Approximating the Held-Karp Bound for Metric TSP in Nearly Linear Time

Chandra Chekuri Kent Quanrud







(Metric) Subtour Elimination Input: clique  $K_n = (V, E)$ , metric  $c : E \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ **Objective:** min  $\sum c_e x_e$  over  $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$  $e \in E$ degree s.t.  $\sum x_e = 2$  for all vertices v; constraínts  $e \in \mathscr{C}(v)$ elímínates  $\sum x_e \ge 2 \text{ for all sets } U \neq \emptyset, V;$ subtours  $e \in \mathscr{C}(U)$ and  $0 \le x \le 1$ 

equivalent to Held-Karp bound

# Related work (abbrev.)

- important for variants of Christofides algorithm
- solvable by ellipsoid method
- $\tilde{O}(n^4/\epsilon^2)$  Plotkin, Shmoys, Tardos [1995]









Yes:  $(1 - \epsilon)$  -APX for Held-Karp in  $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ 

### Held-Karp for Metric TSP

# Packing cuts

Dynamic min cuts (and updates)











Multiplicative weight updates knapsack problems cut packings MWU  $\max \sum x_C \quad \text{over } x \in \mathbb{R}^C$ initialize edge  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ weights  $w \leftarrow 1/c$ s.t.  $\sum x_C \leq c_e \quad e \in E$ solve relaxation  $\begin{array}{c} C \ni e \\ x > \mathbb{O}^{\mathcal{C}} \end{array}$  $\max \sum x_C \text{ s.t. } x \ge 0,$  $\sum_{w_e x_c} \sum_{x_e x_e} w_e c_e$  $c,e:e\in c$ eoutput convex  $ilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$  iterations combination of **2** for each  $e \in E$ relaxed solutions  $w_e \leftarrow \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon \sum_{C \ni e} \frac{x_C}{c_e}}{\max_h \sum_{C \ni h} \frac{x_C}{c_e}}\right)$  $w_e$ 















From 
$$\tilde{O}(m^2/\epsilon^2)$$
 to  $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ min-cut oracleweight updatewhat we  
have $\tilde{O}(m)$  per min cut $\Omega(m)$  edges per cutwhat we  
need $\tilde{O}(1)$  amor. per  
 $(1 + \epsilon)$ -apx min-cut $\tilde{O}(1)$  amortized  
time per cutadditional• no suitable dynamic data structures

challenges
 min-cut varies dramatically between iterations





# Karger's $\tilde{O}(m)$ min-cut algorithm

1. Randomly contract edge. Repeat.

# Karger's $\tilde{O}(m)$ min-cut algorithm

1. Randomly contract edge. Repeat.

- 1. Pack spanning trees
- 2. Randomly sample  $O(\log n)$  trees
- 3. Search each sampled tree for min-cut induced by 1 or 2 edges by dynamic programming

Tree packings and network strength **Input:** graph G = (V, E) w/ spanning trees  $\mathcal{T}$ and positive edge capacities  $c \in \mathbb{R}^{E}$ **Objective:** max  $\sum x_t$  over  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{T}}$  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ s.t.  $\sum x_T \leq c_e$  for each edge e $T \ni e$  $x > \mathbb{O}^{\mathcal{T}}$  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -apx tree packings in  $\tilde{O}(m)$  time via either: - sparsification [Karger 00] - MWU [CQ SODA17]









# Karger's $\tilde{O}(m)$ min-cut algorithm

1. Randomly contract edge. Repeat.

1. Pack spanning trees

- 2. Randomly sample  $O(\log n)$  trees
- 3. Search each sampled tree for min-cut induced by 1 or 2 edges by dynamic programming

#### Fix a rooted tree $T \Rightarrow \text{poset on } V$



- "u < v" means u is a descendant of v
- " $v \parallel w$ " means v and ware incomparable
  - "D(x)" means all descendants of x





#### 2-cuts are a little more complicated...



#### 2-cuts are a little more complicated...



### reduces to dynamic programming with dynamic trees



### Incremental setting

edge weights incremented online (adversarially)

• need to maintain  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -apx min cut

## Incremental Karger's algorithm

- initially:  $\lambda \leftarrow$  initial value of min-cut, pack and sample  $\log n$  spanning trees
- when we need an apx min-cut:
  - continue Karger's search until we find a cut of value  $\leq (1 + \epsilon)\lambda$ , output and pause the search
  - if good cut not found, then re-pack/sample trees
- when we increment an edge weight
  - incorporate into tree sums w/ dynamic trees

From $ ilde{O}(m^2/\epsilon^2)$ to $ ilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$		
	min-cut oracle	weight update
what we have	$\tilde{O}(m)$ per min cut	$\Omega(m)$ edges per cut
what we need	$ ilde{O}(1)$ amor. per $(1+\epsilon)$ -apx min-cut	${\tilde O}(1)$ amortized time per cut
what we get	$\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ total time + $\tilde{O}(1)$ per min cut + $\tilde{O}(1)$ per edge inc	??

