

# On the Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt Algorithm for the (1,2)-TSP

Xianghui Zhong  
University of Bonn, Germany

March 2, 2021

## Abstract

The (1,2)-TSP is a special case of the TSP where each edge has cost either 1 or 2. In this paper we give a lower bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  for the approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm for the (1,2)-TSP. Moreover, we show that the 3-Opt algorithm has an exact approximation ratio of  $\frac{11}{8}$  for the (1,2)-TSP. Furthermore, we introduce the 3-Opt++-algorithm, an improved version of the 3-Opt algorithm for the (1-2)-TSP with an exact approximation ratio of  $\frac{4}{3}$ .

**keywords:** traveling salesman problem; (1,2)-TSP; 3-Opt algorithm; approximation algorithm; approximation ratio

## 1 Introduction

The traveling salesman problem (TSP) is probably the best-known problem in discrete optimization. An instance consists of the pairwise distances of  $n$  vertices and the task is to find a shortest Hamiltonian cycle, i.e. a tour visiting every vertex exactly once. The problem is known to be NP-hard [3].

In this paper we investigate the (1,2)-TSP which is a special case of the TSP. In this case, the distances are restricted to be 1 or 2. This variant is still NP-hard [3]. To get good tours in practice several approximation algorithms are considered. They compute in polynomial time a best possible tour. The approximation ratio is one way to compare approximation algorithms. It is the worst-case ratio between the length of the tour computed by the approximation algorithm and that of the optimal tour.

One class of the approximation algorithms are local search algorithms. These algorithms start with an arbitrary tour and make small local changes improving the tour until it is not possible anymore. The most natural local search approximation algorithm is the  $k$ -Opt algorithm. It starts with an arbitrary tour and replaces at most  $k$  edges

in every iteration to get a shorter tour. If there is no such improvement anymore, it outputs the tour.

The currently best approximation ratio for the (1,2)-TSP is  $\frac{8}{7}$  achieved by two different algorithms by Berman, Karpinski [2] and Adamaszek, Mnich and Paluch [1]. The algorithm given by Berman and Karpinski is a local search algorithm based on  $k$ -Opt. Hence, in contrast to the other TSP variants, for the (1,2)-TSP one of the currently best approximation algorithms in respect of approximation ratio is a local search algorithm. Karpinski and Berman conjectured that their analysis of the algorithm is not tight. Thus, a better understanding of the approximation ratio of local search algorithms could improve the best approximation ratio for the (1,2)-TSP.

The exact approximation ratio of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm is not known for general  $k$  for the (1,2)-TSP. Khanna, Motwani, Sudan and Vazirani gave an upper bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  on the approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm [4]. Zhong showed that the approximation ratio of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm is at least  $\frac{11}{10}$  for any fixed  $k$  [6]. Thus, the exact approximation ratio of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm is between  $\frac{11}{10}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$  for any fixed  $k$  which could be better than the currently best approximation ratio of  $\frac{8}{7}$  for  $k$  large enough. In this paper we make a start by finding the exact approximation ratio for  $k = 3$ .

**New results.** First, we give a lower bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  on the approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm for the (1,2)-TSP. A matching upper bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  was given in [4] and it was noted that this bound can be shown to be tight. Nevertheless, no lower bound was given explicitly.

Next, we show that the exact approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm is  $\frac{11}{8}$  for the (1,2)-TSP.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The exact approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is  $\frac{11}{8}$ .*

The analysis of the 3-Opt algorithm revealed that vertices incident to two edges of cost 2 in the computed tour by the 3-Opt algorithm make the analysis more complicated and increase the approximation ratio. This can be avoided by a small modification. We introduce the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm, a slightly modified version of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP. We also analyze the exact approximation ratio of the 3-Opt++ algorithm.

**Theorem 1.2.** *The exact approximation ratio of the 3-Opt++ algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is  $\frac{4}{3}$ .*

**Outline of the Paper.** First, we give a lower bound for the approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm of  $\frac{3}{2}$  in Section 2. Then, we show in Section 3 that the approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm is  $\frac{11}{8}$ . In Section 4 we introduce the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm, a slightly modified version of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm, for the (1,2)-TSP. We prove that the approximation ratio of the 3-Opt++ algorithm is  $\frac{4}{3}$ .

## 2 Lower Bound on the Approximation Ratio of the 2-Opt Algorithm

In this section we give a lower bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  on the approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP. Note that in [4] a matching upper bound of  $\frac{3}{2}$  was given and it was noted that this bound can be proven to be tight. Nevertheless, an explicit construction for the lower bound was not given. The construction is based on the construction for a lower bound of  $2(1 - \frac{1}{n})$  on the approximation ratio of the  $k$ -Opt algorithm for METRIC TSP in [5].

We construct an instance with  $n$  vertices  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  and a 2-optimal tour  $T$ . For the instance set the cost of the edges of  $\{\{v_i, v_{i+2}\} | i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}, i \text{ odd}\} \cup \{\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} | i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}\}$  and  $\{v_n, v_1\}$  to 1 and the cost of all other edges to 2. The tour  $T$  consists of the edges  $\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_{n-1}, v_n\}$  and  $\{\{v_i, v_{i+2}\} | i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}\}$  (Figure 1).




