

Cuts, Primal Heuristics, and Learning to Branch for the Time-Dependent Traveling Salesman Problem

Christoph Hansknecht, Imke Joormann, Sebastian Stiller

May 4, 2018

We consider the time-dependent traveling salesman problem (TDTSP), a generalization of the asymmetric traveling salesman problem (ATSP) to incorporate time-dependent cost functions. In our model, the costs of an arc can change arbitrarily over time (and do *not* only depend on the position in the tour). The TDTSP turns out to be structurally more difficult than the TSP. We prove it is NP-hard and APX-hard even if a generalized version of the triangle inequality is satisfied. In particular, we show that even the computation of one-trees becomes intractable in the case of time-dependent costs.

We derive two IP formulations of the TDTSP based on time-expansion and propose different pricing algorithms to handle the significantly increased problem size. We introduce multiple families of cutting planes for the TDTSP as well as different LP-based primal heuristics, a propagation method and a branching rule. We conduct computational experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of our approaches on randomly generated instances. We are able to decrease the optimality gap remaining after one hour of computations to about six percent, compared to a gap of more than forty percent obtained by an off-the-shelf IP solver.

Finally, we carry out a first attempt to learn strong branching decisions for the TDTSP. At the current state, this method does not improve the running times.

1 Introduction

The traveling salesman problem (TSP) is among the best studied combinatorial optimization problem (see [4, 16] for summaries). Considerable effort has been put into polyhedral analysis of the problem, development of primal heuristics, and implementation of branch-and-bound based code. Several generalizations of the problem have

been considered as well, such as the TSP with time windows [5, 6], or the class of vehicle routing problems (VRPs) [30].

The classical asymmetric TSP is based on the assumption that the travel time c_{ij} for an arc (i, j) is constant throughout the traversal of the graph by the optimum tour. While this assumption is justified when it comes to travel times based on geometric distances, travel times tend to vary over time in real-world instances (such as road networks).

Some effort has been made in order to generalize the TSP with respect to time-dependent travel times. The authors of [8, 26] consider the problem of minimizing the travel time of a tour where the travel time of an arc (i, j) depends on the position of i in the tour. Thus, the travel time of (i, j) is a function $c_{ij}(k)$ ($k = 1, \dots, n$). This simplified time-dependent TSP (which we denote by STDTSP) has since attracted some attention, specifically, the authors of [1] conduct a polyhedral study and perform computational experiments. The STDTSP is solved on a graph which consists of n layers of vertices, a tour corresponds then to a path containing exactly one representative of each vertex. Note that the STDTSP is closely related to identical machine scheduling, in particular $P||\sum w_j T_j$, which can be solve in a similar fashion [25].

We further generalize the concept of time-dependent travel times to the case where the travel time of an arc (u, v) is a function $c_{uv} : \{0, \dots, \theta^{\max}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. As a result, the corresponding instances tend to be much larger than in the case of position-dependent travel times and particular care has to be taken in order to provide exact solutions within a reasonable time. It is however possible to generalize many results from the STDTSP to the real-time-dependent TSP (TDTSP). (see, e.g., Section 3).

2 Preliminaries

An instance (D, c, θ^{\max}) of the TDTSP consists of a complete directed graph $D = (V, A)$ with n vertices ($V = \{1, \dots, n\}$), a time-horizon θ^{\max} , and time-dependent travel times $c_a : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for $a \in A$, where $\Theta := \{0, \dots, \theta^{\max}\}$ is a set of points in time. The vertex $s := 1$ is defined as the source vertex. For each sequence of arcs (a_1, \dots, a_k) with $a_k = (u_k, v_k)$ and $v_k = u_{k+1}$ we can recursively define an arrival time

$$\theta^{\text{arr}}(a_1, \dots, a_k) := \begin{cases} c_{u_1, v_1}(0), & \text{if } k = 1, \\ \theta^{\text{arr}}(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}) + c_{u_k, v_k}(\theta^{\text{arr}}(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})), & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The asymmetric TDTSP asks for a tour $T = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ which minimizes the arrival time $\theta^{\text{arr}}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

We will consider several special cases of travel time functions which play an important role in time-dependent versions of combinatorial problems:

