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Abstract

The many-visits traveling salesperson problem (MV-TSP) asks for an optimal tour of \( n \) cities that visits each city \( c \) a prescribed number \( k_c \) of times. Travel costs may not be symmetric, and visiting a city twice in a row may incur a non-zero cost. The MV-TSP problem finds applications in scheduling, geometric approximation, and Hamiltonicity of certain graph families.

The fastest known algorithm for MV-TSP is due to Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou (SICOMP, 1984). It runs in time \( n^{O(n)} + O(n^3 \log \sum k_c) \) and requires \( n^{\Omega(n)} \) space. The interesting feature of the Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm is its logarithmic dependence on the total length \( \sum k_c \) of the tour, allowing the algorithm to handle instances with very long tours, beyond what is tractable in the standard TSP setting. However, the superexponential dependence on the number of cities in both its time and space complexity renders the algorithm impractical for all but the narrowest range of this parameter.

In this paper we significantly improve on the Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm, giving an MV-TSP algorithm that runs in single-exponential time with polynomial space. More precisely, we obtain the running time \( 2^{O(n)} + O(n^3 \log \sum k_c) \), with \( O(n^2 \log \sum k_c) \) space. Assuming the Exponential-time Hypothesis (ETH), both the time and space requirements of our algorithm are optimal.

Our algorithm is deterministic, and arguably both simpler and easier to analyse than the original approach of Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou. It involves an optimization over oriented spanning trees of a graph and employs a recursive, centroid-based decomposition of trees.

1 Introduction

The traveling salesperson problem (TSP) is one of the cornerstones of combinatorial optimization, with origins going back (at least) to the 19th century work of Hamilton (for surveys on the rich history, variants, and current status of TSP we refer to the dedicated books [3, 13, 22, 36]). In the standard TSP, given \( n \) cities and their pairwise distances, we seek a tour of minimum total distance that visits each city at least once. If the distances obey the triangle inequality, then an optimal tour necessarily visits each vertex exactly once (apart from returning to the starting city in the end). In the general case of the TSP with arbitrary distances, the optimal tour may visit a city multiple times. (Instances with non-metric distances can arise from various applications that are modeled by the TSP, e.g. from scheduling problems.)

To date, the fastest known exact algorithms for TSP (both in the metric and non-metric cases) are due to Bellman [6] and Held and Karp [25], and run in time \( 2^n \cdot O(n^2) \) for \( n \)-city instances; both algorithms also require space \( \Omega(2^n) \).
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In this paper we study the more general problem where each city has to be visited exactly a given number of times. More precisely, we are given a set $V$ of $n$ vertices, with pairwise distances (a.k.a. costs) $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, for all $i, j \in V$. No further assumptions are made on the values $d_{ij}$, in particular, they may be asymmetric, i.e. $d_{ij}$ may not equal $d_{ji}$, and the cost $d_{ii}$ of a self-loop may be non-zero. Also given are integers $k_i \geq 1$ for $i \in V$, which we refer to as multiplicities. A valid tour of length $k$ is a sequence $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in V^k$, where $k = \sum_{i \in V} k_i$, such that each $i \in V$ appears in the sequence exactly $k_i$ times. The cost of the tour is $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} d_{x_i, x_{i+1}} + d_{x_k, x_1}$. Our goal is to find a valid tour with minimum cost.

The problem is known as the many-visits TSP (MV-TSP). (As an alternative name, high multiplicity TSP, also appears in the literature.) It includes the standard TSP in the special case when $k = n$ (i.e. if $k_i = 1$ for all $i \in V$) and thus it cannot be solved in polynomial time, unless $P = NP$. Nonetheless, the problem is tractable in the regime of very small $n$ values, even if the length $k$ of the tour is very large (possibly exponential in $n$).

As a natural TSP-generalization, MV-TSP is a fundamental problem of independent interest. In addition, MV-TSP proved to be useful for modeling other problems, particularly in scheduling [10, 27, 41, 44]. Suppose there are $k$ jobs of $n$ different types to be executed on a single, universal machine. Processing a job, as well as switching to another type of job come with certain costs, and the goal is to find the sequence of jobs with minimal total cost. Modeling this problem as a MV-TSP instance is straightforward, by letting $d_{ij}$ denote the cost of processing a job of type $i$ together with the cost of switching from type $i$ to type $j$. Emmons and Mathur [10] also describe an application of MV-TSP to the no-wait flow shop problem.

A different kind of application comes from geometric approximation. To solve geometric optimization problems approximately, it is a standard technique to reduce the size of the input by grouping certain input points together. Each group is then replaced by a single, representative, and the reduced instance is solved exactly. (For instance, we may snap points to a nearby grid point, if doing so does not significantly affect the objective cost.) Recently, this technique was used by Kozma and Mömke, to give an efficient polynomial-time approximation scheme (EPTAS) for the maximum scatter TSP in doubling metrics [34], addressing an open question of Arkin et al. [4]. In this case, the reduced problem is exactly the MV-TSP. Yet another application of MV-TSP is in settling the parameterized complexity of finding a Hamiltonian cycle in a graph class with restricted neighborhood structure [35].

To our knowledge, MV-TSP was first considered in 1966 by Rothkopf [42]. In 1980, Psaraftis [41] gave a dynamic programming algorithm with running time $O(n^2 \cdot \prod_{i \in V} (k_i + 1))$. Observe that this quantity may be as high as $(k/n + 1)^n$, which is prohibitive even for moderately large values of $k$. In 1984, Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou [13] observed that MV-TSP can be decomposed into a connectivity subproblem and an assignment subproblem. Taking advantage of this decomposition, they designed a family of algorithms, the best of which has running time $O(n^2 n^2 \log n)$ [13]. The result can be seen as an early example of fixed parameter tractability, where the rapid growth in complexity is restricted to a certain parameter.

The algorithm of Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou is, to date, the fastest solution to MV-TSP. Its analysis is highly non-trivial, combining graph-theoretic insights and involved estimates of various combinatorial quantities. The upper bound is not known to be tight, but the analysis appears difficult to improve, and a lower bound of $\Omega(n^n)$ is known to hold. Similarly, in the space requirement of the algorithm, a term of the form $n^\Omega(n)$ appears hard to avoid.

While it extends the tractability of TSP to a new range of parameters, the usefulness of the Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm is limited by its superexponential dependence on $n$ in the
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1. Here, and in the following, the $O^*(\cdot)$ notation is used to suppress a low-order polynomial factor in $n$.
2. It may seem that a linear dependence on the length $k$ of the tour is necessary even to output the result. Observe however, that a tour can be compactly represented by collapsing cycles and storing them together with their multiplicities.
3. In this paper the term superexponential always refers to a quantity of the form $n^{\Omega(n)}$. 
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running time. In some sense, the issue of exponential space is even more worrisome (the survey of Woeginger \[45\] goes as far as calling exponential-space algorithms “absolutely useless”).

