

4/3-Approximation of Graphic TSP

Ali Çivril*

June 23, 2022

Abstract

We describe a $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for the traveling salesman problem in which the distances between points are induced by graph-theoretical distances in an unweighted graph. The algorithm is based on finding a minimum cost perfect matching on the odd degree vertices of a carefully computed 2-connected spanning subgraph.

1 Introduction

For historical reasons and with little doubt, the traveling salesman problem (TSP) stands out as the most famous of all combinatorial optimization problems. From the viewpoint of approximation algorithms, one can equally claim so for the problem of determining the integrality gap of the Held-Karp relaxation [3] for Metric TSP, the special case of the problem in which the points of the input form a metric space. In particular, it has long been conjectured that there exists a $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for Metric TSP. The ratio $\frac{3}{2}$ of the algorithm of Christofides [1] dating back to more than 45 years ago stood as the best for approximating the problem until very recently an algorithm with factor $\frac{3}{2} - \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \approx 10^{-36}$ was announced in [4].

The lower bound of $\frac{4}{3}$ on the integrality gap of the Held-Karp relaxation holds even for a special class of metric spaces whose points are the vertices of an unweighted graph, and the distance function is induced by the graph-theoretical distances. We call this problem Graphic TSP, which to a great extent captures the difficulty of and is a natural gateway to Metric TSP. For Graphic TSP, a series of improvements including [2, 5, 6] resulted in the factor $\frac{7}{5}$ by Sebö and Vygen [7].

The purpose of this paper is to show the following.

Theorem 1. *There exists a polynomial-time $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for Graphic TSP.*

Our idea is reminiscent of the algorithm of Christofides. Instead of finding a matching on the odd degree vertices of a minimum spanning tree, we find a matching on the odd degree vertices of a carefully computed 2-connected spanning subgraph to create an Euler tour. One then uses the standard technique of short-cutting the edges, relying on the metric property of the input to convert it to a Hamiltonian cycle.

2 Preliminaries

We do not directly use the Held-Karp relaxation, but consider the natural LP relaxation of the 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph problem, which we briefly denote by 2-ECSS: Given an undirected simple graph $G = (V, E)$, find a 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph (2-ECSS) of G with

*Istinye University, Computer Engineering Department, Sariyer, 34396 Istanbul, Turkey, e-mail: ali.civril@istinye.edu.tr

minimum number of edges. It has the following natural LP relaxation, where $\delta(S)$ denotes the set of edges with one end in the cut S and the other not in S .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} x_e && (EC) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq 2, && \forall \emptyset \subset S \subset V, \\
& && 1 \geq x_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

The following is the dual of this LP.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{\emptyset \subset S \subset V} 2y_S - \sum_{e \in E} z_e && (EC-D) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{S: e \in \delta(S)} y_S \leq 1 + z_e, && \forall e \in E, \\
& && y_S \geq 0, && \forall \emptyset \subset S \subset V, \\
& && z_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

Another related problem is the 2-(vertex)-connected spanning subgraph problem (2-VCSS), which asks for a minimum cost 2-connected spanning subgraph (briefly denoted as a 2-VCSS). Every TSP tour is also a 2-VCSS, and every 2-VCSS is also a 2-ECSS. The optimal value of the LP above is then a lower bound on the cost of a minimum 2-VCSS and a minimum TSP tour. In the rest of the paper, we assume without loss of generality that the input graph is 2-connected. Otherwise, one can run the algorithms we will describe on the 2-connected blocks of the graph, and it suffices to prove the approximation ratio on each separate block, since the overall optimal value is the sum of the optimal values on blocks.

Our algorithm is essentially a primal-dual algorithm, introducing a novel extension of the basic schema. We first use this extension to compute a 2-VCSS of G . We then extend this result to an Euler tour. In a typical application of the primal-dual schema, one grows the duals corresponding to minimal violated cuts synchronously. In our case, the minimal violated cuts are the singleton vertices. The growth of the duals continue until the dual constraint of an edge e becomes tight, in which case e is included into the solution, and new minimal violated sets are computed. The iterations repeat until the solution is feasible. For 2-VCSS with unit weights, the dual constraints of all the edges become tight when the dual values of all the cuts reach the value $1/2$. In this case all the edges are included into the solution. The schema then performs the so-called reverse-delete operation to ensure that there are no redundant edges in the solution. It considers the edges in the reverse order of their inclusion, and deletes an edge provided that the solution remains feasible. Since all the edges are included at the same time in our case, the inclusion order might be arbitrary. As a result, there is no clever way of ensuring a cheap solution for 2-VCSS via only the reverse-delete operation. In particular, a direct application of the primal-dual schema as explained here can result in an approximation factor as large as 2, thus forbidding a cheap Euler tour. We rectify this by running the schema twice, and trying to include edges that might improve the solution in the second phase.

