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $d_G(q, p_0) < \delta$ . If  $d_G(q, p) > \delta$ , then there exist some  $p' \in P(p, p_0) - p_0$  such that  $d_G(q, p') = \delta$ . As  $p' \in P(p_0, p_1) - \{p_0, p_1\}$ , we obtain a contradiction to the fact that  $P(p_0, p_1) \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$ .

Now suppose that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour all of whose stopping points are in  $P_\delta(G)$ , let  $P_T$  be the set of stopping points of  $T$ , and consider some  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$ . Then, by definition, there exist some unique  $p, p' \in Q_\delta(G)$  such that  $I = P(p, p')$ . Let  $u, v \in V(G)$  and  $\lambda, \lambda' \in [0, 1]$  such that  $p = p(u, v, \lambda)$  and  $p' = (u, v, \lambda')$ . If some point in  $P(p, p')$  is passed by  $T$ , let  $v \in V(G) \cap P_T$  be chosen such that  $d_G(p, v)$  is minimized. As  $\delta > 1$ , we have  $d_G(p, v) \leq 1 < \delta$ , so  $vx_I \in E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$ . We may hence suppose that no point in  $P(p, p')$  is passed by  $T$ . By Proposition A.3, we can now choose some  $q, q' \in P_T$  such that  $d_G(p, q) = d_G(p, T)$  and  $d_G(p', q') = d_G(p', T)$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour, we have  $d_G(p, q) \leq \delta$  and  $d_G(p', q') \leq \delta$ . If  $d_G(p, q) = d_G(p', q') = \delta$  holds, let  $p'' = (u, v, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda'))$ . As no point in  $P(p, p')$  is passed by  $T$ , we obtain that  $d_G(p'', T) = \min\{d_G(p'', p) + d_G(p, T), d_G(p'', p') + d_G(p', T)\} > \min\{d_G(p, T), d_G(p', T)\} = \delta$ . This contradicts  $T$  being a  $\delta$ -tour. We may hence suppose by symmetry that  $d_G(p, q) < \delta$  holds. We hence have  $qx_I \in E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$ . As  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G,\delta}$  was chosen arbitrarily, we obtain that  $V_T$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . ◀

### B.6.1 Fixed Covering Range $\delta$

The purpose of this section is to give an approximation algorithm for the case that some  $\delta \geq 3/2$  is fixed. Our algorithm is based on the computation of a dominating set in the auxiliary graph defined above. We first need the following result that shows that a suitable dominating set of this auxiliary graph can be efficiently connected into a tour in  $G$ .

► **Proposition B.17.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta \geq 3/2$  a real and  $Y \subseteq P_\delta(G)$  a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour in  $G$  that stops at all points of  $Y$  and whose length is at most  $4\delta|Y|$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $H$  be the graph with  $V(H) = Y$  and where  $E(H)$  contains an edge linking two points  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  if  $d_G(y_1, y_2) \leq 2\delta$ .

▷ **Claim B.18.**  $H$  is connected.

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise and let  $C$  be a component of  $H$ . We further choose some  $v_1 \in V(C)$  and some  $v_2 \in V(H) - V(C)$  such that  $d_G(v_1, v_2)$  is minimized. Let  $W$  be a shortest walk from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  in  $G$ . As  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in distinct connected components of  $H$ , we have that  $E(H)$  does not contain an edge linking  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . Hence we have  $\ell(W) > 2\delta$ . It follows that

there exists a point  $p$  passed by  $W$  that satisfies  $\min\{d_G(v_1, p), d_G(v_2, p)\} > \delta$ . If there exists some  $v'_1 \in V(C)$  such that  $d_G(v'_1, p) \leq \delta$ , then we have  $d_G(v'_1, v_2) \leq d_G(v'_1, p) + d_G(v_2, p) < d_G(v_1, p) + d_G(v_2, p) = \ell(W) = d_G(v_1, v_2)$ , a contradiction to the choice of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . A similar argument shows that  $d_G(v'_2, p) > \delta$  for all  $v'_2 \in V(H) - V(C)$ . By Lemma 3.10, we obtain that  $Y$  is not a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , a contradiction.  $\triangleleft$

Now let  $U$  be the multigraph obtained from an arbitrary spanning tree of  $H$  by replacing every edge by two parallel copies of itself. By Proposition A.1, we obtain that there exists an Euler tour  $T_0 = p_0 \dots p_z$  of  $U$ . We now obtain  $T$  from  $T_0$  by replacing the segment  $p_{i-1}p_i$  by a shortest walk from  $p_{i-1}$  to  $p_i$  for  $i \in [z]$ . Observe that  $\ell(T) = \sum_{i \in [z]} d_G(p_{i-1}, p_i) \leq 2\delta z = 4\delta(|V(H)| - 1) \leq 4\delta|Y|$ . Further, as  $T$  stops at all vertices in  $Y$  and  $Y$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , we obtain that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  by Lemma 3.10.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Our proof is based on the following well-known result on the approximation of the problem of finding a smallest dominating set, see for example [20].

► **Proposition B.19.** *There exists an  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm for finding a minimum dominating set in a given graph.*

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 3.11, which we restate here.

► **Theorem 3.11.** *For any  $\delta \geq 3/2$ ,  $\delta$ -TOUR admits a  $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm.*

**Proof.** By Corollary A.23, we may suppose that  $G$  does not admit a shortest  $\delta$ -tour with at most two stopping points. We first compute  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  which is possible in polynomial time by Proposition B.16. Now, by Proposition B.19, we can compute a dominating set  $Y$  of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  that satisfies  $|Y| \leq \alpha \log(|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))|)|Y^*|$  where  $\alpha$  is an absolute constant and  $Y^*$  is a minimum size dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . By Proposition B.16, we have that  $|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))| = O(n^4)$  and hence  $|Y| \leq \alpha' \log(n)|Y^*|$  for some absolute constant  $\alpha'$ . We now obtain  $Y'$  from  $Y$  by replacing every  $v \in Y - P_\delta(G)$  by some arbitrary  $v' \in N_{\Gamma(G, \delta)}(v)$ , keeping only one copy of multiple elements in  $Y'$ . As  $\Gamma(G, \delta)[P_\delta(G)]$  is a clique and  $\Gamma(G, \delta) - P_\delta(G)$  is an independent set by construction, we obtain that  $Y'$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Further, by Proposition B.17, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T$  in  $G$  whose length is at most  $4\delta|Y'|$  and that stops at all points of  $Y'$ . We now output  $T$ . Observe that  $T$  can be computed in polynomial time. As  $T$  stops at all points of  $Y'$ , we obtain by Lemma 3.10 that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . In order to bound the length of  $T$ , let  $T^*$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Let  $P_{T^*}$  be the set of stopping points of  $T^*$ . By Lemma A.18, we may suppose that  $P_{T^*}$  is contained in  $P_{G, \delta}$ . It hence follows by Lemma 3.10 that  $P_{T^*}$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Now let  $s_\delta = \min\{|s_1 - s_2| : s_1, s_2 \in S_\delta \cup \{0, 1\}\}$ . We obtain that  $\ell(T^*) \geq s_\delta|P_{T^*}|$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(T) &\leq 4\delta|Y'| \\ &\leq 4\delta|Y| \\ &\leq 4\delta\alpha' \log(n)|Y^*| \\ &\leq 4\delta\alpha' \log(n)|P_{T^*}| \\ &\leq 4\delta \frac{1}{s_\delta} \alpha' \log(n)\ell(T^*). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof.  $\blacktriangleleft$

### B.6.2 Covering Range $\delta$ as Part of the Input

In the setting where  $\delta$  is provided as part of the input, the algorithm from the previous section does not yield any non-trivial approximation guarantee. This is due to two reasons: first, we get an additional factor of roughly  $\delta$  when connecting the dominating set into a tour and second, our estimation for the length of a shortest tour gives another factor of  $\frac{1}{s_\delta}$  which may be large for certain values of  $\delta$ .

In an attempt to overcome this problem, we use a result for a slightly different problem that also deals with dominating sets, but, in addition, also takes into account the distance of the points in the dominating set that is sought for.

Formally, given a graph  $H$ , a *dominating tree*  $U$  of  $H$  is a subgraph of  $H$  that is a tree and such that  $V(U)$  is a dominating set of  $H$ . Further, given a weight function  $w : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the weight  $w(U)$  of a subgraph  $U$  of  $H$  is defined to be  $\sum_{e \in E(U)} w(e)$ .

We use the following result due to Kutiel [30].

► **Lemma B.20** ([30]). *There is an algorithm that, given a weighted graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , computes a  $(\log n)^3$ -approximation of a minimum weight dominating tree of  $G$ .*

We now fix a connected graph  $G$  and  $\delta > 1$  and define a weight function  $w : E(\Gamma(G, \delta)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . For all  $p, p' \in P_\delta(G)$ , we set  $w(pp') = d_G(p, p')$  and for all  $p \in P_\delta(G)$  and  $I \in \mathcal{I}_{G, \delta}$  such that  $px_I \in E(\Gamma(G, \delta))$ , we set  $w(px_I) = n^3$ .

We now give the following key lemmas relating  $\delta$ -tours and dominating trees.

► **Lemma B.21.** *Let  $U$  be a dominating tree of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  with  $V(U) \subseteq P_\delta(G)$ . Then, in polynomial time, we can compute a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G$  with  $\ell(T) \leq 2w(U)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $U'$  be the multigraph obtained from  $U$  by replacing every edge by two copies of itself. By Proposition A.1, we obtain that  $U'$  has an Euler tour  $T_0 = p_0 \dots p_z$ . We now obtain  $T$  from  $T_0$  by replacing the segment  $p_{i-1}p_i$  by a shortest walk in  $G$  from  $p_{i-1}$  to  $p_i$ . Observe that  $T$  can be constructed in polynomial time. Further, we have that  $T$  stops at all points in  $V(U)$ . It hence follows from Lemma 3.10 that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Further, by the definition of  $w$ , we have  $\ell(T) = \sum_{i \in [z]} d_G(p_{i-1}, p_i) = \sum_{i \in [z]} w(p_{i-1}p_i) = 2w(U)$ . ◀

► **Lemma B.22.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  all of whose stopping points are in  $P_\delta(G)$ . Then there exists a dominating tree  $U$  in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  with  $w(U) \leq \ell(T)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $V_T$  be the set of points in  $P_\delta(G)$  passed by  $T$ . It follows by Lemma 3.10 that  $V_T$  is a dominating set in  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Now let  $U_0$  be the graph on  $V_T$  that contains an edge linking two points  $p, p' \in P_\delta(G)$  whenever there exists some  $i \in [z]$  such that  $\{p_{i-1}, p_i\} = \{p, p'\}$ . As  $T$  is a tour, we have that  $U_0$  is connected. Now let  $U$  be an arbitrary spanning tree of  $U_0$ . As  $V_T$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , we obtain that  $U$  is a dominating tree of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . Further, we have  $w(U) \leq \ell(T)$ . ◀

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 1.4 (Polylogarithmic Approximation).** *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given  $\delta > 0$  and a graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , computes a  $64(\log n)^3$ -approximation of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$ .*

**Proof.** By Corollary A.23, we may suppose that  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour with at most two stopping points. Next, by Theorems 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.9, we may suppose that  $\delta > 1$ . Finally, by Corollary A.26, we may suppose that  $n \geq 6$ . We first compute

$\Gamma(G, \delta)$  which is possible in polynomial time by Proposition B.16. We further compute the weight function  $w$  which is possible in polynomial time as  $|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))| = O(n^4)$  by Proposition B.16. Now, by Lemma B.20, we can compute a dominating tree  $U$  of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  that satisfies  $w(U) \leq \log^3(|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))|)w(U^*)$  where  $U^*$  is a minimum weight dominating tree of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ . By Proposition B.16, we have that  $|V(\Gamma(G, \delta))| = O(n^4)$  and hence  $w(U) \leq 64 \log^3(n)w(U^*)$ . Clearly, a spanning tree of  $G$  corresponds to a dominating tree of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  of the same weight. This yields that  $w(U^*) \leq n - 1$ . If  $V(U) - P_\delta(G)$  is nonempty, as  $n \geq 6$ , we have  $w(U) \geq n^3 > 4 \log^3(n)(n - 1) \geq 4 \log(n)w(U^*)$ , a contradiction. We hence obtain  $V(U) \subseteq P_\delta(G)$ . Now, by Proposition B.21, in polynomial time, we can compute a tour  $T$  in  $G$  whose length is at most  $2w(U)$  and that stops at all points of  $V(U)$ . We now output  $T$ . Observe that  $T$  can be computed in polynomial time. As  $T$  stops at all points of  $V(U)$  and  $V(U)$  is a dominating set of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$ , we obtain by Lemma 3.10 that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . In order to bound the length of  $T$ , let  $T^*$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Let  $P_{T^*}$  be the set of stopping points of  $T^*$ . By Lemma A.18, we may suppose that all stopping points in  $P_{T^*}$  are contained in  $P_{G, \delta}$ . It hence follows by Lemma B.22 that there exists a dominating tree  $U_0$  of  $\Gamma(G, \delta)$  with  $w(U_0) \leq \ell(T^*)$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(T) &\leq 2w(U) \\ &\leq 64 \log^3(n)w(U^*) \\ &\leq 64 \log^3(n)w(U_0) \\ &\leq 64 \log^3(n) \ell(T^*). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. ◀

## C Inapproximability Results

Having provided approximation algorithms for  $\delta$ -TOUR in the previous section, we now present the complementing lower bounds. Specifically, we show APX-hardness for any fixed  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$ , which rules out a PTAS, and show that there is no  $o(\log n)$ -approximation for any fixed  $\delta \geq 3/2$  unless  $P = NP$ .

### C.1 APX-Hardness for Covering Range $\delta \leq 1/2$

In this section, we prove with Theorem 3.12 APX-hardness for  $\delta$ -TOUR for any given  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$  and with Corollary 3.13 the same for graphic TSP on cubic bipartite graphs.

The proofs of Theorem 3.12 and Corollary 3.13 are based on a connection of tours and certain packings of cycles in cubic graphs. In order to exploit this connection, we show that optimizing such cycle packings is APX-hard. We begin by introducing this packing problem. Specifically, we consider, for any fixed reals  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa$  with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ , the following problem.

**Optimization Problem**  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION, where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$

---

**Instance** A simple graph  $G$ .

**Solution** Any set  $\mathcal{C}$  of pairwise vertex-disjoint cycles in  $G$ .

**Goal** Minimize  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa$ .

---

The main technical contribution for Theorem 3.12 and Corollary 3.13 is showing the APX-hardness of  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa)$ -CYCLESUBPARTITION for all suitable constants. We do this in

Section C.1.1. After that, Theorem 3.12 and Corollary 3.13 follow rather easily, thanks to the above-mentioned connection. We give these proofs in Appendix C.1.2 and Appendix C.1.3, respectively.