Figure 1: The constructed tour for  $n = 8$ . The black and red edges have cost 1 and 2, respectively.  $T$  is the straight tour, the optimal tour is dotted.

The number of edges with cost 2 in  $T$  is  $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ . Thus,  $T$  has total length  $n + \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ . The optimal tour for this instance has length  $n$  since the tour visiting  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$  in this order has length  $n$  and is hence optimal. Therefore, the approximation ratio is at least  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n + \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{n} = \frac{3}{2}$ . It remains to show that  $T$  is indeed 2-optimal for large  $n$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *The tour  $T$  constructed above is 2-optimal for  $n \geq 7$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that there exists an improving 2-move. Then, this 2-move replaces at least an edge of length two. Fix an orientation of  $T$  such that the tour edge  $(v_2, v_4)$  is

oriented this way. It is easy to see that all edges with cost two of the form  $(v_i, v_{i+2})$  with  $i$  even are oriented this way while for  $i$  odd the edges are oriented as  $(v_{i+2}, v_i)$ .

Assume that the improving 2-move replaces two edges of cost two. Then, these edges have by the definition of  $T$  the form  $(v_i, v_{i+2})$  and  $(v_j, v_{j+2})$  for even  $i, j \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}, i \neq j$ . According to the fixed orientation the 2-move replaces  $(v_i, v_{i+2})$  and  $(v_j, v_{j+2})$  by  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  and  $\{v_{i+2}, v_{j+2}\}$ . Since  $i \neq j$  both even, the edges  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  and  $\{v_{i+2}, v_{j+2}\}$  both have cost two. Thus, this 2-move is not improving contradicting the assumption.

It remains the case that the improving 2-move replaces an edge  $(v_i, v_l)$  of cost 1 and an edge  $(v_j, v_{j+2})$  of cost 2. Then the new edges  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  and  $\{v_l, v_{j+2}\}$  both must have length 1. We distinguish two cases: either  $l = i - 2$  with  $i$  odd or  $\{v_i, v_l\} = \{v_h, v_{h+1}\}$  for some  $h \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  where  $v_{n+1} := v_1$ . In the first case the difference of the indices of at least one of the new edges  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  or  $\{v_{i-2}, v_{j+2}\}$  has to be at least three. Hence, at least one new edge has cost 2, contradicting the assumption that we have an improving 2-move. In the second case note that the vertices of the edges  $\{v_h, v_{h+1}\}$  and  $\{v_j, v_{j+2}\}$  are disjoint, otherwise we do not get a tour after the 2-move. Hence, the difference of the indices of at least one new edge has to be at least three and the total cost of the new edges cannot be 2.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *The approximation ratio of the 2-Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is at least  $\frac{3}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* We have constructed an instance with a tour  $T$  which is by Lemma 2.1 2-optimal. Recall that the length of  $T$  is  $n + \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$  while the length of the optimal tour is  $n$ . Hence, the approximation ratio is at least  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n + \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{n} = \frac{3}{2}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt Algorithm

In this section we show that the exact approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm is  $\frac{11}{8}$ .

#### 3.1 Lower Bound on the Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt Algorithm

We construct for all integer  $s \geq 3$  an instance  $I_s$  with the vertices  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{8s-1}\}$  together with a tour  $T$ . We show that for all even  $s \geq 12$  the constructed tour  $T$  for the instance  $I_s$  is 3-optimal. Moreover, the ratio of its length and that of the optimal tour is at least  $\frac{11s}{8s+4}$ .

For simplicity we consider from now on all indices modulo  $8s$  for some fixed  $s$ . Set the cost of the edges  $\{\{v_{8h}, v_{8h+1}\}, \{v_{8h+1}, v_{8h+2}\}, \{v_{8h+2}, v_{8h+3}\}, \{v_{8h+3}, v_{8h+4}\}, \{v_{8h+4}, v_{8h+5}\}, \{v_{8h+2}, v_{8h+5}\}, \{v_{8h+2}, v_{8(h+1)+5}\}, \{v_{8h+3}, v_{8h}\}, \{v_{8h+3}, v_{8(h-1)}\}, \{v_{8h+4}, v_{8h+6}\}, \{v_{8h+4}, v_{8(h+1)+6}\}, \{v_{8h+7}, v_{8(h+1)+1}\}, \{v_{8h+7}, v_{8(h+2)+1}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  to 1 and the cost of all other edges to 2 (Figure 2).

The tour  $T$  consists of the edges  $\{\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} | i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . From the construction it is easy to see that the cost of the tour  $T$  is  $11s$ . Next, we bound the length of the optimal tour.




