

Traveling Salesman Problem from a Tensor Networks Perspective

Alejandro Mata Ali¹, Iñigo Perez Delgado², and Aitor Moreno Fdez. de Leceta³

¹i3B Ibermatica, Quantum Development Department, Paseo Mikeletegi 5, 20009 Donostia, Spain

²i3B Ibermatica, Parque Tecnológico de Bizkaia, Ibaizabal Bidea, Edif. 501-A, 48160 Derio, Spain

³i3B Ibermatica, Unidad de Inteligencia Artificial, Avenida de los Huetos, Edificio Azucarera, 01010 Vitoria, Spain

We present a novel quantum-inspired algorithm for solving the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) and some of its variations using tensor networks. This approach consists on the simulated initialization of a quantum system with superposition of all possible combinations, an imaginary time evolution, a projection, and lastly a partial trace to search for solutions. This is a heuristically approximable algorithm to obtain approximate solutions with a more affordable computational cost. We adapt it to different generalizations of the TSP and apply it to the job reassignment problem, a real productive industrial case.

1 Introduction

The Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) is a widely studied problem with great applicability for both basic research and industry, being applied in route optimization, logistics and scheduling. However, it is an NP-Hard problem, which implies that its resolution time increases exponentially with the size of the problem. Using brute force with n nodes the computational complexity is $O(n!)$, and larger cases can be tackled using the branch and bound technique [1]. Several exact algorithms exist to tackle this problem more efficiently, most notably the Held-Karp algorithm [2], which solves it in $O(n^2 2^n)$. This makes its solution for industrial cases in an exact manner unapproachable by known classical means. To deal with this, approximate methods such as genetic algorithms [3] or heuristics

[4] are applied, that output an approximate solution, which is close enough to the optimal solution to be considered acceptable. In fact, these methods often output the optimal solution itself, albeit they do not offer any guarantee of it being such.

However, in many cases of real application it is not necessary to obtain the optimal solution, being sufficient a solution close to the optimal one. This is due to the fact that, many times, the modeling of reality to the problem is not perfect, so the optimum of the problem may not be the optimum of reality. In these cases the time and cost it would take to calculate the optimum with respect to the approximate solution is not worth it.

The emerging interest in quantum technologies due to their theoretical ability to solve some complex problems faster than classical algorithms [5] has led to research and development of quantum algorithms that can solve them efficiently. This includes combinatorial optimization problems, with algorithms such as Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) [6], Variational Quantum Eigensolver (VQE) [7] or Fixed-point Grover Adaptive Search [8], and also the particular case of the TSP [9–11]. However, due to the current state of quantum hardware, in the Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) era, for many interesting instances we cannot implement these algorithms outside of simulators.

This limitation has led to a growing interest in classical techniques that mimic the properties of quantum systems to perform calculations efficiently. Among them are Tensor Networks (TN) [12], which are based on the properties of tensor operations to simulate quantum systems with restricted entanglement and allow to perform information compression techniques

Alejandro Mata Ali: amata@ayesa.com

Iñigo Perez Delgado: iperezde@ayesa.com

Aitor Moreno Fdez. de Leceta: aimorenof@ayesa.com

of quantum states [13, 14]. Interestingly, they can also apply operations not allowed in quantum systems, such as non-unitary operators, projection or non-normalized states. Although some of these operations, such as imaginary time evolution, can be performed with known techniques [15], linking several of these operations is challenging, especially with projection.

Tensor networks techniques have been used on several occasions for combinatorial optimization problems [16–18], but never specifically tailored for the traveling salesman problem. Although these algorithms are designed for a large number of cases, if they are not specifically adjusted to the particular problem, they may require excessive bond dimensions or tensor network contraction times.

In this paper we will take advantage of the properties of non-unitary operators and projection to create a novel algorithm in tensor networks that allows us to solve this problem with different variants. The resolution consists of simulating the quantum system that represents the solutions and modifying the amplitudes of the combinations with their costs, to finally apply the constraints of the problem and obtain the optimal state. One of the main advantages of this construction is the possibility of obtaining approximate solutions by heuristically eliminating layers to reduce the computational complexity and memory cost, allowing to address a larger number of cases or to couple it to other future algorithms.

The main contributions of this work with respect to previous ones are the adaptation of existing techniques for unconstrained combinatorial problems to the TSP and the definition of matrix product operator layers to implement constraints, in addition to the approximability of the constraints and the reuse of intermediate computations in combinatorial optimization problems with tensor networks.

2 Description of the problem

Given a fully connected graph of N nodes and with a cost associated to each edge, our objective is to determine the route that allows visiting all nodes and then returning to the starting one (returning condition) traversing the edges with the lowest possible total cost. Those edges can be directed or undirected, depending on whether they

can only be traveled in one or in both directions. The solutions can be expressed as a vector \vec{x} of integers, being its components x_t the node visited at the step t . We can see an example of solution in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: TSP graph with the solution $\vec{x} = (0, 3, 1, 6, 4, 2, 9, 8, 13, 11, 7, 12, 10, 5)$. The blue edges represent possible paths that were not taken, and arrowed red edges represent the path taken by the solution. Edges with weight considered infinite are not represented.

