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Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP)
Input: Complete graph $G=(V, E)$ with edge costs $\left(c_{e}: e \in E\right)$ satisfying triangle inequality.

Output: Minimum-cost Hamiltonian cycle.
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- One of the most basic examples of a venice routing problem
- NP-hard [Kan $\left.{ }^{\prime} 72\right]$

What is known about approximation algosithms for the TSP?
For 45 years, best-known approximation was 1,5. [Christofides '76, serdyutou '78]
Recent breakthrough reduced this to $\approx 1.5-10^{-36}$ [Karlin, Klin, vevis Gharan '21] NP-hard to approximate within a factor of $\frac{123}{122}$ [Kappinski, Lampis, Schnied '13]

Subtour LP
Dantzig, Fulkerson, Johnon 's4 Held, Karp 17

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \min \sum_{e} c_{e} x_{e} \\
& \text { s.t. } x(\delta(v))=2 \quad \forall v \in V \\
& x(\delta(s)) \geqslant 2 \quad \forall \phi \leftrightarrows \delta \leftrightarrows V \\
& x_{e} \geqslant 0 \quad \forall e \in E
\end{aligned}
$$


$S$ is toght
if $x(f(s))=2$

Subtour LP Dantzig, Fulkerson, Johnson 'st Held, Kara 17

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min & \frac{\sum}{e} c_{e} x_{e} \\
\text { sit. } & x(\delta(v))=2 \\
& \forall v \in V \\
x(\delta(s)) \geqslant 2 & \forall \phi c s ¢ V \\
x_{e} \geqslant 0 & \forall e \in E
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{LP}(G) \leq O P T(G) \forall$ graphs $G$.
$\therefore$ To get a bound against OPT, it suffices to bound against $L P$. ie. $A L G(G) \leq \alpha-L P(G) \forall G \Rightarrow A L G(G) \leq \alpha-O P T(G) \forall G$.

How different can LP be from OPT?
Def. Integrality gap is $\sup _{G} \frac{\operatorname{OPT}(G)}{L P(G)}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { min } \sum_{e} c x_{e} & \\
\text { st. } x(\delta(v)=2 & \forall v \in V \\
x(\delta(s))>2 & \forall \phi \leqslant s+V \\
x_{e}>0 & \forall e E E
\end{array}
$$



How different can LP be from OPT?

Def. Integality gap is $\sup _{G} \frac{\operatorname{OPT}(G)}{\operatorname{LP}(G)}$.
Integratily gap of subtour $P$ is

- $\frac{3}{2} \quad$ [WOOSey 180 ]
- $\leq \frac{3}{2}-\varepsilon$ [Kaidi, Hlein, Oreis Gharan'22]
- $\geqslant \frac{4}{3} \quad$ [folkbre]

$$
\min \sum_{e} c_{e} x_{e}
$$

s.t.

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
x(\delta(v))=2 & \forall v \in V \\
x(\delta(s))>2 & \forall \phi \leqslant S \leqslant V \\
x_{e} \geqslant 0 & \forall e E E
\end{array}
$$

How different can LP be from OPT?
Def. Integrality gap is $\sup _{G} \frac{\operatorname{OPT}(G)}{L P(G)}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \min \sum_{e} c x_{e} \\
& \text { set. } x(\delta(v))=2 \quad \forall v \in V \\
& x(\delta s)>2 \quad \forall \phi \leq s \leq V \\
& \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{e}}>0 \quad \mathrm{VeE} \mathrm{E}
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrality gap of sumter $L P$ is

- $\leq \frac{3}{2} \quad$ [ $W_{0}$ ley 180 ]
- $\leqslant \frac{3}{2}-\varepsilon[K a d i n$, Hen, Ores Ghacan 22$]$
- $\geqslant \frac{4}{3} \quad$ [foikbre]
$\frac{4}{3}$-conjecture: The integrally gap of the succour $P$ is $\frac{4}{3}$.
We prove the $\frac{4}{3}$-conjecture for a class of TSP instances.

Our Result
The $\frac{4}{3}$-conjecture hods for half-integral cycle cut instances of the TSP.

Haff-integral: Solution to $L P$ has $x_{e} \in\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\right\} \quad \forall e \in E$.
Cycle cut instance: $\widetilde{T i g i g h t}^{-s i n t s} \times(8(s)=2$ have a specific structure.
These capture all known worst-case instances for the $4 / 3$-congetwre.
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Why are half-integral instances interesting?

- Conijecture. [Schalekamp, $W$, van zuylen 14] Haff-integral instances are the wors-case instances for the integacility gap.
- Current-best approximation for TSP $(1.5-\varepsilon)$ Kaatin, Kkein, Oleis Gharan '21] buitt on ideas from half-integral case $[K K O \quad 120]$
- Curreitly, best apperximation for haff-ntegral TSP is 1.4983 [Gupta, Lee, Li, Mucha, Newman, Sarker '22]

What are cycle ut instances?

- A tight art is $S \leqslant V$ st. $x(\delta(s))=2$

- A cycle ut instance is one where $\forall$ tight ants $S$ with $|s| \geqslant 2$,
$\exists$ tight ats $A, B \neq S$ st. $A \cup B=S$.