1. Several well-known results (e.g., [28, 11]) state that the symmetric version of the TSP can be approximated in case of *metric* cost coefficients, i.e. cost coefficients satisfying the triangle inequality. The definition of the triangle inequality can be easily generalized to the time-dependent case. Formally, a set of travel time

functions satisfies the *time-dependent triangle inequality* iff for each $u, v, w \in V$, $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta + c_{uv}(\theta) \leq \theta^{\max}$, it holds that

$$\theta + c_{uw}(\theta) \leq \theta + c_{uv}(\theta) + c_{vw}(\theta + c_{uv}(\theta)). \quad (2)$$

2. Another property of time-dependent cost functions goes by the name of FIFO (first-in-first-out). A function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfies the FIFO-property iff

$$\theta + f(\theta) \leq \theta' + f(\theta') \quad \forall \theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{N}, \theta \leq \theta'. \quad (3)$$

The FIFO property implies that is is never advisable to wait at a certain vertex to decrease the arrival time at a destination. If the FIFO property is satisfied for each time-dependent cost function, then shortest paths with respect to time-dependent costs can be computed efficiently using a variant of Dijkstra's algorithm [19, 12].

3 Complexity

As a generalization of the well-known ATSP, the TDTSP is \mathcal{NP} -hard itself. What is more, there exists no α -approximation for any $\alpha \geq 1$ for the general ATSP [21]. On the other hand, approximation algorithms are known for the metric variant of the ATSP. Unfortunately, such algorithms don't exist in the case of the TDTSP:

Theorem 3.1. *There is no α -approximation algorithm for any $\alpha > 1$ for the TDTSP unless $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$. This is the case even if the time-dependent triangle inequality is satisfied.*

Proof. Suppose there exists an α -approximation algorithm A for the TDTSP for a fixed value of $\alpha \geq 1$. We show that algorithm A could be used to solve the *Hamiltonian cycle* problem on an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$. To this end, let $D = (V, A)$ be the bidirected complete graph with costs

$$c_{uv} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \{u, v\} \in E \\ 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that G is Hamiltonian iff D contains a tour with costs of at most n . Consider the time-expansion of D given by $\theta^{\max} := \alpha n$ and the following time-dependent cost functions (satisfying the time-dependent triangle inequality):

$$c_{uv}(\theta) := \begin{cases} c_{uv}, & \text{if } \theta \leq n \\ \alpha n + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We apply A to the instance (D, c, θ^{\max}) . If the resulting tour T has $\theta^{\text{arr}}(T) \leq n$, it must correspond to Hamiltonian cycle in G . Otherwise we know that $\theta^{\text{arr}}(T) > \alpha n$, since T must contain at least one arc (u, v) such that T arrives at u at a time $\geq n$. Since A is an α -approximation, the optimal tour T_{opt} has $\theta^{\text{arr}}(T_{\text{opt}}) > n$ and G is not Hamiltonian. □

Remark 3.2 (Dynamic Programming). It is well-known that the (asymmetric) TSP can be solved by using a dynamic programming approach: Let $C(S, v)$ be the smallest cost of an (s, v) -path consisting of the vertices $S \subseteq V$ with $s, v \in S$. Then $C(S, v)$ satisfies the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} C(\{s, v\}, v) &= c_{sv} & \forall v \in V, v \neq s \\ C(S, v) &= \min_{\substack{u \in S \\ u \neq s, v}} C(S \setminus \{v\}, u) + c_{uv} & \forall S \subseteq V, v \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The cost of an optimal tour is then given by $\min_{v \neq s} C(V, v) + c(v, s)$ and can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(2^n \cdot n^2)$. If a given TDTSP instance satisfies the FIFO property, these relations can be generalized to incorporate time-dependent costs:

$$\begin{aligned} C(\{s, v\}, v) &= c_{sv}(0) & \forall v \in V, v \neq s \\ C(S, v) &= \min_{\substack{u \in S \\ u \neq s, v}} C(S \setminus \{v\}, u) + c_{uv}(C(S \setminus \{v\}, u)) & \forall S \subseteq V, v \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note that the complexity is the same as in the case of an ATSP. This is due to the fact that the FIFO property ensures that only the shortest path for fixed S, v needs to be considered for subsequent computations. Without the FIFO property it becomes necessary to consider an (s, v) -paths for each $\theta \in \mathcal{T}(v)$ during the computations.