With this formulation, the problem can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x}_{opt} &= \arg \min_{\vec{x}} (C(\vec{x})) \\ x_t &\in [0, N-1] \quad \forall t \in [0, N-1] \\ x_t &\neq x_{t'} \quad \forall t \neq t' \in [0, N-1] \\ C(\vec{x}) &= \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C_{x_t, x_{t+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $C(\vec{x})$ is the cost function of the problem, $C_{i,j}$ is the cost of moving from node i to node j and $x_N = x_0$ is the starting -and final- node. If two nodes i and j are not meant to be connected, $C_{i,j} = \infty$. In the tensor that stores $C_{i,j}$ we include the information of whether it is a directed or undirected graph, which for our method is indifferent in terms of complexity. In the non-symmetrical cost case, $C_{i,j} \neq C_{j,i}$.

The problem can be naturally extended for the $x_0 \neq x_N$ just adjusting the summation limits.

The problem can also be generalized for the case that, at each step t , the costs of going from node i to node j change, we can generalize the cost function to

$$C(\vec{x}) = \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C_{t, x_t, x_{t+1}}, \quad (2)$$

where $C_{t,i,j}$ is the cost of moving from node i to

we build its tensor network layers, consisting of the initialization layer ‘+’ and the optimization layer ‘S’, the ones introduced by the method [19]. These first two layers are extensively explained in [19], so we will make a brief explanation of the result of them.

The first layer generates a state of maximum superposition

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{\vec{x}} |\vec{x}\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where we have the sum of all possible combinations.

The second layer performs the evolution in imaginary time as an operator

$$U = \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-\tau C(\vec{x})} |\vec{x}\rangle \langle \vec{x}| \quad (6)$$

which associates to each state an amplitude proportional to its cost with a damping factor τ for scaling, so that the more expensive it is, the less amplitude it has. Thus, the state after applying this layer would be

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-\tau C(\vec{x})} |\vec{x}\rangle. \quad (7)$$

After that, we have to add the constraints with the inclusion of new MPO projection layers ‘F’. Since the constraint is non-repetition, we can see the R operator represented by the set of tensor layers ‘F’ as a Levi-Civita squared symbol, so that it is 0 if any index is repeated and 1 if they are all different:

$$R = \sum_{\vec{x}} |\epsilon_{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{N}-1}}|^2 |\vec{x}\rangle \langle \vec{x}|. \quad (8)$$

After applying this layer, we only have the combinations that satisfy the constraints, each with its corresponding amplitude. The state is

$$|\psi_2\rangle = \sum_{\vec{x}} |\epsilon_{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{N}-1}}|^2 e^{-\tau C(\vec{x})} |\vec{x}\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Finally, we add the tracing layer ‘+’, also from [19]. The final state after tracing is

$$|P^{x_0}\rangle = \sum_{\vec{x}} |\epsilon_{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{N}-1}}|^2 e^{-\tau C(\vec{x})} |x_0\rangle, \quad (10)$$

a vector whose component i sum up all the amplitudes of the states whose first component is i .

In the limit of $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ the combination with the lowest cost should have an amplitude so much

larger than the others that when traced it should be greater than the sum of all the other states. In this way, the position of the largest component in the vector $|P^{x_0}\rangle$ gives us the optimal value of the variable x_0 .

Fig. 2 shows the total tensor network that will be built after connecting the tensors of the layers and the layers to each other.

We have the + tensors that implement the uniform superposition of all possible combinations as our qudits, the S tensor layer implements the imaginary time evolution using the $\hat{C}_{i, x_i, x_{i+1}}$ tensor of our problem, and each $F(a)$ tensor layer that ensures that node a only appears once in the combination. For any tensor T^i , the superscript i indicates that the tensor is connected on the line of qudit i .

The dimension of the indexes of the tensors ‘+’ and ‘S’ will be in all cases \hat{N} , to be able to indicate which is the state of that qudit and to communicate it to the adjacent qudit. The ‘F’ tensors will have indexes of such dimensions that they can receive and send the \hat{N} possible states of their qudit, but the signal they send to the adjacent ‘F’ tensor of the same layer will be binary.

Using the notation presented in Fig. 3, the tensor $F(a)^i$ will be in charge of receiving if the node a has appeared 0 or 1 times between the qudits 0 and $i-1$, so that the following logics are fulfilled:

- If the node a has appeared before:
 - If qudit i is in state a , removes that combination.
 - If qudit i is not in state a , does not remove that combination and communicates to the next layer tensor that node a has appeared before.
- If the node a has not appeared before, never removes the combination:
 - If qudit i is in state a , communicates to the next layer tensor that node a has appeared before.
 - If qudit i is not in state a , communicates to the next layer tensor that node a has not appeared before.

The tensors $F(a)^0$ (Fig. 3 a) and $F(a)^{\hat{N}-1}$ (Fig. 3 c) have indexes i, j of dimension \hat{N} and index k of dimension 2, while the $F(a)^n$ (Fig. 3

b) in the rest of the cases, their indexes i, j still have dimension \hat{N} , while the indexes k, l have dimension 2. These bond indexes have the function of communicating whether a certain node a of the TSP graph has appeared up to that point or not. Its non-zero elements are those in which $i = j$ and

$$F(a)_{ijk}^0 = 1 \begin{cases} i, k = a, 1 \\ i, k = b, 0 \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$F(a)_{ijkl}^n = 1 \begin{cases} i, k, l = a, 0, 1 \\ i, k, l = b, 0, 0 \\ i, k, l = b, 1, 1 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$$F(a)_{ijk}^{\hat{N}-1} = 1 \begin{cases} i, k = a, 0 \\ i, k = b, 0 \\ i, k = b, 1 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

for $\forall b \neq a \in [0, \hat{N} - 1]$ pairs of different nodes. In this way, we implement in the layer the logics we need.