There have been further studies of the MV-TSP problem. Van der Veen and Zhang \[44\] discuss a problem equivalent to MV-TSP, called K-group TSP, and describe an algorithm with polylogarithmic dependence on the number \(k\) of visits (similarly to Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou). The value \(n\) however is assumed constant, and its effect on the running time is not explicitly computed (the dependence can be seen to be superexponential). Finally, Grigoriev and van de Klundert \[20\] give an ILP formulation for MV-TSP with \(O(n^2)\) variables. Applying Kannan’s improvement \[30\] of Lenstra’s algorithm \[37\] for solving fixed-dimensional ILPs to this formulation yields an algorithm with running time \(n^{O(n^2)} \cdot \log k\). Further ILP formulations for MV-TSP are due to Sarin et al. \[43\] and Aguayo et al. \[2\], both of which again require superexponential time to be solved by standard algorithms.

For further details about the history of the MV-TSP problem we refer to the TSP textbook of Gutin et al. \[22, \S 11.10\].

**Our results.** Our main result improves both the time and space complexity of the best known algorithm for MV-TSP, the first improvement in over 30 years. Specifically, we show that a logarithmic dependence on the number \(k\) of visits, a single-exponential dependence on the number \(n\) of cities, and a polynomial space complexity are simultaneously achievable. Moreover, while we build upon ideas from the previous best approach, our algorithm is arguably both easier to describe, easier to implement, and easier to analyse than its predecessor. To introduce the techniques step-by-step, we describe three algorithms for solving MV-TSP. These are called **enum-MV**, **dp-MV**, and **dc-MV**. We also mention various alternatives and possible improvements. All our algorithms are deterministic. Their complexities are summarized in the following Theorem, proved in \(\S 2\).

**Theorem 1.1.**

(i) **enum-MV** solves MV-TSP with running time \(O^*(n^{n2^n} + \log k)\), and space \(O(n^2 \log k)\).

(ii) **dp-MV** solves MV-TSP with running time \(O^*(c^n + \log k)\), and space \(O^*(c^n + \log k)\), for a constant \(c < 11.09\).

(iii) **dc-MV** solves MV-TSP with running time \(O^*(c^{n^23^n} + \log k)\), and space \(O(n^2 \log k)\), for a constant \(c < 11.09\).

The Exponential-Time Hypothesis (ETH) \[28\] implies that TSP cannot be solved in \(2^{o(n)}\) time, i.e. sub-exponential time. Under this hypothesis, the run time of our algorithm **dc-MV** is optimal for MV-TSP (up to the base of the exponent). Further note that the space requirement of **dc-MV** is also (essentially) optimal, as a compact solution encodes for each of the \(\Omega(n^2)\) edges the number \(t\) of times that this edge is traversed by an optimal tour.

It is interesting to contrast our results for MV-TSP with the results of Abasi et al. \[11\] and Gabizon et al. \[19\] for the \(r\)-simple path problem, where a long path is sought that visits each vertex at most \(r\) times. For this problem, the best algorithms have running time exponential in the average number of visits, which is necessary, under ETH.

**Overview of techniques.** The Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm is based on the following high-level insight, common to most work on the TSP problem, whether exact or approximate. The task of finding a valid tour may be split into two separate tasks: (1) finding a structure that connects all vertices, and (2) augmenting the structure found in (1) in order to ensure that each city is visited the required number of times.

Indeed, such an approach is also used, for instance, in the well-known 3/2-approximation algorithm of Christofides for metric TSP \[12\]. There, the structure that guarantees connectivity
is a minimum spanning tree, and “visitability” is enforced by the addition of a perfect matching that connects odd-degree vertices (ensuring that all vertices have even degree, and can thus be entered and exited, as required).

In the case of MV-TSP, Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou ensure connectivity (part (1)) by finding a minimal Eulerian digraph on the set $V$. Indeed, a minimal Eulerian digraph must be part of every solution, since a tour must balance every vertex (equal outdegree and indegree), and all vertices must be mutually reachable. Minimality is meant here in the sense that no proper subgraph is Eulerian, and is required only to reduce the search space.

Assuming that an Eulerian digraph is found that is part of the solution, it needs to be extended to a tour in which all vertices are visited the required number of times (part (2)). If this is done with the cheapest possible set of edges, then the optimum must have been found. This second step amounts to solving a transportation problem, which takes polynomial time.

The first step, however, requires us to consider all possible minimal Eulerian digraphs. As it is NP-complete to test the non-minimality of an Eulerian digraph [40], the authors relax minimality and suggest the use of heuristics for pruning out non-minimal instances in practice. On the other hand, they obtain a saving in running time by observing that among all Eulerian digraphs with the same degree-sequence only the one with smallest cost needs to be considered. (Otherwise, in the final tour, the Eulerian subdigraph could be swapped with a cheaper one, while maintaining the validity of the tour.)

Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou iterate thus over feasible degree-sequences of Eulerian digraphs; for each such degree-sequence construct the cheapest Eulerian digraph (which may not be minimal) by dynamic programming; finally, for each such Eulerian digraph construct the cheapest extension to a valid tour (by solving a transportation problem). The returned solution is the cheapest tour found over all iterations.

Iterating and optimizing over these structures is no easy task, and Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou invoke a number of graph-theoretic and combinatorial insights. For estimating the total cost of their procedure a sophisticated global counting argument is developed.

The key insight of our approach is that the machinery involving Eulerian digraphs is not necessary for solving MV-TSP. To ensure connectivity (i.e. task (1) above), an oriented spanning tree is sufficient. This may seem surprising, as an oriented tree fails to satisfy the main property of Eulerian digraphs, strong connectivity. Observe however, that a collection of directed edges with the same outdegrees and indegrees as a valid MV-TSP tour is itself a valid tour, unless it consists of disjoint cycles. Requiring the solution to contain an oriented spanning tree is sufficient to avoid this case.

Oriented spanning trees are easier to enumerate and optimize over than minimal Eulerian digraphs; this fact alone explains the reduced complexity of our approach. However, to obtain our main result, further ideas are needed. In particular, we find the cheapest oriented spanning tree that is feasible for a given degree-sequence, first by dynamic programming, then by a recursive partitioning of trees, based on centroid-decompositions.

Given the fundamental nature of the TSP-family of problems and the remaining open questions they pose, we hope that our techniques may find further applications.

2 Improved algorithms for the Many Visits TSP

In this section we describe and analyse our three algorithms. The first, enum-MV is based on exact enumeration of trees ([2][2]), the second, dp-MV uses a dynamic programming approach to find an optimal tree ([2][3]), and the third, dc-MV is based on divide and conquer ([2][4]). Before presenting the algorithms, we introduce some notation and structural observations that are subsequently used ([2][1]).

4By oriented spanning tree we mean a spanning tree whose edge is replaced by a directed edge in one of the two possible directions.
2.1 Trees, tours, and degree sequences

Let $V$ be a set of vertices. We view directed multigraphs $G$ with vertex set $V$ as multisets of edges (i.e. elements of $V \times V$). Observe that self-loops and multiple copies of the same edge are allowed. The multiplicity of an edge $(i,j)$ in a directed multigraph $G$ is denoted $m_G(i,j)$. The outdegree of a vertex $i \in V$ is $\delta^\text{out}(i) = \sum_{j \in V} m_G(i,j)$, the indegree of a vertex $i \in V$ is $\delta^\text{in}(i) = \sum_{j \in V} m_G(j,i)$. Given edge-costs $d : V \times V \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, the cost of $G$ is simply the sum of its edge-costs, i.e. $\text{cost}(G) = \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} m_G(i,j) \cdot d(i,j)$.

