

Polynomial-Time Approximation Schemes for k -Center and Bounded-Capacity Vehicle Routing in Graphs with Bounded Highway Dimension

Amariah Becker^{*§}, Philip N. Klein^{†§}, David Saulpic^{‡§}

Abstract

The concept of bounded highway dimension was developed to capture observed properties of the metrics of road networks. We show that a graph with bounded highway dimension, for any vertex, can be embedded into a graph of bounded treewidth in such a way that the distance between u and v is preserved up to an additive error of ϵ times the distance from u or v to the selected vertex. We show that this theorem yields a PTAS for BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING in graphs of bounded highway dimension. In this problem, the input specifies a depot and a set of clients, each with a location and demand; the output is a set of depot-to-depot tours, where each client is visited by some tour and each tour covers at most Q units of client demand. Our PTAS can be extended to handle penalties for unvisited clients.

We extend this embedding result to handle a set S of distinguished vertices. The treewidth depends on $|S|$, and the distance between u and v is preserved up to an additive error of ϵ times the distance from u and v to S .

This embedding result implies a PTAS for MULTIPLE DEPOT BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING: the tours can go from one depot to another. The embedding result also implies that, for fixed k , there is a PTAS for k -CENTER in graphs of bounded highway dimension. In this problem, the goal is to minimize d such that there exist k vertices (the *centers*) such that every vertex is within distance d of some center. Similarly, for fixed k , there is a PTAS for k -MEDIAN in graphs of bounded highway dimension. In this problem, the goal is to minimize the sum of distances to the k centers.

^{*}Department of Computer Science, Brown University. Email: amariah.becker@brown.edu

[†]Department of Computer Science, Brown University. Email: klein@brown.edu

[‡]Département d'Informatique, École Normale Supérieure, Paris. Work done while visiting Brown University. Email: david.saulpic@ens.fr

[§]Research supported by National Science Foundation grant CCF-1409520.

1 Introduction

The notion of *highway dimension* was introduced by Abraham et al. [3, 1] to explain the efficiency of some shortest-path heuristics. The motivation of this parameter comes from the work of Bast et al. [11, 12] who observed that, on a road network, a shortest path from a compact region to points that are far enough must go through one of a small number of nodes. They experimentally showed that the US road network has this property. Abraham et al. [3, 1, 2] proved results on the efficiency of shortest-path heuristics on graphs with bounded highway dimension.

For $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $v \in V$, $B_v(r) = \{u \in V \mid d(u, v) \leq r\}$ denotes the ball with center v and radius r . The definition of highway dimension we use is from [19]. Let c be a constant greater than 4.

Definition 1. The *highway dimension* of a graph G is the smallest integer η such that for every $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $v \in V$, there is a set of at most η vertices in $B_v(cr)$ such that every shortest path in $B_v(cr)$ of length at least r intersects this set.

(See Section A for more on defining highway dimension.)

1.1 New polynomial-time approximation schemes

Abraham et al. note that “conceivably, better algorithms for other [optimization] problems can be developed and analyzed under the small highway dimension assumption.” Since some road networks are described by graphs of small highway dimension, NP-hard optimization problems that arise in road networks are natural candidates for study. Feldmann [18] and Feldmann, Fung, Könemann, and Post [19] inaugurated this line of research, giving (respectively) a constant-factor approximation algorithm for one problem and quasi-polynomial-time approximation schemes for several other problems. In this paper, we give the first *polynomial-time approximation schemes* (PTASs) for classical optimization problems in graphs of small highway dimension.

Vehicle routing

Consider CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, defined as follows. An instance consists of a positive integer Q (the *capacity*), a graph with edge-lengths, a subset Z of vertices (called *clients*), a demand function $\rho: Z \rightarrow [1, 2, \dots, Q]$, and a distinguished vertex, called the *depot*. A solution consists of a set of *tours*, where each tour is a path starts and ends at the depot, and a function that assigns each client to a tour that passes through it, such that the total client demand assigned to each tour is at most Q . (If a client v is assigned to a tour, we say that the tour *visits* v .) The objective is to minimize the sum of lengths of the tours.

We emphasize that in this version of CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, client demand is *indivisible*: a client’s entire demand must be covered by a single tour. For arbitrary metrics, the problem is APX-hard, even when $Q > 0$ is fixed [9]. When Q is unbounded, it is NP-hard to approximate to within a factor of 1.5 even when the metric is that of a star [21]. Since stars have highway dimension one, this hardness result holds for graphs of bounded highway dimension. We therefore require Q to be constant. To emphasize this, we sometimes refer to the problem as BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING.

Theorem 1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and $Q > 0$, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given an instance of BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING in which the capacity is Q and the graph has highway dimension η , finds a solution whose cost is at most $1 + \epsilon$ times optimum.*

Note that the running time is bounded by a polynomial whose degree depends on ϵ , η , and Q . As we discuss in Section 1.3, polynomial-time approximation schemes for vehicle routing were previously known only for Euclidean spaces. (A quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme was known for planar graphs.)

Our approach can be modified to handle a generalization in which an instance also specifies a *penalty* for each client; the solution is allowed to omit some clients and the goal is to find a solution that minimizes the sum of costs plus penalties. We call this CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING WITH PENALTIES.

As we state in Theorem 5, we give a PTAS for a more general version of the problem, MULTIPLE-DEPOT BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING, in which there are a constant number of depots, and each tour is required only to start and end at one of the depots.

k -CENTER and k -MEDIAN

Next, consider k -CENTER and k -MEDIAN problems. Given a graph, the goal in k -CENTER is to select a set of k vertices (the *centers*) so as to minimize the maximum distance of a vertex to the nearest center. This problem might arise, for example, in selecting locations for k firehouses. The objective in k -MEDIAN is to minimize the average vertex-to-center distance.

For k -CENTER, when the number k of centers is unbounded, for any $\delta > 0$, it is NP-hard [22, 29] to obtain a $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation, even in the Euclidean plane under L_1 or L_∞ metrics,¹ even in unweighted planar graphs [34], and even in n -vertex graphs with highway dimension $O(\log^2 n)$ [18]. It is not yet known to be NP-hard in graphs with constant highway dimension, but Feldmann [18] shows that, under the Exponential Time Hypothesis, the running time of an algorithm achieving a $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation would be doubly exponential in a polynomial in the highway dimension.

These negative results suggest considering the problem in which k is bounded by a constant. However, Feldmann [18] shows that $(2 - \epsilon)$ -approximation is $W[2]$ hard for parameter k , suggesting that the running time of any such approximation algorithm would not be bounded by a polynomial whose degree is independent of k . Thus even for constant k , finding a much better approximation seems to require that we restrict the metric. Feldmann [18] gave a polynomial-time $3/2$ -approximation algorithm for bounded-highway-dimension graphs, and raised the question of whether a better approximation ratio could be achieved. The following theorem answers that question.

Theorem 2. *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and a constant c such that, for each of the problems k -CENTER and k -MEDIAN, for any $\eta > 0, k > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is an $f(\eta, k, \epsilon)n^c$ algorithm that, given an instance in which the graph has highway dimension at most η , finds a solution whose cost is at most $1 + \epsilon$ times optimum.*

Note that the running time is bounded by a polynomial in n whose degree does *not* depend on η, k , or ϵ .

1.2 New metric embedding results

The key to achieving the new approximation schemes is a new result on metric embeddings of bounded-highway-dimension graphs into bounded-treewidth graphs. (*Treewidth*, defined in Section 2, is a measure of how complicated a graph is, and many NP-hard optimization problems in graphs become polynomial-time solvable when the input is restricted to graphs of bounded treewidth.)

A metric embedding of an (undirected) guest graph G into a host graph H (or, more generally, metric space) is a mapping $\phi(\cdot)$ from the vertices of G to the vertices of H such that, for every pair of vertices u, v in G , the $\phi(u)$ -to- $\phi(v)$ distance in H resembles the u -to- v distance in G . Usually in studying metric embeddings one seeks an embedding that preserves u -to- v distance up to some factor (the *distortion*). That is, the allowed error is proportional to the original distance. In this work, the allowed error is instead proportional to the distance from a given root vertex (or a constant number of vertices).

Theorem 3. *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that, for every $\epsilon > 0$ graph G of highway dimension η , and vertex s , there exists a graph H and an embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G into H such that*

- H has treewidth at most $f(\epsilon, \eta)$, and

¹Approximation better than 1.822 is hard under L_2 , see [17].

- for all vertices u and v ,

$$d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(\phi(u),\phi(v)) \leq d_G(u,v) + \varepsilon(d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v))$$

We give a polynomial-time algorithm that, given the graph G , constructs H and the embedding of G into H .

every

As we describe in greater detail in Section 5, our PTAS for BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING first applies Theorem 3 with s being the depot and $\epsilon' = \epsilon/c$ for a constant c to be determined, obtaining an embedding of the original graph into the bounded-treewidth graph H . The embedding induces an instance of VEHICLE ROUTING in H . The algorithm finds an optimal solution to this instance, and converts it to a solution for the original instance. This conversion does not increase the cost of the solution. However, we need to show that the optimal solution in the original instance induces a solution in H of not too much greater cost. We do this using a lower bound due to Haimovich and Rinnoy Kan [27].

For the multiple-depot version of vehicle routing and for k -CENTER and k -MEDIAN, Theorem 3 does not suffice. We present a generalization in which there is a set of root vertices, and the allowed error is proportional to the minimum distance to any root vertex.

Theorem 4. *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ such that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, graph G of highway dimension η and set S of vertices of G , there exists a graph H and an embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G into H such that*

- H has treewidth $f(\eta, |S|, \varepsilon)$, and
- for all vertices u and v ,

$$d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(\phi(u),\phi(v)) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u,v) + \varepsilon \min(d_G(S,u), d_G(S,v))$$

1.3 Related Work

Metric embeddings of bounded-highway-dimension graphs

As mentioned in Section 1.1, Feldmann [18] and Feldmann et al. [19] inaugurated research into approximation algorithms for NP-hard problems in bounded-highway-dimension graphs. We discuss the work of Feldmann [19] soon. Feldmann et al. [19] discovered quasi-polynomial-time approximation schemes for TRAVELING SALESMAN, STEINER TREE, and FACILITY LOCATION. The key to their results is a probabilistic metric embedding of bounded-highway dimension graphs into graphs of small treewidth. The *aspect ratio* of a graph with edge-lengths is the ratio of the maximum vertex-to-vertex distance to the minimum vertex-to-vertex distance. Feldmann et al. show that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, for any graph G of highway dimension η , there is a probabilistic embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G of expected distortion $1 + \epsilon$ into a randomly chosen graph H whose treewidth is polylogarithmic in the aspect ratio of G (and also depends on ϵ and η). There are two obstacles to using this embedding in achieving approximation schemes:

- The distortion is achieved only in expectation. That is, for each pair u, v of vertices, the expected $\phi(u)$ -to- $\phi(v)$ distance in H is at most $(1 + \epsilon)$ times the u -to- v distance in G .
- The treewidth depends on the aspect ratio of G , so is only bounded if the aspect ratio is bounded.