Figure 2: The instance  $I_3$  where the black edges have cost 1. Due to clarity, not all edges with cost 1 are drawn. The drawn pattern of edges with cost 1 repeats periodically. The tour  $T$  connects adjacent vertices on the circle.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The optimal tour  $T^*$  for  $I_s$  has length at most  $8s + 4$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the four sets

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \{v_{8h+2}, v_{8h+5}\}, \{v_{8h+2}, v_{8(h+1)+5}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \{ \{v_{8h+3}, v_{8h}\}, \{v_{8h+3}, v_{8(h-1)}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \\ & \{ \{v_{8h+4}, v_{8h+6}\}, \{v_{8h+4}, v_{8(h+1)+6}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \{ \{v_{8h+7}, v_{8(h+1)+1}\}, \{v_{8h+7}, v_{8(h+2)+1}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z} \} \end{aligned}$$

form four vertex disjoint cycles with edges of cost 1 whose union visits every vertex exactly once. We can construct a tour of cost at most  $8s + 4$  for the instance by removing an arbitrary edge from each cycle and connect the four paths arbitrarily to a tour.  $\square$

To show the 3-optimality of  $T$  we could make a big case distinction. But instead, we use the next Lemma that allows us to perform a computer-assisted proof.

**Definition 3.2.** A family of instances  $(I'_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  for (1,2)-TSP is called *regular*, if the following conditions are satisfied:

- There is an  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the vertices of  $I'_s$  can be labeled by  $v_0, \dots, v_{ls-1}$ . In the following we consider the indices modulo  $ls$ . We partition the vertices in *segments* such that each segment consists of the vertices  $\{v_{hl}, \dots, v_{(h+1)l-1}\}$  for some  $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- The edge  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  has cost 1 if and only if  $\{v_{i+l}, v_{j+l}\}$  has cost 1.
- If  $v_i$  does not lie in the same segment as any of  $v_j, v_{j-l}$  and  $v_{j+l}$ , then the edge  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  has cost 2.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For a regular family of (1,2)-TSP instances  $(I'_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  we have if  $I'_{2k}$  is  $k$ -optimal then  $I'_s$  is also  $k$ -optimal for all  $s \geq 2k$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that there is an improving  $k$ -move for some  $I'_s$  with  $s \geq 2k$ . We show that there is an improving  $k$ -move for  $I'_{2k}$ . Assume that the  $k$ -move removes the edges  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  which lie on  $T$  in this cyclic order. If there is an  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that between  $e_i$  and  $e_{i+1}$  lie more than two complete segments where  $e_{k+1} := e_1$ , then we can map this  $k$ -move to  $I'_{s-1}$  by removing one of these segments. More precisely, we map  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  to  $I'_{s-1}$  without changing their positions in the segments and the distances between the edges  $e_j$  and  $e_{j+1}$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{i\}$ . The distance between  $e_i$  and  $e_{i+1}$  is by the length of a segment, i.e. by  $l$ , shorter as in  $I'_s$ . After removing  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  the new  $k$ -move for  $I'_{s-1}$  connects the same endpoints of  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  as the original  $k$ -move for  $I'_s$ . By the regular property, the cost of the edges we add and remove by the two  $k$ -moves are the same. Repeat this procedure and stop if we have a  $k$ -move for  $I'_{2k}$ . If no such modifications are possible, there is at most one complete segment between  $e_j$  and  $e_{j+1}$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , therefore the instance has at most  $2k$  segments. Hence, in the end we get an improving  $k$ -move for  $I'_{2k}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *The constructed tour  $T$  is 3-optimal for  $I_s$  with  $s$  even and  $s \geq 12$ .*

*Proof.* For  $l = 8$  the instances  $I_s$  are not regular but satisfy the first two conditions of regularity by construction. The third condition is violated since there are for example edges  $\{v_{8h+7}, v_{8(h+2)+1}\}$  of cost 1 whose endpoints are up to 2 segments apart. We can construct the instance  $I'_s := I_{2s}$  and choose  $l = 16$  to get a regular family of instances since the third condition is also satisfied. Therefore, it is enough to check that  $I'_6 = I_{12}$  is 3-optimal. We checked this using a self-written computer program that generates all possible 3-moves for the instance and observed that none of them is improving.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *The approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is at least  $\frac{11}{8}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.4, the constructed tour  $T$  is 3-optimal for  $I_s$  with  $s$  even and  $s \geq 12$ . By construction, it has length  $11s$  and by Lemma 3.1 the length of the optimal tour is at most  $8s + 4$ . Thus, the approximation ratio is at least  $\frac{11s}{8s+4} \rightarrow \frac{11}{8}$  for  $s \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## 3.2 Upper Bound on the Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt Algorithm

For the upper bound assume that an instance with a 3-optimal tour  $T$  is given. Let  $T^*$  be a fixed optimal tour of the instance. Our general strategy is like [2] to distribute counters to the vertices such that on the one hand if there are many edges of cost 2 in  $T$ , many counters are distributed. On the other hand, for many counters we need many edges of length 1 to avoid creating an improving 3-move. This way, we get a lower bound on the fraction of the edges with length 1 in  $T$  and this implies an upper bound on the approximation ratio.