### C.1.1 Hardness for Cycle Subpartitions

Given a connected graph  $G$  and some reals  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa$  with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ , we call a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of vertex-disjoint cycles all of which are subgraphs of  $G$  a *cycle subpartition* of  $G$  and we call  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa$  the weight of  $\mathcal{C}$ , denoted by  $w(\mathcal{C})$ . If  $\gamma$  and  $\kappa$  are not specified, they default to  $\gamma = \kappa = 0$ . We further write  $V(\mathcal{C})$  for  $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} V(C)$ .

Formally, we show the following result:

► **Theorem C.1.** *For all reals  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa$  with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ , there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, unless  $P = NP$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a connected cubic graph  $G$  and a positive real  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $(1 + \epsilon)K$ .*

Our proof of Theorem C.1 is based on a reduction from cubic vertex cover. Given a graph  $G$ , a vertex cover of  $G$  is a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  such that every edge in  $E(G)$  is incident to at least one vertex of  $X$ . The problem of finding a vertex cover of minimum size in a given graph has attracted significant attention. The following well-known result on the APX-hardness of this problem can be found in [1, Thm. 3.1 and Figure 4].

► **Proposition C.2.** *There exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, unless  $P = NP$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a connected simple cubic graph  $G$  and a positive real  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a vertex cover of size  $(1 + \epsilon)K$ .*

In order to use Proposition C.2, we need the following result which is the most difficult part of the proof.

► **Lemma C.3.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  be constants. Then, given a connected simple cubic graph  $G$ , in polynomial time, we can construct a cubic bipartite graph  $H$  that satisfies  $|V(H)| \leq (54 \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 18)|V(G)|$  such that for every positive integer  $K$ , we have that  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight at most  $\alpha(|V(G)| + 2K)$  if and only if  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $K$ .*


Before we give the main proof of Lemma C.3, we need to describe an auxiliary gadget that will be useful throughout the reduction. Namely, for two reals  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  and some positive integer  $k$ , an  $(\alpha, \beta, k)$ -chain gadget connecting  $\ell$  and  $r$  is a graph  $G$  together with two special vertices  $\ell, r \in V(G)$  satisfying the following properties:

- (i)  $d_G(\ell) = d_G(r) = 1$  and  $d_G(v) = 3$  for all  $v \in V(G) - \{\ell, r\}$ ,
- (ii)  $|V(G)| = 6k + 2$ ,
- (iii) there exists a unique bipartition of  $G$  and  $\ell$  and  $r$  are in different classes of this bipartition,
- (iv)  $G$  contains a Hamiltonian  $\ell r$ -path,
- (v) for every cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $G - \{\ell, r\}$ , we have  $w(\mathcal{C}) \geq \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k$ .

We say that  $V(G) - \{\ell, r\}$  is the set of *interior* vertices of the chain gadget.

► **Proposition C.4.** *There exists an  $(\alpha, \beta, k)$ -chain gadget for any reals  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  and any positive integer  $k$ .*





■ **Figure 4** An  $(\alpha, \beta, k)$ -chain gadget  $G$ .

**Proof.** We let  $V(G)$  contain  $\ell, r$  and a vertex  $v_i^j$  for every  $i \in [k]$  and every  $j \in [6]$ . For  $i \in [k]$ , let  $V_i = \{v_i^1, \dots, v_i^6\}$ . Next, for every  $i \in [k]$ , we let  $E(G)$  contain the edges  $v_i^1 v_i^2, v_i^1 v_i^4, v_i^2 v_i^3, v_i^2 v_i^5, v_i^3 v_i^4, v_i^3 v_i^6, v_i^4 v_i^5$ , and  $v_i^5 v_i^6$ . Further, for every  $i \in [k-1]$ , we let  $E(G)$  contain the edge  $v_i^6 v_{i+1}^1$ . Finally, we let  $E(G)$  contain the edges  $\ell v_1^1$  and  $r v_k^6$ . This finishes the description of  $G$ . For an illustration, see Figure 4.

It follows directly by construction that  $(G, \ell, r)$  satisfies (i) and (ii).

Let  $V_{\text{even}} = \{v_i^j : i \in [k], j \in [6] \text{ odd}\} \cup \ell$  and  $V_{\text{odd}} = V(G) - V_{\text{even}}$ . Then  $(V_{\text{even}}, V_{\text{odd}})$  is a bipartition of  $G$  with the desired properties, so (iii) follows.


Let  $P$  be the path defined by  $V(P) = V(G)$  and where  $E(P)$  contains the edges  $v_i^1 v_i^2, v_i^2 v_i^3, v_i^3 v_i^4, v_i^4 v_i^5$ , and  $v_i^5 v_i^6$  for  $i \in [k]$ , the edge  $v_i^6 v_{i+1}^1$  for all  $i \in [k-1]$  and the edges  $\ell v_1^1$  and  $r v_k^6$ . It is easy to see that  $P$  is a Hamiltonian  $\ell r$ -path of  $G$ . This proves (iv).

Now let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cycle subpartition of  $G - \{\ell, r\}$ . For  $i \in [k]$ , let  $V_i = \{v_i^1, \dots, v_i^6\}$ . First suppose that there exists a smallest index  $i \in [k-1]$  such that  $v_i^6 v_{i+1}^1 \in E(\mathcal{C})$  for some  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . Then, by definition, we obtain that  $v_i^6 v_{i+1}^1$  is the only edge of  $E(\mathcal{C})$  linking  $V_i$  and  $V(G) - V_i$ . This contradicts  $C$  being a cycle. We hence obtain that for every  $i \in [k]$ , there exists a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}_i$  of  $G[V_i]$  inherited from  $\mathcal{C}$ . Consider some  $i \in [k]$ . If  $\mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$ , we have  $w(\mathcal{C}_i) \geq \alpha |\mathcal{C}_i| \geq \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}$ . Otherwise, we have  $w(\mathcal{C}) \geq \beta |V_i| \geq \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}$ . It follows that  $w(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{i \in [k]} w(\mathcal{C}_i) \geq \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k$ . Hence (v) holds. ◀

We are now ready to give the main proof of Lemma C.3.

**Proof.** Let  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  be fixed and let  $G$  be a simple connected cubic graph. We set  $k = \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 1$ . We now construct a graph  $H$ . During this construction, when we say that we connect two vertices  $u, v$  with a chain gadget, we mean that we add an  $(\alpha, \beta, k)$ -chain gadget  $(G, \ell, r)$  to the current graph and then identify  $u$  with  $\ell$  and  $v$  with  $r$ . First, for every  $u \in V(G)$ , we let  $V(H)$  contain a set  $X_u = \{u_1^x, u_2^x, u_1^y, u_2^y, u_1^z, u_2^z\}$  of 6 vertices where  $(x, y, z)$  is an arbitrary ordering of  $N_G(u)$ . Next, we add the edges  $u_2^x u_1^y, u_2^y u_1^z$ , and  $u_2^z u_1^x$  to  $E(G)$  and we connect each of the following pairs of vertices with a chain gadget:  $(u_1^x, u_2^x), (u_1^y, u_2^y), (u_1^z, u_2^z)$ . Next, for every edge  $uv \in E(G)$ , we add a set  $X_{uv} = \{u_3^v, u_4^v, u_5^v, u_6^v, v_3^u, v_4^u, v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  of 8 vertices to  $V(H)$ , we add the edges  $u_1^v u_6^v, u_2^v u_3^v, u_3^v u_4^v, u_4^v u_5^v, u_4^v u_3^v, u_5^v u_6^v, u_6^v u_5^v, v_1^u v_6^u, v_2^u v_3^u$ , and  $v_4^u v_5^u$ , and we connect the following pairs of vertices by chain gadgets:  $(u_3^v, u_4^v), (u_5^v, u_6^v), (v_3^u, v_4^u), (v_5^u, v_6^u)$ . When speaking of a chain gadget, we mean one of those explicitly added in the construction. This finishes the description of  $H$ . Further, for a vertex  $u \in V(G)$ , we use  $X'_u$  for  $X_u \cup \bigcup_{v \in N_G(u)} X_{uv}$ . For an illustration, see Figure 5.

It follows directly by construction and property (i) of chain gadgets that  $H$  is cubic. Further, observe that the partition of  $V(H)$  into  $\{u_i^v : uv \in E(G), i \text{ odd}\}$  and  $\{u_i^v : uv \in$



■ **Figure 5** The construction of the graph  $H$ . The figure illustrates the subgraph generated for a vertex  $u \in V(G)$  incident to edges  $ux, uy$ , and  $uz$ . The remaining vertices in  $X_x, X_y$ , and  $X_z$  are omitted for clarity.

$E(G), i \text{ even}$  } is a bipartition of the graph obtained from  $H$  by replacing all chain gadgets by edges. By property (iii) of chain gadgets, this bipartition can be extended into a bipartition of  $H$ . It follows that  $H$  is bipartite.

Observe that  $V(H)$  consists of exactly 9 chain gadgets for every  $v \in V(G)$ ; thus, property (ii) of chain gadgets yields  $|V(H)| = 9(6k + 2)|V(G)| = \left(54 \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 18\right) |V(G)|$ .

It remains to prove that for every positive integer  $K$ , we have that  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight at most  $\alpha(|V(G)| + 2K)$  if and only if  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $K$ . It turns out that one of the two directions, namely constructing a cycle subpartition from a vertex cover is rather straight forward while it is significantly more difficult to construct a vertex cover from a cycle subpartition.

We next introduce a little more notation. Namely, for some  $x, y \in V(H)$  and a cycle  $C$  which is a subgraph of  $H$ , we say that  $C$  contains  $\overline{xy}$  if  $C$  contains a Hamiltonian path of the chain gadget.

We now define a certain collection of cycles in  $H$  of four different types. It will turn out that cycle subpartitions of  $H$  of minimum weight only contain cycles of one of these kinds. First, with the description of these cycles at hand, it will be easy to conclude the existence of a cycle subpartition of small weight of  $H$  from the existence of a small vertex cover of  $G$ . Afterwards, given a cycle subpartition of  $H$  of minimum weight, we use this minimality to show that all cycles of the cycle subpartition are of one of these types and that for every vertex in  $V(G)$ , some of these cycles intersect the corresponding gadget in a certain way. Once this is established, the remainder of the proof is not difficult.

For some  $u \in V(G)$  with  $N_G(u) = \{x, y, z\}$  and  $u_x^x u_1^y \in E(H)$ , a *1-cycle* for  $u$  consists of  $\overline{u_1^x u_2^x}, \overline{u_2^x u_1^y}, \overline{u_1^y u_2^y}, \overline{u_2^y u_1^z}, \overline{u_1^z u_2^z},$  and  $\overline{u_2^z u_1^x}$ . Next for an ordered pair  $(u, v)$  of vertices in  $V(G)$  with  $uv \in E(G)$ , a *2-cycle* for  $(u, v)$  consists of  $\overline{u_1^u u_6^v}, \overline{u_6^v u_5^v}, \overline{u_5^v u_4^v}, \overline{u_4^v u_3^v}, \overline{u_3^v u_2^v},$  and  $\overline{u_2^v u_1^v}$  and a *3-cycle* for  $(u, v)$  consists of  $\overline{u_1^u u_6^v}, \overline{u_6^v u_5^v}, \overline{u_5^v u_4^v}, \overline{u_4^v u_3^v}, \overline{u_3^v u_2^v},$  and  $\overline{u_2^v u_1^v}$ . Finally, for some  $e = uv \in E(G)$ , a *4-cycle* for  $e$  consists either of  $\overline{u_3^v u_4^v}, \overline{u_4^v u_3^u}, \overline{u_3^u u_4^u},$  and  $\overline{u_4^u u_3^v}$  or of  $\overline{u_5^v u_6^v}, \overline{u_6^v u_5^u}, \overline{u_5^u u_6^u},$  and  $\overline{u_6^u u_5^v}$ . An illustration of these cycles can be found in Figure 10. Observe that a 1-cycle for a vertex  $u$  and a 2-cycle or a 3-cycle for an ordered pair  $(u, v)$  are uniquely defined except that there may be several Hamiltonian paths inside chain gadgets which will be of no relevance. For every edge  $e \in E(G)$ , there are two 4-cycles for  $e$  which are distinct even when not taking into account different Hamiltonian paths of chain gadgets.


We are now ready to give the easy direction of the statement of the lemma.

▷ **Claim C.5.** Let  $Z$  be a vertex cover of  $G$ . Then  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight  $\alpha(|V(G)| + 2|Z|)$ .


**Proof.** We describe a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $H$ . First, for every  $u \in V(G) - Z$ , we let  $\mathcal{C}$  contain a 1-cycle for  $u$ . Next consider some  $uv \in E(G)$ . As  $Z$  is a vertex cover and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $u \in Z$ . If  $v \in Z$ , we let  $\mathcal{C}$  contain a 2-cycle for  $(u, v)$  and a 2-cycle for  $(v, u)$ . If  $v \in V(G) - Z$ , we let  $\mathcal{C}$  contain a 3-cycle for  $(u, v)$ . This finishes the description of  $\mathcal{C}$ . By construction, we have  $V(\mathcal{C}) = V(H)$  and  $|\mathcal{C}| = |V(G) - Z| + 3|Z| = |V(G)| + 2|Z|$ . This yields  $w(\mathcal{C}) = \alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta(|V(H) - V(\mathcal{C})|) = \alpha|\mathcal{C}| = \alpha(|V(G)| + 2|Z|)$ . ◀

We now give the other direction, which requires a much more involved proof. The difficulty is, roughly speaking, to obtain, starting with an arbitrary cycle subpartition, a cycle subpartition whose shape is similar to the shape of the cycle subpartitions constructed in Claim C.5.


Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cycle subpartition of  $H$  whose weight is at most  $\alpha(|V(G)| + 2K)$  for some positive integer  $K$ . We need to show that  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $K$ . We may




■ **Figure 6** The 1-cycle for a vertex  $u \in V(G)$ .



■ **Figure 7** The 2-cycle for a pair  $(u, x)$  with  $ux \in E(G)$ .



■ **Figure 8** The 3-cycle for a pair  $(u, x)$  with  $ux \in E(G)$ .



■ **Figure 9** The two 4-cycles for an edge  $ux \in E(G)$ .

■ **Figure 10** An illustration of the four cycle types. The vertex labels are the same as in Figure 5 and are omitted for clarity.

suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  is of minimum weight among all cycle subpartitions of  $H$ . In the following, if we say that a cycle  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  contains an edge of in  $E(H)$  (a set of edges in  $E(H)$ , a subgraph of  $H'$  of  $H$ ), we mean that  $E(C)$  contains this edge (this set of edges,  $E(H')$ ). The following first restriction on the structure of  $\mathcal{C}$  is simple, but very useful.

▷ **Claim C.6.** Let  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $H'$  a chain gadget in  $H$  connecting two vertices  $x, y$  such that  $C$  contains an  $xy$ -path fully contained  $H'$ . Then  $C$  contains a Hamiltonian path of  $H'$ .