For two directed multigraphs $G$ and $H$ over the same vertex set $V$, let $G + H$ denote the directed multigraph obtained by adding the corresponding edge multiplicities of $G$ and $H$. Observe that as an effect, outdegrees and indegrees are also added pointwise. Formally, $m_{G+H}(i,j) = m_G(i,j) + m_H(i,j)$, $\delta^\text{out}_{G+H}(i) = \delta^\text{out}_G(i) + \delta^\text{out}_H(i)$ and $\delta^\text{in}_{G+H}(i) = \delta^\text{in}_G(i) + \delta^\text{in}_H(i)$, for all $i,j \in V$. The relation $\text{cost}(G + H) = \text{cost}(G) + \text{cost}(H)$ clearly holds.

The support of a directed multigraph $G$ is its underlying undirected graph, i.e. $\{i,j\}$ is in the support of $G$ if $m_G(i,j) + m_G(j,i) \geq 1$.

Consider a tour $C = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in V^k$. We refer to the unique directed multigraph $G$ consisting of the edges $(x_1,x_2), \ldots, (x_{k-1},x_k), (x_k,x_1)$ as the edge-set of $C$. We state a simple but crucial observation.

Lemma 2.1. Let $G$ be a directed multigraph over $V$, with outdegrees $\delta^\text{out}_G(\cdot)$ and indegrees $\delta^\text{in}_G(\cdot)$. Then $G$ is the edge-set of a tour that visits each vertex $i \in V$ exactly $k_i$ times if and only if both of the following conditions hold:

(i) the support of $G$ is connected, and

(ii) for all $i \in V$, we have $\delta^\text{out}_G(i) = \delta^\text{in}_G(i) = k_i$.

Proof. The fact that connectedness of $G$ and $\delta^\text{out}_G(i) = \delta^\text{in}_G(i)$ is equivalent with the existence of a tour that uses each edge of $G$ exactly once is the well-known “Euler’s theorem”. (See [5] Thm 1.6.3 for a short proof.) Clearly, visiting each vertex $i$ exactly $k_i$ times is equivalent with the condition that the tour contains $k_i$ edges of the form $(\cdot,i)$ and $k_i$ edges of the form $(i,\cdot)$. □

Moreover, given the edge-set $G$ of a tour $C$, a tour $C'$ with edge-set $G$ can easily be recovered. This amounts to finding an Eulerian tour of $G$, which can be done in time linear in the length $k$ of the tour. To avoid a linear dependence on $k$, we can apply the algorithm of Grigoriev and van de Klundert [20] that constructs a compact representation of $C'$ in time $O(n^4 \log k)$. As the edge-sets of $C$ and $C'$ are equal, $C'$ also visits each $i \in V$ exactly $k_i$ times and $\text{cost}(C') = \text{cost}(C) = \text{cost}(G)$.

Thus, in solving MV-TSP we only focus on finding a directed multigraph whose support is connected, and whose degrees match the multiplicities required by the problem.

An oriented spanning tree of $V$ is a directed multigraph whose support is a tree with vertex set $V$. (We can think of the oriented spanning tree as an undirected tree whose edges have each been oriented in one of the two possible ways.)

Observe that the support of a directed multigraph $G$ is connected exactly if there is an oriented spanning tree $T$ and some directed multigraph $X$, such that $G = T + X$. We can thus split the MV-TSP problem into finding an oriented spanning tree $T$ and an extension $X$, such that $T + X$ is a valid tour.

Moreover, observe that in the decomposition $G = T + X$ of an optimal tour $G$, both $T$ and $X$ are optimal with respect to their degree sequences.

Lemma 2.2. Let $G$ be the edge set of an optimal tour for MV-TSP, let $T$ be an oriented spanning tree, and $X$ a directed multigraph such that $G = T + X$. Then, among all oriented spanning trees with degrees $\delta^\text{out}_T(i), \delta^\text{in}_T(i)$, $T$ is of minimal cost. Among all directed multigraphs with degrees $\delta^\text{out}_X(i), \delta^\text{in}_X(i)$, $X$ is of minimal cost.
outdegrees and indegrees are respectively \(\delta\) and \(\delta^\prime\). We decrease \(\delta\) with an appropriate edge, satisfying the degree requirements.

Similarly, suppose there is a directed multigraph \(X\) such that \(\text{cost}(X') < \text{cost}(X)\) and \(\delta^\prime_X(i) = \delta_X(i), \delta^\prime_T(i) = \delta_T(i)\) for all \(i \in V\). But then \(T + X\) is connected, has the same degree-sequence as \(G\), while \(\text{cost}(T + X) < \text{cost}(G)\), contradicting the optimality of \(G\).

Next, we characterize the feasible degree sequences of oriented spanning trees. We call \(\delta\) a feasible degree-sequence if \(\delta\) is a symmetric degree-set and has indegree 1, outdegree 0, and the other has indegree 0, outdegree 1. Thus, we connect them.

Lemma 2.3. Let \(X\) be a set of \(n\) vertices. There is an oriented spanning tree of \(X\) whose outdegrees and indegrees are respectively \(\delta^\text{out}\) and \(\delta^\text{in}\), if and only if

(i) \(\delta^\text{out}(i) + \delta^\text{in}(i) > 0\) for every \(i \in V\), and

(ii) \(\sum_i \delta^\text{out}(i) = \sum_i \delta^\text{in}(i) = n - 1\).

Proof. In the forward direction, a tree on \(n\) vertices has \(n - 1\) edges, proving (ii). As the tree is connected, each vertex has at least one incident edge, outgoing or incoming, proving (i).

In the backward direction, we argue by induction on \(n\). Let us denote the total degree of a vertex \(i\) as \(\delta_i = \delta^\text{out}(i) + \delta^\text{in}(i)\).

In the case \(n = 2\), there are two vertices, and from (i) and (ii) it follows that one of them has indegree 1, outdegree 0, and the other has indegree 0, outdegree 1. Thus, we connect them with an appropriate edge, satisfying the degree requirements.

Consider now the case of \(n\) vertices. From (i) and (ii) it follows that there is a vertex \(i\) such that \(\delta_i = 1\).

Suppose \(\delta^\text{in}(i) = 1\). Then, there must be a vertex \(j \in V \setminus \{i\}\) such that \(\delta^\text{out}(j) \geq 1\) and \(\delta_j \geq 2\). We decrease \(\delta^\text{out}(j)\) by one. It can be seen that conditions (i) and (ii) hold for \(V \setminus \{i\}\). By induction, we can build a tree on \(V \setminus \{i\}\), and attach \(i\) to this tree as a leaf, with the edge \((j, i)\).

The case when \(\delta^\text{out}(i) = 1\) is symmetric.

Let DS\((n)\) denote the number of different pairs of sequences \((\delta'_1, \ldots, \delta'_n), (\delta^\prime_1, \ldots, \delta^\prime_n)\), that are feasible for an oriented spanning tree, i.e. for vertex set \(V = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}\), for some oriented spanning tree \(T\), we have \(\delta^\text{out}_T(x_i) = \delta'_i\), and \(\delta^\text{in}_T(x_i) = \delta^\prime_i\), for all \(i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\). We show the following exact expression and upper bound for DS\((n)\).