The first is an obstacle for problems (e.g. k -CENTER) where individual distances need to be bounded; this does not apply to problems such as TRAVELING SALESMAN or VEHICLE ROUTING where the objective is a sum of lengths of paths. The second is the reason that Feldmann et al. obtain only quasi-polynomial-time approximation schemes; it seems to be an obstacle to obtaining true polynomial-time approximation schemes.

Nevertheless, the techniques introduced by Feldmann et al. are at the core of our embedding results. We build heavily on their framework.

Vehicle routing

Haimovich and Rinnoy Kan [27] proved the following lower bound²:

Lemma 1. *For CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING with capacity Q , and client set Z ,*

$$\text{cost}(OPT) \geq \frac{2}{Q} \sum \{d(c,s) : c \in Z\}$$

Note that the CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING problem, is a generalization of TRAVELING SALESMAN ($Q = n$, $Z = V$, and $\rho(v) = 1, \forall v$). Conversely, Haimovich and Rinnoy Kan show how to use a solution to TRAVELING SALESMAN to achieve a constant-factor approximation for CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, where the constant depends on the approximation ratio for TRAVELING SALESMAN.

Since CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING in general graphs is APX-hard for every fixed $Q \geq 3$ [8, 9], much work has focused on the Euclidean plane. Haimovich and Rinnoy Kan [27] gave a polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) for the Euclidean plane for the case when the capacity Q is constant. Asano et al. [9] showed how to improve this algorithm to get a PTAS when Q is $O(\log n / \log \log n)$. For general capacities, Das and Mathieu [16] gave a quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme for unbounded Q . Building on this work, Adamaszek, Czumaj, and Lingas [4] gave a PTAS that for any $\epsilon > 0$ can handle Q up to $2^{\log^\delta n}$ where δ depends on ϵ .

Little is known for higher dimensions or other metrics. Kachay gave a PTAS in R^d that requires Q to be $O(\log^{1/d} \log n)$ [32], and Hamaguchi and Katoh [28] and Asano, Katoh, and Kawashima [7] focused on constant-factor approximation algorithms for the case where the graph is a tree and client demand is divisible. Becker, Klein and Saulpic [13] gave the first approximation scheme for a non-Euclidean metric: they describe a quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme in planar graphs, but only when the capacity Q is polylogarithmic in the graph size. They introduce the idea of an error that depends on the distance to the depot, which we also use in the embedding presented in our work here.

k -MEDIAN

We have already surveyed some of the results on k -CENTER. Note that the results of Feldmann [18] are based on the definition of highway dimension of 2011 [1], but can be adapted to the definition we use here.

For k -MEDIAN, constant-factor approximation algorithms have been found for general metric spaces [35, 30, 6]. The best known approximation ratio for k -MEDIAN in general metrics is $1 + \sqrt{3}$ [33], and it is NP-hard to approximate within a factor of $1 + 2/e$ [23]. For k -MEDIAN in d -dimensional Euclidean space, PTAS have been found when k is fixed (e.g. [10]) and when d is fixed (e.g. [5]) but there exists no PTAS if k and d are part of the input [26]. Recently Cohen-Addad et al. [14] gave a local search-based PTAS for k -MEDIAN in edge-weight planar graphs that extends more generally to minor-closed graph families.

1.4 Paper Outline

Section 2 provides preliminary definitions and presents useful results from Feldmann et al. [19]. In Section 3 we give a first embedding result, that concerns graphs of bounded aspect ratio. Section 4 explains the second embedding result (Theorem 3) and Section 5 presents how to use it to achieve a PTAS for CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, proving Theorem 1. Section 6 describes the dynamic program used for CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, and finally Section 7 gives the third embedding result (Theorem 4) and applies it to several problems.

²Although their result addresses the unit-demand case, it generalizes to instances where all non-zero client demand $\rho(v)$ is at least one for every client $v \in Z$.

2 Preliminaries

We use OPT to denote the optimum solution for an optimization problem. For minimization problems, an α -approximation algorithm returns a solution with cost at most $\alpha \cdot \text{cost}(OPT)$. An *approximation scheme* is a family of $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms indexed by $\varepsilon > 0$. A *polynomial-time approximation scheme* (PTAS) is an approximation scheme that for each ε runs in polynomial time.

For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, we use $d_G(u, v)$ (or $d(u, v)$ when G is unambiguous) to denote the shortest-path distance between u and v . For any vertex subsets $W \subseteq V$ and vertex $v \in V$ we let $d(v, W)$ denote $\min_{w \in W} d(v, w)$, and we let $\text{diam}(W)$ denote $\max_{u, v \in W} d(u, v)$.

An *embedding* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a mapping ϕ from a *guest* graph G to a *host* graph $H = (V, E_H)$. For notational simplicity, we identify the vertices of H with points of G and therefore omit ϕ .

A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a tree T_G whose nodes are *bags* of vertices that satisfy the following three criteria:

1. Every $v \in V$ appears in at least one bag.
2. For every edge $(u, v) \in E$ there is some bag containing both u and v .
3. For every $v \in V$, the bags containing v form a connected subtree.

The *width* of T_G is the size of the largest bag minus one. The *treewidth* of G is the minimum width among all tree decompositions of G . It is a measure of how *treelike* a graph is. Observe that the treewidth of a tree is one. Tree decompositions are useful for dynamic-programming algorithms, but often give runtimes that are exponential in the treewidth. Therefore many problems that are NP -hard in general can be solved efficiently in graphs of bounded treewidth.

Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subset of elements in a metric space (X, d) . Y is a δ -*covering* of X if for all $x \in X$, $d(x, Y) \leq \delta$. Y is a β -*packing* of X if for all $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ with $y_1 \neq y_2$, $d(y_1, y_2) \geq \beta$. Y is an ε -*net* if it is both an ε -covering and an ε -packing.

2.1 Shortest-Path Covers

Instead of working directly with Definition 1, we use the concept of a *shortest-path cover*, which as noted in Abraham et al. [1] is a closely related and more convenient tool.

Recall that c is a constant greater than 4.

Definition 2. For a graph G with vertex set V and $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, a *shortest-path cover* $\text{SPC}(r) \subseteq V$ is a set of *hubs* such that every shortest path of length in $(r, cr/2]$ contains at least one hub from this set. Such a cover is called *locally s -sparse* for scale r if every ball of diameter cr contains at most s vertices from $\text{SPC}(r)$.

For a graph of highway dimension η , Abraham et al. [1] showed how to find a $\eta \log \eta$ -sparse shortest-path cover in polynomial time (though they show it for a different definition of highway dimension ($c = 4$), the algorithm can be straightforwardly adapted). This result justifies using shortest-path covers instead of directly using highway dimension.

2.1.1 Town Decomposition

Feldmann et al. [19] observed that a shortest-path cover for scale r naturally defines a clustering of the vertices into *towns* [19]. Informally, a *town* at scale r is a subset of vertices that are close to each other and far from other towns and from the shortest-path cover for scale r . Formally, a town is defined by at least one $v \in V$ such that $d(v, \text{SPC}(r)) > 2r$ and is composed of $\{u \in V \mid d(u, v) \leq r\}$.

Lemma 2 describes key properties of towns proved in Feldmann et al and depicted in Figure 1.

Lemma 2 (Lemma 3.2 in [19]). *If T is a town at scale r , then*

1. $\text{diam}(T) \leq r$ and
2. $d(T, V \setminus T) > r$

Proof. See Appendix B for proof sketch. □




Figure 1: Illustration of Lemma 2

Feldmann et al. define a recursive decomposition of the graph using the concept of towns, which we adopt for this paper. First, scale all distances so that the shortest point-to-point distance is a little more than $c/2$. Then fix a set of scales $r_i = (c/4)^i$. We say that a town T at scale r_i is on *level* i . Remark that the scaling ensures that $\text{SPC}(r_0) = \emptyset$, and therefore at level 0 every vertex forms a singleton town. Also note that the largest level is $r_{\max} = \lceil \log_{c/4} \text{diam}(G_{\text{scaled}}) \rceil = \lceil \log_{c/4} (\frac{c}{2} \cdot \theta_G) \rceil$, where θ_G is the aspect ratio of the input graph. Similarly at this topmost level, $\text{SPC}(r_{\max}) = \emptyset$ since there are no shortest paths that need to be covered. The only town at scale r_{\max} is the town that contains the entire graph. We say that the town at scale r_{\max} and the singleton towns at scale r_0 are *trivial* towns. Since c is a constant greater than four, the total number of scales is linear in the input size.

Consider the set $\mathcal{T} = \{T \subseteq V \mid T \text{ is a town on level } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of towns for all levels. Because of the properties of Lemma 2, this set forms a laminar family and therefore has a tree structure. Towns on the same level are disjoint from each other. By the isolation property of the town (the second property of Lemma 2), vertices outside of a town must be far from the town, so a smaller town cannot be both inside and outside of a larger town. Indeed, if two towns intersect, then the smaller town must be entirely inside the bigger (see [19] for more details). Moreover, the decomposition has the following properties:

Lemma 3 (Lemma 3.3 in [19]). *For every town T in a town decomposition \mathcal{T} ,*

1. T has either 0 children or at least 2 children, and
2. if T is a town at level i and has child town T' at level j , then $j < i$.

Proof. See Appendix B for proof sketch. □

The set \mathcal{T} is called the *town decomposition* of G , with respect to the shortest-path cover, and is a key concept used in this paper.

2.1.2 Approximate Core Hubs

Another insight that we adopt from Feldmann et al. is that rather than working with *all* hubs in the shortest-path covers, it is sufficient for approximation algorithms to retain only a representative subset of the hubs: for $\varepsilon > 0$, Feldmann et al. define for each town T a set X_T of *approximate core hubs* which is a subset of $T \cap \cup_i \text{SPC}(r_i)$ with the properties described in Lemma 4. One key property of these sets is a bound on their *doubling dimension*. The doubling dimension of a metric is the smallest θ such that for every r , every ball of radius $2r$ can be covered by at most 2^θ balls of radius r .