Let the *1-paths* be the connected components we obtain after deleting all edges with cost 2 in  $T$ . We call the vertices with degree 1 in a 1-path the *endpoints* of the 1-path. We distribute counters as follows: For 1-paths of length 0 consisting of the vertex  $v$  we distribute two counters on the vertex  $w$  if  $\{v, w\} \in T^*$ ,  $c(v, w) = 1$ . We call these counters *good*. For every 1-path of length greater than 0 we distribute a counter on  $w$  if  $v$  is an endpoint of the 1-path and  $\{v, w\} \in T^*$ ,  $c(v, w) = 1$ . These counters are called *bad*.

Next, we show some properties of  $T$  we need for the analysis.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $p, q$  be the endpoints of different 1-paths of a 3-optimal tour  $T$ , then  $c(p, q) = 2$ .*

*Proof.* Assume there is an edge  $\{p, q\}$  connecting two endpoints  $p, q$  of different 1-paths with  $c(p, q) = 1$  we show that there is an improving 3-move. Let  $\{p, q\}$  be incident to the two edges  $\{p, u\}$  and  $\{q, v\}$  with cost 2 in  $T$ . We perform first a 2-move replacing the edges  $\{p, u\}$  and  $\{q, v\}$  by  $\{p, q\}$  and  $\{u, v\}$ . Then, the cost decreases since  $c(p, u) + c(q, v) = 4 > 1 + 2 \geq c(p, q) + c(u, v)$ . Hence, if afterward the tour stays connected we have found an improving 2-move. It remains the case that the tour splits into two connected components. Since  $\{p, q\}$  does not connect two endpoints of a single 1-path, there has to be an edge  $\{a, b\}$  of cost 2 in the connected component containing  $p$  and  $q$  (Figure 3). We perform a 2-move replacing  $\{u, v\}$  and  $\{a, b\}$  by  $\{a, u\}$  and  $\{b, v\}$  to get a connected tour again. Note that in total we performed a single 3-move since we added  $\{u, v\}$  and removed it again. In the end the total cost decreased compared to the initial tour  $T$  since

$$c(p, u) + c(q, v) + c(a, b) = 2 + 2 + 2 > 1 + 2 + 2 \geq c(p, q) + c(a, u) + c(b, v).$$

This is a contradiction to the 3-optimality of  $T$ . □

**Corollary 3.7.** *The endpoints  $p$  and  $q$  of a 1-path of  $T$  can only have counters distributed by the edge  $\{p, q\}$ . In particular, each of them can have at most one bad counter.*

*Proof.* For any other endpoint  $r$  by Lemma 3.6 we have  $c(p, r) = c(q, r) = 2$ . Therefore, these edges cannot assign a counter to  $p$  or  $q$ . □

**Lemma 3.8.** *There are no vertices  $p, q, u, v, a, b$  such that  $\{p, u\}, \{q, v\}, \{a, b\} \in T$ ,  $c(p, u) = c(q, v) = 2$ ,  $c(a, u) = c(b, v) = 1$  and  $p, q, a, b$  lie on the same side of  $\{u, v\}$  (Figure 3).*

*Proof.* Like in the proof of Lemma 3.6 we can replace the edges  $\{p, u\}$ ,  $\{q, v\}$  and  $\{a, b\}$  by  $\{p, q\}$ ,  $\{a, u\}$  and  $\{b, v\}$ . The cost of the tour decreases since in this case we have

$$c(p, u) + c(q, v) + c(a, b) \geq 2 + 2 + 1 > 2 + 1 + 1 \geq c(p, q) + c(a, u) + c(b, v).$$

□




Figure 3: Sketch for Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.8. The tour  $T$  consists of the solid edges and the cost of each red edge is 2. In Lemma 3.6 we have in addition  $c(a, b) = 2$  and  $c(p, q) = 1$ , while in Lemma 3.8 we have instead  $c(a, u) = c(b, v) = 1$ . In both cases we replace the edges  $\{p, u\}$ ,  $\{q, v\}$  and  $\{a, b\}$  by  $\{p, q\}$ ,  $\{a, u\}$  and  $\{b, v\}$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** *If the vertices  $r$  and  $t$  have good counters, then  $\{r, t\} \notin T$ . Moreover, if there is a vertex  $s$  with  $\{r, s\}, \{s, t\} \in T$ , then  $s$  does not have a counter.*

*Proof.* For the first statement assume the contrary, then there are two 1-paths of length 0 consisting of the vertices  $u$  and  $v$  such that  $c(r, u) = c(t, v) = 1$ , respectively. Since  $u$  and  $v$  are 1-paths of length 0 we can choose  $a = r$ ,  $b = t$  and appropriate neighbors  $p$  and  $q$  to contradict Lemma 3.8.