Lemma 2.4. The function DS\((n)\) satisfies the following:

(i) \(DS(n) = \sum_{z=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{z} \binom{n-2}{n-z-1} \binom{2n-z-2}{n-1}\), and

(ii) \(DS(n) < n \cdot 2^{3.471n} = O(11.09^n)\).

Proof. (i) We enumerate outdegree sequences (or out-sequences) by their number of zero-entries \(z\), and for each out-sequence we count the number of possible indegree sequences (or in-sequences).

By Lemma 2.3 for an out-sequence with \(z\) zeros \((1 \leq z \leq n - 1)\), the corresponding in-sequences can have at most \(n - z\) zeros.

For each of the \(\binom{n}{z}\) ways to distribute \(z\) zeros among \(n\) entries, there are \(\binom{n-2}{n-z-1}\) ways of distributing \(n - 1\) degrees among the \(n - z\) non-zero entries. (We can think of this as choosing \(n - z - 1\) internal separators to split the items).

\[\text{There has been significant research on realisable degree sequences (see e.g. [8, 17, 18, 23, 24, 32, 33], but we are not aware of oriented trees being considered before.}\]
As no vertex can have zero outdegree and indegree, we assign one indegree to each node with zero outdegrees, leaving us with the task of distributing \(n - z\) indegrees between \(n\) nodes arbitrarily. This can be done in \(\binom{2n-z-2}{n-1}\) ways (choosing which of the \((n-z) + (n-1) - 1\) locations are separators), yielding the result.

(ii) We use Stirling’s approximation for \(\binom{n}{k}\) with the binary entropy function (see e.g. [38, page 2]) and find that the summed quantity is maximized when \(z/n \approx 0.382\).

The first few values of \(DS(n)\) are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(DS(n))</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>7002</td>
<td>65226</td>
<td>623576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of feasible degree sequences of \(n\)-vertex oriented spanning trees.

### 2.2 ENUM-MV: polynomial space and superexponential time

Given a vertex set \(V\) with \(|V| = n\), multiplicities \(k_i \in \mathbb{N}\) and cost function \(d\), we wish to find a tour of minimum cost that visits each \(i \in V\) exactly \(k_i\) times.

From Lemma 2.1 our first algorithm presents itself. It simply iterates over all possible oriented spanning trees with vertex set \(V\), and extends each of them optimally to a valid tour. Among all valid tours constructed, the one with smallest cost is returned (Algorithm 1).

This simple algorithm already improves slightly on the previous best running time (although it is still superexponential), and reduces the space requirement from superexponential to polynomial. The correctness of the algorithm is immediate: from Lemma 2.1 it follows that all \(C_T\)’s considered are valid (connected, and with degrees matching the required multiplicities), and by Lemma 2.2 the optimal tour \(C\) must be considered during the execution.

The iteration of Line 1 requires us to enumerate all labeled trees with vertex set \(V\). There are \(n^{n-2}\) such trees [11], and standard techniques can be used to enumerate them with a constant overhead per item (see e.g. Kapoor and Ramesh [31]). For each such tree we iterate through all possible \(2^{n-1}\) edge orientations.

Let \(T\) be the current tree. In Line 2 we need to find a minimum cost directed multigraph \(X\), with given outdegree and indegree sequence (such as to extend \(T\) into a valid tour). If, for some vertex \(i\), it holds that \(\delta^\text{out}_X(i) > k_i\) or \(\delta^\text{in}_X(i) > k_i\), we proceed to the next spanning tree, since the current tree cannot be extended to a valid tour. Observe that this may happen only if \(k_i < n-1\), for some \(i \in V\).

Otherwise we find the optimal \(X\) by solving a transportation problem in polynomial time. During the algorithm we maintain the current best tour, which we output in the end. We describe next the transportation subroutine, which is common to all our algorithms, and is essentially the same as in the Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm.
The transportation problem. The subproblem we need to solve is to find a minimum cost directed multigraph $X$ over vertex set $V$, such as to satisfy given outdegree and indegree requirements.

We can map this problem to an instance of the Hitchcock transportation problem [20], where the goal is to transport a given amount of goods from $N$ warehouses to $M$ outlets with given pairwise shipping costs. (This is a special case of the more general min-cost max-flow problem.) The transportation problem can be solved in polynomial time using the scaling method of Edmonds and Karp [15].

More precisely, let us define a digraph with vertices $\{s,t\} \cup \{i_1,i_2, \ldots, i_n\}$. Edges are $\{(s,i_1),(t,i_1) \mid i_1 \in V\}$, and $\{(i_1,i_2) \mid i_1,i_2 \in V\}$. We set cost 0 to edges $(s,i_1)$ and $(t,i_1)$ and cost $d_{ij}$ (i.e. the costs given in the MV-TSP instance) to $(s,i_2)$. We set capacity $\infty$ to edges $(s,i_2)$ and capacities $k_i - \delta^\text{in}_i$ to $(s,i_1)$, and $k_i - \delta^\text{in}_i$ to $(t,i_1)$. The construction is identical to the one used by Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou, apart from the fact that in our case the capacity of $(s,i_1)$ may be different from the capacity of $(t,i_1)$. Observe that the sum of capacities of $(s,i_1)$-edges equals the sum of capacities of $(t,i_1)$-edges over all $i \in V$. Thus, a maximal $s-t$ flow saturates all these edges.

The amount of flow transmitted on the edge $(s,i_2)$ gives the multiplicity of edge $(i,j)$ in the sought after multigraph, for all $i,j \in V$. A minimum cost maximum flow clearly maps to a minimum cost edge set with the given degree constraints.

The Edmonds-Karp algorithm proceeds by solving $O(\log k)$ approximate versions of the problem, where the costs are the same as in the original problem, but the capacities are scaled by a factor $2^p$ for $p = [\log k], \ldots, 0$. Each approximate problem is solved by performing flow augmentations on the optimal flow found in the previous approximation (multiplied by two). Each approximation can be solved in $O(n^3)$ time. Therefore, the running time of the Edmonds-Karp scaling algorithm for solving the described transportation problem is $O(n^3 \cdot \log k)$.

Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou describe an improvement which also applies for our case. Namely, they observe that the total running time for solving several instances with the same costs may be reduced, if the capacities on corresponding edges in two different instances may differ by at most $n$.

The strategy is to solve all but the last $\log n$ approximate problems only once, as these are (essentially) the same for all instances. For the different instances we only need to solve the last $\log n$ approximate problems (i.e. at the finest levels of approximation). This gives a running time of $O(n^3 \cdot \log k)$ for solving the “master problem”, and $O(n^3 \cdot \log n)$ for solving each individual instance. (We refer to Cosmadakis and Papadimitriou [14] as well as Edmonds and Karp [15] for details.)

In our case, the different instances of the transportation problem are for finding the directed multigraphs $X$ for different trees $T$. Each of these instances agree in the underlying graph and cost function, and may differ only in the capacities. As the maximum degree of a tree is at most $n - 1$, the differences are bounded, as required.