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise and let  $C'$  be the cycle which is obtained from  $C$  by replacing the  $xy$ -path fully contained in  $H'$  by a Hamiltonian  $xy$ -path of  $H'$ . By property (iv) of chain gadgets, such a path exists. Further, let  $C'$  be obtained from  $\mathcal{C}$  by replacing  $C$  by  $C'$ . It is easy to see that  $|C'| \leq |C|$  and  $V(C) \subseteq V(C')$ . Further, by assumption, one of  $|C'| < |C|$  and  $V(C) \subsetneq V(C')$  holds. This yields  $w(C') - w(C) = \alpha(|C'| - |C|) + \beta(|V(H) - V(C')| - |V(H) - V(C)|) = \alpha(|C'| - |C|) + \beta(|V(C)| - |V(C')|) < 0$ , a contradiction to the choice of  $\mathcal{C}$ . ◀

In order to approach the crucial part of our proof, we need some definitions. First, we say that a chain gadget connecting two vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  is *neglected* if there does not exist a cycle in  $\mathcal{C}$  that contains  $\overline{xy}$ . Next, we say that some  $u \in V(G)$  is *erroneous* if there exists a neglected chain gadget connecting two vertices in  $X'_u$ . Next, we say that a cycle in  $\mathcal{C}$  is *affected* if it is not an  $i$ -cycle for some  $i \in [4]$ . We further define  $V_0$  to be the set of erroneous vertices.

We now prove through two claims that the existence of affected cycles implies the existence of erroneous vertices and hence contributes to  $\mathcal{C}$  being of large weight.

▷ **Claim C.7.** Let  $u \in V(G), v \in N_G(u)$  and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  an affected cycle that contains at least one of  $u_1^v u_6^v$  and  $u_2^v u_3^v$ . Then  $u$  is erroneous.

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise and suppose by symmetry that  $C$  contains  $u_1^v u_6^v$ . Then, as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle cover and by assumption, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $\overline{u_1^v u_2^v}$  and  $\overline{u_6^v u_5^v}$ . As  $C$  is a cycle, we obtain that  $C$  contains exactly one of  $u_5^v u_4^v$  and  $u_5^v v_6^u$ . We distinguish these two cases.

▶ **Case 1.**  $C$  contains  $u_5^v u_4^v$ .

By assumption, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $\overline{u_4^v u_3^v}$ . As  $C$  is not a 1-cycle for  $u$ , we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $u_2^v u_3^v$ . Hence, as  $C$  is a cycle, we have that  $C$  contains  $u_3^v v_4^u$ . Next, as  $u$  is not erroneous, there must be a cycle  $C'$  that contains  $\overline{v_5^u v_6^u}$ . As  $H[\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}]$  is acyclic, we have that  $C'$  contains at least two edges linking  $\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  and  $V(H) - \{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$ . As all vertices in  $N_H(\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}) - v_1^u$  have two neighbors in  $C$  not contained in  $\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$ , all edges linking  $\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  and  $V(H) - \{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  in  $C'$  must be incident to  $v_1^u$ . As there is only one edge in  $H$  linking  $\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  and  $v_1^u$ , we obtain a contradiction to  $C'$  being a cycle.

▶ **Case 2.**  $C$  contains  $u_5^v v_6^u$ .

By assumption, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $\overline{v_6^u v_5^u}$ . As  $C$  is a cycle that contains  $u_1^v u_6^v$  and  $\overline{u_6^v u_5^v}$ , we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $v_5^u u_6^u$ . It follows that  $C$  contains  $v_5^u v_4^u$  and hence, by assumption  $\overline{v_4^u v_3^u}$ . As  $C$  is a cycle, we obtain that  $C$  contains exactly one of  $v_3^u v_2^u$  and  $v_3^u u_4^u$ .

First suppose that  $C$  contains  $v_3^u v_2^u$ . As  $u$  is not erroneous, there must be a cycle  $C'$  that contains  $\overline{u_3^v u_4^v}$ . As  $H[\{u_3^v, u_4^v\}]$  is acyclic, we have that  $C'$  contains at least two edges linking  $\{v_5^u, v_6^u\}$  and  $V(H) - \{u_3^v, u_4^v\}$ . As all vertices in  $N_H(\{u_3^v, u_4^v\}) - u_2^v$  have two neighbors in  $C$  not contained in  $\{u_3^v, u_4^v\}$ , all edges linking  $\{u_3^v, u_4^v\}$  and  $V(H) - \{u_3^v, u_4^v\}$  in  $C'$  must be incident to  $u_2^v$ . As there is only one edge in  $H$  linking  $\{u_3^v, u_4^v\}$  and  $u_2^v$ , we obtain a contradiction to  $C'$  being a cycle.

Now suppose that  $C$  contains  $v_3^u u_4^v$ . By assumption, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $\overline{u_4^v u_3^v}$ . As  $C$  is a cycle that contains  $v_4^u v_5^u$  and  $\overline{v_4^u v_5^u}$ , we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $u_3^v u_4^u$ . As  $C$  is a cycle, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $u_2^v u_3^v$ . Hence  $C$  is a 3-cycle for  $(u, v)$ , a contradiction to  $C$  being affected. ◀

▷ **Claim C.8.** Let  $u \in V(G)$  and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  an affected cycle that contains at least one vertex of  $X_u$ . Then  $u$  is erroneous.

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise and let  $N_G(u) = \{x, y, z\}$  such that  $u_2^x u_1^y \in E(H)$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that  $C$  contains  $u_1^x$ . By assumption and as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition, we have that  $C$  contains  $\overline{u_1^x u_2^x}$ . If  $C$  contains one of  $u_1^x u_6^x$  and  $u_2^x u_3^x$ , we obtain a contradiction by Claim C.7. As  $C$  is a cycle, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $u_1^x u_2^z$  and  $u_2^x u_1^y$ . By assumption, we obtain that  $C$  contains  $\overline{u_1^y u_2^y}$  and  $\overline{u_1^z u_2^z}$ . If  $C$  contains  $u_2^y u_3^y$ , we obtain a contradiction by Claim C.7. Otherwise, we have that  $C$  contains  $u_2^y u_1^z$ , so  $C$  is a 1-cycle for  $u$ , a contradiction to  $C$  being affected. ◀

The following result precisely describes the interaction of  $\mathcal{C}$  and gadgets corresponding to vertices which are not erroneous.

▷ **Claim C.9.** Let  $u \in V(G) - V_0$ . Then either  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 1-cycle for  $u$  or  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 2-cycle or a 3-cycle for  $(u, v)$  for every  $v \in N_G(u)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $N_G(u) = \{x, y, z\}$  such that  $u_2^x u_1^y \in E(H)$ . As  $u \in V(G) - V_0$ , we obtain that  $\overline{u_1^x u_2^x}$  is contained in a cycle  $C$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ . By Claim C.8, we obtain that  $C$  is not affected. If  $u_2^x u_1^y \in E(C)$ , this implies that  $C$  is a 1-cycle for  $u$ . Otherwise, this implies that  $C$  is a 2-cycle or a 3-cycle for  $(u, x)$ . Similar arguments show that  $\mathcal{C}$  either contains a 1-cycle for  $u$  or 2-cycles or 3-cycles for  $(u, y)$  and  $(u, z)$ . As  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition, the statement follows. ◀

In the following, let  $E_0 \subseteq E(G)$  be the set of edges  $uv$  with  $u, v \in V(G) - V_0$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 1-cycle for  $u$  and a 1-cycle for  $v$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  contains at most one 4-cycle for  $uv$ .

We show that edges in  $E_0$  have a similar effect as erroneous vertices.

▷ **Claim C.10.** Let  $e = uv \in E_0$ . Then there exists a neglected chain gadget connecting two vertices in  $X_e$ .

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise, so, by symmetry and assumption, we may suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a cycle  $C$  that contains  $\overline{u_3^v u_4^v}$  and is not a 4-cycle. As  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition of  $H$  and contains a 1-cycle for  $u$ , we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $u_2^v u_3^v$ . Hence  $C$  contains  $u_3^v u_4^u$  and, by assumption,  $\overline{v_4^u v_3^u}$ . Next, as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition of  $H$  and contains a 1-cycle for  $v$ , we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $v_2^u v_3^u$ . Further, as  $C$  is not a 4-cycle, we obtain that  $C$  does not contain  $v_3^u u_4^v$ . This contradicts  $C$  being a cycle. ◀

Finally, in the following claim, we can show that there are actually no erroneous vertices and edges in  $E_0$  and hence the structure which was previously established for vertices which are not erroneous holds for all vertices in  $V(G)$ . The following claim in particular implies that  $\mathcal{C}$  does not contain affected cycles.

▷ **Claim C.11.**  $V_0 = E_0 = \emptyset$ .

**Proof.** We call a cycle in  $\mathcal{C}$  *indirectly affected* if it is not affected, but it contains a vertex of  $X_u$  for some  $u \in V_0$ . We describe in the following a different cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}'$  of  $H$ , obtaining a contradiction to the minimality of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We first delete all affected and indirectly

affected cycles from  $\mathcal{C}$ . Observe that every cycle that is not affected contains vertices of  $X_u$  for at most one  $u \in V(G)$ . Hence no cycle of  $\mathcal{C}$  that intersects  $X_u$  for some  $u \in V(G) - V_0$  is deleted. Now consider some  $uv \in E(G)$  with  $u, v \in V_0$ . We add a 1-cycle for  $(u, v)$  and a 1-cycle for  $(v, u)$ . Next consider some  $u \in V_0$  and some  $v \in N_G(u) - V_0$ . By Claim C.9, we have that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 1-cycle for  $v$ , a 2-cycle for  $(v, u)$ , or a 3-cycle for  $(v, u)$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 1-cycle for  $v$ , we add a 3-cycle for  $(u, v)$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 2-cycle for  $(v, u)$ , we add a 2-cycle for  $(u, v)$ . Further, if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 3-cycle for  $(v, u)$ , we replace this cycle by a 2-cycle for  $(v, u)$  and we add a 2-cycle for  $(u, v)$ . Finally, for every  $e \in E_0$ , we add 2 disjoint 4-cycles for  $e$ , deleting previously existing ones. We denote this newly constructed collection of cycles by  $\mathcal{C}'$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{C}'$  is a cycle subpartition of  $H$ .

In the following, we will show that  $w(\mathcal{C}') < w(\mathcal{C})$  unless  $V_0$  and  $E_0$  are empty. To this end, let  $V_1 \subseteq V(H)$  be the set of vertices which are contained in the interior of a neglected chain gadget and let  $V_2 = V(H) - V_1$ . By property (i) of chain gadgets, Claim C.6 and construction, we have that  $V(\mathcal{C})$  is fully contained in one of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_i$  be the cycle subpartition of  $H[V_i]$  inherited from  $\mathcal{C}$ . By the definition of  $V_0$ , for every  $u \in V_0$ , there exists a neglected chain gadget connecting two vertices in  $X'_u$ .

Next, by Claim C.10, for every  $e \in E_0$ , there exists a neglected chain gadget connecting two vertices in  $X_e$ . It follows that the total number of neglected chain gadgets is at least  $\frac{1}{2}|V_0| + |E_0|$ . It hence follows by property (v) of chain gadgets that  $w(\mathcal{C}_1) \geq \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k(\frac{1}{2}|V_0| + |E_0|)$ . Next observe that by construction and Claim C.9, we have that  $V(\mathcal{C}') = V(H)$ , so in particular  $|V(H) - V(\mathcal{C}')| \leq |V(H) - V(\mathcal{C})|$ . Finally observe that, when constructing  $\mathcal{C}'$ , we added at most two cycles for every  $u \in V_0$  and  $v \in N_G(u)$  and we added at most two cycles for every  $e \in E_0$ . This yields  $|\mathcal{C}'| - |\mathcal{C}| \leq 6|V_0| + 2|E_0|$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{C}') - w(\mathcal{C}) &= (w(\mathcal{C}') - w(\mathcal{C}_1)) - w(\mathcal{C}_2) \\ &\leq \alpha(|\mathcal{C}'| - |\mathcal{C}|) - \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k(\frac{1}{2}|V_0| + |E_0|) \\ &\leq \alpha(6|V_0| + 2|E_0|) - \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k(\frac{1}{2}|V_0| + |E_0|) \\ &= (6\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k)|V_0| + (2\alpha - \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k)|E_0|. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of  $k$ , we obtain that  $6\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k < 6\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}(\max\{12, \frac{2\alpha}{\beta}\}) < 0$  and  $2\alpha - \min\{\alpha, 6\beta\}k < 0$ . Hence, if one of  $V_0$  and  $E_0$  is nonempty, we obtain a contradiction to the choice of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Hence the statement follows.  $\blacktriangleleft$

We are now ready to construct a vertex cover of  $G$ . First we associate cycles in  $\mathcal{C}$  to vertices in  $V(G)$ . For every vertex  $u \in V(G)$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 1-cycle of  $u$ , we associate this 1-cycle to  $u$ . For vertex  $u \in V(G)$  and every  $v \in N_G(u)$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 2-cycle or 3-cycle of  $(u, v)$ , we associate this cycle to  $u$ . Finally consider an edge  $e = uv \in E(G)$  such that  $X_e$  contains two disjoint 4-cycles. Then we associate these two cycles to an arbitrary vertex in  $\{u, v\}$ . Let  $Z \subseteq V(G)$  be the set of vertices which are associated to at least 3 cycles. By Claims C.9 and C.11 and construction, every vertex is associated to at least one cycle. Further, we have by construction that every cycle is associated to at most one vertex. This implies  $w(\mathcal{C}) \geq \alpha|\mathcal{C}| \geq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2|Z|)$ . As  $w(\mathcal{C}) \leq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2K)$ , we obtain  $|Z| \leq K$ . It remains to prove that  $Z$  is a vertex cover of  $G$ . To this end, let  $uv \in E(G)$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 2-cycle or a 3-cycle for one of  $(u, v)$  or  $(v, u)$ , then, by construction, we have that  $Z$  contains one of  $u$  and  $v$ . Otherwise, by Claims C.9 and C.11, we obtain that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains 1-cycles for  $u$  and  $v$ . By Claim C.11, we have that  $uv$  is not contained in  $E_0$  and hence  $\mathcal{C}$  contains 2 4-cycles for  $uv$ . It follows by construction that  $Z$  contains one of  $u$  and  $v$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

For the main proof of Theorem C.1,  
we use the following simple result.

► **Proposition C.12.** *Let  $G$  be a cubic graph and  $Z$  a vertex cover of  $G$ . Then  $|Z| \geq |V(G)|/2$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $|Z| < |V(G)|/2$ . Since  $\deg_G(v) = 3$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ , it follows that the number of edges incident to  $Z$  is at most  $3|Z| < 3|V(G)|/2 = |E(G)|$ , a contradiction. ◀

We are now ready to give the main proof of Theorem C.1.

**Proof.** (of Theorem C.1) Let  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \kappa$  with  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$  be fixed. Let  $\epsilon$  be the constant from Proposition C.2 and let  $\epsilon' = \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{(3\alpha + \gamma + 1)2(54 \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 18)}$ .