As we can observe, these tensors are highly sparse, since the only non-zero elements are in $i = j$, if $i = a$, it behaves as an identity with respect to the indexes k, l and if $i = a$, there is only one non-zero element. To give a numerical example, if $\hat{N} = 10$, of the 400 elements ($10 \times 10 \times 2 \times 2$) that any intermediate $F(a)^n$ would have, only 19 would be nonzero: one for the $(a, 0, 1)$, 9 for the 9 possible values of b in $(b, 0, 0)$ and another 9 for the 9 possible values of b in $(b, 1, 1)$.

3.2 Iterative resolution and contraction

We apply the iterative method of resolution, choosing randomly when encountering degenerate cases, and we obtain the different steps of the path. In each solving iteration we solve the first step of a TSP without the nodes already obtained, with an initial condition at the last node obtained and the same final condition. In this way, at iteration i we will create the tensor network for a problem with $\mathcal{N} = \hat{N} - i$ variables.

The tensors of this new tensor network of iteration i will be the same as in the previous iteration $i - 1$, but eliminating the possibility of choosing again a previously chosen node. To do this, we have two options. The first is to re-create all the tensors from scratch taking into account the new problem, which would imply a reduction of the




Figure 3: Notation for all indexes used in all tensors in this paper. a), b), c) Tensors with 1 bond index, d), e), f) Tensors with 2 bond index, g), h), i) Tensors with 3 bond index.

dimensionality of each particular node, but having to re-do all the creation and all the contractions. The second is to use the same tensors from the previous iteration, but making the ‘+’ tensors have as non-zero values only those corresponding to the nodes not yet chosen. By doing this, the ‘ F ’ filter layers of the nodes that have already appeared are unnecessary, since they will never be activated, so we can remove them to have a smaller and exponentially faster contracting network tensor. After that, we only have to change the second tensor of the minimization layer, S^1 , which will now be the first one, so that it collects the information of the node chosen in the previous iteration, following the method presented in [19]. Although the first method is more efficient in the dimensionality of each of the individual tensors, the second method allows us to reuse intermediate calculations, so it is more advisable.

Our contraction scheme is the presented in Fig. 4. To reduce computational complexity and to take advantage of intermediate calculations, we contract the tensor network by variables. First we contract all the layers of the last variable, obtaining the tensor $W^{\hat{N}-1}$ with \hat{N} indexes and $O(\hat{N}2^{\hat{N}})$ elements. After that, we contract the $W^{\hat{N}-1}$ layer with the nodes of the previous variable, obtaining a new tensor $W^{\hat{N}-2}$ with the same




Figure 4: Contraction scheme for 3 variables with the cost of its steps for \hat{N} variables.

number of indexes and elements. We repeat this process with each variable until the whole tensor network is contracted. The elements of the tensor W^i are $W^i_{s,k_0,k_1,\dots,k_N}$, such that the first index s is connected to the tensor S^{i-1} above and the index k_j is connected to the tensor $F(j)^{i-1}$.

3.3 Computational complexity analysis

We will analyze the computational complexity of the algorithm, using the presented contraction scheme. As the number of available nodes \mathcal{N} in each iteration of the global algorithm decreases, we will calculate the complexity for a generic iteration and then sum over that to obtain the complexity of the total number of iterations. We will assume that contracting a tensor of N indexes of dimension n_i with another of M indexes of dimension m_j through its first index has the usual computational cost of $O\left(n_0 \prod_{i,j=1}^{N-1, M-1} n_i m_j\right)$.

Contracting the last variable tensors to obtain $W^{\hat{N}-1}$ with \mathcal{N} variables and an original problem with \hat{N} nodes requires $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ steps and contracting each tensor W^i with the previous variable layers requires $O\left(\hat{N}^3 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ steps.

The cost of this first tensor $W^{\hat{N}-1}$ is given by the fact that in each step i of the contraction we have a tensor A^i with i indexes of dimension 2 connecting to the layers $F^{\hat{N}-2}$ of the previous variable, obtained by contracting the last i tensors $F^{\hat{N}-1}$ and the '+' of tracing. We will contract it with another F tensor of 3 indexes of dimension 2, \hat{N} and \hat{N} , with a cost of $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^i\right)$. However, in the last step we will have that the tensor S will have already been contracted with the initialization '+' tensor, having two indexes of dimension N and N . There-

fore, the complexity of contracting it with the $A^{\mathcal{N}-1}$ is $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$. Thus, the total complexity is $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$. The complexity of contracting it with the tensors of the next layer follows the same reasoning.

Contracting all the tensor network requires contracting the tensors of the \mathcal{N} variables, so the complexity is $O\left(\hat{N}^3 \mathcal{N} 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ steps for determine one variable with a memory cost of $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$. Using the fact that each variable is less expensive than the previous one to compute, because of the iterative reduction of layers and nodes, we have that the complexity to solve an entire TSP of \hat{N} variables is $O\left(\sum_{\mathcal{N}=1}^{\hat{N}} \hat{N}^3 \mathcal{N} 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$, resulting in a complexity of $O\left(\hat{N}^4 2^{\hat{N}}\right)$ with a memory cost of $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\hat{N}}\right)$. We emphasize the fact that the tensors involved are highly sparse, so that contraction calculations could be performed faster with specialized sparse calculation algorithms.