Similarly, for the second statement assume there are such vertices  $r, s, t$ . Then, there is an endpoint  $w$  of a 1-path with  $c(w, s) = 1$  and a vertex  $z$  with  $\{z, w\} \in T$  and  $c(z, w) = 2$ . Now,  $z$  lies either on the same side of  $\{w, s\}$  as  $r$  or  $t$ . Depending on this we get a contradiction to Lemma 3.8 for  $a = s, b = t$  or  $a = r, b = s$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $p, q$  be the endpoints of a 1-path containing  $w$  with  $c(w, q) = 1$ . If  $w$  has a good counter, then  $p, q$  do not have counters.*

*Proof.* Assume the contrary, by Corollary 3.7 the counters of  $p$  and  $q$  are distributed by the edge  $\{p, q\}$  and we must have  $c(p, q) = 1$ . Let the good counter of  $w$  be originated from the 1-path of length 0 consisting of the vertex  $u$ . Moreover, let w.l.o.g.  $v_1$  be the vertex adjacent to  $u$  in  $T$  with  $c(v_1, u) = 2$  and lying on the same side of  $\{u, w\}$  as  $p$  and let  $r$  be the vertex with  $\{q, r\} \in T$  and  $c(q, r) = 2$  (Figure 4). Then, we can replace the edges  $\{v_1, u\}$ ,  $\{p, w\}$  and  $\{q, r\}$  by  $\{v_1, r\}$ ,  $\{u, w\}$  and  $\{p, q\}$ . The cost of  $T$  decreases

since

$$c(v_1, u) + c(p, w) + c(q, r) = 2 + 1 + 2 > 2 + 1 + 1 \geq c(v_1, r) + c(u, w) + c(p, q).$$

This is a contradiction to the 3-optimality.  $\square$




Figure 4: Sketch for Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 4.3. The solid edges are the edges of the tour  $T$  and the red edges have cost 2. In Lemma 3.10 we replace the edges  $\{v_1, u\}$ ,  $\{p, w\}$  and  $\{q, r\}$  by  $\{v_1, r\}$ ,  $\{u, w\}$  and  $\{p, q\}$ . In Lemma 4.3 the edges  $\{u, v_2\}$  and  $\{p, w\}$  are replaced by  $\{v_2, p\}$  and  $\{u, w\}$ .

Before we bound the number of counters, we summarize the properties we showed about counters.

**Corollary 3.11.** *The following properties hold:*

1. *Every vertex has two slots where a slot can be empty or contain two good counters or one bad counter.*
2. *If the vertices  $a$  and  $c$  both have good counters, then  $\{a, c\} \notin T$ . Moreover, if there is a vertex  $b$  such that  $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\} \in T$ , then  $b$  does not have counters.*
3. *The endpoint of a 1-path of length 0 does not have counters. Each endpoint of all other 1-paths can only have at most one bad counter and no good counters.*
4. *If the endpoint  $p$  of a 1-path has a counter, then  $w$  does not have a good counter if  $\{w, p\} \in T$  and  $c(w, p) = 1$ .*
5. *The total number of bad counters is less or equal to four times the number of 1-paths of length greater than 0.*

*Proof.* The first property is due to the fact that every vertex is incident to at most two edges of cost 1 in the optimal tour and every such edge can distribute two good counters or one bad counter. The second, third and fourth property follow from Lemma 3.9, Corollary 3.7 and Lemma 3.10, respectively. The fifth property follows from the fact that the bad counters are distributed by the endpoints of 1-paths with length greater than 0 and each such endpoint distributes at most two bad counters.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.12.** *Every 3-optimal tour  $T$  has at most  $\frac{12}{5}h$  counters, where  $h$  is the number of edges with cost 1 in  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Assume the contrary that there is an instance together with a tour  $T$  with more than  $\frac{12}{5}h$  counters, where  $h$  is the number of edges with cost 1 in  $T$ . Take such an instance and tour  $T$  with  $h$  minimal. We want to get a contradiction only using the properties in Corollary 3.11. More precisely, we discard any other properties of counters that are implied by the 3-optimality of  $T$  and assume that the counters are distributed arbitrarily on the vertices of  $T$  such that the properties in Corollary 3.11 are satisfied.

First, note that if a vertex  $v$  has two good counters, then we may assume that it has four good counters instead of exactly two good counters or two good counters and one bad counter. It is easy to check that this assumption does not decrease the number of counters or contradict Corollary 3.11 since  $v$  already had a good counter.

Next, we exclude the case that there are two vertices  $a$  and  $c$  on the same 1-path with good counters such there is a vertex  $b$  with  $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\} \in T$ . In this case by property 2 in Corollary 3.11 the vertex  $b$  does not have a counter. Let  $u$  be the neighbor of  $a$  in  $T$  other than  $b$ . We remove the vertices  $a$  and  $b$  from the instance, remove the edges  $\{u, a\}, \{a, b\}$  and  $\{b, c\}$  and add the edge  $\{u, c\}$  to  $T$  and set its cost to 1. By property 3 in Corollary 3.11,  $u$  belongs to the same 1-path as  $a$  in the original tour, hence the new tour does not contradict property 3. This also implies that the number of edges with cost 1 decreased by 2 while the number of counters decreased by 4. Moreover, we did not introduce new bad counters or new vertices neighboring to a vertex with a good counter. Hence, the new tour does not contradict Corollary 3.11. Let the number of counters before the modification be  $s$ . Since the edges  $\{u, a\}, \{a, b\}$  and  $\{b, c\}$  all had cost 1 in the old tour we have  $h - 2 \geq 1$ . We conclude that the ratio  $\frac{s}{h}$  does not decrease as

$$\frac{s}{h} > \frac{12}{5} > 2 \Rightarrow 2s > 4h \Rightarrow \frac{s-4}{h-2} > \frac{s}{h} > \frac{12}{5}.$$

This contradicts that we chose a tour  $T$  with more than  $\frac{12}{5}h$  counters and  $h$  minimal. Thus, the distance of two vertices  $a$  and  $c$  on the same 1-path each having good counters is at least 3.