Now suppose that there exists a polynomial time algorithm  $A$  that, given a connected cubic graph  $H$  and a positive constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight at most  $K$  and returns ‘no’ if  $H$  does not admit a cycle subpartition of weight at most  $(1 + \epsilon')K$ .

Let a graph  $G$  and an integer  $K_1$  be given. We will design an algorithm that returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size  $K_1$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a vertex cover of size at most  $(1 + \epsilon)K_1$ . First, if  $K_1 < \frac{1}{2}|V(G)|$ , we return ‘no’ and if  $K_1 \geq |V(G)|$ , we return ‘yes’. This is justified by Proposition C.12 and the fact that  $V(G)$  is trivially a vertex cover of  $G$ . Next, if  $|V(G)| < \max\{\kappa, \frac{|\kappa|}{\gamma}\}$ , we compute a minimum vertex cover by a brute force approach and output an appropriate answer. We may hence in the following assume that  $\frac{1}{2}|V(G)| \leq K_1 < |V(G)|$  and  $|V(G)| \geq \max\{\kappa, \frac{|\kappa|}{\gamma}\}$ . We now use Lemma C.3 and compute, in polynomial time, a cubic bipartite graph  $H$  with  $|V(H)| \leq (54 \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 18)|V(G)|$  such that for every positive integer  $K$ , we have that  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta(|V(H) - V(\mathcal{C})|) \leq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2K)$  if and only if  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $K$ .

We now apply  $A$  to  $H$  and  $K_2$  which is defined by  $K_2 = \alpha(|V(G)| + 2K_1) + \gamma|V(H)| + \kappa$ . Observe that  $K_2 > \gamma|V(H)| + \kappa \geq \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa \geq \gamma \frac{|\kappa|}{\gamma} + \kappa = |\kappa| + \kappa \geq 0$ . We output the output of  $A$ .

Observe that our complete algorithm can be executed in polynomial time. We now analyze the correctness of this algorithm. First suppose that  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $K_1$ . Then  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition of weight  $K_2$ . By assumption, our algorithm outputs ‘yes’.

Now suppose that our algorithm outputs ‘yes’. Then, by assumption, we have that  $H$  admits a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  of weight at most  $(1 + \epsilon')K_2$ .

Observe that, by the assumptions on  $K_1$ , the definition of  $\epsilon'$  and  $|V(H)| \geq |V(G)|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\epsilon K_1 &\geq \alpha\epsilon \frac{1}{2}|V(G)| \\ &\geq \alpha\epsilon \frac{1}{2(54 \max\{12, \lceil \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \rceil\} + 18)}|V(H)| \\ &\geq \epsilon'(3\alpha + \gamma + 1)|V(H)| \\ &\geq \epsilon'(\alpha(2K_1 + |V(G)|) + \gamma|V(H)| + \kappa) = \epsilon'K_2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{C}) &\leq (1 + \epsilon')K_2 = K_2 + \epsilon'K_2 \\ &\leq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2K_1) + \gamma|V(H)| + \kappa + \alpha\epsilon K_1 \\ &\leq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2(1 + \epsilon)K_1) + \gamma|V(H)| + \kappa. \end{aligned}$$



It follows by the definition of the weight function that  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta(|V(H) - V(\mathcal{C})|) \leq \alpha(|V(G)| + 2(1 + \epsilon)K_1)$ .

This yields that  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $(1 + \epsilon)K_1$ . We now obtain  $P = NP$  from Proposition C.2.  $\blacktriangleleft$

### C.1.2 Hardness for $\delta$ -Tours

We prove the following more formal restatement for Corollary 3.13.

► **Theorem C.13.** *For every  $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ , there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that, unless  $P = NP$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a connected graph  $G$  and a positive real  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $(1 + \epsilon)K$ .*

► **Lemma C.14.** *Let  $G$  be a connected, cubic graph and  $\delta, K$  constants with  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $K > 0$ . Then  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  if and only if  $G$  admits a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa \leq K$  where  $\alpha = 4\delta, \beta = 1, \gamma = 2 - 2\delta$  and  $\kappa = -4\delta$ .*

**Proof.** Let first  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cycle subpartition of  $G$  that satisfies  $\alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa \leq K$ . Let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by contracting every cycle of  $\mathcal{C}$  into a single vertex. As  $G$  is connected, so is  $G'$ . We can hence choose a spanning tree  $T$  of  $G'$ . Let  $F$  be the set of edges in  $E(G)$  that correspond to the edges in  $E(T)$ . Observe that  $|F| = |V(G')| - 1 = |\mathcal{C}| + |V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| - 1$ . Now let  $H$  be the multigraph on  $V(G)$  that contains  $E(\mathcal{C})$  and that contains two copies of every edge of  $F$ . As  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition of  $G$ , we obtain that the degree of every vertex of  $H$  is even. Further, it follows by construction that  $H$  is connected. Hence, by Proposition A.1, we obtain that  $H$  admits an Euler tour  $T_0$ . We now obtain a tour  $T$  in  $G$  from  $T_0$  in the following way: for every  $uv \in E(G)$  that is not traversed by  $T_0$ , we choose an arbitrary occurrence of one of  $u$  and  $v$ , say  $u$ , and replace this occurrence by the segment  $up(u, v, 1 - 2\delta, u)$ . It follows directly by construction and Lemma A.11 that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$ . Further, as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition and  $G$  is cubic, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(T) &= 2|F| + |E(\mathcal{C})| + (2 - 4\delta)|E(G) - (F \cup E(\mathcal{C}))| \\ &= 4\delta|F| + (4\delta - 1)|E(\mathcal{C})| + (2 - 4\delta)|E(G)| \\ &= 4\delta(|\mathcal{C}| + |V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| - 1) + (4\delta - 1)|V(\mathcal{C})| + (3 - 6\delta)|V(G)| \\ &= \alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa \\ &\leq K. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $G$  a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  with  $\ell(T) \leq K$ . By Lemma A.24 and as  $G$  is cubic, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice and that one of (c) and (d) of Lemma A.24 holds for every  $uv \in E(G)$ . Now let  $F_1$  be the set of edges in  $E(G)$  which are traversed an odd number of times by  $T$ , let  $F_2$  be the set of edges of  $E(G)$  that are traversed an even number of times, but at least twice, by  $T$  and let  $F_3 = E(G) - (F_1 \cup F_2)$ . Observe that, as  $T$  is a tour, every vertex of  $G$  is incident to an even number of edges in  $F_1$ . Hence  $F_1$  forms the edge set of a cycle subpartition  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $G$ . Further, as  $T$  is a nice tour stopping at every vertex of  $G$  and (d) of Lemma A.24 holds for every  $uv \in F_3$ , we obtain  $|F_2| \geq |\mathcal{C}| + |V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| - 1$ .

Further, as  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cycle subpartition and  $G$  is cubic, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K &\geq \ell(T) \\
&\geq 2|F_2| + |F_1| + (2 - 4\delta)|F_3| \\
&= 2|F_2| + |F_1| + (2 - 4\delta)|E(G) - (F_1 \cup F_2)| \\
&= 4\delta|F_2| + (4\delta - 1)|F_1| + (2 - 4\delta)|E(G)| \\
&\geq 4\delta(|\mathcal{C}| + |V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| - 1) + (4\delta - 1)|V(\mathcal{C})| + (3 - 6\delta)|V(G)| \\
&= \alpha|\mathcal{C}| + \beta|V(G) - V(\mathcal{C})| + \gamma|V(G)| + \kappa.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Observe that for any constant  $\delta$  with  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ , we have that all of  $4\delta$ ,  $1$ , and  $2 - 2\delta$  are positive. Hence Lemma C.14 and Theorem C.1 directly imply Theorem C.13.

### C.1.3 Hardness for Cubic Bipartite TSP

We now obtain the hardness result for cubic bipartite TSP through the following simple observation.

► **Lemma C.15.** *Let  $G$  be a cubic bipartite connected graph and  $K$  a constant. Then  $G$  admits a TSP-tour of length at most  $K$  if and only if  $G$  admits a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour of length  $K$ .*

**Proof.** First let  $T$  be a TSP-tour of  $G$  with  $\ell(T) \leq K$ . Clearly, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. It then follows directly from Lemma A.11 that  $T$  is a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour of  $G$ .

Now suppose that  $G$  admits a  $\frac{1}{2}$ -tour  $T$  with  $\ell(T) \leq K$ . By Lemma A.24 and as  $G$  is cubic, we may suppose that one of (c) and (d) of Lemma A.24 holds for every  $uv \in E(G)$ . Hence  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

Theorem C.13 and Lemma C.15 immediately imply Corollary 3.13.

## C.2 APX-Hardness for $\delta \geq 1/2$ via Subdivision

In this section, we extend the hardness result obtained for small  $\delta$  in the previous section to arbitrary values of  $\delta$ . More concretely, we prove Theorem 3.14. The key ingredient to transfer the hardness result to larger  $\delta$  is the following simple subdivision result.

► **Lemma C.16.** *Let  $G$  be a graph,  $\delta > 0$  a constant and  $k$  a positive integer. Then, in polynomial time, we can create a graph  $G'$  such that for every  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$ , there exists a  $k\delta$ -tour  $T'$  with  $\ell(T') = k\ell(T)$  in  $G'$ , and for every  $k\delta$ -tour  $T'$  in  $G'$ , there exists a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$  with  $\ell(T) = \frac{1}{k}\ell(T')$ . Moreover,  $T$  and  $T'$  can be constructed from each other in polynomial time.*

**Proof.** We obtain  $G'$  from  $G$  by subdividing each edge of  $G$   $k - 1$  times. Clearly,  $G'$  can be constructed from  $G$  in polynomial time. For some  $uv \in E(G)$ , we denote the newly created vertices by  $x_{uv}^1, \dots, x_{uv}^{k-1}$  in the order they appear when following the path in  $G'$  corresponding to  $uv$  from  $u$  to  $v$ . Further, we use  $x_{uv}^0$  for  $u$  and  $x_{uv}^k$  for  $v$ . By convention, we have  $x_{uv}^i = x_{vu}^{k-i}$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ . We next define a natural bijection  $\varphi : P(G) \rightarrow P(G')$ ; namely, we set  $\varphi(v) = v$  for all  $v \in V(G)$  and for any  $p = p(u, v, \lambda) \in P(G)$  with  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , we set  $\varphi(p) = p(x_{uv}^{\lfloor k\lambda \rfloor}, x_{uv}^{\lfloor k\lambda \rfloor + 1}, k\lambda - \lfloor k\lambda \rfloor)$ . It is easy to see that  $\varphi$  is a bijection.

First let  $T$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . By Lemma A.2, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. In order to construct a tour  $T'$  in  $G'$ , let  $p$  and  $q$  be consecutive stopping points on  $T$ . As  $T$  is nice

and by symmetry, we may suppose that there exists some  $uv \in E(G)$  with  $p = u$  and  $\varphi(q) = (x_{uv}^{i-1}, x_{uv}^i, \lambda)$  for some  $i \in [k]$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . We replace  $pq$  by  $u, x_{uv}^1, x_{uv}^2, \dots, x_{uv}^{i-1}, \varphi(q)$ . We obtain  $T'$  by applying this replacement to every pair of consecutive stopping points of  $T$ . It is easy to see that  $T'$  is a tour in  $G$  with  $\ell(T') = k\ell(T)$ . In order to prove that  $T'$  is a  $k\delta$ -tour, consider some  $q' \in P(G')$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , there exists some  $p \in P(T)$  with  $d_G(p, \varphi^{-1}(q')) \leq \delta$ . We obtain that  $d_{G'}(\varphi(p), q') \leq k\delta$ . By construction, we have  $\varphi(p) \in P(T')$ ; it follows that  $T'$  is a  $k\delta$ -tour in  $G'$ .

Now let  $T'$  be a  $k\delta$ -tour in  $G'$ . We obtain  $T$  from  $T'$  by replacing  $p'$  by  $\varphi^{-1}(p')$  for all  $p' \in P(T')$ . It is easy to see that  $T$  is a tour in  $G$  with  $\ell(T) = \frac{1}{k}\ell(T')$ . Now consider some  $q \in P(G)$ . As  $T'$  is a  $k\delta$ -tour in  $G'$ , there exists some  $p' \in P(T')$  such that  $d_{G'}(\varphi(q), p') \leq k\delta$ . This yields  $d_{G'}(q, \varphi^{-1}(p')) \leq \delta$ . As  $\varphi^{-1}(p') \in P(T)$  by construction, it follows that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

We are now ready to conclude Theorem 3.14 from Theorem 3.12 and Lemma C.16. For convenience, Theorem 3.14 is restated below.

► **Theorem 3.14.** *The problem  $\delta$ -TOUR is APX-hard for any real  $\delta > 0$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\delta > 0$  and consider  $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{\lceil 2\delta \rceil + 1}$ . Observe that  $\delta' < \frac{1}{2}$ , so by Theorem 3.12, there exists some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that there is no polynomial-time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the problem of computing a shortest  $\delta'$ -tour unless  $P = NP$ .

Suppose that there exists a polynomial-time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for  $\delta$ -TOUR. Let  $G'$  be a graph and  $K$  be a constant. By Lemma C.16, in polynomial time, we can compute a graph  $G$  such that for every  $\delta'$ -tour  $T'$  in  $G'$ , there exists a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  with  $\ell(T) = (\lceil 2\delta \rceil + 1)\ell(T')$  and for every  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$ , there exists a  $\delta'$ -tour  $T'$  in  $G'$  with  $\ell(T') = \frac{1}{\lceil 2\delta \rceil + 1}\ell(T)$ . By assumption, there exists a polynomial time algorithm that outputs ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $(\lceil 2\delta \rceil + 1)K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $(1 + \epsilon)(\lceil 2\delta \rceil + 1)K$ . Observe that this algorithm outputs ‘yes’ if  $G'$  admits a  $\delta'$ -tour of length at most  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $(1 + \epsilon)K$ . Further, the total running time of this procedure is polynomial. It follows that  $P = NP$ . ◀

### C.3 Inapproximability for Covering Range $\delta \geq 3/2$

This section is dedicated to proving Theorem 3.15. Our main technical ingredient is a lemma mapping instances of the dominating set problem in so-called split graphs to instances of our tour problem. This lemma will be reused in Section D.2.

We need two technical definitions. A graph  $G$  is called a *split graph* if there exists a partition  $(C, I)$  of  $V(G)$  such that  $C$  is a clique and  $I$  is an independent set. We say that a split graph is *trivial* if it contains a dominating set of size at most 2, *nontrivial* otherwise.

We are now ready to give the main lemma for Theorem 3.15.