Analysis of the algorithm. We iterate over all $O(n^{n-2} \cdot 2^n)$ oriented spanning trees and solve a transportation problem for each, with running time $O(n^3 \cdot \log k)$. The total running time $O(n^{n+1} \cdot 2^n \cdot \log k)$ follows. With the described improvement w.r. to solving a master-problem in advance, we improve this to $O(n^{n+1} \cdot 2^n \cdot \log n + n^3 \cdot \log k)$.

The algorithm only needs to store the edge-set of a single tour (apart from minor bookkeeping), with space complexity $O(n^2 \cdot \log k)$.

2.2.1 Improved enumeration algorithm

We can improve the running time of ENUM-MV by observing that the solution of the transportation problem depends only on the degree-sequence of the current tree $T$, and not the actual edges of $T$. Therefore, different trees with the same degree-sequence can be extended in the
same way. (Several trees may have the same degree-sequence, see e.g. Fig. 1. In an extreme case, all \((n−2)!\) simple Hamiltonian paths with the same endpoints have the same degree-sequence.)

![Figure 1: Different trees with outdegrees \((1, 1, 2, 0, 0)\) and indegrees \((0, 1, 0, 2, 1)\).](image)

Algorithm 2 thus, iterates over all trees grouped by their degree-sequences. It solves the transportation problem only once for each degree-sequence (there are \(DS(n)\) of them).

**Algorithm 2** ENUM-MV for solving MV-TSP using enumeration (improved)

**Input:** Vertex set \(V\), cost function \(d\), multiplicities \(k_i\).

**Output:** A tour of minimum cost that visits each \(i \in V\) exactly \(k_i\) times.

1: for each feasible degree-sequence \(\delta_{\text{out}}(\cdot), \delta_{\text{in}}(\cdot)\) of an oriented spanning tree do
2:   for each oriented spanning tree \(T\) with \(\delta_{\text{out}}^T = \delta_{\text{out}}, \delta_{\text{in}}^T = \delta_{\text{in}}\) do
3:     Find minimum cost directed multigraph \(X\) such that for all \(i \in V\):
4:        \(\delta_{\text{out}}^X(i) := k_i - \delta_{\text{out}}^T(i), \delta_{\text{in}}^X(i) := k_i - \delta_{\text{in}}^T(i)\).
5:     Denote \(C_T := T + X\).
6:   return \(C_T\) with smallest cost.

The correctness is immediate, as all oriented spanning trees \(T\) are still considered, as before. Assume that we can iterate over all feasible degree-sequences with \(O(n)\) overhead per item, and all corresponding trees with constant overhead per item. (We describe these subroutines in §2.2.2 and §2.2.3) We thus obtain the running time \(O(n^{n-1} \cdot 2^n + DS(n) \cdot n^4 \cdot \log k)\). Using the same technique of solving a master-problem in advance, we get \(O(n^{n-1} \cdot 2^n + n^3 \cdot \log k)\). The space requirement is asymptotically unchanged.

### 2.2.2 Generating all feasible degree-sequences

We construct all degree-sequences that are feasible for an oriented spanning tree with vertex set \(V\). Let us denote \(V = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}\) and represent as \((\delta_{\text{out}}, \delta_{\text{in}}) = ((\delta_{\text{out}}^1, \ldots, \delta_{\text{out}}^n), (\delta_{\text{in}}^1, \ldots, \delta_{\text{in}}^n))\) the outdegree- and indegree-sequences, where \(\delta_{\text{out}}^i = \delta_{\text{out}}(x_i)\) and \(\delta_{\text{in}}^i = \delta_{\text{in}}(x_i)\).

The described procedure (Algorithm 3) follows the idea used in counting degree-sequences (Lemma 2.4) in a straightforward way. It assumes the existence of a procedure \(\text{DISTRIBUTE}(n, k)\) that gives all possible sequences of \(k\) non-negative integer entries summing to \(n\) with \(O(n)\) overhead per item. (For completeness, we describe this auxiliary procedure in Appendix A)

We begin by generating all feasible outdegree-sequences, which means distributing \(n - 1\) degrees among \(n\) vertices, allowing for vertices with zero degrees. Then we generate all matching indegree-sequences, fulfilling the conditions of Lemma 2.3. In particular, we make sure that \(\delta_{\text{in}}^i \geq 1\) for all \(i\) such that \(\delta_{\text{out}}^i = 0\).

The running time is \(O(n)\) per returned sequence (the construction of both outdegrees and indegrees takes \(O(n)\)). An improvement in this overhead factor is likely possible, which we leave as an interesting extension.
Algorithm 3 ORIENTEDTREEDEGSEQ for generating all feasible degree-sequences \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\) of oriented trees on \(n\) nodes

**Input:** positive integer \(n\)

**Output:** all possible directed tree degree sequences \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\) on \(n\) nodes

1. for every sequence \(\delta^{\text{out}}\) in \(\text{DISTRIBUTE}(n, n - 1)\) do
2. \(Z \leftarrow\) indices \(i\) where \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i = 0\)
3. for every sequence \(\delta^{\text{in}}\) in \(\text{DISTRIBUTE}(n - 1 - |Z|, n - 1)\) do
4. \(\text{for every index } i \text{ in } Z \text{ do}\)
5. \(\delta^{\text{in}}_i := \delta^{\text{in}}_i + 1\)
6. yield \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\)

2.2.3 Generating trees by degree-sequence

In the proof of Lemma 2.3, we generate one oriented tree from its degree-sequence. In this subsection we show how to generate all trees for a given degree-sequence.

Let \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}}) = ((\delta^{\text{out}}_1, \ldots, \delta^{\text{out}}_n), (\delta^{\text{in}}_1, \ldots, \delta^{\text{in}}_n))\), and let \(\delta_i\) denote the sum \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i + \delta^{\text{in}}_i\) for all \(i \in V\). Algorithm 4 generates all possible oriented trees for \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\) by recursively calling the BUILDTREE() method.

The initial call is with the input degree-sequence \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\) and an empty "stub" \((x^{\text{stub}} = 0)\) as arguments. The algorithm first finds the leaf with smallest index \(i\) (that is, \(\delta_i = 1\)), and checks whether it has outdegree 1 or indegree 1. Then it finds all possibilities for an edge connecting leaf \(i\) to the rest of the tree, i.e. all non-leaves \(j\) that can be "paired up" with \(i\) (having one indegree if \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i = 1\) and one outdegree if \(\delta^{\text{in}}_i = 1\)). The same method is then called with modified arguments: edge \((i, j)\) or \((j, i)\) is added to the stub and the remaining degrees of \(i\) and \(j\) are modified accordingly.