Lemma 4 (Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 5.1 in [19]). *Let G be a graph of highway dimension η , and \mathcal{T} be a town decomposition with respect to an inclusion-wise minimal, s -sparse shortest-path cover. For any town $T \in \mathcal{T}$,*

1. if T_1 and T_2 are different child towns of T , and $u \in T_1$ and $v \in T_2$, then there is some $h \in X_T$ such that $d(P[u,v],h) \leq \varepsilon d(u,v)$, where $P[u,v]$ is the shortest u -to- v path, and
2. the doubling dimension of X_T is $\theta = O(\log(\eta \log(1/\varepsilon)))$.

Intuitively, the shortest-path cover at scale r_i forms a set of points that covers *exactly* the shortest-paths of length in $(r_i, r_{i+1}]$. Therefore to cover the shortest-path between $u \in T_1$ and $v \in T_2$, we can use a hub at level j such that $d(u,v) \in (r_j, r_{j+1}]$. Unfortunately, taking all the shortest-path covers gives a set too big for our purpose. But since we want to cover *approximately* the distances between points in different child towns, we can take only a subset of the shortest-path covers that has a low doubling dimension. This subset can be found in $n^{O(1)}$ time as explained in Feldmann et al. [19].

2.1.3 Minimality of Shortest-Path Covers

Note that the result of Lemma 4 requires the shortest-path covers be inclusion-wise minimal. For the embedding we present in Section 4, however, it is useful to assume that the depot is not a member of any town except for the trivial topmost town containing all of G and bottommost singleton town containing just the depot. One way to ensure this is to add the depot to the shortest-path cover at every level, but this violates the minimality requirement (see Appendix C for further discussion). Lemma 5, however, shows that this assumption can be made *safely* without asymptotically changing our results.

We prove a more general statement for a set S of depots. Recall that c is a constant greater than four and that all edges have been scaled so that the smallest point-to-point distance is slightly more than $c/2$.

Lemma 5. *Any graph $G = (V, E)$ with highway dimension η , diameter Δ_G , and designated vertex set $S \subseteq V$ can be modified by adding $O(\eta^2 |S|^3 \log \Delta_G)$ new vertices and edges, such that the resulting graph $G' = (V', E')$*

- has highway dimension at most $\eta + |S|$
- for all $u, v \in V'$, $d_{G'}(u, v) \in (\frac{c}{2}, \frac{3c}{4} \Delta_G]$
- for all $u, v \in V$, $d_{G'}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$, and
- for every $s \in S$, the only towns containing s in the town decomposition of G' are the trivial towns.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Note that after applying the modification of Lemma 5 to the (scaled) input graph, the resulting graph has size that is polynomial in the size of the original input.

3 Embedding for Graphs of Bounded Diameter

Lemma 6 describes an embedding for the case when the graph has bounded diameter. This embedding gives only a small *additive* error, and will prove to be a useful tool for the following sections. In this section we show how to construct this embedding.

Lemma 6. *There is a function $f(x, y)$ such that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, for any graph G with highway dimension at most η and diameter Δ , there is a graph H with treewidth at most $f(\varepsilon, \eta)$ and an embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G into H such that, for all points u and v ,*

$$d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq d_G(u, v) + 4\varepsilon \Delta$$

Furthermore, there is a polynomial-time algorithm to construct H and the embedding.

We first present an algorithm to compute the host graph H and a tree decomposition of H . This algorithm relies on the town decomposition \mathcal{T} of G , described in Section 2.

The host graph H is constructed as follows. First, consider a town T that has diameter $d \leq \varepsilon \Delta$ but has no ancestor towns of diameter $\varepsilon \Delta$ or smaller. We call such a town a *maximal* town of diameter at most




Figure 2: (a) An example town decomposition. T_1 has diameter at most $\varepsilon\Delta$ and T_2 has diameter greater than $\varepsilon\Delta$. (b) Two cases of town embeddings. T_1 is embedded as a star with center v_{T_1} . The embedding of T_2 connects all vertices in T_2 to all hubs in \hat{X}_{T_2} (depicted as squares). (c) Hub $\hat{h} \in \hat{X}_T$ is close to hub $h \in X_T$ which itself is close to the shortest u -to- v path.

$\varepsilon\Delta$. The town T is embedded into a star: choose an arbitrary vertex v_T in T , and for each $u \in T$, include an edge in H between u and v_T with length $d_G(u, v_T)$ equal to their distance in G (see Figures 2a and 2b).

Now consider a town T of diameter $d_T > \varepsilon\Delta$. The set of approximate core hubs X_T can be used as *portals* to preserve distances between vertices lying in different child towns of T . Specifically, by Lemma 4, for every pair of vertices (u, v) in different child towns of T , X_T contains a vertex that is close to the shortest path between u and v . In order to approximate the shortest paths, it is therefore sufficient to consider a set of points *close to* X_T . Let \hat{X}_T be an εd_T -net of X_T . For each $\hat{h} \in \hat{X}_T$ and $v \in T$, include an edge in H connecting v to \hat{h} with length $d_H(v, \hat{h}) = d_G(v, \hat{h})$ equal to the v -to- \hat{h} distance in G (see Figures 2a and 2b).

The tree decomposition D mimics the town decomposition tree: for each town T of diameter greater than $\varepsilon\Delta$, there is a bag b_T . This bag is connected in D to all of the bags of child towns of T and contains all of the vertices of the net assigned to T and of the nets assigned to T 's ancestors in the town decomposition. Formally, if A_T denotes the set of all towns that contain T , $b_T = \bigcup_{T' \in A_T} \hat{X}_{T'}$. Note that if T' is the parent of T in the town decomposition, $b_T = \hat{X}_T \cup b_{T'}$. Now for each maximal town T of diameter at most $\varepsilon\Delta$ with parent town T' , the tree decomposition contains a bag b_T^0 connected to a bag b_T^u for each vertex $u \in T$. We define $b_T^0 = \{v_T\} \cup b_{T'}$ and $b_T^u = \{u\} \cup b_T^0$.

Following Feldmann et al. [19], the above construction can be shown to be polynomial-time constructible. The following three lemmas therefore prove Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. D is a valid tree decomposition of H .

Proof. For D to be a valid tree decomposition of H , it has to satisfy the three criteria listed in the preliminaries.

As every vertex v is in some maximal town T of diameter at most $\varepsilon\Delta$ (because every vertex form a singleton town at level 0), there is a leaf b_T^v of D that contains v . Moreover, this leaf contains all of the vertices adjacent to v in H : if an edge connects u and v , then either u or v is the center of the star for T , or u is in the net of some town that contains v . In both cases the construction of D ensure that u is in b_T^v . Finally, let T be a town such that b_T is the *highest* bag in the tree decomposition that contains v . As the towns at a given height of the town decomposition form a partition of the vertices, this town is unique. Since the town decomposition has a laminar structure, v cannot appear in a bag that is not a descendant of b_T . Furthermore, by definition of the bags, v appears in all descendants of b_T , proving the third property. \square

Lemma 8. H has a treewidth $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^\theta \log_{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$, where θ is a bound on the doubling dimension of the sets X_T .

Proof. Since the size of the bags is clearly bounded by the depth times the maximal cardinality of \hat{X}_T , it is enough to prove that, for each town T , \hat{X}_T is bounded by $(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^\theta$, and that the tree decomposition has a depth $O(\log_{\frac{c}{4}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.

By Lemma 4, the doubling dimension of X_T is bounded by θ . \hat{X}_T is a subset of X_T , so its doubling dimension is bounded by 2θ (see Gupta et al. [24]). Furthermore, the aspect ratio of \hat{X}_T is $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$: the longest distance between members of \hat{X}_T is bounded by the diameter d_T of the town, and the smallest distance is at least εd_T by definition of a net. The cardinality of a set with doubling dimension x and aspect ratio γ is bounded by $2^{x \lceil \log_2 \gamma \rceil}$ (see [25] for a proof), therefore $|\hat{X}_T|$ is bounded by $(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^\theta$.

We prove now that the tree decomposition has a depth $O(\log_{\frac{c}{4}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Let T be a town of diameter $d_T > \varepsilon \Delta$ and let r_i be the scale of that town. By Lemma 2, $d_T \leq r_i$, and since $r_i = (\frac{c}{4})^i$ and $d_T > \varepsilon \Delta$, we can conclude that $i > \log_{\frac{c}{4}} \varepsilon \Delta$. As the diameter of the graph is Δ , the biggest town has a diameter at most Δ . It follows that $r_i \leq \Delta$ and therefore $i \leq \log_{\frac{c}{4}} \Delta$. The depth of b_T in the tree decomposition is therefore bounded by $\log_{\frac{c}{4}} \frac{\Delta}{\varepsilon \Delta} = \log_{\frac{c}{4}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Furthermore, the tree decomposition of a town of diameter at most $\varepsilon \Delta$ has depth 2. The overall depth is therefore $O(\log_{\frac{c}{4}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 9. *For all vertices u and v , $d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(u,v) \leq d_G(u,v) + 4\varepsilon \Delta$*

Proof. Let u and v be vertices in V , and let T be the town that contains both u and v such that u and v are in different child towns of T .

If T has diameter $d_T \leq \varepsilon \Delta$, then let T' be the maximal town of diameter at most $\varepsilon \Delta$ that is an ancestor of T (possibly T itself). By construction, T' was embedded into a star centered at some vertex $v_{T'} \in T'$, so $d_H(u,v) \leq d_H(u,v_{T'}) + d_H(v_{T'},v) \leq d_G(u,v_{T'}) + d_G(v_{T'},v) \leq 2\varepsilon \Delta$.

Otherwise if T has diameter $d_T > \varepsilon \Delta$, then by Lemma 4, there is some $h \in X_T$ such that $d_G(P[u,v],h) \leq \varepsilon d(u,v)$. Since \hat{X}_T is an εd_T cover of X_T , there is some $\hat{h} \in \hat{X}_T$ such that $d(h,\hat{h}) \leq \varepsilon d_T$. The host graph H includes edges (u,\hat{h}) and (\hat{h},v) , so

$d_H(u,v) \leq d_H(u,\hat{h}) + d_H(\hat{h},v) \leq d_G(u,h) + d_G(h,v) + 2\varepsilon d(u,v) + 2\varepsilon d_T \leq d_G(u,v) + 4\varepsilon \Delta$ (see Figure 2c). Finally, since edge lengths in H are given by distances in G , $d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(u,v)$ for all $u,v \in V$. \square

The next sections present some applications of the above embedding.

4 Main Embedding

In this section, we prove Theorem 3, restated here for convenience.