► **Lemma C.17.** *For any fixed  $\delta \geq 1.5$  and every nontrivial, connected split graph  $G$ , in polynomial time, we can compute a graph  $G'$  such that the following conditions hold:*

1.  $|V(G')| \leq \delta|V(G)|$ ,
2. for every dominating set  $S$  in  $G$ , there exists a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G'$  with  $\ell(T) \leq |S|$ ,
3. for every  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  in  $G'$ , there exists a dominating set  $S$  in  $G$  with  $|S| \leq \frac{1}{s_\delta}\ell(T)$  where  $s_\delta = \min\{|s_1 - s_2| : \{s_i, 1 - s_i\} \cap S_\delta \neq \emptyset \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}, s_1 \notin \{s_2, 1 - s_2\}\}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $(C, I)$  be a partition of  $V(G)$  such that  $C$  is a clique and  $I$  is a stable set. It is easy to see that  $(C, I)$  can be computed in polynomial time given  $G$ . We now create  $G'$  from

$G$  in the following way. If  $\delta \geq 2$ , for every  $v \in I$ , we add a new vertex  $v'$  and we connect  $v$  and  $v'$  by a path of length  $\lfloor \delta \rfloor - 1$ . If  $\delta < 2$ , we set  $G' = G$  and  $v' = v$  for all  $v \in I$ . This finishes the description of  $G'$ . By construction, we have  $|V(G')| = |V(G)| + (\lfloor \delta \rfloor - 1)|I| \leq \delta|V(G)|$ , so (1) holds.

To prove (2), let  $S$  be a dominating in  $G$ . Suppose that there exists some  $v \in I \cap S$ . If there exists some  $u \in N_G(v) \cap S$ , then, as  $G$  is a split graph, we have that  $S - v$  is a dominating set in  $G$ . Otherwise, as  $G$  is connected, there exists some  $u \in N_G(v)$ . Now, as  $G$  is a split graph, we have that  $S - v \cup u$  is a dominating set of  $G$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $S \subseteq C$ . Let  $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$  be an arbitrary ordering of  $S$  and let  $T = (s_1, \dots, s_k, s_1)$ . As  $C$  is a clique, we have that  $T$  is a tour in  $G'$ . Further, we clearly have  $\ell(T) = |S|$ . In order to see that  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G'$ , let  $p = p(x, y, \lambda) \in P(G)$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that  $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . If  $x \in C$ , let  $u \in S$ . As  $C$  is a clique, we have  $d_{G'}(p, T) \leq d_{G'}(p, u) \leq d_{G'}(p, x) + d_{G'}(x, u) \leq \frac{1}{2} + 1 \leq \delta$ . Otherwise, by construction, we have  $d_{G'}(p, v) \leq \delta - 1$  for some  $v \in I$ . As  $S$  is a dominating set, there exists some  $u \in N_{G'}(v) \cap S$ . This yields  $d_{G'}(p, T) \leq d_{G'}(p, u) \leq d_{G'}(p, v) + d_{G'}(v, u) \leq (\delta - 1) + 1 = \delta$ . This proves (2).

In order to prove (3), let  $T$  be a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G'$ . By Lemma A.18, we may suppose that every stopping point of  $T$  is of the form  $p(x, y, \lambda)$  for some  $xy \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \in S_\delta$  and further, that either  $\alpha(T) \leq 2$  or  $T$  is nice. Further, let  $S$  contain all the elements  $u$  of  $C$  such that  $T$  stops at a point of the form  $p(u, v, \lambda)$  for some  $\lambda < 1$ .

First suppose that  $S = \emptyset$ . Then, by construction, there exists some  $v \in I$  such that all stopping of  $T$  are on the unique path from  $v$  to  $v'$  in  $G'$ . As  $G$  is non-trivial, there exists some  $w \in I - v$ . By construction, we have  $d_{G'}(w', T) \geq d_{G'}(w', v) = d_{G'}(w', w) + d_{G'}(w, v) = \lfloor \delta \rfloor - 1 + 2 > \delta$ , a contradiction to  $T$  being a  $\delta$ -tour. We may hence suppose that  $S \neq \emptyset$ .

We next show that  $S$  is a dominating set of  $G$ . As  $S \neq \emptyset$  and  $C$  is a clique, we have that  $S$  dominates  $C$ . Now consider some  $v \in I$  and suppose for the sake of a contradiction that  $S$  does not dominate  $v$ . As  $T$  is a tour and by construction, we obtain that  $T$  does not stop at any point of the unique path in  $G'$  linking  $v$  and  $v'$ . This yields that  $d_G(v', T) = d_G(v, v') + d_G(v, T) = \lfloor \delta \rfloor - 1 + 2 > \delta$ , a contradiction to  $T$  being a  $\delta$ -tour.

As  $G$  is non-trivial and  $S$  is a dominating set, we obtain  $|S| \geq 3$ . It follows that  $T$  has at least  $|S|$  stopping points and hence, in particular, is nice. We obtain  $\ell(T) \geq s_\delta |S|$ . Hence (3) holds.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The following well-known result can easily be obtained from a corresponding result for the set cover problem in [10].

► **Proposition C.18.** *Unless  $P = NP$ , there exists an absolute constant  $\alpha_0$  for which there exists no algorithm that runs in polynomial time and, given a graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a dominating set of size at most  $\alpha_0 \log(|V(G)|)K$ .*

Literally following a proof by Raman and Saurabh [34, Thm. 2], we obtain the following result from Proposition C.18.

► **Theorem C.19.** *Unless  $P = NP$ , there exists an absolute constant  $\alpha$  for which there exists no algorithm that runs in polynomial time and, given a split graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a dominating set of size at most  $\alpha \log(|V(G)|)K$ .*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.15, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.15.** *Unless  $P = NP$ , for every  $\delta \geq 3/2$ , there exists an absolute constant  $\alpha_\delta$  such that there is no  $P$ -time algorithm that, given a connected graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  and ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $\alpha_\delta \log(|V(G)|)K$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\delta \geq \frac{3}{2}$ , let  $\alpha_\delta = \frac{\delta}{2}\alpha$  and suppose that there exists a polynomial time algorithm  $A$  that, given a graph  $G'$  and a constant  $K'$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K'$  and ‘no’ if  $G'$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $\alpha_\delta \log(|V(G')|)K'$ . We will show that  $P = NP$  using Theorem C.19.

Let  $G$  be a split graph and  $K$  a constant. Observe that every subgraph of a split graph is also a split graph. Hence, if  $G$  is disconnected, we may apply our algorithm to every connected component of  $G$ . Next, if  $|V(G)| \leq \delta$ , we can solve the problem by a brute force approach by Corollary A.26. We first test in  $O(|V(G)|^2)$  whether  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most 2. If this is the case, we may output an appropriate answer. We may therefore suppose that  $G$  is nontrivial, connected and satisfies  $|V(G)| \geq \delta$ .

It then follows by Lemma C.17 that we can compute a graph  $G'$  satisfying (1), (2), and (3) in polynomial time. We then apply  $A$  to  $G'$  and  $K$  and output the output of  $A$ . Observe that the total running time of the algorithm is polynomial. Further, if  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most  $K$ , then, by (1), we have that  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ , so the algorithm returns ‘yes’. Now assume that the algorithm returns ‘yes’, so by assumption, we have that  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $\alpha_\delta \log(|V(G')|)K$ . By (3), there exists a dominating set  $S$  of  $G$  that satisfies  $|S| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}\alpha_\delta \log(|V(G')|)K$ . As  $|V(G)| \geq \delta$ , we have  $\log(|V(G')|) \leq 2 \log(|V(G)|)$ , yielding  $|S| \leq \alpha \log(|V(G)|)K$ . By Theorem C.19, we obtain that  $P = NP$ .

By Theorem C.19, we obtain that  $P = NP$ . ◀

## D Parameterized Complexity

In this section, we analyze the parameterized complexity of our problem  $\delta$ -TOUR. On the one hand, we look at the problem parameterized by the length of a shortest tour. Here we give an FPT algorithm for all  $\delta < 3/2$  in Appendix D.1 and provide hardness results for  $\delta \geq 3/2$  in Appendix D.2. On the other hand, we analyze the problem with the parameter  $n/\delta$  where  $n$  is the given graph’s order. Appendix D.3 presents an XP-algorithm and Appendix D.4 rules out the existence of an FPT algorithm under the assumption  $FPT \neq W[1]$ .

### D.1 FPT Algorithm Parameterized by Tour Length for $\delta < 3/2$

This section derives an FPT algorithm for  $\delta$ -TOUR parameterized by the length of a shortest tour  $\text{OPT}_{\delta\text{-tour}}$ . In fact, we give an algorithm which allows  $\delta$  to be part of the input and that is fixed-parameter tractable for  $\delta$  and tour length  $K$  combined. Formally, we prove Theorem 3.16, which we restate here for convenience.

► **Theorem 3.16.** *There is an algorithm that, given a graph  $G$  and reals  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$  and  $K \geq 0$ , decides whether  $G$  has a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $f(K, \delta) \cdot n^{O(1)}$  time, for some computable function  $f$ .*

Our algorithm is based on the following kernelization: Given a graph  $G$ , reals  $\delta \in (0, 3/2)$  and  $K \geq 0$ , we either correctly conclude that  $G$  has no  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ , or output an equivalent instance of size at most  $f(K, \delta)$  for a computable function  $f$ . The key insight is a bound on the vertex cover size of  $f(K, \delta)$  for a computable function, assuming there exists

a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ , see Lemma D.1. Hence we may compute an approximation  $C$  of a minimum vertex cover, and reject the instance if  $C$  is too large. We partition the vertices in  $V(G) - C$  by their neighborhood in the vertex cover  $C$ . The main remaining insight from Proposition D.2 is that we can remove from any set  $S$  of the partition whose size is larger than  $f(K, \delta)$  for a given computable function  $f$ , one vertex and obtain an equivalent instance.

Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $T$  a tour of  $G$  that stops at at least 3 points. We then say that  $T$  *neglects* a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  if  $T$  does not stop at a point in distance less than 1 to  $v$ . Let  $S_\delta \subseteq [0, 1]$  be the set of edge positions of a discretized tour according to Lemma 3.2. Further, let  $s_\delta = \min\{|s_1 - s_2| : \{s_i, 1 - s_i\} \cap S_\delta \neq \emptyset \text{ for } i \in [2], s_1 \notin \{s_2, 1 - s_2\}\}$ . Further, let  $s_\delta = \min\{|s_1 - s_2| : \{s_i, 1 - s_i\} \cap S_\delta \neq \emptyset \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}, s_1 \notin \{s_2, 1 - s_2\}\}$ .

The next result shows that if a connected graph  $G$  admits a short  $\delta$ -tour, then it also admits a small vertex cover.

► **Lemma D.1.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and let  $T$  be a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  for some  $\delta > 0$  with  $\delta < \frac{3}{2}$  where  $T$  stops at at least 3 points. Then  $G$  admits a vertex cover of size at most  $\frac{1}{s_\delta} \ell(T) + 1$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $X$  be the set of vertices in  $V(G)$  which are not neglected by  $T$ . As  $T$  stops at at least 3 points, we may suppose that  $T$  stops at some  $v_0 \in V(G)$  and  $|X| \geq 3$ . For every  $v \in X - v_0$ , we now define  $\lambda_v$  to be the largest constant such that  $T$  stops at a point of the form  $p(u, v, \lambda_v)$  for some  $u \in N_G(v)$ . As  $T$  is nice, we obtain that  $\ell(T) \geq \sum_{v \in X - v_0} \min\{2\lambda_v, 1\} \geq \sum_{v \in X - v_0} \min\{2s_\delta, 1\} \geq (|X| - 1)s_\delta$ . It follows that  $|X| \leq \frac{1}{s_\delta} \ell(T) + 1$ . In order to prove that  $X$  is a vertex cover, let  $e = uv \in E(G)$  and let  $p = (u, v, \frac{1}{2})$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  and by Proposition A.3, there exists some  $q \in P(G)$  stopped at by  $T$  such that  $d_G(p, q) \leq \delta$ . As  $\delta < \frac{3}{2}$  and by symmetry, we may suppose that  $q = (w, u, \lambda)$  for some  $w \in N_G(u)$  and some  $\lambda > 0$ . We obtain that  $u \in X$ . It follows that  $X$  is a vertex cover of  $G$ . ◀

The next result shows that if the graph is very large in comparison to the tour length, then the tour neglects some vertices of the graph.

► **Proposition D.2.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $T$  a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  stopping at at least 3 points and  $Y$  a set of at least  $\frac{1}{s_\delta} \ell(T) + 2$  vertices in  $V(G)$ . Then at least one vertex in  $Y$  is neglected by  $T$ .*

**Proof.** By assumption, there exists some  $v_0 \in V(G)$  that  $T$  stops at. Now suppose that no vertex of  $Y$  is neglected by  $T$ . Then we have  $\ell(T) \geq |Y - v_0| \min\{2s_\delta, 1\} \geq (|Y| - 1)s_\delta$ . This yields  $|Y| \leq \frac{1}{s_\delta} \ell(T) + 1$ , a contradiction. ◀

Given a graph  $G$ , two vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$  are *false twins* in  $G$  if  $N_G(u) = N_G(v)$  and  $E(G)$  does not contain an edge linking  $u$  and  $v$ . A *set of false of twins* in  $G$  is a set of vertices which are pairwise false twins in  $G$ .

► **Lemma D.3.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta > 0$  and  $K > 0$ . Moreover, let  $Y \subseteq V(G)$  be a set of false twins of size at least  $\frac{1}{s_\delta} K + 3$  and  $y \in Y$ . Then  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  if and only if  $G - y$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ . Moreover, every nice  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $G - y$  is a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $G$ .*

**Proof.** First suppose that  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of length at most  $K$ . By Lemma 3.1, without loss of generality, we may suppose that  $T$  is nice. It follows from Proposition D.2 that  $G$  neglects some vertex in  $Y$ . Possibly relabeling some elements of  $Y$ , we may suppose that  $T$  neglects  $y$ . We now show that  $T$  is also a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G - y$ . First observe that, as  $T$  neglects  $y$ ,

we clearly have that  $T$  is a tour in  $G - y$ . Now consider some  $p \in P(G - y)$ . As  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ , we obtain that there exists some point  $q \in P(G)$  passed by  $T$  such that  $d_G(p, q) \leq \delta$ . As  $T$  neglects  $y$ , we obtain  $q \in P(G - y)$ . Now let  $W = pp_1 \dots p_z q$  be a shortest  $pq$ -walk in  $G$ . By assumption, we have  $\ell(W) \leq \delta$ . Further, we may suppose that  $p_i \in V(G)$  for  $i \in [z]$ . If  $p_i \neq y$  for all  $i \in [z]$ , it holds  $d_{G-y}(p, T) \leq d_{G-y}(p, q) \leq \ell(W) \leq \delta$ . We may hence suppose that  $p_i = y$  for some  $i \in [z]$ . Let  $y' \in Y - y$  and let  $W' = pp_1 \dots p_{i-1} y' p_{i+1} \dots p_z q$ .

As  $y$  and  $y'$  are false twins, we obtain that  $W'$  is a walk in  $G - y$ . This yields  $d_{G-y}(p, T) \leq d_{G-y}(p, q) \leq \ell(W') = \ell(W) \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G - y$ .