However, we can greatly reduce the execution time by reusing the W tensors, although we will not improve the computational complexity as such except for the iterations after the first one. During the contraction of the tensor network for the first variable, we can store each tensor W_i obtained. This requires increasing the memory cost to $O\left(\hat{N}^3 2^{\hat{N}}\right)$. To determine the variable i , we take the tensor W^{i+1} , and create a new tensor V^{i+1} which will be the tensor W^{i+1} reduced with the solution already obtained. To construct it, each index k_j of W^{i+1} is set to 0 if node j has already appeared in the solution up to variable $i-1$. In this way, we automatically remove such nodes from the state. Performing this requires $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ steps. After that, we contract the V^{i+1} tensor with the layers of the variable i corresponding for this step, removing the F^i tensors of the nodes that have already appeared. Thus, the complexity of this variable becomes $O\left(\hat{N}^2 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$ instead of $O\left(\hat{N}^3 \mathcal{N} 2^{\mathcal{N}}\right)$. In this case we see that there is no advantage at the complexity level, since the first iteration is the one that gives the complexity. However, for later cases we will see that it can offer an improvement.

We see that this method is better than doing a blind brute-force search, which would require $O\left(\hat{N}!\right)$ operations.

4 Generalized TSP cases

4.1 Different number of steps than number of nodes (DNSNN)

We can generalize the problem to other cases of industrial interest. The first is the case of having N^s time steps, N nodes and each node i can be visited between N_i^0 and N_i^f times.

In this case, we make a tensor network with the same structure as before, with N^s qudits, but with a change in the filter layers. We generalize the tensors $F(a)$, which used to make sure that each node has appeared exactly once in our solution, as tensors $F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)$, which will make sure that node a only appears between N_a^0 and N_a^f times. They will follow the same logics as the F tensors presented above, but with the difference that now they will only remove the combination if node a has appeared N_a^f times and its qudit is in a . Also if it has appeared less than $N_a^0 - 1$ times until the last qudit, or if it has appeared $N_a^0 - 1$ and the last qudit is not in a . In addition, they will communicate to the next tensor how many times a has appeared up to that qudit.

The tensors $F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)^0$ (Fig. 3 d) and $F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)^{N^s-1}$ (Fig. 3 f) have indexes i, j of dimension N and index k of dimension $N_a^f + 1$, while the $F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)^n$ (Fig. 3 e) in the rest of the cases, their indexes i, j have dimension N , while the indexes k, l have dimension $N_a^f + 1$. These bond indexes have the function of communicating how many times a certain node a of the TSP graph has appeared up to that point. The bond indexes can have a smaller dimension, adapting to the step in which we are, but not if we want to reuse intermediate steps. However, we will not consider this adaptation in the paper, as it would only complicate the analysis. Its non-zero elements are those in which $i = j$ and

$$F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)_{ijk}^0 = 1 \begin{cases} i, k = a, 1 \\ i, k = b, 0 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)_{ijkl}^n = 1 \begin{cases} k < N_a^f, i, l = a, k + 1 \\ i = b, k = l \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$F(a, N_a^0, N_a^f)_{ijk}^{N^s-1} = 1 \begin{cases} N_a^0 < k + 1 < N_a^f, & i = a \\ N_a^0 < k < N_a^f, & i = b \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

for $\forall b \neq a \in [0, N - 1]$. Again, the tensors are highly sparse.

As before, we use the iterative method to obtain the different nodes in the different time steps. Here, after determining in one step i the node a , in the next iteration we reduce N_a^0 and N_a^f by one unit. If N_a^0 reaches 0, it stops decreasing. If N_a^f reaches 0, we remove the filter layer from that node and eliminate that possibility in the '+' tensors. In case $N_a^f > N - 1$ and $N_a^0 = 0$ at some step, that filter layer can be removed, since the node loses the appearance constraint. The contraction scheme is the same as the one described for the original TSP.

To analyze the computational complexity, without loss of generality let us assume that each node can appear up to a uniform number of N^f times. Following the reasoning of the previous algorithm, the complexity of contracting the last W tensor is $O(N^2 (N^f)^N)$, contracting it with the previous variable layers has a complexity of $O(N^3 (N^f)^N)$, and the complexity of contracting all the tensor network would be $O(N^3 N^s (N^f)^N)$. For determine the N^s variables, we would have a complexity of $O(N^3 (N^s)^2 (N^f)^N)$ with a memory cost of $O(N^2 (N^f)^N)$ in the worst of cases.

In this case we can also use the reuse of intermediate calculations, being this time that the tensors W^{i+1} have indexes k_j of dimension N^f . For this process, instead of creating a tensor V^{i+1} , we redefine the tensors $F(j)^i$, so that, if node j has appeared n_j times in the solution, the n_j first elements of the bond index are null. This is to tell the tensor W^{i+1} that no such node can have appeared less than n_j times. Thus, the computational complexity of such steps goes from $O(N^3 N^s (N^f)^N)$ to $O(N^2 (N^f)^N)$. Thus, the computational complexity of determining all the variables is reduced to $O(N^3 N^s (N^f)^N)$.

4.2 Non-markovian TSP (NMTSP)

The second case we will study is the TSP with memory. This problem consists of a generalization in which the cost of a step depends not only on the previous step, but also on the previous

ones up to a certain term. In this case we stop having a QUDO case and we move to a HODO (Higher Order Discrete Optimization) case.