## Updating edge weights along cuts

- need to update weights of all edges in a cut
- we know how to update fixed sets efficiently [Young '14, Chekuri-Q SODA17]
- problem: cuts vary dramatically between iterations
- key point: all cuts are induced by trees



 Range tree decomposes each side of a 1,2-cut to log n
 "canonical subtrees"

Euler tour converts subtrees to intervals

- $[s^{-}, s^{+}]$
- this decomposes each 1,2-cut to  $\log^2 n$ "canonical cuts" between canonical subtrees

## Updating edge weights along cuts

need to update weights of all edges in a cut

we know how to update fixed sets efficiently
[Young '14, Chekuri-Q SODA17]

- problem: cuts vary dramatically between iterations
- key point: all cuts are induced by trees

 $\bigstar$  "canonical cuts" with total size  $\tilde{O}(m)$ 

 $\bigstar$  +  $\bigstar$  =>  $\log^2 n$  efficient updates on fixed sets

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \mbox{From } \tilde{O}(m^2/\epsilon^2) \mbox{ to } \tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2) \\ \mbox{min-cut oracle} & \mbox{weight update} \\ \mbox{what we have} & \tilde{O}(m) \mbox{ per min cut} & \mbox{$\Omega(m)$ edges per cut} \\ \mbox{what we } & \tilde{O}(1) \mbox{ amor. per } \\ \mbox{need} & (1+\epsilon)\mbox{-apx min-cut} & \mbox{$O(1)$ amortized} \\ \mbox{time per cut} & \mbox{$O(1)$ amortized} \\ \mbox{time per cut} & \mbox{$O(m/\epsilon^2)$ total time} \\ \mbox{$\Phi(m/\epsilon^2)$ total time} & \mbox{$\Phi(m/\epsilon^2)$ init time} \\ \mbox{$+\tilde{O}(1)$ per min cut} & \mbox{$+\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ edge} \\ \mbox{$+\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2)$ edge} & \mbox{$increments$} \end{array}$$



The main result. In this paper we obtain a near-linear running time for a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation, substantially improving the best previously known running time bound.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  be an undirected graph with  $|\mathcal{E}| = m$  edges and  $|\mathcal{V}| = n$  vertices, and positive edge weights  $c : \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . For any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a randomized algorithm that computes a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation to the Held-Karp lower bound for the Metric-TSP instance on  $(\mathcal{G}, c)$  in  $O(m \log^4 n / \epsilon^2)$  time. The algorithm succeeds with high probability.

The algorithm in the preceding theorem can be modified to return a  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate solution to the 2ECSS LP within the same asymptotic time bound. For fixed  $\epsilon$ , the running time we achieve is asymptotically faster than the time to compute or even write down the metric completion of  $(\mathcal{G}, c)$ . Our algorithm can be applied low-dimensional geometric point sets to obtain a running-time that is near-linearly in the number of points.

In typical approximation algorithms that rely on mathematical programming relaxations, the bottleneck for the running time is solving the relaxation. Surprisingly, for algorithms solving Metric-TSP via the Held-Karp bound, the bottleneck is no longer solving the relaxation (albeit we only find a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation and do not guarantee a basic feasible solution). We mention that the recent approaches towards the 4/3 conjecture for Metric-TSP are based on variations of the classical Christofides heuristic (see [Vygen, 2012]). The starting point is a near-optimal feasible solution x to the 2ECSS LP on  $(\mathcal{G}, c)$ . Using a well-known fact that a scaled version of x lies in the spanning tree polytope of  $\mathcal{G}$ , one generates one or more (random) spanning trees T of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The tree T is then augmented to a tour via a min-cost matching M on its odd degree nodes. Genova and Williamson [2017] recently evaluated some of these *Best-of-Many Christofides' algorithms* and demonstrated their effectiveness. A key step in this scheme apart from solving the LP is to decompose a given



### Christofides' heuristic [1976] (Recent work)

- simple (& best) 3/2-approximation for metric TSP
- bottlenecks include all-pairs shortest paths, min-cost perfect matching on dense graph

• 
$$(1 + \epsilon)$$
-apx to 2ECSS =>  
 $(1 + \epsilon)\frac{3}{2}$ -apx in  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.5}/\epsilon^3)$  time

• => 
$$\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^2 + n^{1.5}/\epsilon^3)$$
 time total