Now suppose that  $G - y$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  and let  $T$  be a nice shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G - y$ . Clearly, we have  $\ell(T) \leq K$  and  $T$  is also a tour in  $G$ . Now consider some  $p \in P(G)$ . If  $p \in P(G - y)$ , as  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G - y$ , we have  $d_G(p, T) \leq d_{G-y}(p, T) \leq \delta$ . We may hence suppose that  $p = p(x, y, \lambda)$  for some  $x \in N_G(y)$  and some  $\lambda > 0$ . Further, by Proposition D.2, there exists some  $y' \in Y - y$  which is neglected by  $T$ . Let  $p' = p(x, y', \lambda)$ . As  $T$  neglects  $y'$  and is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G - y$ , we have  $d_G(p, T) = d_G(p', T) \leq \delta$ . Hence  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

We are now ready to prove the existence of the desired kernel.

► **Lemma D.4.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\delta > 0$  with  $\delta < \frac{3}{2}$  and  $K > 0$ . Then the problem of deciding whether  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  admits a kernel of size  $f(K, \delta)$  that can be computed in  $n^{O(1)}$  for some computable function  $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*

**Proof.** We first use a brute force algorithm to check whether  $G$  contains a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  stopping at at most 2 points. This is possible in  $n^{O(1)}$  by Lemma 3.2. If this is the case, then  $K_1$  serves as the desired kernel. We next greedily compute a maximal matching in  $G$ . Let  $X$  be the set of vertices covered by this matching and let  $k = |X|$ . Observe that every vertex cover needs to contain at least one vertex of each edge in the matching, hence every vertex cover of  $G$  is of size at least  $\frac{1}{2}k$ . Thus, if  $\frac{1}{2}k > \frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 1$ , by Lemma D.1, we obtain that the desired tour does not exist. Hence, a path on  $\lceil K + 4\delta \rceil + 1$  vertices may serve as the desired kernel. We may therefore assume that  $\frac{1}{2}k \leq \frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 1$ . Let  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  be an arbitrary ordering of  $X$ . Now for every  $I \subseteq [k]$ , let  $Y_I$  be the set of vertices  $y \in V(G) - X$  with neighborhood  $N_G(y) = \{x_i : i \in I\}$ . Observe that for all  $I \subseteq [k]$ , we have that  $Y_I$  is a set of false twins. Further, as  $X$  is a vertex cover of  $G$ , we have that  $(X, (Y_I : I \subseteq [k]))$  is a partition of  $V(G)$ . Now for every  $I \subseteq [k]$ , let  $Y'_I$  be an arbitrary subset of  $Y_I$  of size  $\min\{|Y_I|, \lceil \frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 2 \rceil\}$ . Further, let  $G' = G[X \cup \bigcup_{I \subseteq [k]} Y'_I]$ . Repeatedly applying Lemma D.3, we obtain that  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  if and only if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$ . Hence  $G$  is a kernel for the problem. Clearly,  $G'$  can be computed in  $n^{O(1)}$ . Finally, we have that  $|V(G')| = |X| + \sum_{I \subseteq [k]} |Y'_I| \leq k + 2^k \lceil \frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 2 \rceil \leq 2(\frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 1) + 2^{2\frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 1} \lceil \frac{1}{s_\delta}K + 2 \rceil$ . ◀

Lemma D.4 and Corollary A.26 directly imply Theorem 3.16.

## D.2 Hardness with Respect to Tour Length for $\delta \geq 3/2$

In Section D.1, we have showed that for  $\delta < 3/2$ , the problem of computing a shortest  $\delta$ -tour is fixed parameter tractable with respect to the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. The objective of this section is to rule out a similar result when  $\delta \geq 3/2$ . We heavily make use of Lemma C.17.

The following result was proved by Karthik et al. in [27].

► **Theorem D.5.** *Unless  $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ , for any function  $f : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a dominating*

set of size  $k$ , returns ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a dominating set of size  $f(k)$ , and runs in  $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ .

Again, using literally the same reduction as for Theorem 2 in [34], we can obtain the same result when restricting to split graphs.

► **Theorem D.6.** *Unless  $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ , for any function  $f : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a split graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a dominating set of size  $k$ , returns ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a dominating set of size  $f(k)$ , and runs in  $f(k)n^{O(1)}$ .*

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section that rules out the possibility of an asymptotic approximation in FPT time.

► **Theorem D.7.** *Let  $\delta \geq 3/2$  be fixed. Unless  $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ , for any function  $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , there exists no algorithm that, given a connected graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $K$ , returns ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $f(K)$  and runs in  $f(K)|V(G)|^{O(1)}$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that for some function  $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , there exists an algorithm  $A$  that, given a connected graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , returns ‘yes’ if  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $K$ , returns ‘no’ if  $G$  does not admit a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $f(K)$  and runs in  $f(K)|V(G)|^{O(1)}$ . Without loss of generality, we may suppose that  $f$  is monotonously increasing. We define  $f' : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  by  $f'(k) = \max\{\delta^c, \frac{1}{s_\delta}\}f(k)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  where  $c$  is the constant hidden in the polynomial time expression in Lemma C.17. We will show that  $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$  using Theorem D.6.

Let  $G$  be a split graph and  $k$  a positive integer. We first test in  $O(|V(G)|^2)$  whether  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most 2. If this is the case, there is nothing to prove. Next observe that every subgraph of a split graph is also a split graph. Hence, if  $G$  is disconnected, we may apply our algorithm to every connected component of  $G$ . We may therefore assume that  $G$  is nontrivial and connected.

It then follows by Lemma C.17 that we can compute a graph  $G'$  satisfying (1), (2), and (3) in polynomial time. We now apply  $A$  to  $(G', k)$  and output the output of  $A$ .

First suppose that  $G$  admits a dominating set of size  $k$ . Then, by (2) of Lemma C.17, we obtain that  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length  $k$  and hence  $A$  outputs ‘yes’ by assumption.

Now suppose that  $A$  outputs ‘yes’. By assumption, we have that  $G'$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $f(k)$ . It follows by (3) of Lemma C.17 that  $G$  admits a dominating set of size at most  $\frac{1}{s_\delta}f(k) \leq f'(k)$ .

Finally observe that by (1), the total running time of our algorithm is  $f(k)\delta^c|V(G)|^c = f'(k)|V(G)|^{O(1)}$ .

It hence follows that  $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$  by Theorem D.6. ◀

As an immediate corollary, we have the following result, which contrasts with Theorem 3.16.

► **Corollary D.8.** *For every  $\delta \geq \frac{3}{2}$ ,  $\delta$ -tour is  $\text{W}[1]$ -hard parameterized by the length of a shortest  $\delta$ -tour.*

### D.3 XP Algorithm Parameterized by $n/\delta$

We have seen that  $\delta$ -TOUR is easy for  $\delta = 0$ , where it corresponds to the CHINESEPOSTMAN-PROBLEM Observation B.1. Further, the problem is also trivial for the other extreme, that is, when  $\delta$  is very large. Indeed, if  $\delta \geq n$  (where  $n$  denotes the number of vertices in the



graph), any single point  $\delta$ -covers the entire graph and hence forms a shortest  $\delta$ -tour. We are interested in how the hardness of the problem increases when  $\delta$  is decreased from this upper point of triviality. We therefore analyze the problem  $\delta$ -TOUR parameterized by  $n/\delta$ . (Note that this parameter is 1 for the trivial case of  $\delta = n$ .) We first present in this section an XP-algorithm and then rule out, in the following section, the possibility of an FPT algorithm under the assumption that  $\text{FPT} \neq \text{W}[1]$ .

The main result of this section is Theorem 1.6 which we restate here.

► **Theorem 1.6 (XP Algorithm for Parameter  $n/\delta$ ).** *There is an algorithm, which, given a connected  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$ , computes a shortest  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$  in  $f(k) \cdot n^{O(k)}$  time where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ .*

We start by giving the key lemma for the proof of Theorem 1.6 which is restated below.

► **Lemma 3.17.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$ ,  $\delta$  a positive real,  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$  and suppose that  $n \geq 12k$ . Further, let  $T$  be a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Then there exists a set  $Z \subseteq P(G)$  of points stopped at by  $T$  with  $|Z| \leq 12k$  such that for every point  $p \in P(G)$ , we have  $d_G(p, Z) \leq \delta$ .*

**Proof.** We denote by  $X$  the set of vertices  $x \in V(G)$  with  $d_G(x, T) \geq \frac{n}{2k}$ . Let  $Z_1$  be an inclusion-wise minimal set of points passed by  $T$  such that  $d_G(x, T) = d_G(x, Z_1)$  for all  $x \in X$ . By Proposition A.3, we may suppose that  $T$  stops at  $z$  for every  $z \in Z_1$ .

▷ **Claim D.9.**  $|Z_1| \leq 3k$ .

**Proof.** Clearly, we have  $|Z_1| \leq n$ , so  $Z_1$  is finite. Hence, by the definition of  $Z_1$ , there exists an ordering  $z_1, \dots, z_q$  of  $Z_1$  and a collection  $x_1, \dots, x_q$  of elements of  $X$  such that  $d_G(x_i, z_i) = d_G(x_i, T)$  for  $i \in [q]$  and  $d_G(x_i, z_j) > d_G(x_i, T)$  for  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $i \neq j$ . For  $i \in [q]$ , let  $P_i$  be a shortest  $x_i z_i$ -walk in  $G$ . We may suppose that for  $i \in [q]$ , all the points distinct from  $x_i$  and  $z_i$  that  $P_i$  stops at are vertices of  $G$ . Further, by the minimality of  $P_i$ , we have that  $P_i$  stops at most once at every vertex of  $G$ . We denote the set of vertices of  $G$  that  $P_i$  stops at by  $V(P_i)$ . First suppose that there exist distinct  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $V(P_i) \cap V(P_j) \neq \emptyset$  and let  $v \in V(P_i) \cap V(P_j)$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} d_G(x_i, z_i) + d_G(x_j, z_j) &= d_G(x_i, v) + d_G(v, z_i) + d_G(x_j, v) + d_G(v, z_j) \\ &= (d_G(x_i, v) + d_G(v, z_j)) + (d_G(x_j, v) + d_G(v, z_i)) \\ &\geq d_G(x_i, z_j) + d_G(x_j, z_i) \\ &> d_G(x_i, z_i) + d_G(x_j, z_j), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

We hence obtain that  $V(P_i) \cap V(P_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $i \neq j$ . Further, observe that for every  $i \in [q]$ , as the length of  $P_i$  is at least  $\frac{n}{2k}$ , we have that  $|V(P_i)| \geq \frac{n}{2k} - 1$ . This yields  $n \geq \sum_{i=1}^q |V(P_i)| \geq q(\frac{n}{2k} - 1)$ . As  $n \geq 12k$ , we obtain  $q \leq \frac{2k}{1 - \frac{2k}{n}} \leq 3k$ . ◀

▷ **Claim D.10.** There exists a set  $Z_2$  of points stopped at by  $T$  with  $|Z_2| \leq 9k$  such that  $d_G(p, Z_2) \leq \frac{n}{3k}$  holds for all  $p \in P(G)$  which are stopped at by  $T$ .

**Proof.** Let  $[T] = v_1 \dots v_t v_1$  be the truncation of  $T$ . Further, let  $\beta$  be the largest integer such that  $1 + \beta \lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor \leq t$  and let  $Z_2 = \{v_{1+i \lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor} \mid i \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}\}$ , where only a single copy of a vertex is maintained in case it occurs several times. Now consider a point  $p$  stopped at by  $T$ . Then, clearly, there exists some  $i \in [t]$  with  $d_G(p, v_i) \leq 1$ . Further, either  $t - i + 1 \leq \frac{n}{4k}$

or there exists some  $j \in \{1 + i \lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor \mid i \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}\}$  such that  $|i - j| \leq \frac{n}{4k}$ . We obtain  $d_G(p, Z_2) \leq d_G(p, v_j) \leq d_G(p, v_i) + d_G(v_i, v_j) \leq 1 + |i - j| \leq 1 + \frac{n}{4k} \leq \frac{n}{3k}$  as  $n \geq 12k$ . If  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we obtain  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil \geq n$ , a contradiction. We hence have  $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , so by the optimality of  $T$  and Proposition A.2, it follows that  $\ell(\lfloor T \rfloor) \leq \ell(T) \leq 2n - 2$ . As  $n \geq 12k$ , and  $k \geq 1$ , we obtain that  $|Z_2| \leq \beta + 1 \leq \frac{\ell(\lfloor T \rfloor)}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor} + 1 \leq \frac{2n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2k} \rfloor} + 1 \leq \frac{2n}{\frac{n}{4k}} + 1 \leq 8k + 1 \leq 9k$ . ◀

Let  $Z = Z_1 \cup Z_2$  and observe that  $|Z| \leq 12k$ . Now let  $p = (u, v, \lambda) \in P(G)$  for some  $uv \in E(G)$  and some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . First suppose that  $\{u, v\} - X \neq \emptyset$ , say  $d_G(u, T) \leq \frac{n}{2k}$ . Then there exists a point  $p'$  stopped at by  $T$  with  $d_G(u, p') \leq \frac{n}{2k}$ . By the definition of  $Z_2$ , we obtain  $d_G(p, Z) \leq d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, p') + d_G(p', Z_2) \leq 1 + \frac{n}{2k} + \frac{n}{3k} \leq n/k$ , as  $n \geq 12k$ . Now suppose that  $\{u, v\} \subseteq X$ . As  $n \geq 12k$  and  $T$  is a feasible  $\delta$ -tour of  $G$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} d_G(p, Z) &\leq \min\{d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, Z_1), d_G(p, v) + d_G(v, Z_1)\} \\ &= \min\{d_G(p, u) + d_G(u, T), d_G(p, v) + d_G(v, T)\} \\ &= d_G(p, T) \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

◀

Given a graph  $G$  and a positive constant  $\delta$ , we denote by  $S_{G, \delta}$  be the set of points  $(u, v, \lambda) \in P(G)$  such that  $uv \in E(G)$  and  $\lambda \in S_\delta$ . We can now prove a structural result which is the key to our algorithm.