3 Constructing a Good 2-VCSS

The algorithm to construct a 2-VCSS consists of two phases. The first phase is the primal-dual schema described in the previous section. We first introduce some terminology. Given a vertex

Algorithm 1: 2-VCSS($G(V, E)$)

```
1 // The first phase
2 Let  $F^1$  be the solution returned by the standard primal-dual schema
3 // The second phase
4  $F \leftarrow F^1$ 
5  $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
6 Mark all  $e \in H$  as non-futile
7 while there exists a non-futile critical edge  $e \in H$  do
8   // Improvement operation
9    $F' \leftarrow F \cup \{e\}$ 
10  Perform deletion on  $F'$  considering the edges in the order  $F, e$ 
11  if  $|F'| < |F|$  then
12     $F \leftarrow F'$ 
13     $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
14  else
15    | Mark  $e$  as futile
16 return  $F$ 
```

$v \in V$ and a feasible solution F , the degree of v on F is denoted by $\deg_F(v)$. v is called a *degree- d vertex* on F if $\deg_F(v) = d$, and a *high-degree vertex* on F if $\deg_F(v) \geq 3$. If F is clear from the context, we do not pronounce it. For the path $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_{k-1}v_k$, v_1 and v_k are the *end vertices* of P , all the other vertices are the *internal vertices* of P . A path whose internal vertices are all degree-2 vertices on F is called a *plain path* on F . A maximal plain path is called a *segment*. The length of a segment is the number of edges on the segment. If the length of a segment is ℓ , it is called an *ℓ -segment*. A 1-segment is also called a *trivial segment*. For $\ell \neq 1$, an ℓ -segment is called a *non-trivial segment*. A non-trivial ℓ -segment with $\ell \leq 3$ is called a *short segment*, otherwise a *long segment*.

Let F^1 be the solution returned by the first phase. The second phase of the algorithm considers modifications on the running solution F , which is initialized to F^1 . Modifications are performed via what we call *improvement operations*. The basic idea is to consider certain edges not in F , which can possibly improve the cost of the solution. To this aim, we consider the set H , which is initialized to $E \setminus F$. An edge in $e = (u, v) \in H$ is called a *critical edge* if u and v are the internal vertices of short segments. The algorithm iterates over the critical edges e in H . Initially, all such edges are declared *non-futile*. In an improvement operation, the algorithm considers $F' = F \cup \{e\}$. It then performs a deletion operation on F' , considering the deletion of edges in the order F, e . Recall that this operation deletes an edge provided that its removal does not violate feasibility. F is updated to the result of this operation if there is an improvement in the cost. Otherwise, e is declared *futile*.

3.1 Termination of the Algorithm and the Running Time

Proposition 2. *After $|E|$ iterations of the while loop of the second phase, there is no non-futile critical edge in H .*

Proof. If a critical edge $e \in H$ does not lead to any modification by the end of an iteration, it is declared futile. Thus, if all the non-futile critical edges $e \in H$ do not appear in H again, the

result follows. Given this, let e be a non-futile critical edge at the beginning of an iteration. If e is included into F via an improvement operation, then e does not appear in H again, since it is only incident to internal vertices of a segment formed after the operation. The result follows. \square

In a deletion operation, the algorithm checks for feasibility, which can be performed by removing each edge one by one and testing connectivity of the residual graph, taking $O(|E|(|V| + |E|))$ time using a standard graph traversal algorithm. Considering the proposition above, the total running time of the algorithm is then $O(|E|^2(|V| + |E|))$. In practice, the algorithm may be made faster. The issue of efficient implementations however, are not the focus of this paper.

4 Constructing an Euler Tour

We have decomposed the 2-VCSS F into segments in the previous section. Another way of doing so is via an *ear decomposition*. An ear decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a partition of E into subgraphs, namely P_0, P_1, \dots, P_k such that P_0 is the trivial path of length 0, and for $i = 1, \dots, k$, P_i is either

1. a path with exactly both end vertices in $V(P_0) \cup V(P_1) \cup \dots \cup V(P_{i-1})$, or
2. a cycle with exactly one vertex in $V(P_0) \cup V(P_1) \cup \dots \cup V(P_{i-1})$.