Haff-integral cycle cut instances capture the known cases where the $4 / 3$-conjecture is tight
"Ewelope" graph


Haff-integral cycle cut instances capture the known cases where the $4 / 3$-conjecture is tight




Haff-integral cycle cut instances capture the known cases where the 4/3-conjecture is tight


A more useful view of cycle cut instances

- A tight ant is $S \leq V$ sit. $x(s(s))=2$
- Two uts $S, T \subseteq V$ cross if $S n T, \overline{3} n T, S \cap \bar{T}, \bar{S} \cap \bar{T}+\phi$
- A critical cut is a tight unit that does not cross any other tight cunt.
- Fix arbitrary root vertex $r \in V$.
- Define hierarchy $H=\{S \leqslant V \backslash r: S$ is a critical cut $\}$.

A more useful view of cycle cut instances

- Define hierarchy $H=\{S \leq V \backslash r: S$ is a cuitical ant $\}$.
- H is a laminar family tyith at turd des ont

- Topmose elemenen of His VIr
- Botfommot elemento are angeton vertices in vir.
- $S \in \mathcal{H}$ is a cycle unt if
(1) $|s| \geqslant 2$
(2) After contrating VIS and the chiden of $S$, resuting gaph is a cycle. Hieracty of cition ants

A more useful view of cycle cut instances

- $H=\{S \leq V \backslash r: S$ is a critical cut $\}$
- $S \in \mathcal{H}$ is a cycle cut if


Hierarchy of critical cuts
(1) $|s| \geqslant 2$
(2) After contracting V $\backslash S$ and the children of S, resulting graph is a cycle.
Fact. If $G$ is a cycle cat instance, all uts in the hierarchy are cycle uts (for any choice of $r$ ).
Fact. If for some choice of $r),($ consists only of ache cuts, $G$ is a accle cat instance.

Illustration of Hierarchy






To sum up,
a half-integral cycle cut instance of the TSP is one where
(1) Solution $x$ to subtour LiP has $x_{e} \in\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\right\}$ Veges $e$
(2) All cuts in the hierarchy are cycle cuts.

All known hard instances for the $\frac{4}{3}$-conjecture are halfintegal ede ant instances.

Our result is ...

An algorithm that outputs a tour $T$ with

$$
\mathbb{E}[\cos (T)]^{*} \leq \frac{4}{3} \sum_{e} \operatorname{ce} x_{e}
$$

for any haff-integral cycle cut instance of the TSP.

* $\mathbb{E}$ over randomness in algorithm. Can be derandomized.
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Our Approach

- Triangle inequality $\Rightarrow$ it suffices to find Eulerian tour $T s t, ~ c o s t(T) \leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot P$. $t$ anected, every voter ever deco
- Well construct a distribution of Eulerian tours such that each edge e is used at most $\frac{4}{3}$ xe of the time in expectation
- Sampling from this distribution gives the result
- Work on the hierarchy top-down
- Inductively specify the distribution of edges entering each cut
- Give rules for how to connect chillier given edges entering parent

Proof Sketch

- Simplifying assumptions: (1) Each $S_{E} H$ ( has exactly 2 children


Proof Sketch

- Simpiffying assumptions: (1) Each $S \in t$ has exactly 2 children,
(2) Edges in $S$ are "straight"

-: Edge with $X_{e}=\frac{1}{2}$

Proof Sketch


- For Eulerian tour, need to select an even \# of edges entering each set
- Take 0,1, or 2 copies of each edge
- Focus on edges with 1 copy and group by type

The four states


* Blue edges repress party of edos entering the cut.

State 1


* Blue edges repeat parity of edos entenng the cut.


Edges connecting children used $\frac{1}{2}$ the time in expectation.

These rules induce a distribution over states for each child. eeg. If parent is in state 1 , children are in $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { state } 1 \text { up. } \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text { state } 3 \text { mp. } \frac{1}{2} \text {. }\end{array}\right.$



Markov chain mapping distribution of pattens on the parent to distribution on the children. * Being in a state means equally likely to be in top piave us bottom picture.

The Fixed Point


$$
\pi=\left(\frac{4}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{9}\right)
$$

- Can check that states $1,2,3,4$ use each edge $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1,1$ of the time, resp.
$\therefore$ Under $\pi$, each edge is used $\frac{1}{2} \pi_{1}+\frac{1}{2} \pi_{2}+\pi_{3} t \pi_{4}=\frac{2}{3}=\frac{4}{3} x_{e}$ of the time.
* $\left(\frac{4}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{9}\right)$ is fixed point even in the general case!

Algorithm Recap

- Algorithm inducts on the hierarchy top-down
- At top level, sample edges according to fixed point $p=\left(\frac{4}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, 2, \frac{1}{9}\right)$
- State 1 wp: $\frac{4}{9}$, state $2 \mathrm{wpp} \frac{2}{9}$, etc.
- For each cut in $\operatorname{tl}$, given its state, comet its children auording to the mules.
- $p$ is fired port $\Rightarrow$ for even $S \in l l, P[[S$ is in state $i]=P$
- Under $p$, each edge is used $\frac{4}{3} x$ e of the time lin expectation)
- Resulting set of edges is Fulerian, with expected cost $=\frac{4}{3} \sum_{e} c$ ce e
- Can be derandomized using method of conditional expectations

Future Directions

- $4 / 3$ for cycle cut instances that are not haff-integral?
- What about the degree cut case?
* Degree ut $\equiv$ critical cut that is not a cycle cut.
- (In progress) Max Entropy is not a $4 / 3$-approx. alg. for

Thank you!


On the mericet this year!


Happy to discuss more!.

State 2


State 3


State 4