Theorem 3. *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that, for every $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ graph G of highway dimension η , and vertex s , there exists a graph H and an embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G into H such that*

- H has treewidth at most $f(\hat{\varepsilon}, \eta)$, and
- for all vertices u and v ,

$$d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq d_G(u,v) + \hat{\varepsilon}(d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v))$$

4.1 Embedding Construction

Given the parameter $\hat{\varepsilon}$, our goal for the embedding is that

$$d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq d_G(u,v) + \hat{\varepsilon}(d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v))$$

With this goal in mind, we define $\epsilon = \min\{1/4, \hat{\varepsilon}/c\}$ for an appropriate constant c , and we prove that

$$d_G(u,v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq d_G(u,v) + O(\epsilon)(d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v))$$

The constant c is chosen to compensate for the big-O in the above inequality.

Our construction relies on the assumption that the depot s does not appear in any non-trivial town. By Lemma 5 (using $S = \{s\}$), this assumption is *safe*, since the input graph can be modified to satisfy this assumption without (asymptotically) changing the highway dimension, diameter, or size of the graph. Furthermore since the modification preserves original distances, and all newly added vertices can be assumed to have no client demand, the modification does not affect the solution.

The root town in the composition, denoted T_0 , is the town that contains the entire graph. We say that a town T that is a child of the root town is a *top-level town*, which means that the only town that properly contains T is T_0 .

The assumption that the depot, s , does not appear in any non-trivial town implies that the top-level town that contains s is the trivial singleton town. This assumption is helpful to bound the distance between a top-level town T and the depot s : as $s \notin T$, Lemma 2 gives the bound $d(T, s) \geq \text{diam}(T)$. This bound turns out to be very helpful in the construction of the host graph.

We use Lemma 6 to construct an embedding for each top-level town. It remains to connect these embeddings : we cannot approximate X_{T_0} with a net as we did in Lemma 6, because the diameter of G may be arbitrarily large.

To cope with that issue, we define inductively the hub sets X_0^0, X_0^1, \dots such that X_0^k is a net of $X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^k)$. Let X_0^0 be an ε -net of $X_{T_0} \cap B_s(1)$ that contains the depot, s , and for $k \geq 0$ let X_0^{k+1} be an $\varepsilon 2^{k+1}$ -net of the set $(X_{T_0} \cap (B_s(2^{k+1}) - B_s(2^k))) \cup X_0^k$ that contains the depot. This construction ensures that $X_0^{k+1} \cap B_s(2^k) \subseteq X_0^k$, which will be helpful in Section 4.3 to find a tree decomposition of the host graph. Note that we can assume $s \in X_{T_0}$, since adding it increases the doubling dimension by at most one and thus does not change the result of Lemma 4.

For a set of vertices $\mathcal{X} \subseteq V$, we define $l(\mathcal{X}) = \lceil \log_2(\max_{v \in \mathcal{X}} d(s, v)) \rceil$ (See Figure 3a).

For every child town T of T_0 , the host graph connects every vertex v of T to every hub h in $X_0^{l(T)}, \dots, X_0^{l(T) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)}$ with an edge of length $d_G(v, h)$ (See Figure 3b).

4.2 Proof of Error Bound

In Lemma 11 we prove a bound on the error incurred by the embedding. Our proof makes use of the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *For all k , X_0^k is an $\varepsilon 2^{k+1}$ -covering of $X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^k)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction. By construction, X_0^0 is an ε -net (and thus also an $\varepsilon 2^1$ -covering) of $X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^0)$. Assume that X_0^{k-1} is an $\varepsilon 2^k$ -covering of $X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^{k-1})$, and let $x \in X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^k)$.

X_0^k is an $\varepsilon 2^k$ -net of the set $(X_{T_0} \cap (B_s(2^k) - B_s(2^{k-1}))) \cup X_0^{k-1}$, so if $x \in B_s(2^k) - B_s(2^{k-1})$ then there is a $y \in X_0^k$ such that $d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon 2^k < \varepsilon 2^{k+1}$. Otherwise $x \in B_s(2^{k-1})$. By assumption, there is an $\hat{x} \in X_0^{k-1}$ such that $d(x, \hat{x}) \leq \varepsilon 2^k$, and by construction, there is a $y \in X_0^k$ such that $d(y, \hat{x}) \leq \varepsilon 2^k$. Therefore $d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon 2^k + \varepsilon 2^k = \varepsilon 2^{k+1}$. \square

Lemma 11. *For all vertices u and v , $d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(u, v) \leq d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v))$*


Proof. Consider two vertices u and v . Let T_u and T_v denote the top-level towns that contain u and v , respectively. There are two cases to consider.

If $T_u = T_v$, Lemma 2 gives $d_G(u, v) \leq \text{diam}(T_u) \leq d_G(T_u, V \setminus T_u)$, and therefore $\text{diam}(T_u) \leq \min\{d_G(s, u), d_G(s, v)\}$. Because $T_u = T_v$ is a top-level town, its embedding is given by Lemma 6, which directly gives the desired bound.

Otherwise $T_u \neq T_v$. Without loss of generality, assume that $d_G(u, s) \geq d_G(v, s)$. We show that there exists some X_0^k connected to u with a vertex $\hat{h} \in X_0^k$ close to $P[u, v]$.

By definition of the approximate core hubs, there exists $h \in X_{T_0}$ such that $d(h, P[u, v]) \leq \varepsilon d(u, v)$. Moreover, $h \in B_s(2^{l(T_u)+2})$:

Figure 3: (a) Towns T_1 and T_2 are top-level towns, with $l(T_1) = i$ and $l(T_2) = i+1$. (b) The embedding of each top-level town (shown as circles) are connected to a band of $\log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + 1$ hub sets (shown as squares). Edges are striped to convey that they connect *all* vertices of the given hub-set endpoint to *all* vertices of the town-embedding endpoint. (c) The vertices of each bag \mathcal{B} (shown as circles) are added to each bag of each descendent top-level-town tree decomposition (shown as triangles).



$$\begin{aligned}
d(s, h) &\leq d(s, u) + d(u, h) \\
&\leq d(s, u) + (1 + \varepsilon)d(u, v) \\
&\leq d(s, u) + (1 + \varepsilon)(d(s, u) + d(s, v)) \quad \text{by the triangle inequality} \\
&\leq d(s, u) + (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 2d(s, u) \quad \text{since } d(u, s) \geq d(v, s) \\
&\leq (3 + 2\varepsilon)2^{l(T_u)} \\
&\leq 2^{l(T_u) + 2}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $h \in X_{T_0} \cap B_s(2^{l(T_u) + 2})$, then by Lemma 10, there is an $\hat{h} \in X_0^{l(T_u) + 2}$ such that $d(\hat{h}, h) \leq \varepsilon 2^{l(T_u) + 3}$. Since $\log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \geq 2$, u is connected to \hat{h} in the host graph.

Depending on v , there remain two cases: either v is connected to \hat{h} (see Figure 4a) or not (Figure 4b). First, if v is connected to \hat{h} in the host graph, $d_H(v, \hat{h}) = d_G(v, \hat{h})$ (and the same holds for u). The triangle inequality gives therefore,

$$d_H(u, v) \leq d_G(u, \hat{h}) + d_G(v, \hat{h}) \leq \underbrace{d_G(u, h) + d_G(v, h)}_{\leq (1 + 2\varepsilon)d_G(u, v) \text{ by definition of } h} + \underbrace{2d_G(\hat{h}, h)}_{\leq 2\varepsilon 2^{l(T_u) + 3} = O(\varepsilon)d(s, u)}$$

Since $d_G(u, v) \leq d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v)$, we can conclude that,

$$d_H(u, v) \leq d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v))$$

Otherwise, v is not connected to \hat{h} . That means that either $l(T_u) + 2 < l(T_v)$ or $l(T_u) + 2 > l(T_v) + \log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. We exclude the first case by noting that since the diameter of a town is less than its distance to the depot, $d_G(v, s) \leq d_G(u, s)$ implies that $l(T_v) \leq l(T_u) + 1$. The second case implies that $d_G(s, u) \geq O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})d_G(s, v)$. Since the host graph connects the source s to all the vertices, $d_H(u, v) \leq d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v) \leq d_G(u, v) + 2d_G(s, v) \leq d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)(d_G(s, u) + d_G(s, v))$. \square




Figure 4: The shortest path between u and v in G is indicated by the curved, directed lines. The path in the host graph is represented by the straight lines.

4.3 Tree Decomposition

We present here the construction of a tree decomposition D of the host graph with a bounded width.

For each $k > 0$ let $\mathcal{B}_k = \bigcup_{i=k-1}^{k+\log_2(1/\varepsilon)} X_0^i$. For a top-level town T , the tree decomposition D connects the decomposition D_T given by Lemma 6 to the bag $\mathcal{B}_l(T)$. Moreover, we add all vertices that appear in $\mathcal{B}_l(T)$ to all bags in the tree D_T . Finally, for every k we connect \mathcal{B}_k to both \mathcal{B}_{k-1} and \mathcal{B}_{k+1} in D . (See Figure 3b.)

Lemma 12. D is a valid tree decomposition of the host graph H .

Proof. For D to be a valid tree decomposition of H , it has to satisfy the three properties listed in Section 2.

First, because the top-level towns are a partition of the vertices, each vertex appears in some tree decomposition D_T . The union of all bags is therefore $V(H)$.

Next, let (u, v) be an edge of H . There are two cases to consider: if u and v are in the same top-level town, Lemma 6 ensures that u and v appear together in some bag. Otherwise, as the top-level towns are disjoint, one of u or v is a hub connected to the other. Without loss of generality assume that v is a hub of X_0^k for some $k \in \{l(T_u), \dots, l(T_u) + \log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}$. In this case, $v \in \mathcal{B}_l(T_u)$, so v is added to all the bags of D_{T_u} , and in particular is in some bag that contains u .