We define for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$

$$\begin{aligned}
b_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i}{3} - 2, & g_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i}{3} & \text{for } i \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\
b_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i-1}{3} + 2, & g_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i-1}{3} & \text{for } i \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\
b_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i-2}{3}, & g_i &:= 4 \cdot \frac{i+1}{3} & \text{for } i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the distance of two vertices on a 1-path each having good counters is at least 3 and the endpoints of the 1-path do not contain good counters, the number of good counters on a 1-path with  $i$  edges is at most  $g_i$ . To maximize the number of counters, we have to maximize the number of vertices with good counters, since every vertex can contain at most four good counters or two bad counters. For  $i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  we can either have no counters on the endpoints of the 1-path and  $g_i$  good counters and at most  $b_i$  bad counters or one bad counter on each of the endpoints but by property 4 in Corollary 3.11 only  $g_i - 4$  good counters and at most  $b_i + 2$  additional bad counters. The total number of counters is the same but the first case has the advantage that we have fewer bad counters and the total number of bad counters is bounded by property 5 in Corollary 3.11. For  $i \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  each endpoint of the 1-path can contain a bad counter such that in total we have  $g_i$  good counters and at most  $b_i$  bad counters. Therefore, we may assume for all  $i$  that a 1-path with  $i$  edges has  $g_i$  good counters and at most  $b_i$  bad counters for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ . Every 1-path of length 0 does not contain counters by property 3 in Corollary 3.11.

Consider the following LP:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} g_i x_i + z \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} i x_i = h \\
& \quad \quad z - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i x_i \leq 0 \\
& \quad \quad z - 4 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} x_i \leq 0 \\
& \quad \quad x_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}
\end{aligned}$$

This LP gives an upper bound on the number of counters in a tour with  $h$  edges of cost 1. The variable  $x_i$  counts the number of 1-paths with  $i$  edges. Each of these 1-paths have  $g_i$  good counters and at most  $b_i$  bad counters. The variable  $z$  is equal to the total number of bad counters. The first equation ensures that the total number of edges with cost 1 is  $h$  while the second inequality bounds the number of bad counters by the sum of the upper bounds of bad counters on each 1-path. The third inequality ensures that the number of bad counters is at most four times the number of 1-paths with length greater than 0 since every such 1-path distributes at most 4 bad counters.

Note that by the first equation for any fixed  $h$  only a finite number of  $x_i$  are nonzero. Now, consider the dual LP:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & y_1 h \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & iy_1 - b_i y_2 - 4y_3 \geq g_i \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \\ & y_2 + y_3 \geq 1 \\ & y_2, y_3 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We show that  $y_1 = \frac{12}{5}, y_2 = \frac{4}{5}$  and  $y_3 = \frac{1}{5}$  is a feasible dual solution with value  $\frac{12}{5}h$ . Therefore, by weak duality we get  $\frac{12}{5}h$  as upper bound on the primal LP. Obviously, we have  $y_2 + y_3 = 1$  and  $y_2, y_3 \geq 0$ . Moreover, we can check the first inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} i \cdot \frac{12}{5} - \left(4 \cdot \frac{i}{3} - 2\right) \cdot \frac{4}{5} - 4 \cdot \frac{1}{5} &= 4 \cdot \frac{i}{3} + \frac{4}{5} > 4 \cdot \frac{i}{3} && \text{for } i \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\ i \cdot \frac{12}{5} - \left(4 \cdot \frac{i-1}{3} + 2\right) \cdot \frac{4}{5} - 4 \cdot \frac{1}{5} &= 4 \cdot \frac{i-1}{3} && \text{for } i \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ i \cdot \frac{12}{5} - 4 \cdot \frac{i-2}{3} \cdot \frac{4}{5} - 4 \cdot \frac{1}{5} &= 4 \cdot \frac{i+1}{3} && \text{for } i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the first inequality is also satisfied and we get the upper bound of  $\frac{12}{5}h$  on the number of counters.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let the number of counters in the tour  $T$  be at most  $d \cdot h$  where  $d$  is a constant and  $h$  is the number of edges with cost 1 in  $T$ . Then, the ratio between the length of  $T$  and that of the optimal tour is at most  $1 + \frac{d}{4+d}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $l$  and  $f$  be the number of edges with cost 2 in  $T$  and the optimal tour, respectively. If the optimal tour consists only of edges with cost 1, every 1-path distributes four counters: For every 1-path of length 0 the unique endpoint is incident to two edges of length 1 in the optimal tour and distributes four good counters. Every endpoint of the other 1-paths is incident to two edges of length 1 in the optimal tour and distributes two bad counters. Every edge of cost 2 in the optimal tour decreases the number of counters distributed by at most 4. Note that the number of 1-paths is equal to the number of edges with cost 2 which is  $l$ . Therefore, the  $l$  1-paths distribute at least  $4l - 4f$  counters and we conclude  $dh \geq 4l - 4f$  or  $h \geq \frac{1}{d}4(l - f)$ . Note that the length of the tour  $T$  is  $h + 2l$ , while that of the optimal tour  $T^*$  is  $n + f = h + l + f$ . Therefore, we get the upper bound on the ratio of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c(T)}{c(T^*)} &= \frac{h + 2l}{h + l + f} = 1 + \frac{l - f}{h + l + f} \leq 1 + \frac{l - f}{\frac{1}{d}4(l - f) + l + f} = 1 + \frac{l - f}{\frac{4+d}{d}l - \frac{4-d}{d}f} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{l - f}{\frac{4+d}{d}l - \frac{4+d}{d}f} = 1 + \frac{d}{4 + d}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Theorem 3.14.** *The approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is at most  $\frac{11}{8}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.12, there are at most  $\frac{12}{5}h$  counters in  $T$  where  $h$  is the number of edges with cost 1 in  $T$ . By Lemma 3.13, the approximation ratio is at most  $1 + \frac{\frac{12}{5}}{4 + \frac{12}{5}} = \frac{11}{8}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt++ Algorithm