Algorithm 4 BUILDTREE for generating all oriented trees for a given degree-sequence

**Input:** degree sequence \((\delta^{\text{out}}, \delta^{\text{in}})\) and partial tree \(x^{\text{stub}}\)

1. if \(\sum \delta_k = 2\) then
2. \(i \leftarrow\) index where \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i = 1\)
3. \(j \leftarrow\) index where \(\delta^{\text{in}}_j = 1\)
4. yield \(x^{\text{stub}} \cup \{(i, j)\}\)
5. else (\(\sum \delta_k > 2\))
6. \(i \leftarrow\) first index where \(\delta_i = 1\)
7. if \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i = 1\) then \(\triangleright\) leaf \(i\)
8. \(\text{for every node } j \neq i, \text{ s.t. } \delta_j \geq 2 \text{ and } \delta^{\text{in}}_j \geq 1 \text{ do}\)
9. \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i' := \delta^{\text{out}}_i\) and \(\delta^{\text{in}}_i' := \delta^{\text{in}}_i\)
10. \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i' := \delta^{\text{out}}_i' - 1\) and \(\delta^{\text{in}}_j' := \delta^{\text{in}}_j' - 1\)
11. BUILDTREE\((\delta^{\text{out}}_i', \delta^{\text{in}}_i', x^{\text{stub}} \cup \{(i, j)\})\)
12. else (\(\delta^{\text{in}}_i = 1\))
13. \(\text{for every node } j \neq i, \text{ s.t. } \delta_j \geq 2 \text{ and } \delta^{\text{out}}_j \geq 1 \text{ do}\)
14. \(\delta^{\text{out}}_i' := \delta^{\text{out}}_i\) and \(\delta^{\text{in}}_i' := \delta^{\text{in}}_i\)
15. \(\delta^{\text{out}}_j' := \delta^{\text{out}}_j' - 1\) and \(\delta^{\text{in}}_i' := \delta^{\text{in}}_i' - 1\)
16. BUILDTREE\((\delta^{\text{out}}_i', \delta^{\text{in}}_i', x^{\text{stub}} \cup \{(j, i)\})\)

At each recursive level there are as many new calls as possible candidates for the next edge, with both degree demands decreased by one, and with the stub gaining one additional edge. At the \((n - 1)\)-th level exactly two one-degree vertices remain, say, \(i\) with outdegree 1 and \(j\) with indegree 1. Adding the edge \((i, j)\) finishes the construction.

Observe that there are no “dead ends” during this process, i.e. every call of the method
buildTree eventually results in a valid oriented tree in the last level of the recursion, and there are no discarded graphs during the process. Furthermore, each tree is constructed exactly once.

Fig. 3 illustrates the execution of Algorithm 4 while constructing the trees in Fig. 1, in the given order. We remark that the process can be seen as the construction of a directed Prüfer code for each tree (see e.g. Bollobás [9, page 277]); it is the directed counterpart of a well-known procedure for undirected trees.

2.3 DP-MV: exponential space and exponential time

Next, we improve the running time to single-exponential, by making use of Lemma 2.2. Specifically, we observe that for every feasible degree-sequence only the tree with minimum cost needs to be considered. The enumeration in Algorithm 4 can easily be modified to return, instead of all trees, just the one with smallest cost, this, however, would not improve the asymptotic running time.

Instead, in this section we give a dynamic programming algorithm resembling the algorithms by Bellman, and Held and Karp, for directly computing the optimal oriented tree for a given sequence. (The algorithms by Bellman and by Held and Karp compute an optimal tour.)

The outline of the algorithm is shown in Algorithm 5, and it is identical for dp-MV and dc-MV, described in the 2.4.

Algorithm 5 Outline for solving MV-TSP by optimizing over trees (common for dp-MV and dc-MV)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Input}: Vertex set \(V\), cost function \(d\), multiplicities \(k_i\).
\item \textbf{Output}: A tour of minimum cost that visits each \(i \in V\) exactly \(k_i\) times.
\end{itemize}

1: \textbf{for} each feasible degree-sequence \(\delta^\text{out}(\cdot), \delta^\text{in}(\cdot)\) of an oriented spanning tree \(T\) \textbf{do}
2: \quad Find minimum cost oriented tree \(T\) with \(\delta^\text{in}_T = \delta^\text{in}, \delta^\text{out}_T = \delta^\text{out}\).
3: \quad Find minimum cost directed multigraph \(X\) such that for all \(i \in V\):
   \begin{align*}
   \delta^\text{in}_X(i) &:= k_i - \delta^\text{in}_T(i), \\
   \delta^\text{out}_X(i) &:= k_i - \delta^\text{out}_T(i).
   \end{align*}
   Denote \(C_T := T + X\).
4: \textbf{return} \(C_T\) with smallest cost.

The algorithms dp-MV and dc-MV differ in the way they find the minimum cost oriented tree, i.e. Line 2 of the generic Algorithm 5.

The dynamic programming approach (dp-MV) resembles Algorithm 4 for iterating over all oriented trees with a given degree-sequence. Specifically, let \((\delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in})\) be the degree-sequence for which we wish to find the minimum cost tree. The dynamic programming table \(T\) holds the optimum tree (and its cost) for \textit{every} feasible sequence. The solution can thus be read from \(T[\delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in}]\).

Observe that specifying a degree-sequence allows us to restrict the problem to arbitrary subsets of \(V\) (we can simply set the degrees of non-participating vertices to zero).

To compute \(T[\delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in}]\), we find the leaf with smallest index \(i\) (that is, \(\delta_i = 1\)) and all non-leaves \(j\) that may be connected to \(i\) by an edge in the optimal tree. A vertex \(j\) can be connected to \(i\) if \(\delta_j \geq 2\), and either \(\delta^\text{out}_i + \delta^\text{in}_j \geq 2\), or \(\delta^\text{out}_j + \delta^\text{in}_i \geq 2\). The connecting edge is \((i, j)\) if \(\delta^\text{out}_i = 1\), and \((j, i)\) if \(\delta^\text{in}_j = 1\).

For each choice of \(j\) we compute the optimal tree by adding the connecting edge \((i, j)\) or \((j, i)\) to the the optimal tree over \(V \setminus \{i\}\), with the degree-sequence suitably updated (i.e. with \(\delta^\text{out}_i, \delta^\text{in}_i\) set to zero and either \(\delta^\text{out}_j\) or \(\delta^\text{in}_j\) decreased by one).

The correctness of the dynamic programming solution follows from an observation similar to Lemma 2.2: every subtree of the optimal tree must be optimal for its degree-sequence, as otherwise a cheaper subtree could replace it. We describe the details in Algorithm 6.
Algorithm 6 dp-MV for generating the optimal oriented tree for a given degree-sequence

**Input:** degree sequence \((\delta_{\text{out}}, \delta_{\text{in}})\)

**Output:** \((T, c), \text{ where } T \text{ is optimum tree for } \delta_{\text{out}}, \delta_{\text{in}} \text{ and } c \text{ is its cost}\)