► **Lemma D.11.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$ ,  $\delta$  a positive real,  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$  and suppose that  $n \geq 12k$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(z_1, \dots, z_q)$  of points in  $S_{G, \delta}$  with  $q \leq 12k$  such that for any collection of walks  $Q_1, \dots, Q_q$  in  $G$  such that  $Q_i$  is a shortest  $z_i z_{i+1}$ -walk in  $G$  for  $i \in [q - 1]$  and  $Q_q$  is a shortest  $z_q z_1$ -walk in  $G$ , we have that the concatenation  $Q_1 \dots Q_q$  is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour.*

**Proof.** As  $n \geq 12k$ , we have  $\delta > 1$ . Hence, by Lemma A.18, there exists a shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G$  such that all the points visited by  $T$  are contained in  $S_{G, \delta}$ . By Lemma 3.17, there exists a collection  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_q\}$  of  $q \leq 12k$  points stopped at by  $T$  such that  $d_G(p, Z) \leq \delta$  for all  $p \in P(G)$ . By symmetry, we may suppose that the points of  $Z$  are visited in the order  $(z_1 \dots z_q)$  by  $T$ . Now let  $Q_1, \dots, Q_q$  be a collection of paths in  $G$  such that  $Q_i$  is a shortest  $z_i z_{i+1}$ -walk in  $G$  for  $i \in [q - 1]$  and  $Q_q$  is a shortest  $z_q z_1$ -walk in  $G$  and let  $T^*$  be the concatenation  $Q_1 \dots Q_q$ . It follows by construction that  $T^*$  is a tour in  $G$ . Further, as  $d_G(p, Z) \leq \delta$  for all  $p \in P(G)$  and all points of  $Z$  are visited by  $T^*$ , we obtain that  $T^*$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . Next, for  $i \in [q - 1]$ , let  $Q'_i$  be the subwalk of  $T$  from  $z_i$  to  $z_{i+1}$  corresponding to the chosen occurrences of  $z_i$  and  $z_{i+1}$  and let  $Q'_q$  be the subwalk of  $T$  from  $z_q$  to  $z_1$  corresponding to the chosen occurrences of  $z_q$  and  $z_1$ . Observe that  $T$  is the concatenation  $Q'_1 \dots Q'_q$ . Further, by the choice of  $Q_i$ , we have  $\ell(Q_i) \leq \ell(Q'_i)$  for  $i \in [q]$ . This yields  $\ell(T^*) = \sum_{i=1}^q \ell(Q_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \ell(Q'_i) = \ell(T)$ . Hence  $T^*$  is a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$ . ◀

We are now ready to prove our main result.

**Proof.** (Proof of Theorem 1.6) Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$ ,  $\delta > 0$  a constant and  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$ .

If  $n < 12k$ , then, by Corollary A.26, we can find a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  in  $f(k)$ .

We may hence suppose that  $n \geq 12k$ . We first compute a  $\delta$ -tour  $T_0$  in  $G$  of length at most  $2n - 2$  which can be done in  $n^{O(1)}$  by Proposition A.2. Throughout the algorithm, we maintain a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  in  $G$  that is shortest among all those found so far. It hence suffices to

prove that we find a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  at some point during the algorithm. Let  $(z_1, \dots, z_q)$  be a sequence of points in  $S_{G,\delta}$ . We now compute a collection of walks  $Q_1, \dots, Q_q$  in  $G$  such that  $Q_i$  is a shortest  $z_i z_{i+1}$ -walk in  $G$  for  $i \in [q-1]$  and  $Q_q$  is a shortest  $z_q z_1$ -walk in  $G$ . We then let  $Q$  be the tour in  $G$  obtained by concatenating  $Q_1, \dots, Q_q$ . If  $Q$  is a  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  and  $Q$  is shorter than  $T$ , we replace  $T$  by  $Q$ . We now do this for every sequence  $(z_1, \dots, z_q)$  of points in  $S_{G,\delta}$  for  $q \leq 12k$ . By Lemma D.11, we obtain that  $T$  is assigned a shortest  $\delta$ -tour in  $G$  at some point during this process.

We still need to analyze the running time of this algorithm. Note that the shortest paths between all pairs of vertices in  $V(G)$  can be computed in time  $O(n^3)$  by the Floyd–Warshall algorithm [7]. After, given two points in  $P(G)$ , a shortest walk linking these points can be computed in constant time. Indeed, if both points are on the same edge, it is trivial to compute. Otherwise, such a walk can be obtained by attaching these points to a shortest path from a vertex of the edge the first point is on to a vertex the second point is on. There are only four choices for these vertices.

It follows that, given a sequence  $(z_1, \dots, z_q)$  of points in  $S_{G,\delta}$ , each of the walks  $Q_i$  for  $i \in [q]$  can be computed in  $O(1)$ -time, given the all-pair shortest paths computed above. Further, it follows directly from Corollary A.25 that we can check in  $O(n^c)$ -time for some fixed constant whether  $Q$  is a  $\delta$ -tour. Observe that, as  $G$  does not contain multiple edges, we have  $|S_{G,\delta}| = O(n^2)$ . Given an integer  $q$ , there are hence at most  $O(n^{2q})$  possibilities to choose  $\{z_1, \dots, z_q\}$  and for each of them we need to consider  $q! = f(k)$  orderings. Hence the total running time is  $O(q!n^{2q}n^c) = O(f(k)n^{24k+c})$ . ◀

#### D.4 W[1]-Hardness When Parameterized by $n/\delta$

In this subsection, we show that the running time of the algorithm implied by Theorem 1.6 is conditionally optimal up to a  $\log k$ -factor in the exponent. More precisely, we show that the problem is W[1]-hard for the parameterization by  $k := \lceil \frac{n}{\delta} \rceil$ , and, moreover, unless ETH fails, the XP-time algorithm from Theorem 1.6 cannot be significantly improved in the regime  $\delta = \Omega(n)$ .

► **Theorem 1.7 (Hardness for Parameter  $n/\delta$ ).** *There are constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $k_0$  such that, unless ETH fails, for every  $k \geq k_0$ , there is no algorithm that, given an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , decides whether  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $O(n^{\alpha k / \log k})$  time where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ . Moreover, the problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by  $k$ .*

We base our hardness on that of the Binary Constraint Satisfaction Problem (BINARY-CSP) in cubic graphs, defined as follows. A BINARYCSP instance  $I$  is a triple  $(V, \Sigma, \mathcal{C})$ , where  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_{|V|}\}$  is a set of *variables* taking values from a *domain*  $\Sigma = [n]$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of  $k$  *constraints*, each of which is a triple  $(v_i, v_j, C_{i,j})$  with  $1 \leq i < j \leq |V|$ , and  $C_{i,j} \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$  is a relation constraining variables  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . The instance  $I$  is *satisfiable* if there is an assignment to the variables  $\mathcal{A} : V \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $(\mathcal{A}(i), \mathcal{A}(j)) \in C_{i,j}$  for every constraint relation  $C_{i,j}$ . BINARYCSP is the problem of deciding whether a given instance is satisfiable.

The instance  $I$  is associated with a constraint graph  $G$ , with  $V(G) := V$  and where two vertices are adjacent if there is a constraint between them [6].

BINARYCSP is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the number of constraints  $k$ . In [31], Marx shows that an  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k/\log k)}$ -time algorithm for BINARYCSP on cubic constraint graphs violates ETH. We make use of a slightly stronger formulation of that result, which was shown by Karthik et al. [28].

► **Theorem D.12** ([28, Theorem 1.5]). *Unless ETH fails, there exist absolute positive constants  $\alpha$  and  $k_0 \geq 6$  such that for every fixed  $k \geq k_0$ , where  $k$  is divisible by 3, there is no algorithm solving BINARYCSP on cubic constraint graphs with  $k$  constraints over a domain of size  $n$  in time  $O(n^{\alpha k / \log k})$ .*<sup>1</sup>

► **Lemma D.13.** *For every fixed  $k \geq 6$  which is divisible by 3, and constant integer  $r \geq 0$ , given an instance  $I = (V, \Sigma, \mathcal{C})$  of BINARYCSP in a cubic graph  $G$  with  $k := |E(G)|$  over a domain of size  $n$ , we can compute a graph  $G'$  in  $n^{O(1)}$ -time of order  $n' = (9k + r)\delta$ , for some integer  $\delta$ , with  $n' = O(n^5)$  such that  $I$  is satisfiable if and only if there is a  $\delta$ -tour of  $G'$  of length  $k(\delta + 1)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $I = (V, \Sigma, \mathcal{C})$  be a BINARYCSP instance in a cubic graph  $G$  with  $k$  constraints on a set of variables  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_{|V|}\}$  on some domain  $\Sigma = \{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$ . By renaming the values in  $\Sigma$ , we may assume  $\Sigma = [n]$ .

First suppose that  $n < k$ . Then  $I$  can be decided in  $f(k)$ -time by a brute-force approach. Let  $\delta := 1$  and  $n' = 9k + r$ . If  $I$  is satisfiable, let  $n'_0 := k + 2$ ; otherwise, we let  $n'_0 := k + 3$ . We then return a graph  $G'$  of order  $n'$  constructed from a path  $v_0, \dots, v_{n'_0}$  of length  $n'_0$  with additional vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_{n' - n'_0}$  and edges  $v_1 u_1, v_1 u_2, \dots, v_1 u_{n' - n'_0}$ . The shortest  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  of  $G'$  is of the form  $T = (v_1, \dots, v_{n'_0 - 1}, v_{n'_0 - 2}, \dots, v_1)$  of length  $\ell(T) = 2(n'_0 - 2)$ . Then we have that  $\ell(T) \leq 2k = k(\delta + 1)$  if and only if  $I$  is satisfiable.

Therefore, we may assume that  $n \geq k$ . Let  $\delta := 100kn^3 + n$ . We construct  $G'$  consisting of  $k$  constraint gadgets and a collection of long paths connecting them, which we detail in what follows.

We construct a gadget  $\Gamma_e$  for every  $e = uv = v_i v_j \in E(G)$  corresponding to a constraint  $C_{i,j}$  between variables  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  with  $i < j$ .

Let  $\Gamma_e$  include the following four paths of length  $\delta - 4n$ , which we call *connectors*:

- a path  $P_e^u$  between vertices  $s_e^u$  and  $t_e^u$ ,
- a path  $\bar{P}_e^u$  between vertices  $\bar{s}_e^u$  and  $\bar{t}_e^u$ ,
- a path  $P_e^v$  between vertices  $s_e^v$  and  $t_e^v$ , and
- a path  $\bar{P}_e^v$  between  $\bar{s}_e^v$  and  $\bar{t}_e^v$ .

Further, add two paths  $P_e^{\text{tail}1}$  and  $P_e^{\text{tail}2}$ , each of length  $\delta - 2n$  between vertices  $s_e^{\text{tail}1}$  and  $t_e^{\text{tail}1}$  and between vertices  $s_e^{\text{tail}2}$  and  $t_e^{\text{tail}2}$ ; we refer to those paths as *tails*.

Let  $\Phi_e := \{\varphi : \{v_i, v_j\} \rightarrow \Sigma \mid (\varphi(v_i), \varphi(v_j)) \in C_{i,j}\}$ , and let  $\Gamma_e$  include a set of vertices  $A_e := \{a_e^\varphi \mid \varphi \in \Phi_e\}$ , which we refer to as *candidate* vertices. Now for every candidate  $a_e^\varphi \in A_e$ , add the following paths between  $a_e^\varphi$  and the connectors in  $\Gamma_e$ :

- a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $s_e^u$  of length  $2n + 2\varphi(u)$ ,
- a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $\bar{s}_e^u$  of length  $4n - 2\varphi(u)$ ,
- a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $s_e^v$  of length  $2n + 2\varphi(v)$ , and
- a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $\bar{s}_e^v$  of length  $4n - 2\varphi(v)$ .

Finally, for all  $a_e^\varphi \in A_e$ , create a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $s_e^{\text{tail}1}$  and a path from  $a_e^\varphi$  to  $s_e^{\text{tail}2}$  of length  $2n$  each. This finishes the description of  $\Gamma_e$ ; see Figure 11.

Now for every  $v \in V(G)$ , let  $e_1, e_2, e_3$  be the edges incident to  $v$ . We use the connectors corresponding to the variable  $v$  to connect the gadgets  $\Gamma_{e_1}, \Gamma_{e_2}$ , and  $\Gamma_{e_3}$  as follows. For all distinct  $i, j \in [3]$ , we add the two paths  $M_{e_i, v, e_j}$  from  $t_{e_i}^v$  to  $\bar{t}_{e_j}^v$ , and  $M_{e_j, v, e_i}$  from  $\bar{t}_{e_j}^v$  to  $t_{e_i}^v$ ,

<sup>1</sup> Note that the exact formulation in [28] uses  $k$  to denote the number of variables (nodes), which is even. As the input graph is cubic, the statement we use is equivalent.

of length  $2n$ , which we refer to as *middle* paths. Figure 12 shows how the three gadgets sharing a variable are connected. Note that every vertex  $v \in V(G)$  corresponds to six such middle paths as  $G$  is cubic; thus, we add exactly  $4k$  new paths.

As a last step in the construction, let  $\Gamma_{e_1}, \dots, \Gamma_{e_k}$  be any ordering of the gadgets, and let  $\Gamma_{e_{k+1}} := \Gamma_{e_1}$ . We add  $k$  paths  $P_{i,i+1}$  with endpoints  $s_i$  and  $t_{i+1}$  of length  $\delta - 4n + 1$  each for all  $i \in [k]$ . Now we connect the gadgets cyclically by paths from  $a_{e_i}^\varphi$  to  $s_i$  and from  $t_{i+1}$  to  $a_{e_{i+1}}^\varphi$  of length  $2n$  for all  $i \in [k]$ , all candidates  $a_{e_i}^\varphi \in A_{e_i}$ , and all candidates  $a_{e_{i+1}}^\varphi \in A_{e_{i+1}}$ .

Since there are  $O(n^2) = O(\frac{\delta}{kn})$  candidates per gadget, we add at most  $k\delta + O(\delta) \leq 2k\delta$  vertices in this last step. Let  $n'_0$  be the total number of vertices added thus far, which satisfies the bound  $n'_0 \leq k(6\delta + 30n^3) + 2k\delta \leq 9k\delta$ . We ensure that the total number of vertices is exactly  $(9k + r)\delta$  by picking an arbitrary gadget  $\Gamma_e$  and adding  $(9k + r)\delta - n'_0$  twins to the leaf vertex  $t_e^{\text{tail}_1}$ . Let  $G'$  be the resulting graph of order  $n' := |V(G')| = (9k + r)\delta = O(k^2n^3) = O(n^5)$ , which can be constructed in time  $O(n^5)$ .

To prove the correctness of the reduction, we make use of some key observations regarding  $G'$ .

First note that there is a path of length  $\delta + 1$  between every pair of candidate vertices  $a_{e_i}^\varphi \in A_{e_i}$  and  $a_{e_{i+1}}^{\varphi'} \in A_{e_{i+1}}$  from every pair of consecutive gadgets, which contains every  $P_{i,i+1}$  path. Thus, there is a cycle of length  $k(\delta + 1)$  that stops at exactly one candidate in every gadget. See Figure 13. Observe that the length of any path between candidate vertices corresponding to different constraints passing through a middle path is longer than  $\delta + 1$  as the following claim shows.

▷ **Claim D.14.** For any  $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$  with  $e_1 \cap e_2 = \{u\}$  for some  $u \in V(G)$ , any candidates  $c_1 \in A_{e_1}, c_2 \in A_{e_2}$ , and any vertex  $v$  on  $M_{e_1, u, e_2}$  or  $M_{e_2, u, e_1}$ , it holds that  $d_{G'}(c_1, v) + d_{G'}(v, c_2) \geq 2\delta - 2n$ .