In the last section we showed that the approximation ratio of the 3-Opt algorithm is  $\frac{11}{8}$ . The 1-paths with length 0 play a central role in the analysis. Every endpoint of such a 1-path distribute at most four good counters instead of two bad counters and increase the approximation ratio. We introduce the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm by adapting a concept from the  $k$ -improv algorithm from [2]. The  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm does not only search for improving  $k$ -moves but also  $k$ -moves that decrease the number of 1-paths of length 0 without increasing the cost of the tour. We show that the 3-Opt++ algorithm has a better approximation ratio of  $\frac{4}{3}$  than 3-Opt.

### 4.1 The $k$ -Opt++ algorithm

We first describe the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm. An *improving  $k$ -Opt++-move* is a  $k$ -move that is either improving or does not change the cost of the tour but decreases the number of 1-paths of length 0 of the tour. A tour is called  *$k$ -Opt++-optimal* if there does not exist an improving  $k$ -Opt++-move. Like the  $k$ -Opt algorithm the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm starts with an arbitrary tour  $T$  and performs improving  $k$ -Opt++ moves until  $T$  is  $k$ -Opt++-optimal (Algorithm 1).

---

#### Algorithm 1 $k$ -Opt++ Algorithm

---

**Input:** Instance of TSP  $(K_n, c)$

**Output:** Tour  $T$

- 1: Start with an arbitrary tour  $T$
  - 2: **while**  $\exists$  improving  $k$ -Opt++-move for  $T$  **do**
  - 3:     Perform an improving  $k$ -Opt++-move on  $T$
  - 4: **return**  $T$
- 

Obviously, every  $k$ -Opt++-optimal tour is also  $k$ -optimal. Moreover, every iteration of the  $k$ -Opt++ algorithm can also be performed in polynomial time since the number of  $k$ -moves is polynomially bounded. Thus, the algorithm also terminates in polynomial time since the length of the initial tour is bounded by  $2n$  and every step improves the length of the tour by at least 1 or decreases the number of 1-paths with length 0 by 1.

## 4.2 Lower Bound on the Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt++ Algorithm

For every natural number  $s \geq 2$  we construct an instance  $I_s$  with the vertices  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{6s-1}\}$  and approximation ratio  $\frac{4}{3}$ . For simplicity we consider the indices modulo  $6s$ . Set the cost of the edges  $\{\{v_{6h}, v_{6h+1}\}, \{v_{6h+2}, v_{6h+3}\}, \{v_{6h+3}, v_{6h+4}\}, \{v_{6h+4}, v_{6h+5}\}, \{v_{6h}, v_{6h+3}\}, \{v_{6h+2}, v_{6h+5}\}, \{v_{6h+4}, v_{6(h+1)+1}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  to 1 and the cost of all other edges to 2.

The tour  $T$  consists of the edges  $\{\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} | i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . The optimal tour  $T^*$  consists of the edges  $\{\{v_{2h+1}, v_{2h}\}, \{v_{2h}, v_{2h+3}\} | h \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  (Figure 5). It is easy to check that  $T^*$  consists only of edges with cost 1 and is hence optimal.




Figure 5: The constructed tour for  $s = 2$ . The black and red edges have cost 1 and 2, respectively.  $T$  is the straight tour, the optimal tour  $T^*$  is dotted.