An element of the set $\{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$ is called an *ear*. If it is of the first type above, it is called an *open ear*, otherwise a *closed ear*. Note that P_1 is always closed. It is well known by a result of Whitney [9] that a graph is 2-connected if and only if it has an ear decomposition with all ears open except P_1 . It is then an easy consequence that the number of odd degree vertices in a 2-VCSS is even. The algorithm to construct a TSP tour finds a minimum cost perfect matching M on these vertices (which can be performed in polynomial-time), assuming the cost function c on the segments of F , defined as $c(S) := \ell(S)$ for a given segment S , where $\ell(S)$ is the length of S . The edges of the matching M are doubled to produce the Euler tour T , followed by a deletion operation, which deletes redundant double edges from T . Examples are given in Figure 1.

The final step of the algorithm checks if the solution can further be improved. To this aim, it works on the solution on which we apply a certain decomposition followed by a *degree reduction*. Two single segments in F with both end vertices identical are called *sibling* segments. Remove sibling segments from F one by one without violating feasibility, until there are no sibling segments. Let the resulting graph be F_1 so that $F = F_1 \cup F_2$, where F_2 is the graph containing the sibling segments. By considering the metric completion of the input graph, we reduce all the degrees of the odd degree vertices of F_1 to 3, and of the even degrees to 2 as follows. First, given an element of

Algorithm 2: TSP($G(V, E)$)

- 1 Let F be the solution returned by Algorithm 1
 - 2 Assume the cost function c on the segments of F , defined as $c(S) := \ell(S)$
 - 3 Find a minimum cost perfect matching M on the odd degree vertices of F
 - 4 $T \leftarrow F \cup M$
 - 5 Perform a deletion operation on T to exclude redundant double edges, without violating the Euler tour property
 - 6 Modify T by checking if the cost can be improved via segment squares on F'
 - 7 return T
-




Figure 1: Examples of deletion operations on T




Figure 2: An example of a modification via a segment square

M , combine all the segments defining it into a single segment. Then, perform the same operation on the remaining segments without violating feasibility until we obtain a subcubic graph. Let $F' = (V', E')$, where V' is the set of odd degree vertices, and E' is the set of segments after the described operation. Then F' is a bridgeless cubic multigraph by definition.

A segment in M is called a *double* segment. All other segments are called *single* segments. A cycle of length 4 in F' with alternating single and double segments is called a *segment square*. The algorithm goes over segment squares and performs a modification on T as follows. Let the segments of the segment square be S_1, D_1, S_2, D_2 in order, where S_1 and S_2 are the single segments, and D_1 and D_2 are the double segments. It doubles the edges of S_1 and S_2 , and selects the edges of D_1 and D_2 once, an operation which does not change the Euler tour property. It then performs a deletion operation on the (doubled) edges of S_1 and S_2 akin to the previous step of the algorithm. If the resulting solution has a lower cost than the solution before this modification, the solution is updated to the modified one. A modified segment square is not considered by the algorithm again. This step can be performed in polynomial time by a simple graph traversal algorithm, which we do not describe in detail. An example of this step is given in Figure 2.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

We will show that the cost of T computed by Algorithm 2 is at most $\frac{4}{3}$ times the cost of an optimal 2-ECSS on G , which we denote by $OPT(G)$. For brevity, given a set K , we denote the total cost of the segments in K by $c(K)$.

Lemma 3. $c(M) \leq \frac{c(F')}{3}$.

Proof. Recall that F' is the graph obtained after the degree reduction described above, which as noted, a bridgeless cubic multigraph. Given two parallel edges in this multigraph, subdivide both of them by introducing two new vertices, and define a zero cost edge between them. This operation performed on all parallel edges transforms F' into a cubic simple graph, which by Vizing's theorem