*Proof.* By construction, any path between  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  through a middle path traverses at least two connectors, each of length  $\delta - 4n$ , and three paths of length at least  $2n$ . ◁

We additionally require the following properties regarding the  $\delta$ -dominating sets of  $G'$ . A set  $S \subseteq V(G')$  is a  $\delta$ -dominating set of  $G'$  if  $d_{G'}(v, S) \leq \delta$  for all  $v \in V(G')$ .

▷ **Claim D.15.** Any  $\delta$ -dominating set  $S$  of  $G'$  of size  $k$  contains exactly one candidate from each gadget.

*Proof.* Fix an arbitrary gadget  $\Gamma_e$ , and let  $V_1, V_2$  be the subsets of vertices within a distance  $\delta$  from  $t_e^{\text{tail}_1}$  and  $t_e^{\text{tail}_2}$ , respectively. Observe that  $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V(\Gamma_e)$ , so  $S$  contains exactly one vertex in each gadget, which can only be picked from  $V_1 \cap V_2 = A_e$ . ◁

The property below shows the key equivalence between the existence of  $\delta$ -dominating sets of size  $k$  in  $G'$  and the satisfiability of the BINARYCSP instance in  $G$ .

▷ **Claim D.16.**  $I$  is satisfiable if and only if  $G'$  has a  $\delta$ -dominating set  $S$  of size  $k$ .

*Proof.* For the forward direction, let  $\mathcal{A} : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$  be a satisfying assignment. Then we claim that the set of vertices  $S := \{a_e^\varphi \mid e = uv \in E(G), \varphi(u) = \mathcal{A}(u), \varphi(v) = \mathcal{A}(v)\}$  is a  $\delta$ -dominating set of  $G'$  of size  $k$ . To see this, note that within an arbitrary gadget  $\Gamma_e = \Gamma_{uv}$ , for all  $x \in V(\Gamma_e)$  and all candidate vertices  $c \in A_e$ , we have  $d_{G'}(x, c) \leq \delta$ . Indeed, the endpoints  $t_e^{\text{tail}_1}$  and  $t_e^{\text{tail}_2}$  are at a distance  $2n + (\delta - 2n) = \delta$  from  $c$ . All other candidates are at a distance at most  $4n < \delta$  from  $c$ , and all connector endpoints  $s_e^u, \bar{s}_e^u, s_e^v$ , and  $\bar{s}_e^v$  lie at a distance at most  $4n + \delta - 4n = \delta$  from  $c$ . The remaining vertices within a gadget lie on one of the shortest paths between  $c$  and the above vertices. Besides the vertices in the gadgets,

for any vertex  $m$  on an arbitrary middle path  $M_{e_1, u, e_2}$ , let  $a_{e_1}^\varphi$  and  $a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}$  be the candidates picked in  $S$ . Observe that  $\varphi(u) = \varphi'(u) = \mathcal{A}(u)$ . Then note that  $d_{G'}(a_{e_1}^\varphi, m) + d_{G'}(m, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}) = d_{G'}(a_{e_1}^\varphi, s_{e_1}^u) + 2(\delta - 4n) + 2n + d_{G'}(\bar{s}_{e_2}^u, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}) = 2\delta - 6n + 2n + 2\mathcal{A}(u) + 4n - 2\mathcal{A}(u) = 2\delta$ , so we have  $d_{G'}(v, S) \leq d_{G'}(v, \{c_1, c_2\}) \leq \delta$ . Finally, note that all vertices  $x$  on every path  $P_{i, i+1}$  have  $d_{G'}(x, (A_{e_i} \cup A_{e_{i+1}}) \cap S) \leq \delta$ . Thus,  $S$  is a  $\delta$ -dominating set of size  $k$ .

In the backward direction, by Claim D.15, a  $\delta$ -dominating set  $S$  in  $G'$  of size at most  $k$  consists of exactly  $k$  candidates, one per constraint gadget.

Now let  $a_{e_1}^\varphi \in S \cap A_{e_1}$  and  $a_{e_2}^{\varphi'} \in S \cap A_{e_2}$  for an arbitrary pair of gadgets sharing a variable  $u$ , that is,  $e_1 \cap e_2 = \{u\}$ . We claim that  $\varphi(u) = \varphi'(u)$ .

Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be the unique paths in  $G'$  that contain  $\{a_{e_1}^\varphi, s_{e_1}^u, t_{e_1}^u, \bar{t}_{e_2}^u, \bar{s}_{e_2}^u, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}\}$ , and  $\{a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}, s_{e_2}^u, t_{e_2}^u, \bar{t}_{e_1}^u, \bar{s}_{e_1}^u, a_{e_1}^\varphi\}$ , respectively and all of whose other vertices are of degree 2 in  $G'$ . Since  $S$  is a  $\delta$ -dominating set,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are of (even) lengths  $2\delta + 2(\varphi(u) - \varphi'(u))$  and  $2\delta + 2(\varphi'(u) - \varphi(u))$ , respectively. If  $\varphi(u) \neq \varphi'(u)$ , then there exists a vertex  $x$  on one of the two paths such that  $d_{G'}(x, a_{e_1}^\varphi) = d(x, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}) \geq \delta + 1$ . Further, observe that  $x$  lies on one of the middle paths  $M_{e_1, u, e_2}$  and  $M_{e_2, u, e_1}$ . Because  $x$  lies on one of the middle paths, for any different candidate  $c' \notin A_{e_1} \cup A_{e_2}$ , we have  $d_{G'}(x, c') \geq 2n + d_{G'}(x, \{a_{e_1}^\varphi, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}\})$  as it traverses an entire middle path additionally. Thus,  $d_{G'}(x, S) = d_{G'}(x, \{a_{e_1}^\varphi, a_{e_2}^{\varphi'}\}) > \delta$ , and  $x$  is not  $\delta$ -dominated by  $S$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $\varphi(u) = \varphi'(u)$ .

We thus obtain an assignment  $\mathcal{A}$  by setting  $\mathcal{A}(u) := z_u$  where  $z_u$  is the unique value such that  $\{z_u\} = \{\varphi(u) \mid a_e^\varphi \in S, u \in e \in E(G)\}$ .

To see that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a satisfying assignment, every  $e = v_i v_j \in E(G)$  with  $i < j$  has some candidate  $a_e^\varphi \in S$ , where  $(\mathcal{A}(v_i), \mathcal{A}(v_j)) = (\varphi(v_i), \varphi(v_j)) \in C_{i, j}$ .  $\triangleleft$

We require the following additional property implying that a  $\delta$ -dominating set also  $\delta$ -covers all points on all edges.

$\triangleright$  **Claim D.17.** Let  $S$  be a  $\delta$ -dominating set of  $G'$  of size  $k$ . Then for any two vertices  $x, y \in V(G')$  with  $d_{G'}(x, S) = d_{G'}(y, S) = \delta$ , we have that  $xy \notin E(G')$ ,

*Proof.* If  $x$  and  $y$  are in the same gadget, then they have to be the endpoints of either the tails or one of the four connectors, which are all pairwise non-adjacent. If  $x$  and  $y$  belong to different gadgets, then they must be on the middle paths. If they are on the same path, which is of length  $2\delta$ , then  $x = y$ , and, otherwise, they are not adjacent by construction.  $\triangleleft$

We are finally ready to show the main claim of this lemma and the key connection between  $\delta$ -tours and  $\delta$ -dominating sets in  $G'$ .

$\triangleright$  **Claim D.18.**  $G'$  has a  $\delta$ -dominating set of size  $k$  if and only if  $G'$  has  $\delta$ -tour of length  $k(\delta + 1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a  $\delta$ -dominating set in  $G'$ . By Claim D.15,  $S$  contains exactly one candidate in every gadget. Take  $T$  as the unique tour that stops at  $a_{e_1}^{\varphi_1}, s_1, t_2, \dots, a_{e_k}^{\varphi_k}, s_k, t_1$ , and  $a_{e_1}^{\varphi_1}$  in this order and all of whose other stopping points are vertices of degree 2 in  $V(G')$ , where  $S = \{a_{e_i}^{\varphi_i} \mid i \in [k]\}$ . As  $T$  traverses every path  $P_{i, i+1}$ , it passes all points on such paths. Moreover, because  $T$  visits a  $\delta$ -dominating set of  $G'$ , the vertices  $V(G')$  are within a distance  $\delta$  from  $T$ . By Claim D.17, there is no edge  $xy$  between any two vertices  $x, y \in V(G')$  at a distance exactly  $\delta$  from  $S$ ; hence, every point in the graph is within a distance  $\delta$  from the constructed tour  $T$ , which makes it a  $\delta$ -tour.

For the backward direction, note that because  $\delta$  is an integer, a  $\delta$ -tour  $T$  visits some  $\delta$ -dominating set  $V(T)$  of  $G'$ ; otherwise,  $d_{G'}(x, V(T)) \geq \delta + 1$  for some vertex  $x \in V(G')$ , so  $x$  is not covered by  $T$ . By Claim D.15,  $V(T)$  contains at least one candidate per gadget.

By Claim D.14, the distance between any two such candidates through middle paths is at least  $2\delta - 2n$ . However, this distance is exactly  $\delta + 1$  through  $P_{i,i+1}$  for any two consecutive gadgets  $\Gamma_{e_i}$  and  $\Gamma_{e_{i+1}}$ , so  $\ell(T) = k(\delta + 1)$  implies that  $T$  stops at exactly  $k$  candidates. Taking  $S := V(T) \cap \bigcup_{e \in E(G)} A_e$ , it is easy to see that  $d_{G'}(x, V(T)) \leq d_{G'}(x, S) \leq \delta$  for every  $x \in V(G')$ , so  $S$  is a  $\delta$ -dominating set in  $G'$  of size  $k$ .  $\triangleleft$

This concludes the proof of Lemma D.13.  $\blacktriangleleft$

With Lemma D.13, the main theorem of this section follows easily.

► **Theorem 1.7 (Hardness for Parameter  $n/\delta$ ).** *There are constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $k_0$  such that, unless ETH fails, for every  $k \geq k_0$ , there is no algorithm that, given an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  and a constant  $K$ , decides whether  $G$  admits a  $\delta$ -tour of length at most  $K$  in  $O(n^{\alpha k / \log k})$  time where  $k = \lceil n/\delta \rceil$ . Moreover, the problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by  $k$ .*

**Proof.** Assume that for some fixed  $k \geq k'_0$ , there is an algorithm as in the above statement for  $\alpha' := \alpha/90$  and  $k'_0 := 27k_0$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $k_0$  are the absolute constants implied by Theorem D.12. Given an instance of cubic BINARYCSP with  $k_{\text{CSP}} := 3\lfloor \frac{k}{27} \rfloor$  constraints over a domain of size  $n$ , apply Lemma D.13 with  $k_{\text{CSP}}$  and  $r := k \bmod 27$  to obtain  $G'$  where  $n' = (9k_{\text{CSP}} + r)\delta$  and  $n' = O(n^5)$ .


Observe that  $n'/\delta = \lceil \frac{n'}{\delta} \rceil = 27\lfloor \frac{k}{27} \rfloor + k \bmod 27 = k$ .

Thus, a hypothetical algorithm deciding  $(G', k(\delta + 1))$  yields an algorithm deciding such BINARYCSP instances in time  $O((n')^{\alpha' \cdot k / \log k}) = O(n^{\alpha k / (18 \log k)}) = O(n^{\alpha k_{\text{CSP}} / \log k_{\text{CSP}}})$ , contradicting Theorem D.12. Moreover, as the starting problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by the number of constraints  $k$ , we obtain W[1]-hardness in our setting for parameterization by  $n'/\delta$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$


As a side product of the proof of Lemma D.13, we obtain the following result which might be of independent interest.

► **Corollary D.19.** *There are constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $k_0$  such that, unless ETH fails, for every  $k \geq k_0$ , there is no algorithm that, given an  $n$ -vertex graph, computes a minimum-cardinality  $\delta$ -dominating set in  $O(n^{\alpha k / \log k})$  time where  $\delta = n/k$ . Moreover, the problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by  $k$ .*

**Proof.** As in Theorem 1.7, the proof follows immediately from Lemma D.13 and Claim D.18.  $\blacktriangleleft$




■ **Figure 11** Constraint gadget  $\Gamma_e$  for  $e = uv \in E(G)$ .



■ **Figure 12** An example of the connection between gadgets  $\Gamma_{e_1}$ ,  $\Gamma_{e_2}$ , and  $\Gamma_{e_3}$  sharing a variable  $v$ . The bold lines are paths of length  $2n$ , and the nodes within gadgets indicate candidate vertices.





■ **Figure 13** The graph  $G'$ . The figure shows an example of how three gadgets sharing a variable connect. The remaining connectors and middle paths are omitted for clarity. Oscillating lines are paths of length  $\delta - 4n + 1$ , and bold lines are paths of length  $2n$ .

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Formal Definitions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Overview of Results</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Structural Results . . . . .	6
3.2	Approximation Algorithms . . . . .	7
3.3	Inapproximability Results . . . . .	12
3.4	Parameterized Complexity . . . . .	13
<b>A</b>	<b>Structural Results</b>	<b>19</b>
A.1	General Observations . . . . .	19
A.2	Making a Tour Nice . . . . .	20
A.3	Characterization . . . . .	23
A.4	Discretization . . . . .	26
A.5	Immediate Consequences . . . . .	34
<b>B</b>	<b>Approximation Algorithms</b>	<b>34</b>
B.1	Covering Range $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$ . . . . .	35
B.2	Covering Range $\delta \in (1/6, 1/2)$ . . . . .	35
B.3	Covering Range $\delta = 1/2$ . . . . .	37
B.4	Covering Range $\delta \in (1/2, 33/40)$ . . . . .	38
B.5	Covering Range $\delta \in [33/40, 3/2)$ . . . . .	39
B.6	Covering Range $\delta > 3/2$ . . . . .	43
B.6.1	Fixed Covering Range $\delta$ . . . . .	44
B.6.2	Covering Range $\delta$ as Part of the Input . . . . .	46
<b>C</b>	<b>Inapproximability Results</b>	<b>47</b>
C.1	APX-Hardness for Covering Range $\delta \leq 1/2$ . . . . .	47
C.1.1	Hardness for Cycle Subpartitions . . . . .	48
C.1.2	Hardness for $\delta$ -Tours . . . . .	57
C.1.3	Hardness for Cubic Bipartite TSP . . . . .	58
C.2	APX-Hardness for $\delta \geq 1/2$ via Subdivision . . . . .	58
C.3	Inapproximability for Covering Range $\delta \geq 3/2$ . . . . .	59
<b>D</b>	<b>Parameterized Complexity</b>	<b>61</b>
D.1	FPT Algorithm Parameterized by Tour Length for $\delta < 3/2$ . . . . .	61
D.2	Hardness with Respect to Tour Length for $\delta \geq 3/2$ . . . . .	63
D.3	XP Algorithm Parameterized by $n/\delta$ . . . . .	64
D.4	W[1]-Hardness When Parameterized by $n/\delta$ . . . . .	67