For a number of steps K to be considered in each time slot, we have the cost function

$$C(\vec{x}) = \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C_{t,x_{t+1},x_t,x_{t-1},\dots,x_{t-K+1}}, \quad (17)$$

being $C_{t,i,j_0,\dots,j_{K-1}}$ the cost of moving from node j_0 to node i at step t with j_1, \dots, j_{K-1} being the last K nodes. If $t < K$, we only use the nodes until x_0 or $x_{N-n} = x_{-n}$ if we want the returning condition.




Figure 5: MPO layer for 3 multiple bond index tensors.

For this problem, we change the tensor layer S to a tensor MPO layer $S(K)$ where for each bond index k, l we put K bond indexes k_m, l_m , as in Fig. 3. Each of them pass the signal from a previous node and an imaginary time evolution is applied according to the signal obtained through the input indexes. Thus, the non-zero elements of these tensors are those with $i = j = l_0$ and $l_{m+1} = k_m \forall m \in [0, K - 2]$. They will be connected as Fig. 5.

The value of its elements is analogous to that described in general terms in [19]. The rest of the method is analogous to that used in the previous cases, and can be combined with the generalization of Ssec. 4.1, since in it only the filtering layers are changed and in this one only the evolution layer.

Its computational complexity without reuse is $O(N^{2K+2}2^N)$ with memory cost $O(N^{K+1}2^N)$ in the simple case and $O(N^{2K+1}(N^s)^2(N^f)^N)$ with memory cost $O(N^{K+1}(N^f)^N)$ in the version of Ssec. 4.1.

For the reuse we do the same as indicated for the original problem, obtaining com-

putational complexity $O(N^{2K+2}2^N)$ with memory cost $O(N^{K+2}2^N)$ in the simple case and $O(N^{2K+1}N^s(N^f)^N)$ with memory cost $O(N^{K+1}(N^f)^N \max(N, N^s))$ in the version of Ssec. 4.1.

4.3 Bottleneck TSP (BTSP)

The variant we are going to solve now is the TSP with bottleneck. The problem is to find the route which minimizes the cost of the highest-cost edge of the route. The applications of this problem are multiple, such as bus route planning or the design of plate drilling routes.

The formulation of this problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x}_{opt} &= \arg \min_{\vec{x}} (\max (C_{x_t, x_{t+1}})) & (18) \\ x_t &\in [0, N - 1] \quad \forall t \in [0, N - 1] \\ x_t &\neq x_{t'} \quad \forall t \neq t' \in [0, N - 1], \end{aligned}$$

To solve this problem, we use the same scheme as in Fig. 2, but changing the S tensor layer to a Z tensor layer. Now this layer will be in charge of communicating which is the highest displacement cost. Its final tensor will be responsible for applying the imaginary time evolution. For the same reason, we need that instead of having a single index bond that communicates the node of the previous step, we have two that communicate the previous node and the maximum cost that has appeared until that step.

For this method we assume that all elements of the tensor C are positive integers with max value of M . The generalization to rational numbers and the approximation to integers with truncation is straightforward. For the sake of simplicity, we also assume the returning condition, generalization to other cases is straightforward.

Its physical indexes i, j are of dimension $N - 1$ and its bond indexes k, l for the node signal in the previous step are of dimension $N - 1$ and its bond indexes q, p for carrying the maximum cost signal are of dimension $\max(C_{a,b}) \forall a, b$. The non-zero elements of these tensors are those in which $i = j = k$ for the Z^0 , $i = j = l$ for the Z^n and $i = j$ for the Z^{N-2} . These non-zero elements are

$$Z_{ijkq}^0 = 1 \text{ if } q = C_{x_{N-1}, i} \quad (19)$$

$$Z_{ijklqp}^n = 1 \text{ if } p = \max(q, C_{k,i}) \quad (20)$$

$$Z_{ijkq}^{N-2} = e^{-\tau \max(q, C_{k,i}, C_{i,x_{N-1}})} \quad (21)$$

for $\forall b \neq a \in [0, N - 2]$, being τ the decay hyperparameter.

Another variation would be to find the path that maximizes the cost of the lowest-cost edge of the path. This variant is useful for the scheduling of metalworking steps in aircraft manufacture, where we need to avoid accumulating heat in steps close together in space and time.

The rest of the algorithm is exactly the same as the previous ones, but changing the Z^0 so that its non-zero elements are at $q = \max(C_{x_{m-1}, x_m}, C_m^{\max})$, being m the variable we want in this step and C_m^{\max} the highest cost found up to this step.

To solve this version, we only have to do the same as in the minimization version, but changing all the max by min and vice versa and using a $\tau < 0$ for maximizing.

Its computational complexity is $O(\hat{N}M2^{\hat{N}} \max(\hat{N}, M))$, with a cost in memory $O(\hat{N}M2^{\hat{N}})$. With reuse, the computational complexity is $O(\hat{N}M2^{\hat{N}} \max(\hat{N}, M))$, with a cost in memory $O(\hat{N}^2M2^{\hat{N}})$.

4.4 Politician TSP (PTSP)

Another variant with industrial utility is the traveling politician problem, which deals with states that have several cities each and you have to visit exactly one city in each state. This can be abstracted as a graph with N nodes of different M classes so that we have to visit one node of each class. Its industrial utility includes the more optimal cutting of types of sheets of paper from a larger sheet.