1. \(\mathcal{T}[\delta_{\text{out}}, \delta_{\text{in}}]\):
2. \(\text{if } \sum \delta_k = 2 \text{ then}\)
3. \(i \leftarrow \text{index where } \delta_{\text{out}}^i = 1\)
4. \(j \leftarrow \text{index where } \delta_{\text{in}}^j = 1\)
5. \(\text{return } (\{(i, j)\}, d_{ij})\)
6. \(\text{else } (\sum \delta_k > 2)\)
7. \(i \leftarrow \text{first index where } \delta_i = 1\)
8. \(\text{if } \delta_{\text{out}}^i = 1 \text{ then}\)
9. \(\text{for every node } j \neq i, \text{ s.t. } \delta_j \geq 2 \text{ and } \delta_{\text{in}}^j \geq 1 \text{ do}\) \(\triangleright \text{ add edge } (i, j)\)
10. \(\delta_{\text{out}}' := \delta_{\text{out}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{in}}' := \delta_{\text{in}}\)
11. \(\delta_{\text{out}}^i' := \delta_{\text{out}}^i - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{in}}^j' := \delta_{\text{in}}^j - 1\)
12. \((T_j, c_j) := \mathcal{T}[\delta_{\text{out}}', \delta_{\text{in}}']\)
13. \(T_j := T_j \cup \{(i, j)\}\)
14. \(c_j := c_j + d_{ij}\)
15. \(\text{return } (T_j, c_j) \text{ with minimum } c_j\)
16. \(\text{else } (\delta_{\text{in}}^i = 1)\)
17. \(\text{for every node } j \neq i, \text{ s.t. } \delta_j \geq 2 \text{ and } \delta_{\text{out}}^j \geq 1 \text{ do}\) \(\triangleright \text{ add edge } (j, i)\)
18. \(\delta_{\text{out}}' := \delta_{\text{out}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{in}}' := \delta_{\text{in}}\)
19. \(\delta_{\text{out}}^j' := \delta_{\text{out}}^j - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\text{in}}^i' := \delta_{\text{in}}^i - 1\)
20. \((T_j, c_j) := \mathcal{T}[\delta_{\text{out}}', \delta_{\text{in}}']\)
21. \(T_j := T_j \cup \{(j, i)\}\)
22. \(c_j := c_j + d_{ji}\)
23. \(\text{return } (T_j, c_j) \text{ with minimum } c_j\)
For the analysis of Algorithm 6, observe that the number of possible entries $T[\cdot, \cdot]$ is exactly $DS(n)$, estimated in Lemma 2.4. Computing each entry involves taking the minimum of $O(n)$ previously computed entries, yielding the mentioned time complexity. The overall running time of Algorithm 5 with Algorithm 6 as a subroutine is still $O^*(DS(n))$, since the entry for a given degree sequence is computed at most once over all iterations, and the values are stored through the entire iteration.

We observe that in practice, storing an entire tree in each $T[\cdot, \cdot]$ is wasteful. Only storing the node to which the lowest-index leaf is connected is sufficient for the optimum tree to be constructible from the table. The claimed space-complexity follows.

### 2.4 DC-MV: polynomial space and exponential time

Finally, we show how to reduce the space complexity to polynomial, while maintaining a single-exponential running time.

The outer loop (Algorithm 5) remains the same, but we replace the subroutine for finding an optimal oriented spanning tree (Algorithm 6) with an approach based on divide and conquer (Algorithm 7). The approach is inspired by the algorithm of Gurevich and Shelah [21] for finding an optimal TSP tour.

The algorithm relies on the following observation about tree-separators. Let $(V_1, V_2)$ be a partition of $V$, i.e. $V_1 \cup V_2 = V$, and $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$, and let $|V| = n$. We say that $(V_1, V_2)$ is balanced if $[n/3] \leq |V_1|, |V_2| \leq [2n/3]$.

**Lemma 2.5.** For every tree $T$ with edge set $V$, there is a balanced partition $(V_1, V_2)$ of $V$ such that all edges of $T$ between $V_1$ and $V_2$ are incident to a vertex $v \in V_1$.

**Proof.** A very old result of Jordan [29] states that every tree has a centroid vertex, i.e. a vertex whose removal splits the tree into subtrees not larger than half the original tree. (To find such a centroid, start at an arbitrary vertex and simply move, one edge at a time, towards the largest subtree.)

Let $T_1, \ldots, T_m$ be the vertex sets of the trees, in decreasing order of size, resulting from deleting the centroid in $T$. If $|T_1| \geq [n/3]$, then we have the balanced partition $(V \setminus T_1, T_1)$, with a single crossing edge.

Otherwise, let $m'$ be the smallest index such that $[n/3] \leq |T_1| + \cdots + |T_{m'}| \leq [2n/3]$. (As $|T_i| < [n/3]$ for all $i$, such an index $m'$ must exist.) Now the balanced partition is $(V \setminus (T_1 \cup \cdots \cup T_{m'}), T_1 \cup \cdots \cup T_{m'})$. The partition fulfils the stated condition as all crossing edges are incident to the centroid, which is on the left side.

At a high-level, DC-MV works as follows. It “guesses” the partition $(V_1, V_2)$ of vertex set $V$ according to a balanced separator of the (unknown) optimal tree $T$, satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.5. It also “guesses” the distinguished vertex $v \in V_1$ to which all edges that cross the partition are incident.

The balanced separator splits $T$ into a tree with vertex set $V_1$ and a forest with vertex set $V_2$. Observe that the outdegrees and indegrees of vertices in $V_1$ are feasible for an oriented tree, except for vertex $v$ which has additional degrees due to the edges crossing the partition (we refer to these outdegrees and indegrees as the excess of $v$). From Lemma 2.3(ii), the excess of $v$ can be exactly computed. This excess determines the number of edges across the cut, as well as their orientation (but not their endpoints, other than $v$).

By the same argument as in Lemma 2.2, the subtree of $T$ induced by $V_1$ is optimal for its corresponding degree-sequence (after subtracting the excess of $v$), therefore we can find it by a recursive call to the procedure.

On the other side of the partition we have a collection of trees. To obtain an instance of our original problem, we add a virtual vertex $w$ to $V_2$ (that plays the role of $v$). We set the outdegree
and indegree of \( w \) to the excess of \( v \), to allow it to connect to all vertices of \( V_2 \) that \( v \) connects to in \( T \). Now we can find the optimal tree on this side too, by a recursive call to the procedure.

After obtaining the optimal trees on the two sides (assuming the guesses were correct), we reconstruct \( T \) by gluing the two trees together, identifying the vertices \( v \) and \( w \). As this operation adds all degrees, we obtain a valid tree for the original degree sequence, furthermore, the tree must be optimal. We illustrate this process in Fig. 2. Finally, we remark that the "guessing" should be understood as iterating through all possible choices.