Finally, let v be a vertex that appears in two different bags. If the two bags are in the tree decomposition of the same top-level town T , Lemma 6 ensures that the bags are connected in D_T and thus also in D . Otherwise, as the top-level towns are disjoint, v must be a hub. Consider all nets X_0^k containing v . Any bag \mathcal{B}_ℓ containing such a net also contains v . Let $\mathcal{I} = \{k | v \in X_0^k\}$. We prove that \mathcal{I} is an interval, and therefore that the bags \mathcal{B}_ℓ are connected. Let $i = \min(\mathcal{I})$ and $j = \max(\mathcal{I})$. As $v \in X_0^i$, it must be that $v \in B_s(2^i) \subseteq B_s(2^{i+1}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq B_s(2^j)$. Repeatedly applying the property $X_0^k \cap B_s(2^{k-1}) \subseteq X_0^{k-1}$ proves that for all $k \in \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$, $v \in X_0^k$. Therefore \mathcal{I} is an interval, and the bags \mathcal{B}_ℓ such that $v \in \mathcal{B}_\ell$ are connected. Finally, we show that interval \mathcal{I} includes $\mathcal{B}_l(T_v)$. Since v is a hub, $v \in X_0^{l(\{v\})}$. By Lemma 2, $d(v, s) > \text{diam}(T_v)$, so $l(T_v) - 1 \leq l(\{v\}) \leq l(T_v)$, and therefore $v \in \mathcal{B}_l(T_v)$. Since the vertices of $\mathcal{B}_l(T_v)$ are added to every bag in D_{T_v} , the bags containing v form a connected subtree of D . \square

Lemma 13. For all k , $|X_0^k| \leq (\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^\theta$.

Proof. Since X_0^k is a subset of X_{T_0} , it has doubling dimension 2θ (see Lemma 4). Since X_0^k is a $\varepsilon 2^k$ -net, the smallest distance between two hubs in X_0^k is at least $\varepsilon 2^k$. Moreover, since $X_0^k \subseteq B_s(2^k)$, the longest distance between two hubs is at most $2 \cdot 2^k$, therefore, X_0^k has an aspect ratio of at most $\frac{2}{\varepsilon}$. The bound used in Lemma 8 on the cardinality of a set using its aspect ratio and its doubling dimension concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 14. *The tree decomposition D has bounded width.*

Proof. Bag \mathcal{B}_i is the union of $\log_2 \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + 2$ sets X_0^k . Lemma 13 gives $|X_0^k| \leq (\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^\theta$, therefore $|\mathcal{B}_i| \leq (\log_2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + 2)(\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^\theta$. Moreover, by Lemma 8, each bag of the D_T decompositions has a cardinality bounded by $O((\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^\theta \log_{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Therefore, since each bag of the decomposition D is either a bag \mathcal{B}_i for some i or is formed by adding a single bag \mathcal{B}_i to some bag of a D_T decomposition, its size is bounded. Therefore D has a bounded width. \square

5 Capacitated Vehicle Routing

5.1 PTAS for Bounded Highway Dimension

The CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING problem for some graph G , demand function $\rho: V \rightarrow [1, 2, \dots, Q]$, depot vertex $s \in V$ and capacity $Q > 0$ seeks a set of tours of minimal total length that collectively visit all clients (vertices with positive client demand), such that each tour contains s and covers at most Q units of client demand. In this section, we apply Theorem 3 to CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING, for graphs of bounded highway dimension η and fixed capacity Q .

The algorithm works as follows. The input graph G is embedded into a host graph H of bounded treewidth using the embedding given in Theorem 3. The algorithm then optimally solves the CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING problem with capacity Q for H , using the dynamic programming algorithm given in Section 6. The solution for H is then *lifted* to a solution in G : for each tour in the solution for H , a tour in G that visits the same clients in the same order is added to the solution for G .

We show that the embedding given in Theorem 3 is such that an optimal solution in the host graph H gives a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ solution in G . Furthermore, the embedding ensures that H has small treewidth, allowing CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING to be solved exactly in polynomial time using dynamic programming. Putting these together gives Theorem 1, restated here for convenience.

Theorem 1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and $Q > 0$, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given an instance of BOUNDED-CAPACITY VEHICLE ROUTING in which the capacity is Q and the graph has highway dimension η , finds a solution whose cost is at most $1 + \varepsilon$ times optimum.*

Given an embedding with the properties described in Theorem 3, all that remains in proving Theorem 1 is showing how to solve CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING optimally on the host graph H and proving that such an optimal solution has a corresponding *near-optimal* solution in G . We do so in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 15. *Given a graph with bounded treewidth ω and a capacity $Q > 0$, CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING can be solved optimally in $n^{O(\omega Q)}$ time.*

Proof. See Section 6 \square

Lemma 16. *For an embedding with the properties given by Theorem 3, the cost of an optimal solution in the host graph H is within a $(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ -factor of the cost of the optimal solution in the guest graph G .*

Proof. Let OPT_H be the optimal solution in the host graph H and OPT_G be the optimal solution in G . A solution is described by the order in which the clients and the depot are visited: $(u,v) \in S$ indicates that the solution S visits the client v immediately after visiting u . We want to prove that $\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_H) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$.

First, since $d_G \leq d_H$, $\text{cost}_G \leq \text{cost}_H$. Second, the solution OPT_G is also a solution in the host graph H , since the vertices of G and H are the same. So, by definition of OPT_H , $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_H) \leq \text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G)$. It is therefore sufficient to prove that $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$.

By definition of cost , $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) = \sum_{(u,v) \in \text{OPT}_G} d_H(u,v)$. Applying Theorem 3 gives

$$\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq \sum_{(u,v) \in \text{OPT}_G} d_G(u,v) + O(\varepsilon)(d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v))$$

The right side of the inequality can be rewritten as

$$\underbrace{\sum_{(u,v) \in \text{OPT}_G} d_G(u,v)}_{= \text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)} + \underbrace{O(\varepsilon) \sum_{(u,v) \in \text{OPT}_G} d_G(s,u) + d_G(s,v)}_{= O(\varepsilon) \sum_{v \in Z} 2d_G(s,v) \leq O(\varepsilon)Q\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)} \quad (*)$$

To get the inequalities (*), it is enough to remark that OPT_G visits every client exactly once and then to apply Lemma 1. As Q is constant, the whole inequality becomes

$$\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq \text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G) + O(\varepsilon)\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G) = (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$$

□

5.2 Generalization to Routing with Penalties

The CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING WITH PENALTIES is a natural generalization of CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING in which a penalty is specified for each client, and the solution can omit some clients (and pay their penalties). The embedding proposed previously can be used to solve it. First, the dynamic program for graphs of bounded treewidth can be adapted to solve this problem optimally in such graphs. The only change to make is that instead of visiting a client, the algorithm can chose to pay the penalty. It remains to prove that an optimal solution in the host graph is close to an optimal solution in the guest graph.

Lemma 17. *The optimal solution to CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING WITH PENALTIES in the host graph has a cost at most $(1+\varepsilon)\text{cost}(\text{OPT}_G)$*

Proof. The clients can be divided into two sets U and W : the optimal solution in G visits every vertex in U and pays the penalty for the ones in W . Applying Lemma 1 to the set U , gives the following:

$$\text{cost}(\text{OPT}_G) \geq \frac{2}{Q} \sum_{v \in U} d(v,s) + \sum_{v \in W} p(v)$$

With this lower bound, the proof of Lemma 16 can be adapted to handle penalties, giving $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$. The conclusion is similar to the one of Lemma 16: $\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_H) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$. □

6 Dynamic Program for Capacitated Vehicle Routing

In this section, we present a dynamic program running in $n^{O(\omega Q)}$ to solve CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING for capacity Q on graphs with treewidth ω . Given a tree decomposition, D , choose an arbitrary bag to be the root, and for each bag b of the decomposition let *cluster* C_b be the union of the bags descending from b in the tree decomposition, minus the elements of b itself. The bag b forms a boundary between cluster C_b and $V \setminus C_b$.

A configuration in the dynamic program describes how a solution interacts with a cluster: for each vertex v in the boundary b of the cluster, and for each possible capacity $q \leq Q$, the configuration

specifies $I_{v,q}$ and $O_{v,q}$ which are respectively the number of tours that enter and exit C_b by vertex v and that have visited exactly q clients at the moment they reach v . We refer to this as the *flow* in and out of C_b at v . These values are sufficient to recover the intersection of the solution with the cluster: connecting each entering tour with an exiting one, at minimal cost, gives the optimal solution.

To simplify the dynamic program, we first convert D into a *nice* tree decomposition with $O(\omega n)$ bags. This can be done in polynomial time, while preserving the width [15]. In a nice tree decomposition, each leaf bag contains a single vertex and each non-leaf bag of the decomposition is one of three types:

- An *introduce* bag b has one child b' , such that $b = b' \cup \{v\}$ for some vertex $v \notin b'$. The vertex v is introduced at b .
- A *forget* bag b has one child b' , such that $b = b' \setminus \{v\}$ for some vertex $v \in b'$. The vertex v is forgotten at b .
- A *join* bag b has two children b_1 and b_2 such that $b = b_1 = b_2$.

Moreover, as observed in [15], the third property of a tree decomposition ensures that each vertex can be forgotten only once.

Furthermore, we assume the forget bag for the depot occurs at the root of the decomposition. If not, s can be added to every bag in the tree, and the leaves extended. This results in a nice tree decomposition with at most twice as many bags while adding at most one to the width.

A tour can be uncrossed to avoid crossing the same vertex in the same direction twice. As there are at most n different tours, $I_{v,q} \leq n$ and $O_{v,q} \leq n$, so there are $n^{O(\omega Q)}$ possible configurations per bag. Since there are $O(\omega n)$ bags in the nice tree decomposition, there are a total of $n^{O(\omega Q)}$ different configurations.

The algorithm runs bottom-up: given a configuration for each child node, it finds all possible *compatible* configurations for the parent node. Each different type of bag of the nice tree decomposition requires a particular treatment.

For a leaf bag, b , containing vertex u , C_b is empty, so trivially there are no tours entering or exiting C_b . For configurations with $I_{u,q} = O_{u,q} = 0$ for all q , the algorithm stores the cost zero.

For a forget bag, the parent bag b is equal to its child bag b' minus some vertex u . For each child bag configuration, the algorithm considers all ways to form a compatible parent bag configuration by rerouting u 's flow and, if u is a client, covering its demand, $\rho(u)$. For each resulting parent bag configuration, the dynamic program stores the cost only if it is less than the current value stored for that configuration. After considering all child bag configurations and ways of forming a parent bag configuration, the values stored in the table are guaranteed to be optimal. Consider some configuration for the child bag. First, if u is a client, one tour is selected to visit it. There are three cases. If the tour crosses into $C_{b'}$ after visiting u , the algorithm chooses a capacity $q \geq \rho(u)$ and makes the following changes to the flow at u :

$$I_{u,q} \rightarrow I_{u,q} - 1, \quad I_{u,q-\rho(u)} \rightarrow I_{u,q-\rho(u)} + 1$$

There are at most Q such choices.