The formulation of this problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x}_{opt} &= \arg \min_{\vec{x}} (C(\vec{x})) \\ x_t &\in [0, N - 1] \quad \forall t \in [0, N - 1] \\ x_t &\neq x_{t'} \quad \forall t \neq t' \in [0, N - 1] \\ \text{if } x_t &\in G_k \rightarrow x_{t'} \notin G_k \quad \forall t \neq t' \in [0, N - 1] \\ C(\vec{x}) &= \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C_{t, x_t, x_{t+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

being G_k the k -th class.

To solve this problem, we change the filter layers F in a very simple way. We make that, instead of the layer being associated to the node, it will

be associated to the group. That is, instead of activating signal 1 and filtering only for an incoming state, now the tensors activate signal 1 and filter for all the states of the corresponding group.

The rest of the algorithm is exactly the same, except that each time a node of a class appears, we remove the initialization and the filtering layer not only of that node, but of all nodes of its same class.

Its complexity is $O(N^32^M)$ with a memory cost of $O(N^22^M)$ without reuse and $O(N^32^M)$ with a memory cost of $O(N^32^M)$ with reuse.

4.5 TSP with precedence (TSPP)

Another interesting case is the TSP in which we have a precedence rule between nodes. That is, certain nodes have to appear earlier in the route than others. This additional rule is straightforward to implement in the first version of the algorithm by slightly modifying the tensors $F(a)$. We will see how to do it with an example.

Let us imagine that we have the rule that node 4 has to appear before node 7 in the path. To take this into account, we only have to make the tensors of layer $F(4)$, in case a 0 arrives for index k , let all the states pass through i except for $i = 7$. Also, node 7 cannot appear first and 4 cannot appear last, which is embodied in the initialization. The rest of the algorithm is exactly the same.

5 Proof of Concept for the ONCE

We now present a real use case in which we have applied this method [20]. This is the case of the Job Reassignment Problem (JRP) developed for Organización Nacional de Ciegos Españoles (ONCE).

5.1 Problem description

The Job Reassignment Problem consists of, given a set of workers assigned each to one of a set of jobs, and a set of vacant jobs, finding whether any of the assigned workers should move to the vacant jobs. Each job has its own quality score, given by its profitability, and an affinity with each of the workers, given by the suitability of this worker occupying that job. The objective is to

obtain an outplacement that increases the sum of productivity and affinity in the group of workers.

Since the whole process is extensively analyzed in the original paper, we focus on the subproblem, where given a set of workers and vacant positions, we have to choose which position to send them to (if any). The constraint is that no two workers can be sent to the same job. Each worker can only be assigned to one job, but that will be assured by the encoding of the variables and will not be a restriction we need to impose to our tensor network.

The solutions is encoded as a vector \vec{x} of integer values, where x_i is the vacant position to which the worker i is sent. Moreover, $x_i = 0$ means that worker i stays in his position without moving to any of the vacant ones. Its cost function is

$$C(\vec{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[c^P (P_i^C - P_{x_i}^V) + c^A (A_{i,i}^C - A_{x_i,i}^V) \right], \quad (23)$$

being $P_{x_i}^V$ the quality of the x_i vacant job, P_i^C the quality of the current i worker job, $A_{x_i,i}^V$ the affinity of the worker i at x_i vacant job, $A_{i,i}^C$ the affinity of the worker i at its current job, and c^V and c^A are proportion factors.

Therefore, we can see that our problem can be expressed as a general TSP problem as in eq. (3) in which we have only the C^0 term.

By the fact that we only have the linear term, we do not need the S tensor layer, we can put the imaginary time evolution in the ‘+’ tensor of each variable itself. In addition, since several workers may not move jobs, we also remove the filter layer of $x_i = 0$. The other filter layers will have $N^0 = 0$ and $N^J = 1$, since a vacancy may not be chosen. After each choice step of x_i , if we obtain that $x_i \neq 0$, we remove that state from the ‘+’ tensors and its corresponding filter layer. If at any step we run out of free vacancies, we stop the algorithm and fill the remaining components of \vec{x} with 0.

The computational complexity of solving a subproblem for I vacant jobs and J workers is $O(J^2 I^2 2^{I+1})$ with a memory cost of $O(I 2^{I+1})$. With reuse of intermediate calculations we can achieve a complexity of $O(J I^2 2^{I+1})$ with a memory cost of $O(J I 2^{I+1})$.

Due to the symmetry of the problem, since assigning workers to jobs and jobs to workers is equivalent, in the case that $I > J$, we only have

to run the same algorithm with the cost tensor C_{i,x_i} changed so that now the elements x_i are the worker we send to vacant i and $x_i = 0$ means that no worker is sent to this vacant. Thus, the computational complexity is $O(I^2 J^2 2^{J+1})$ with a memory cost of $O(J 2^{J+1})$. With reuse of intermediate calculations we can achieve a complexity of $O(J^2 I 2^{J+1})$ with a memory cost of $O(J I 2^{J+1})$.

5.2 Results

For the productive resolution of the JRP we compared three different methods: Dwave’s Advantage_system4.1 Quantum Annealer, Azure’s Digital Annealer (DA) and the Tensor Networks method explained in this paper.

Initial comparisons showed good results for the three platforms, but Advantage_system4.1 was discarded for lack of production-scale access.