![Figure 2: Illustration of dc-MV. (left) optimal tree and balanced centroid-partitioning, centroid vertex shown as full circle; (right) optimal trees on the two sides of the partitioning, centroid vertex \( v \) and its virtual pair \( w \) shown as full circles.](image)

**Algorithm 7** dc-MV for generating the optimal oriented tree for a given degree sequence

**Input:** degree sequence \((\delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in})\), vertex set \( V \)

**Output:** \((T, c)\), where \( T \) is optimum tree for \( \delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in} \) and \( c \) is its cost

\( T [V, \delta^\text{out}, \delta^\text{in}] : \)

1. if \( |V| \leq 3 \) then
2. directly find optimum tree \( T \) with cost \( c \)
3. return \((T, c)\)
4. else
5. for each partition \((V_1, V_2)\) of \( V \), such that \( |V_1|, |V_2| \leq \lceil 2n/3 \rceil \) do
6. for each \( v \in V_1 \) do
7. \( \text{excess}^\text{out}_v := |V_1| - 1 - \sum_{p \in V_1, p \neq v} \delta^\text{out}_p \) and \( \text{excess}^\text{in}_v := |V_1| - 1 - \sum_{p \in V_1, p \neq v} \delta^\text{in}_p \)
8. \( \delta^\text{out}_v := \text{excess}^\text{out}_v \) and \( \delta^\text{in}_v := \text{excess}^\text{in}_v \)
9. \( \delta^\text{out}_v := \delta^\text{out}_v - \text{excess}^\text{out}_v \) and \( \delta^\text{in}_v := \delta^\text{in}_v - \text{excess}^\text{in}_v \)
10. \( V'_2 := V_2 \cup \{w\} \)
11. \( \delta^\text{out}_w := \text{excess}^\text{out}_v \) and \( \delta^\text{in}_w := \text{excess}^\text{in}_v \)
12. if \( \delta^\text{out}_v, \delta^\text{in}_v, \delta^\text{out}_v, \delta^\text{in}_v \geq 0 \) and \( \delta^\text{out}_v + \delta^\text{in}_v \geq 1 \) and \( \delta^\text{out}_w + \delta^\text{in}_w \geq 1 \) then
13. \( c_1 := T [V_1, \delta^\text{out}_v | V_1, \delta^\text{in}_v | V_1] \)
14. \( c_2 := T [V'_2, \delta^\text{out}_v | V'_2, \delta^\text{in}_v | V'_2] \)
15. \( c := c_1 + c_2 \)
16. \( T \leftarrow \text{merge } T_1 \text{ and } T_2 \text{ by identifying } v \text{ and } w \)
17. return \((T, c)\) with minimum \( c \)

In Line 7 of Algorithm 7 the excess outdegree and indegree of \( v \) is calculated. Both types of
degrees need to sum to $|V_1| - 1$, from which the expression follows. The condition in Line 12 ensures that we only solve feasible problems. The notation $\delta|_X$ indicates a restriction of a degree-sequence to a subset $X$ of the vertices.

For a set $V$ of size $n$ we consider at most $2^n$ partitions and at most $\lceil 2n/3 \rceil$ choices of $v$. We recur on subsets of size at most $\lceil 2n/3 \rceil$. All remaining operations take $O(n)$ time. The running time $\tau(n)$ of DC-MV thus satisfies:

$$
\tau(n) \leq 2^n \cdot n \cdot 2 \cdot \tau(2n/3)
= n^{O(\log n)} \cdot 2^n \cdot (\sum_i (2/3)^k)
= n^{O(\log n)} \cdot O(2^{3n}).
$$

The overall running time is therefore $DS(n) \cdot 8^n \cdot n^{O(\log n)} = O((8c)^n)$, for $c < 11.09$. For the space complexity, observe that as we do not precompute $T[.,.]$, only a single tour is stored at each time, spread over $O(\log n)$ recursive levels.

3 Discussion

We describe three new algorithms for the many-visits TSP problem. In particular, we show how to solve the many-visits TSP problem in time single-exponential in the number $n$ of cities and logarithmic in the multiplicities, while using space only polynomial in $n$. This way we give the first improvement over the Cosmadakis-Papadimitriou algorithm in more than 30 years.

It remains an interesting open question to improve the bases of the exponents in our running times. An algorithm solving MV-TSP in time $O^*(2^n \cdot \log k)$, i.e. matching the best known upper bounds for solving the standard TSP, would be particularly interesting, even in the special case when all edge costs are equal to 1 or 2. (Such instances of MV-TSP arise e.g. in the Maximum Scatter TSP application by Kozma and Mömke [34].)

In practice, one may reduce the search space of our algorithms via heuristics, for instance by forcing certain (directed) edges to be part of the solution. An edge $(i,j)$ is part of the solution if the optimal tour visits it at least once. This may be reasonable if the edges in question are very cheap.
Figure 3: Constructing trees with degree sequence \(((1, 1, 2, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 2, 1))\). Node labels correspond to the degrees still to be taken care of, the edge labels correspond to the newly added edges in the constructed tree. The boldfaced numbers are the values in the directed Prüfer code of the constructed tree.
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### A Deferred subroutines

**Algorithm 8 Generating all possible r-subsets of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \)**

1: **Input:** Positive integers \( n \) and \( r \).
2: **Output:** All possible \( r \)-subsets of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \).
3: **procedure** \textsc{combinations}(\( n \), \( r \))
4: \( \text{comb} := [1, \ldots, r] \)
5: yield \( \text{comb} \)
6: while true do
7: \( i \leftarrow \text{last index such that } \text{comb}_i \neq n - r + i \), if no such index exists, break
8: \( \text{comb}_i := \text{comb}_i + 1 \)
9: for every index \( j := i + 1, \ldots, r \) do
10: \( \text{comb}_j := \text{comb}_j - 1 + 1 \)
11: yield \( \text{comb} \)

The algorithm \textsc{combinations} is an implementation of the algorithm NEXKSB by Nijenhuis and Wilf [39, page 26]. It takes two integers as input, \( n \) and \( r \), and generates all (ordered) subsets of size \( r \), of the base set \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \). It starts with the set \( [1, 2, \ldots, r] \) and generates all \( r \)-subsets in lexicographical order, up to \( [n - r + 1, n - r + 2, \ldots, n - r + r] = [n - r + 1, n - r + 2, \ldots, n] \).

In every iteration, it increases the rightmost number \( \text{comb}_i \) not being equal to \( n - r + i \) by one, and then makes \( \text{comb}_j \) equal to \( \text{comb}_{j-1} + 1 \) for all \( j \) indices between \( i + 1, r \). The algorithm stops when there are no such indices \( i \), that happens when reaching \( [n - r + 1, \ldots, n] \).

An example is shown in Fig. 4. The corresponding integer sequence would be \([1, 1, 2, 0, 0]\), however \textsc{combinations} returned the sequence \([2, 4, 7, 8]\), that is, a sequence of the positions (separating bars) of the integer sequence above. In order to obtain the actual degree sequence, we use a short script \textsc{combinationToSequence} in Algorithm 9 that converts the sequence with the positions of the bars to the degree sequence.

![Figure 4: Sequence [2, 4, 7, 8] representing the degree sequence [1, 1, 2, 0, 0]](image)

**Algorithm 9 Converting \([a_1, \ldots, a_m]\) into \([a_1, a_2 - a_1 - 1, \ldots, r + m - a_m]\)**

1: **Input:** list of positions \( a = [a_1, \ldots, a_m] \), integer \( r \)
2: **Output:** A sequence of \( m + 1 \) integers that sum up to \( r \).
3: **procedure** \textsc{combinationToSequence}(\( a \), \( r \))
4: \( \text{seq}_1 := a_1 - 1 \)
5: for every index \( i := 2, \ldots, m \) do
6: \( \text{seq}_i := a_i - a_{i-1} - 1 \)
7: \( \text{seq}_{m+1} := r + m - a_m \)
8: return \( \text{seq} \)

Finally, the procedure \textsc{Distribute}(\( n, k \)) simply calls \textsc{combinationToSequence}(\( a, n \)), for each output \( a \) of \textsc{combinations}(\( n + k, n \)).