Figure 3: Modification of F' so as to create three perfect matchings

[8] admits either a 3-edge-coloring or a 4-edge-coloring. If F' admits a 3-edge-coloring, then we have a partition of the edges into three perfect matchings. In this case consider a 3-edge-coloring around a subdivided edge, which colors the newly added edge with 1, and the others with 2 and 3. Assign the cost 0 to each of the colors on one side, leaving the original costs of the parallel edges on the other side (See Figure 3a for an illustration). This ensures that there is exactly one edge of cost 0 in each of the three matchings, and the other costs in the modified graph are identical to those of the original graph. Since M is the minimum cost perfect matching on F' , the result follows. Suppose now that F' does not admit a 3-edge-coloring. By Petersen's theorem, there is a perfect matching M_1 on F' . Color the edges of this matching with 1. Discard the edges in M_1 from F' , find a maximal matching M_2 , and color its edges with 2. Discard the edges of M_2 to find another maximal matching on the residual graph, and color its edges with 3. There remain two edges, which must be colored with 4. Subdivide both of these edges by introducing two new vertices, and define a zero cost edge between them. This operation makes F' 3-edge-colorable, where we can color the newly introduced edge with 1. We thus have that F' can be partitioned into three perfect matchings. Perform the same cost assignment as in the previous case, which is depicted in Figure 3b. One can then compare the cost of M plus the zero cost edges, and the cost of all the edges to see that the result holds. \square

Theorem 4. *Let T be a solution returned by Algorithm 2. Then,*

$$|T| \leq \frac{4}{3} OPT(G).$$

Given a segment S , denote the cost incurred by the segment on T by $c_T(S)$. Similarly, for a set of segments K , denote the total cost of the segments in K on T by $c_T(K)$. Remove all the internal vertices of the segments in F_2 from G to obtain G_1 . The theorem above is implied by the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.

$$\frac{c_T(F')}{OPT(G_1)} \leq \frac{4}{3}.$$

Proof. Define $\Delta_T(S) := 2c(S) - c_T(S)$ for a segment S . Let d be the number of vertices in F' . Since $OPT(G_1) \geq c(F') - \frac{d}{2}$, it then suffice to prove the following:

$$\frac{c(F') + c(M) - \sum_{D \in M} \Delta_T(D)}{c(F') - \frac{d}{2}} \leq \frac{4}{3},$$

which is equivalent to

$$c(F') - 2d \geq 3c(M) - 3 \sum_{D \in M} \Delta_T(D). \quad (1)$$




Figure 4: Examples of a third segment D_3 with $\Delta_T(D_3) = 2$




Figure 5: An illustration for the proof of Claim 6

By Lemma 3, it then suffices to show

$$\sum_{D \in M} \Delta_T(D) \geq \frac{2d}{3}. \quad (2)$$

Note that each segment $D \in M$ identifies two odd degree vertices. Given this, if $\Delta_T(D) = 2$ for all such segments, then (2) clearly holds since $2 > \frac{2 \cdot 2}{3}$. Let $D_1 \in M$ with $\Delta_T(D_1) = 0$, i.e. all the edges of D_1 are doubled. We claim we may assume without loss of generality that there exists a segment $D_2 \in M$ with $\Delta_T(D_2) = 2$ such that D_1 and D_2 belong to a segment square. Otherwise, if there is an odd degree vertex on one of the paths between the end vertices of D_1 and D_2 , the double segment $D_3 \in M$ incident to that vertex must have $\Delta_T(D_3) = 2$. Two possible configurations are given in Figure 4. In this case D_3 is identified by D_1 and D_2 , i.e. there cannot be any other double segment D_4 with $\Delta_T(D_4) = 0$ pairing with D_3 , as D_1 and D_2 are paired. Indeed, $\Delta_T(D_1) = 0$ implies that the removal of D_1 and D_2 from F' violates feasibility. One can see however from the figures that for any such D_4 , the graph remains 2-connected upon the removal of D_3 and D_4 . Given this, the number of odd degree vertices defined by the segments D_1, D_2 and D_3 is 6, and the total Δ_T value induced by these segments satisfies $4 \geq \frac{2 \cdot 6}{3}$, validating (2).

Let S_1, D_1, S_2 and D_2 be the segments of the aforementioned segment square, where S_1 and S_2 are single segments.

Claim 6. $c(S_1) + c(S_2) \geq c(D_1) + c(D_2) + 2$.