From the construction it is easy to see that the cost of the tour  $T$  is  $8s$  while that of the optimal tour is  $6s$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *For  $I_s$  with  $s \geq 6$  the tour  $T$  constructed above is 3-Opt++-optimal.*

*Proof.* Since the constructed instances  $(I_s)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  do not contain 1-paths of length 0, the tour  $T$  is 3-Opt++-optimal if and only if  $T$  is 3-optimal. By construction, the constructed family of instance  $(I_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$  is regular. Hence, by Lemma 3.3 it is enough to check that  $I_6$  is 3-optimal. We checked this using a self-written computer program that generates all possible 3-moves for the instance and observed that none of them is improving.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2.** *The approximation ratio of the 3-Opt++ algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is at least  $\frac{4}{3}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.1, the tour  $T$  for  $I_s$  with  $s \geq 6$  is 3-Opt++-optimal. Moreover, we know that the length of  $T$  is  $8s$  and that of the optimal tour  $T^*$  is  $6s$ . Therefore, we get an approximation ratio of  $\frac{8s}{6s} = \frac{4}{3}$ .  $\square$

### 4.3 Upper Bound on the Approximation Ratio of the 3-Opt++ Algorithm

For the upper bound assume that an instance with a 3-Opt++-optimal tour  $T$  is given. Let the counters be distributed as in the analysis of the upper bound of the 3-Opt algorithm. Since every 3-Opt++-optimal tour is also 3-optimal, we can apply the results from the upper bound of the 3-Opt algorithm.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Every 1-path in a 3-Opt++-optimal tour  $T$  having a good counter has exactly two edges.*

*Proof.* Let the good counter be assigned to the vertex  $w$  from the 1-path of length 0 consisting of the vertex  $u$  which is incident to the edges  $\{v_1, u\}$  and  $\{u, v_2\}$  of cost 2 in  $T$ . Then  $\{u, w\}$  has cost 1 and assume that  $w$  is not the internal vertex of a 1-path of length 2. By Lemma 3.6  $w$  cannot be an endpoint of a 1-path. Hence, there is an edge  $\{p, w\} \in T$ ,  $c(p, w) = 1$  such that  $p$  is not endpoint of a 1-path. W.l.o.g. assume that  $p$  lies on the same side of  $\{u, w\}$  as  $v_1$  (Figure 4). Now, we can replace the edges  $\{u, v_2\}$  and  $\{p, w\}$  by  $\{v_2, p\}$  and  $\{u, w\}$ . As

$$c(u, v_2) + c(p, w) = 2 + 1 \geq c(v_2, p) + c(u, w),$$

after the 2-move the cost of  $T$  does not increase. Moreover, we have one 1-path of length 0 less than before, namely  $u$ . Since  $p$  is not endpoint of a 1-path we did not create new 1-paths of length 0, contradicting the 3-Opt++-optimality of  $T$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Every 1-path with  $x$  edges in a 3-Opt++-optimal tour  $T$  has at most  $2x$  counters.*

*Proof.* For  $x = 0$  the 1-path consists of one vertex and by Corollary 3.7 it cannot have any counters. For  $x \geq 1$  every 1-path with  $x$  edges has two endpoints and  $x - 1$  internal vertices. If the 1-path does not have a good counter, then each of the inner vertices has two incident edges in the optimal tour and can have at most two bad counters. By Corollary 3.7 the two endpoints can each have at most one counter. Therefore, the 1-path can have in total at most  $2x$  counters. For the case that the 1-path does have a good counter by Lemma 4.3 the 1-path must have exactly two edges and there are at most  $2 \cdot 2 = 4$  good counters on the internal vertex. Moreover, by Lemma 3.10 the endpoints of this 1-path cannot have any counters. Thus, this 1-path can have at most 4 counters.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5.** *The approximation ratio of the 3-Opt++ algorithm for (1,2)-TSP is at most  $\frac{4}{3}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.4, we distributed at most  $2h$  counters where  $h$  is the number of edges with cost 1 in  $T$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.13 the approximation ratio is at most  $1 + \frac{2}{4+2} = \frac{4}{3}$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Anna Adamaszek, Matthias Mnich, and Katarzyna Paluch. New approximation algorithms for (1, 2)-TSP. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Christos Kaklamanis, Dániel Marx, and Donald Sannella, editors, *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 107 of *LIPICs*, pages 9:1–9:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [2] Piotr Berman and Marek Karpinski. 8/7-approximation algorithm for (1,2)-TSP. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, (069), 2005.
- [3] Richard M. Karp. *Reducibility among combinatorial problems in: Raymond E. Miller, James W. Thatcher (Eds.), Complexity of Computer Computations*. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.
- [4] Sanjeev Khanna, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Umesh Vazirani. On syntactic versus computational views of approximability. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1):164–191, 1998.
- [5] Daniel J Rosenkrantz, Richard E Stearns, and Philip M Lewis, II. An analysis of several heuristics for the traveling salesman problem. *SIAM journal on computing*, 6(3):563–581, 1977.
- [6] Xianghui Zhong. On the approximation ratio of the k-opt and Lin-Kernighan algorithm. *CoRR*, abs/1909.12755, 2020.