For the comparison between DA and TN methods we selected 72 days at random from a whole year, in order to minimize the variations caused by seasonal effects. The day selection was also equiprobably selected amongst the seven days of the week.

The first thing we did in order to compare the two methods was to sum the total $\Delta P \equiv \sum_i P_i^C - P_{x_i}^V$ job quality gain of all days, that is, the accumulated difference between the qualities of the originally assigned jobs and the qualities of the reassigned jobs that each method suggested. It turned out that, for each of the 72 days, $\Delta P_{DA} = \Delta P_{TN}$. Then, as the problem itself minimizes the total cost function C and not only ΔP , we compared the other part of the cost function, $\Delta A \equiv \sum_i A_{i,i}^C - A_{x_i,i}^V$, to break the tie. It did not. However, the solutions were not equivalent due to the existence of degeneration. For example, we found a case where the only available worker i , which was assigned to a low-quality job, could be reassigned to two different workplaces with the same high quality $P_{x_i}^V$. The worker also had the same $A_{x_i,i}^V$ affinity with the two vacant workplaces. Then, the gain of choosing one or the other was identical, and the two methods -DA and TN- chose at random different non-equivalent answers.

The fact that the two methods agree to such extent, reaching the same accumulated cost throughout all days and only being distinguish-

able by differences in degenerate cases, give us strong confidence on both methods.

6 Approximate approach

As we have seen in the previous sections, the computational complexity of the different resolution algorithms is exponential in the number of nodes. Although this is still a considerably better complexity than the factorial complexity of brute-force search, it may be excessive for sufficiently large industrial cases. The exponential computational cost is due to the constraint layers, since each gives an extra index to the intermediate W^i tensors of the contraction. This makes it clear that if we reduce the number of layers, we can control the scaling of the algorithm.

If during the execution of the algorithm, instead of applying all the constraint layers, we only apply a subset of them, we can obtain an approximate solution to the problem. Now, because during solving, we already partially impose the non-repetition constraint, making it so that at step $i + 1$ none of the previously determined i nodes can be activated. Given this, despite reducing the number of layers used, we can approximate a solution that satisfies the constraints. The main limitation of this method is that, in certain problems, there is a possibility that in the last steps of the solution only non-connected nodes are available. However, if we choose correctly the layers to apply in each step of the resolution, this problem can be avoided.

To choose which rules are relevant to obtain the solution, we have two options. The first is to choose at each step a set of constraint layers at random from among the constraints that have not been imposed through initialization. The second is heuristically, by means of node closeness relations or based on previous failed solutions. Obviously, this version will not tend to obtain the global minimum, but it will tend to obtain sufficiently good solutions.

Another possibility to obtain approximate solutions is that, in the contraction scheme, instead of using the dense tensors to operate, we perform a compression in Matrix product state (MPS) representation. Thus, both the intermediate A^i tensors and the W^i tensors are in approximate MPS representations, allowing to require much less memory, approximating the system.

7 Limitations

This set of algorithms has two main limitations. The first one consists of exponential scaling to obtain an exact solution of the problem. Even with the application of the above approximate techniques, to obtain a good result we need to apply several rules, increasing the number of rules needed with the size of the problem. On the part of the compression techniques, due to the projection layers we need an exponentially large bond dimension to maintain the necessary entanglement in the worst case to obtain a good solution.

Therefore, although both methods allow dealing with larger cases, depending on the instances to be solved, they may still require exponential memory and time.

The second constraint is numerical stability. That is, we have to balance the number of states we are summing when tracing, since we are summing an exponential number of amplitudes, and the damping factor τ , since it has to be large to distinguish the maximum, but not so large as to make all the amplitudes go to zero.

Although in all the cases we have run we have not encountered any problems, we must consider that for larger cases this problem may appear. It could be solved by partitioning the problems, applying state rescaling techniques or simply allowing the states with higher cost to disappear due to the numerical error, since we really only need to maintain one amplitude, that of the valid state with lowest cost.

8 Conclusions

We have studied a new family of conceptually simple algorithms to deal with a set of different versions of the Traveling Salesman Problem using tensor networks and have shown their effectiveness in a real industrial case. Tab. 1 shows the comparative computational complexities of each of the cases presented, both for the case without reuse of intermediate calculations and for the case with reuse. In addition, we can combine all these algorithms for hybrid cases, such as a politician TSP problem with precedence and non-Markovian.

We have also seen the main limitation of these algorithms, which is the exponential scaling in

computational complexity and memory with the size of the problem, and two ways to approach this problem through approximations and heuristics.

Future lines of research could include the application of these algorithms to different TSP problems or to certain particular cases, the study of how to take advantage of the sparse characteristics of the tensors being used or the contraction of them with quantum resources, or even applying the techniques to problems outside the generalised TSP family of problems we discuss in this paper.

Acknowledgement

We thank ONCE INNOVA for the project proposal which kickstarted this work.

The research leading to this paper has received funding from the Q4Real project (Quantum Computing for Real Industries), HAZITEK 2022, no. ZE-2022/00033.