Proof. Note first that we cannot have the configuration in Figure 5a, which contradicts the non-redundancy of all the edges of D_1 . Thus, we must have the one in Figure 5b, so that $\Delta_T(S_1) = \Delta_T(S_2) = 2$. Since the algorithm did not perform any modifications on the segment square, we then have

$$(2c(D_1) + 2c(D_2) - 2) + (c(S_1) + c(S_2)) \leq (2c(S_1) + 2c(S_2) - 4) + (c(D_1) + c(D_2)),$$

which implies the result. \square

By this claim, considering the matching on F' obtained by interchanging the single segments with double segments in the segment square, and recalling that M is the minimum cost perfect matching, we then have a strengthening of Lemma 3: $c(F') - 2 \geq 3c(M)$. Considering this in (1), it then suffices to see for the segment square at hand that

$$\Delta_T(D_1) + \Delta_T(D_2) + 2 \geq \frac{2 \cdot 4}{3},$$

which clearly holds. Noting that the constant 2 in the strengthening of Lemma 3 applies to each segment square separately, the proof is completed. \square

Given G , contract all the vertices in G_1 to a single vertex to obtain G_2 , which contains the (single) sibling segments in F_2 . The following lemma together with Lemma 5 establishes Theorem 4.

Lemma 7.

$$\frac{c(F_2)}{OPT(G_2)} \leq \frac{4}{3}.$$

Proof. Remove all the long segments from F_2 to obtain F'_2 . Remove the internal vertices of all the long segments together with all the incident edges from G_2 one by one to obtain G'_2 . If the residual graph loses 2-connectivity at any step, add a new edge between the end vertices of the removed segment. Denote the value of an optimal solution on these graphs by $OPT(G_2)$ and $OPT(G'_2)$, respectively. For an ℓ -segment in G_2 , there exist in any optimal solution at least $\ell - 1$ edges corresponding to that segment. In particular, if G_2 and G'_2 differ only by a 4-segment, we have $OPT(G_2) \geq OPT(G'_2) + 3$. In this case supposing $\frac{c(F'_2)}{OPT(G'_2)} \leq \frac{4}{3}$, we obtain

$$\frac{4}{3} \geq \frac{c(F'_2)}{OPT(G'_2)} \geq \frac{c(F'_2) + 4}{OPT(G'_2) + 3} \geq \frac{c(F'_2) + 4}{OPT(G_2)} = \frac{c(F_2)}{OPT(G_2)}.$$

Since $\ell \geq 4$ for the removed segments, it thus suffices to show $\frac{c(F'_2)}{OPT(G'_2)} \leq \frac{4}{3}$. We only have short segments in F'_2 on which we describe a feasible dual solution. We then compare the cost of a set of segments with the associated dual value. Let the dual values of all the singleton high-degree vertices be 0. Given this, assign the y_S dual value 1 to the internal vertices of short segments. For a 3-segment assign the z_e dual value 1 to the middle edge of the segment. Note that this assignment is feasible: By the improvement operations of Algorithm 1, there are no critical edges between the internal vertices of the segments, so that we do not have to define a positive z_e value to any other edge. The value of the assignment is 2 for a 2-segment, and $2 + 2 - 1 = 3$ for a 3-segment, optimally covering the cost of the segments. This completes the proof. \square

6 A Tight Example

A tight example for Algorithm 2 is given in Figure 6. Algorithm 1 selects the three k -segments in Figure 6b, where k is a large odd positive integer. The cost of the Euler tour is then $4k - 2$. The optimal solution is the Hamiltonian cycle shown in Figure 6c, with a total cost of $3k - 1$.

References

- [1] N. Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the traveling salesman problem. Technical Report 388, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, 1976.




Figure 6: A tight example for the algorithm

- [2] S. O. Gharan, A. Saberi, and M. Singh. A randomized rounding approach to the traveling salesman problem. In *IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 550–559, 2011.
- [3] M. Held and R. M. Karp. The traveling-salesman problem and minimum spanning trees. *Operations Research*, 18:1138–1162, 1970.
- [4] A. R. Karlin, N. Klein, and S. Oveis Gharan. A (Slightly) Improved Approximation Algorithm for Metric TSP. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2007.01409, 2020.
- [5] T. Mömke and O. Svensson. Removing and adding edges for the traveling salesman problem. *J. ACM*, 63(1):2:1–2:28, 2016.
- [6] M. Mucha. 13/9-approximation for graphic TSP. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 55(4):640–657, 2014.
- [7] A. Sebö and J. 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*, 34(5):597–629, 2014.
- [8] V. G. Vizing. On an estimate of the chromatic class of a p-graph. *Diskret. Analiz*, 3:25–30, 1964.
- [9] H. Whitney. Nonseparable and planar graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 34:339–362, 1932.