If the tour crosses out of $C_{b'}$ after visiting u , the algorithm chooses a capacity $q \leq Q - \rho(u)$ and makes the following changes to the flow at u :

$$O_{u,q} \rightarrow O_{u,q} - 1, \quad O_{u,q+\rho(u)} \rightarrow O_{u,q+\rho(u)} + 1$$

There are at most Q such choices.

Otherwise, the tour segment that visits u does not cross into $C_{b'}$. The algorithm chooses $v_1, v_2 \in b$ and $q \leq Q - \rho(u)$, makes the following changes to the flow at v_1 and v_2 :

$$I_{v_1,q} \rightarrow I_{v_1,q} + 1, \quad O_{v_2,q+\rho(u)} \rightarrow O_{v_2,q+\rho(u)} + 1,$$

and adds $d(v_1, u) + d(u, v_2)$ to the intermediate configuration cost. There are $\omega^2 Q$ such choices. The algorithm then reroutes all flow through u to some vertex in the parent bag, b . The algorithm chooses, for each vertex v of b and each capacity, the number of the tours that enter (resp. exit) $C_{b'}$ through u directly from (resp. to) v . Each such tour adds a cost of $d(u, v)$ to the intermediate configuration cost. There are $O(n^{2\omega Q})$ such choices. Thus, for each child configuration there are $O(\omega^2 Q n^{2\omega Q})$ choices, giving an $n^{O(\omega Q)}$ overall runtime for each forget bag.

For an introduce bag, the parent bag is equal to its child bag plus some vertex u . Since the child bag forms a boundary between the inside and outside of the cluster, no tour can cross directly into the cluster via u , as it must first cross some vertex of the child bag. Therefore the only compatible parent configurations are those that have no tours crossing at u . So for every parent configuration, if $I_{u,q} = O_{u,q} = 0$ for all q , the algorithm stores the cost of the corresponding child configuration, namely the configuration that results by removing u . Otherwise the cost is ∞ .

For a join bag, the parent bag has two child bags identical to itself. Lemma 18 presents an oracle that tells, in constant time, the minimal cost needed to form parent configuration (I^0, O^0) given child configurations (I^1, O^1) and (I^2, O^2) , with an infinite cost if the configurations are not compatible. The algorithm tries all combinations of configurations: the complexity of this step is $n^{O(\omega Q)}$.

Since each vertex will appear exactly once in a forget bag, each client will be visited exactly once. The overall complexity is $n^{O(\omega Q)}$, as claimed. The algorithm considers all possible solutions and outputs the minimal one, so the resulting cost is optimal.

Lemma 18. *For each join bag b , it is possible to compute, in $O(n^{6\omega Q})$ time, a table \mathcal{T}_b such that $\mathcal{T}_b[(I^0, O^0), (I^1, O^1), (I^2, O^2)]$ is the minimal cost to connect child configurations (I^1, O^1) and (I^2, O^2) to form parent configuration (I^0, O^0) of b .*

Proof. We design a dynamic program to compute this table. The base cases are when $I^0 = I^1 + I^2$. If $O^0 = O^1 + O^2$ the cost is 0, since the configurations are therefore compatible. Otherwise the cost is ∞ , because it is not possible to balance incoming and outgoing flow.

For the recursion step, assume $I^0 \neq I^1 + I^2$. Pick the first pair (u, q) such that $I_{u,q}^1 + I_{u,q}^2 - I_{u,q}^0 = x \neq 0$. If $x < 0$, the incoming flow at u with capacity q is bigger in b than in its child bags. Since this is not possible, the cost is ∞ . Otherwise, some flow entering Cluster 1 comes from Cluster 2 (or vice versa). Suppose this flow exits Cluster 2 at vertex v : it means that

$$\mathcal{T}_b[(I^0, O^0), (I^1, O^1), (I^2, O^2)] = \mathcal{T}_b[(I^0, O^0), (\hat{I}^1, \hat{O}^1), (I^2, \hat{O}^2)] + d(u, v)$$

where $\hat{I}^1 = \{I^1, I_{u,q}^1 - 1\}$ and $\hat{O}^2 = \{O^2, O_{v,q}^2 - 1\}$. By this equation, the algorithm connects one segment exiting Cluster 2 at v with capacity q to a segment entering Cluster 1 at u . The value of $\mathcal{T}_b[(I^0, O^0), (I^1, O^1), (I^2, O^2)]$ can therefore be computed in ω steps, by applying the above equality for each vertex v of the boundary and storing the minimum value. This computation requires $O(\omega Q)$ operations to find the pair (u, q) , and then $O(\omega)$ operations to compute the value of the table. The recursion step therefore requires $O(\omega Q)$ time.

As there are $O(n^{6\omega Q})$ states for this DP, the overall complexity is therefore $O(\omega Q n^{6\omega Q}) = O(n^{6\omega Q})$, concluding the proof. \square

7 Embedding for Multiple Depots

We present in this section how to extend Theorem 3 and apply it to several problems.

7.1 Theorem

Theorem 4 *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ such that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, graph G of highway dimension η and set S of vertices of G , there exists a graph H and an embedding $\phi(\cdot)$ of G into H such that*

- H has treewidth $f(\eta, |S|, \varepsilon)$, and
- for all vertices u and v ,

$$d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + \varepsilon \min(d_G(S, u), d_G(S, v))$$

We slightly modify the embedding of Theorem 3 in that purpose. We assume that the vertices of S do not appear in non-trivial towns. This assumption is *safe* because, using S , we can apply the

modification of Lemma 5 to satisfy this assumption without asymptotically changing the diameter or size of the graph. Note that the modification preserves all distances from the original input graph but increases the highway dimension to $\eta + |S|$.

The algorithm computes the town decomposition with respect to the shortest-path covers, and embeds the top-level towns using Lemma 6. By analogy with Section 4, we define the set X_0^i to be a $\varepsilon 2^i$ -net of $\cup_{s \in S} B_s(2^i)$ (and we ensure moreover that the X_0^i are nested). We also modify the definition of $l(\mathcal{X})$: for a set \mathcal{X} , $l(\mathcal{X}) = \lceil \log_2(\max_{v \in \mathcal{X}} d(S, v)) \rceil$. Following Section 4, the host graph connects every vertex v of a town T to every hub h in $X_0^{l(T)}, \dots, X_0^{l(T) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)}$ with an edge of length $d_G(v, h)$.

We now prove that this embedding has the properties of Theorem 4. We use H to denote the host graph produced by the embedding. First, we prove the first point: the treewidth is bounded.

Proof. Let θ_S be the doubling dimension of the union of the approximate core hubs with S . The shortest-path covers are locally $(\eta + |S|) \log(\eta + |S|)$ -sparse [1], therefore Lemma 4 gives, $\theta_S = O\left(\log\left((\eta + |S|)^2 \log(\eta + |S|) \log(1/\varepsilon) + |S|\right)\right)$, where the final $|S|$ term comes from the extra balls required to cover S . The proof of Lemma 13 directly gives that $|X_0^i| \leq |S| \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\theta_S}$. Finally, following the proof of Lemma 14, the host graph has a treewidth bounded by a function of η , $|S|$ and ε . \square

We now prove the distortion bound.

Proof. Let u and v be two points of the metric space and h be the approximate core hub such that $d_G(u, h) + d_G(v, h) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v)$. Let s_u, s_v and s_h denote the points of S closest to u, v and h . The proof is divided into three parts, according to the distances between $l(h)$, $l(T_u)$ and $l(T_v)$.




Figure 5: The shortest path between u and v is approximated in the host graph by the dashed line. In case (a), the distance from u and v to their centers is large compared to the distance between h and s_h ; in case (b), only the distance from v to s_v is large, and in case (c) the distance from h to s_h is larger than the other two.

We first prove an inequality that is used several times:

$$d_G(h, s_h) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + \min(d_G(u, s_u), d_G(v, s_v)) \quad (1)$$

The definition of s_h leads indeed to $d_G(h, s_h) \leq d_G(h, s_u)$ and using the triangle inequality we obtain $d_G(h, s_h) \leq d_G(h, u) + d_G(u, s_u)$. By definition, h is near the shortest path between u and v : this gives the desired bound for u (the same holds for v).

Consider three cases, illustrated in Figure 5. Suppose that both $l(h) \leq l(T_u) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ and $l(h) \leq l(T_v) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ (see Figure 5a). Let \hat{h} be the point in $X_0^{l(h)}$ closest to h : by definition of a net, $d_G(h, \hat{h}) \leq$

$\varepsilon 2^{l(h)} \leq 2\varepsilon d_G(h, s_h)$; by construction of the embedding, \hat{h} is adjacent to u and v . In this case, we have

$$d_H(u, v) \leq d_H(u, \hat{h}) + d_H(\hat{h}, v) \leq d_G(u, \hat{h}) + d_G(\hat{h}, v) \leq d_G(u, h) + d_G(v, h) + 2d_G(h, \hat{h})$$

We infer from the definition of h and \hat{h} that $d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + 4\varepsilon d_H(h, s_h)$ and using Equation 1

$$d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)\min(d_G(u, S), d_G(v, S))$$

Then suppose that $l(h) > l(T_u) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ but $l(h) \leq l(T_v) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ (see Figure 5b). It means that u is not adjacent to \hat{h} but v is. It means in particular that $d_G(s_h, h) > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}d_G(s_u, u)$. The shortest-path between u and v is therefore approximated in the host graph by the path u, s_u, \hat{h}, v . The edges along this path have the length as in G , therefore $d_H(u, v) \leq d_H(u, s_u) + d_H(s_u, \hat{h}) + d_H(\hat{h}, v) \leq d_G(u, s_u) + d_G(s_u, \hat{h}) + d_G(\hat{h}, v)$. We now apply the triangle inequality in G : $d_G(s_u, \hat{h}) \leq d_G(s_u, u) + d_G(u, \hat{h})$. Using the former inequality and previously-derived bounds gives

$$d_H(u, v) \leq 2d_G(u, s_u) + d_G(u, \hat{h}) + d_G(\hat{h}, v) \leq 2\varepsilon d_G(h, s_h) + d_G(u, h) + d_G(h, v) + 2d_G(\hat{h}, h)$$

Recall that $d_G(h, \hat{h}) \leq 2\varepsilon d_G(h, s_h)$ and $d_G(u, h) + d_G(h, v) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)d_G(u, v)$. Using this and Equation 1 finally gives

$$d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)d_G(u, v) + 4\varepsilon d_H(h, s_h) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)\min(d_G(u, S), d_G(v, S))$$

Finally, suppose that $l(h) > l(T_u) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ and $l(h) > l(T_v) + \log_2(1/\varepsilon)$ (see Figure 5c). It means in particular that neither u nor v is adjacent to \hat{h} . In this case, the shortest path between u and v is approximated in the host graph by the path u, s_u, \hat{h}, s_v, v : using the same arguments as in the former case, we derive that $d_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, v) + O(\varepsilon)\min(d_G(u, S), d_G(v, S))$. \square

7.2 Applications

MULTIPLE-DEPOT CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING

The first application we consider is for MULTIPLE-DEPOT CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING with a constant number of depots. Let S denote the set of depots, and recall that Z is the set of clients. We assume that any vertices added in the modification in Lemma 5 do not have any client demand.