References

- [1] Manfred Padberg and Giovanni Rinaldi. A branch-and-cut algorithm for the resolution of large-scale symmetric traveling salesman problems. *SIAM Review*, 33(1):60–100, 1991. DOI: [10.1137/1033004](https://doi.org/10.1137/1033004). URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1033004>.
- [2] Michael Held and Richard M. Karp. A dynamic programming approach to sequencing problems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 10(1):196–210, 1962. ISSN 03684245. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2098806>.
- [3] Adewole Philip, Akinwale Adio Taofiki, and Otunbanowo Kehinde. A genetic algorithm for solving travelling salesman problem. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 2(1), 2011. DOI: [10.14569/IJACSA.2011.020104](https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2011.020104). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2011.020104>.
- [4] Nicos Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. *Operations Research Forum*, 3(1):20, Mar 2022. ISSN 2662-2556. DOI: [10.1007/s43069-021-00101-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s43069-021-00101-z). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43069-021-00101-z>.
- [5] P.W. Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 124–134, 1994. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700).
- [6] Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann. A quantum approximate optimization algorithm, 2014.
- [7] Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Peter J. Love, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L. O’Brien. A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature Communications*, 5(1):4213, Jul 2014. ISSN 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/ncomms5213](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5213). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5213>.
- [8] Ákos Nagy, Jaime Park, Cindy Zhang, Atithi Acharya, and Alex Khan. Fixed-point grover adaptive search for binary optimization problems, 2024.
- [9] Karthik Srinivasan, Saipriya Satyajit, Bikash K. Behera, and Prasanta K. Panigrahi. Efficient quantum algorithm for solving travelling salesman problem: An ibm quantum experience, 2018.
- [10] Jieao Zhu, Yihuai Gao, Hansen Wang, Tiefu Li, and Hao Wu. A realizable gas-based quantum algorithm for traveling salesman problem, 2022.
- [11] Andris Ambainis, Kaspars Balodis, Jānis Iraids, Martins Kokainis, Krišjānis Prūsis, and Jevgēnijs Vihrovs. *Quantum Speedups for Exponential-Time Dynamic Programming Algorithms*, pages 1783–1793. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611975482.107](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975482.107). URL <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611975482.107>.
- [12] Jacob Biamonte and Ville Bergholm. Tensor networks in a nutshell, 2017.
- [13] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac. Matrix product state representations, 2007.
- [14] V. Murg F. Verstraete and J.I. Cirac. Matrix product states, projected entangled pair states, and variational renormalization group methods for quantum spin systems. *Advances in Physics*, 57(2):143–224, 2008. DOI: [10.1080/00036810801970468](https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810801970468).

Case	Steps without reuse	Space without reuse	Steps with reuse	Space with reuse
TSP	$\hat{N}^4 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^2 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^4 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^3 2^{\hat{N}}$
DNSNN	$N^3 (N^s)^2 (N^f)^N$	$N^2 (N^f)^N$	$N^3 N^s (N^f)^N$	$N^2 N^s (N^f)^N$
NMTSP	$N^{2K+1} (N^s)^2 (N^f)^N$	$N^{K+1} (N^f)^N$	$N^{2K+1} N^s (N^f)^N$	$N^{K+1} (N^f)^N \max(N, N^s)$
BTSP	$\hat{N} M 2^{\hat{N}} \max(\hat{N}, M)$	$\hat{N} M 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N} M 2^{\hat{N}} \max(\hat{N}, M)$	$\hat{N}^2 M 2^{\hat{N}}$
PTSP	$N^3 2^M$	$N^2 2^M$	$N^3 2^M$	$N^3 2^M$
TSPP	$\hat{N}^4 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^2 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^4 2^{\hat{N}}$	$\hat{N}^3 2^{\hat{N}}$

Table 1: Comparative table of computational complexities orders with and without reuse of intermediate calculations.

- [10.1080/14789940801912366](https://doi.org/10.1080/14789940801912366). URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789940801912366>.
- [15] Hirofumi Nishi, Taichi Kosugi, and Yu-ichiro Matsushita. Implementation of quantum imaginary-time evolution method on nisq devices by introducing nonlocal approximation. *npj Quantum Information*, 7(1):85, Jun 2021. ISSN 2056-6387. DOI: [10.1038/s41534-021-00409-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00409-y). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00409-y>.
- [16] Konstantin Sozykin, Andrei Chertkov, Roman Schutski, Anh-Huy Phan, Andrzej Cichocki, and Ivan Oseledets. Ttopt: A maximum volume quantized tensor train-based optimization and its application to reinforcement learning, 2022.
- [17] Javier Alcazar, Mohammad Ghazi Vakili, Can B. Kalayci, and Alejandro Perdomo-Ortiz. Enhancing combinatorial optimization with classical and quantum generative models. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):2761, Mar 2024. ISSN 2041-1723. DOI: [10.1038/s41467-024-46959-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-46959-5). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-46959-5>.
- [18] Tianyi Hao, Xuxin Huang, Chunjing Jia, and Cheng Peng. A quantum-inspired tensor network algorithm for constrained combinatorial optimization problems. *Frontiers in Physics*, 10, 2022. ISSN 2296-424X. DOI: [10.3389/fphy.2022.906590](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2022.906590). URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphy.2022.906590>.
- [19] Alejandro Mata Ali, Iñigo Perez Delgado, Marina Ristol Roura, and Aitor Moreno Fdez. de Leceta. Polynomial-time solver of tridiagonal qubo and qudo problems with tensor networks, 2024.
- [20] Iñigo Perez Delgado, Beatriz García

Markaida, Alejandro Mata Ali, and Aitor Moreno Fdez de Leceta. Qubo resolution of the job reassignment problem. In *2023 IEEE 26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 4847–4852, 2023. DOI: [10.1109/ITSC57777.2023.10422467](https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC57777.2023.10422467).