Generalizing the algorithm from Section 5 relies on generalizing the lower bound given in Lemma 1 to $\frac{1}{Q} \sum \{d(c, S) : c \in Z\}$, as proved in [13]. This lower bound allows for an error of $\varepsilon d(c, S)$ for each client c : the embedding of Theorem 4 can therefore be applied.

Theorem 5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$, k and any $Q > 0$, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given an instance of MULTIPLE-DEPOTS CAPACITATED VEHICLE ROUTING in which the capacity is Q , the number of depots is k and the graph has highway dimension at most η , finds a solution whose cost is at most $1 + \varepsilon$ times optimum.*

The proof that an optimal solution in the host graph gives an approximate solution on the original graph follows directly from Lemma 16, and the DP presented in Section 6 can be extended easily: for a constant number of depots and a constant highway dimension, the embedding gives a constant treewidth.

k -CENTER

Another application is to get a fixed-parameter approximation (FPA) for k -CENTER in a graph G with highway dimension η , i.e. an algorithm with running time $f(\eta, k)n^{O(1)}$.

The algorithm proceeds in two steps: first, computes a constant-factor approximation S (see [29] or [22] for a 2-approximation). Applying Theorem 4 to G with the set S gives a host graph. Finally, the algorithm runs a DP that gives a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the optimal solution in the host graph

(where any vertices added in the modification in Lemma 5 are not required to be covered). We prove that this solution is also a $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation of the optimal solution in the original graph.

Lemma 19. *A $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation of k -center in the host graph given by Theorem 4 is a $(1+O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation of k -center in the original graph.*

Proof. Let OPT_H denote the optimal solution in the graph H . For each vertex u , let c_u denote the closest center to u in OPT_G . We have the following:

$$\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) = \max_{u \in V(G)} d_H(u, c_u) \leq \max_{u \in V(G)} (1+O(\varepsilon))d_G(u, c_u) + O(\varepsilon)\min(d_G(u, S), d_G(c_u, S))$$

This inequality can be rewritten

$$\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon)) \max_{u \in V(G)} d_G(u, c_u) + O(\varepsilon) \max_{u \in V(G)} d_G(u, S)$$

Since the set S is a $O(1)$ -approximate solution in G , $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G) + O(\varepsilon)\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G) = (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$. By definition of OPT_H , $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_H) \leq \text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_G)$ and therefore $\text{cost}_H(\text{OPT}_H) \leq (1+O(\varepsilon))\text{cost}_G(\text{OPT}_G)$. That is, since the optimal solution in H is an approximate solution in G , an approximate solution in H is also an approximate solution in G . \square

The complexity of finding a constant-factor approximation and of constructing the embedding is a polynomial in n with fixed degree. The complexity of the DP given by Schild, Fox-Epstein and Klein [20] for a treewidth tw is $O(n(\log n)^{tw})$ which is $O(n^{O(1)}tw^{2tw})$ following Lemma 1 in Katsikarelis et al. [31]. As the treewidth only depends on the highway dimension η , k and ε , the FPA claims follows.

k -MEDIAN

The last application presented here is to get a FPA k -MEDIAN. The outline is the same as for k -CENTER: first compute a constant-factor approximation S (see [35]), then apply Theorem 4 using the set S and finally compute an approximate solution in the host graph. The dynamic program for k -center can be adapted to solve k -median with the same complexity (again, any vertices added in the modification in Lemma 5 do not contribute to the cost). The following lemma is straightforward:

Lemma 20. *A $(1+\varepsilon)$ -approximation of k -median in the host graph given by Theorem 4 is a $(1+O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation of k -median in the original graph.*

The proof is indeed the same as for Lemma 19, replacing the max by a sum.

Theorem 2 *There is a function $f(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and a constant c such that, for each of the problems k -CENTER and k -MEDIAN, for any $\eta > 0, k > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an $f(\eta, k, \varepsilon)n^c$ algorithm that, given an instance in which the graph has highway dimension at most η , finds a solution whose cost is at most $1+\varepsilon$ times optimum.*

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Andreas Feldmann and Vincent Cohen-Addad for helpful discussions and comments.

References

- [1] I. Abraham, D. Delling, A. Fiat, A. V. Goldberg, and R. F. Werneck. Vc-dimension and shortest path algorithms. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 690–699. Springer, 2011.
- [2] I. Abraham, D. Delling, A. Fiat, A. V. Goldberg, and R. F. Werneck. Highway dimension and provably efficient shortest path algorithms. *J. ACM*, 63(5):41:1–41:26, Dec. 2016.

- [3] I. Abraham, A. Fiat, A. V. Goldberg, and R. F. Werneck. Highway dimension, shortest paths, and provably efficient algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 782–793. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.
- [4] A. Adamaszek, A. Czumaj, and A. Lingas. PTAS for k -tour cover problem on the plane for moderately large values of k . *Algorithms and Computation*, pages 994–1003, 2009.
- [5] S. Arora, P. Raghavan, and S. Rao. Approximation schemes for Euclidean k -medians and related problems. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, Dallas, Texas, USA, May 23-26, 1998*, pages 106–113, 1998.
- [6] V. Arya, N. Garg, R. Khandekar, A. Meyerson, K. Munagala, and V. Pandit. Local search heuristics for k -median and facility location problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 33(3):544–562, 2004.
- [7] T. Asano, N. Katoh, and K. Kawashima. A new approximation algorithm for the capacitated vehicle routing problem on a tree. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 5(2):213–231, 2001.
- [8] T. Asano, N. Katoh, H. Tamaki, and T. Tokuyama. Covering points in the plane by k -tours: a polynomial approximation scheme for fixed k . *IBM Tokyo Research Laboratory Research Report RT0162*, 1996.
- [9] T. Asano, N. Katoh, H. Tamaki, and T. Tokuyama. Covering points in the plane by k -tours: towards a polynomial time approximation scheme for general k . In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 275–283. ACM, 1997.
- [10] M. Bădoiu, S. Har-Peled, and P. Indyk. Approximate clustering via core-sets. In *STOC*, pages 250–257, 2002.
- [11] H. Bast, S. Funke, and D. Matijević. Ultrafast shortest-path queries via transit nodes. In *The Shortest Path Problem*, pages 175–192, 2006.
- [12] H. Bast, S. Funke, D. Matijević, P. Sanders, and D. Schultes. In transit to constant time shortest-path queries in road networks. In *Proceedings of the Meeting on Algorithm Engineering & Experiments*, pages 46–59. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007.
- [13] A. Becker, K. Philip N., and D. Saulpic. A quasi-polynomial-time approximation scheme for vehicle routing on planar and bounded-genus graphs. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*. Springer, 2017. to appear.
- [14] V. Cohen-Addad, P. N. Klein, and C. Mathieu. Local search yields approximation schemes for k -means and k -median in Euclidean and minor-free metrics. In *57th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science FOCS*, pages 353–364, 2016.
- [15] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*, volume 3, chapter 7: Treewidth. Springer, 2015.
- [16] A. Das and C. Mathieu. A quasipolynomial time approximation scheme for euclidean capacitated vehicle routing. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):115–142, 2015.
- [17] T. Feder and D. Greene. Optimal algorithms for approximate clustering. In *Proceedings of the twentieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '88, pages 434–444, New York, NY, USA, 1988. ACM.
- [18] A. E. Feldmann. Fixed parameter approximations for k -center problems in low highway dimension graphs. In *Proceedings, Part II, of the 42nd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 588–600. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 2015.

- [19] A. E. Feldmann, W. S. Fung, J. Könemann, and I. Post. A $(1+\varepsilon)$ -embedding of low highway dimension graphs into bounded treewidth graphs. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 469–480. Springer, 2015.
- [20] E. Fox-Epstein, P. N. Klein, and A. Schild. Embedding planar graphs into low-treewidth graphs, with application to efficient approximation schemes for metric problems. Unpublished manuscript, 2017.
- [21] B. L. Golden and R. T. Wong. Capacitated arc routing problems. *Networks*, 11(3):305–315, 1981.
- [22] T. F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 38:293–306, 1985.
- [23] S. Guha and S. Khuller. Greedy strikes back: Improved facility location algorithms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 31(1):228–248, 1999.
- [24] A. Gupta, R. Krauthgamer, and J. R. Lee. Bounded geometries, fractals, and low-distortion embeddings. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2003. Proceedings. 44th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 534–543. IEEE, 2003.
- [25] A. Gupta, R. Krauthgamer, and J. R. Lee. Bounded geometries, fractals, and low-distortion embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 534–543. IEEE, 2003.
- [26] V. Guruswami and P. Indyk. Embeddings and non-approximability of geometric problems. In *SODA*, volume 3, pages 537–538, 2003.
- [27] M. Haimovich and A. Rinnóoy Kan. Bounds and heuristics for capacitated routing problems. *Mathematics of operations Research*, 10(4):527–542, 1985.
- [28] S. Hamaguchi and N. Katoh. A capacitated vehicle routing problem on a tree. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 399–407. Springer, 1998.
- [29] D. S. Hochbaum and D. B. Shmoys. A best possible heuristic for the k -center problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(2):180–184, 1985.
- [30] K. Jain and V. V. Vazirani. Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k -median problems using the primal-dual schema and lagrangian relaxation. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(2):274–296, 2001.
- [31] I. Katsikarelis, M. Lampis, and V. T. Paschos. Structural parameters, tight bounds, and approximation for (k,r) -center. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08868*, 2017.
- [32] M. Khachay and R. Dubinin. PTAS for the euclidean capacitated vehicle routing problem in \mathbb{R}^d . In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Discrete Optimization and Operations Research (DOOR 2016)*, pages 193–205. Springer, 2016.
- [33] S. Li and O. Svensson. Approximating k -median via pseudo-approximation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 45(2):530–547, 2016.
- [34] J. Plesník. On the computational complexity of centers located in a graph. *Aplikace matematiky*, 25(6):445–452, 1980.
- [35] D. B. Shmoys, É. Tardos, and K. Aardal. Approximation algorithms for facility location problems. In *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 265–274. ACM, 1997.

A Definitions of highway dimension

The definition of highway dimension we use is the one given by Feldmann et al. [19]. However, alternate definitions exist. We summarize here the differences between them that are discussed in Feldmann et al. The original definition comes from Abraham et al. [3], in 2010. Their work uses $c=4$, but interestingly they remark that “one could use constants bigger than 4”. Nonetheless, Feldmann et al. [19] shows that changing the constant is not innocuous: for any constant c , there is a graph with n vertices that has highway dimension 1 with respect to c and highway dimension $\Omega(n)$ with respect to any $c' > c$.

Another definition of highway dimension comes from a 2011 paper of Abraham et al. [1]. Their definition differs from Definition 1 in that they use $c=2$ and all shortest paths of length in $(r, 2r]$ that *intersect* the ball $B_v(2r)$ (not just the ones that stay inside the ball). This is a generalization of Definition 1 for $c=4$: a path of length at most $2r$ that intersects the ball $B_v(2r)$ is also entirely contained in the ball $B_v(4r)$. As is, the results of Feldmann et al. and, consequently, the ones presented in this paper cannot be generalized to this definition.

The last noteworthy definition of highway dimension was also introduced by Abraham et al. [2] in a journal paper in 2016 (we use h to denote this parameter, different from η). This definition is stricter than the one of 2010 (and therefore the one of our paper), Feldmann et al. show that if a metric has a highway dimension h according to the 2016 definition, it has a highway dimension $O(h^2)$ according to the 2010 definition.

B Proof Sketches of Section 2 Lemmas

We now give proof sketches for Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, restated here for convenience. See [19] for full proofs.

Lemma. 2. [Lemma 3.2 in [19]]

If T is a town at scale r , then

1. $\text{diam}(T) \leq r$ and
2. $d(T, V \setminus T) > r$

Proof. We give a sketch of the proof from [19]. For the first point (illustrated on Figure 6a), let u and v be two vertices of the same town. It means that there exists w such that $d(u, w) \leq r$ and $d(v, w) \leq r$ (by definition of a town). So $d(u, v) \leq 2r$. Suppose by contradiction that $d(u, v) > r$: it means that $d(u, v) \in (r, 2r] \subseteq (r, cr/2]$ (because $c > 4$). Therefore there exists a point of the shortest-path cover for scale r on the path between u and v : this point is at a distance at most r from u or v (because $d(u, v) \leq 2r$), and therefore $2r$ from w , which contradicts the construction of the town. Therefore $d(u, v) \leq r$, and $\text{diam}(T) \leq r$.

We proceed similarly for the second point, illustrated in Figure 6b. Let $u \in T, v \in V \setminus T$, and suppose by contradiction that $d(u, v) \leq r$. The definition of T gives a point w such that $d(u, w) \leq r$, $d(v, w) > r$ and $d(w, \text{SPC}(r)) > 2r$. Combining the inequalities gives that $r < d(v, w) \leq d(u, v) + d(u, w) < 2r < cr/2$. By definition of the shortest-path cover, there is a hub h on the shortest path between v and w , so $d(w, h) \leq d(w, v) \leq 2r$, which contradicts the choice of w . That concludes the proof. \square

Lemma. 3. [Lemma 3.3 in [19]]

For every town T in a town decomposition \mathcal{T} ,

1. T has either 0 children or at least 2 children, and
2. if T is a town at level i and has child town T' at level j , then $j < i$.

Proof. We sketch the proof from [19]. The first property comes from the facts that every singleton is a town at level 0 and that if T' is a child town of T , then $T \setminus T' \neq \emptyset$. The second property is a consequence of the first one combined with the isolation of the child town T' . \square




Figure 6: The shortest path cover is represented with black dots, the other points are grey dots. The dashed circles are towns.

C Proof of Lemma 5

In Section 2 we emphasize that the shortest-path covers are required to be inclusion-wise minimal, and that we cannot simply add the depot to the shortest-path cover at every scale. In fact, doing so actually *is* safe. This is not immediately obvious, as this modification can greatly alter the town decomposition. However, the only risk in adding a hub to the shortest-path cover is exceeding the bound on the doubling dimension of X_T for some town T . Indeed, the only place where Feldmann et al. [19] depend on the shortest-path covers being inclusion-wise minimal is in the proof of this doubling-dimension bound. It is fairly simple to adapt their proofs to show that adding a fixed number of vertices to a minimal shortest-path cover at every levels adds at most a small factor to the bound on the doubling dimension.

Instead of reproving their results, however, we modify the graph to give the desired property. We now prove the claimed properties of the Lemma 5 modification (restated for convenience).

Lemma. 5. *Any graph $G = (V, E)$ with highway dimension η , diameter Δ_G , and designated vertex set $S \subseteq V$ can be modified by adding $O(\eta^2 |S|^3 \log \Delta_G)$ new vertices and edges, such that the resulting graph $G' = (V', E')$*

- *has highway dimension at most $\eta + |S|$*
- *for all $u, v \in V'$, $d_{G'}(u, v) \in (\frac{c}{2}, \frac{3c}{4} \Delta_G]$*
- *for all $u, v \in V$, $d_{G'}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$, and*
- *for every $s \in S$, the only towns containing s in the town decomposition of G' are the trivial towns.*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the smallest integer such that $(\frac{c}{4})^a > \frac{c}{2}$ and let $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the smallest integer such that $(\frac{c}{4})^b > \Delta_G$. We modify G by adding, for each $i \in \{a, a+1, \dots, b\}$ and each $s \in S$, $(\eta + |S|)^2$ copies of vertex v_i^s and an edge (s, v_i^s) of length $r_i = (\frac{c}{4})^i$ for each copy. This modification adds $(\eta + |S|)^2 |S| (b - a + 1) = O(\eta^2 |S|^3 \log \Delta_G)$ vertices and edges (see Figure 7). We show that each of the listed properties holds for the modified graph G' .

First, this modification increases the highway dimension by at most $|S|$, since adding S as hubs covers all newly introduced shortest paths.

Second the smallest introduced edge has length $(\frac{c}{4})^a > \frac{c}{2}$, and all point-to-point distances in G are already assumed to be greater than $\frac{c}{2}$ (see Section 2). The largest introduced edge has length

$(\frac{c}{4})^b > \Delta_G \geq (\frac{c}{4})^{b-1}$, so the largest point-to-point distance in G' is between two copies of v_b^s from distinct vertices $s_1, s_2 \in S$, namely $\Delta_{G'} \leq 2(\frac{c}{4})^b + \Delta_G < 3(\frac{c}{4})^b = \frac{3c}{4}(\frac{c}{4})^{b-1} \leq \frac{3c}{4}\Delta_G$.

Third, all newly added edges are only connected to vertices in S , so all point-to-point distances between vertices in V are preserved in G' .

Finally, recall that the trivial towns in the town decomposition of G' are the singleton towns at scale $r_0 = (\frac{c}{4})^0 = 1$ and the topmost town at scale $r_{max} = \lceil \log_{c/4} \text{diam}(G') \rceil$ that contains all of G' . By the second property above, all point-to-point distances in G' are greater than $c/2$ and, clearly, at most $\text{diam}(G')$. Therefore there are no shortest paths in G' in the intervals $(1, c/2]$ or $(r_{max}, \frac{c}{2}r_{max}]$, so $\text{SPC}(r_0) = \text{SPC}(r_{max}) = \emptyset$. So all of G' is in the trivial town at scale r_{max} and each vertex $v \in V'$, including each $s \in S$, is in a trivial singleton town at scale r_0 . Consider some $s \in S$. We must show that s does not appear in a town at any scale $r_i \in [r_1, r_{max})$.

We first show that for every scale $r_i = (\frac{c}{4})^i \in [\frac{c}{4}, (\frac{c}{4})^b) = [r_1, r_b)$, every locally-sparse shortest-path cover $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ of G' includes s , and therefore s cannot be in any town at these scales. The shortest path cover $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ must contain a hub on each path with length in $(\frac{c}{4})^i, \frac{c}{2}(\frac{c}{4})^i]$. By the first property above, $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ is guaranteed to be locally $(\eta + |S|)\log(\eta + |S|)$ -sparse [1], so $|B_s(c(\frac{c}{4})^i) \cap \text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)| \leq (\eta + |S|)\log(\eta + |S|) < (\eta + |S|)^2$. There are two cases to consider.

If $\frac{c}{4} \leq (\frac{c}{4})^i < (\frac{c}{4})^a$, then $(\frac{c}{4})^a \in ((\frac{c}{4})^i, \frac{c}{2}(\frac{c}{4})^i]$, since $(\frac{c}{4})^{a-1} \leq \frac{c}{2}$ implies $(\frac{c}{4})^a \leq \frac{c}{2}(\frac{c}{4})^i \leq \frac{c}{2}(\frac{c}{4})^i$. Since each edge (s, v_a^s) has length $(\frac{c}{4})^a$, $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ must contain either s or all $(\eta + |S|)^2$ copies of v_a^s . By the sparsity argument above, $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ must therefore contain s .

Otherwise, $(\frac{c}{4})^a \leq (\frac{c}{4})^i < (\frac{c}{4})^b$. Therefore, $(\frac{c}{4})^{i+1} \leq (\frac{c}{4})^b$, so there are $(\eta + |S|)^2$ newly added edges (s, v_{i+1}^s) of length $(\frac{c}{4})^{i+1}$. Furthermore $(\frac{c}{4})^{i+1} \in ((\frac{c}{4})^i, \frac{c}{2}(\frac{c}{4})^i]$, since $\frac{c}{4} < \frac{c}{2}$. Therefore $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ must contain either s or all $(\eta + |S|)^2$ copies of v_{i+1}^s . Again, by the sparsity argument above, $\text{SPC}((\frac{c}{4})^i)$ must therefore contain s .

What remains to show is that s is in no town at scales in $[r_b, r_{max})$. We show that in fact there are no non-trivial towns at these levels. Assume to the contrary that T is a non-trivial town at scale $r_i \in [r_b, r_{max})$. By Lemma 2, $d_{G'}(T, V' \setminus T) > r_i$. In particular, any edges in the cut $\delta(T)$ must have length greater than r_i . Furthermore since T is non-trivial, $T \neq V'$, and since G' is connected, $\delta(T) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore there is some edge in G' that has length greater than r_i and thus greater than r_b . However all edges from G have length at most $\Delta_G < r_b$, and all newly added edges have length at most r_b . Therefore no such town exists. □




Figure 7: Here, $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ is depicted as hollow vertices in G . For each $s \in S$, the modification of G to G' introduces new vertices and edges between these new vertices and s .