3.1 Approximation for Special Cases

While the TDTSP problem is relatively hard by itself, some results regarding approximations can be preserved in the case where the time-dependent cost functions are of low variance.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\lambda \geq 1$ such that for all $u, v \in V$, $\theta, \theta' \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ it holds that*

$$c_{uv}(\theta) \leq \lambda c_{uv}(\theta'). \quad (6)$$

Then, any α -approximation of the TSP yields a $(\alpha\lambda)$ -approximation of the TDTSP.

Proof. Let $c : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be defined as

$$c_{uv} := \min_{\theta \in \{0, \dots, T\}} c_{uv}(\theta). \quad (7)$$

This implies that $c_{uv} \leq c_{uv}(\theta) \leq \lambda c_{uv}$ for all θ . Let T_{opt} , T_h be the optimal and α -approximate tour with respect to the costs c and $T_{\text{opt}, t}$ be the optimal tour. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{\text{arr}}(T_h) &\leq \lambda \cdot c(T_h) \leq (\alpha\lambda) \cdot c(T_{\text{opt}}) \\ &\leq (\alpha\lambda) \cdot c(T_{\text{opt}, t}) \\ &= (\alpha\lambda) \cdot \theta^{\text{arr}}(T_{\text{opt}, t}) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

□

Note that since the ATSP in general is inapproximable in general, further assumptions, such as a metric lower bound c_{uv} , are still necessary to obtain an approximation.

3.2 One-trees

Relaxations play an important role in integer programming in general and the TSP in particular. They provide lower bounds which can be used to obtain quality guarantees for solutions. The prevalent relaxation of combinatorial problems formulated as integer programs is given by their LP relaxations. In several cases however, it is possible to derive purely combinatorial relaxations. In the case of the *symmetric* traveling salesman problem, a popular combinatorial relaxation is given by *one-trees*. A one-tree with respect to a graph $G = (V, E)$ is given by a spanning tree of G together with an edge adjacent to a distinguished source $1 \in V$. Since every tour is a one-tree, the one-tree of minimum cost provides a lower bound on the cost of a tour.

The computation of a one-tree in the static case involves the computation of a minimum spanning tree (MST). This computation can be performed efficiently using Prim's algorithm. It is therefore natural to ask whether this approach can be generalized to the time-dependent case.

Let $T = (V, F)$ be a spanning tree of the graph G . We direct the edges in T away from 1. For each vertex $v \in V$, there exists a unique $(1, v)$ -path P_v in T . Hence, there is a unique arrival time $\theta^{\text{arr}}(u)$ induced by T for each $u \in V$. The total cost of the edges in T is then given by


$$c(T) := \sum_{(u,v) \in F} c_{u,v}(\theta^{\text{arr}}(u)). \quad (9)$$

A *time-dependent minimum spanning tree (TDMST)* minimizes $c(T)$. Unfortunately the computation of a TDMST is hard:

Theorem 3.4. *There is no α -approximation algorithm for any $\alpha > 1$ for the TDMST problem unless $P = \mathcal{NP}$.*

Proof. Consider an instance of the 3SAT problem. Let $X := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a set of n variables and $\mathcal{Z} := \{Z_1, \dots, Z_m\}$ be a set of m clauses, where each clause contains at most three literals. We construct a suitable instance of the TDMST problem using a number of components. First we define a component A_i for each literal $x_i \in X$. The component is shown in Figure 1a, the edges are annotated with their (static) travel times. Any spanning tree will arrive at x_i either at time 1 or time 2 depending on whether the resulting path leads past s_i or not. Next we define a component B_j for each clause $Z_j \in \mathcal{Z}$. Let x_k, x_l, x_m be the literals which appear in Z_j . The edges in the component have the following travel times:

1. The edges between the vertices $w_{j,k}, w_{j,l}$ and $w_{j,m}$ have a constant travel time of 1.
2. The edge connecting $v_{j,k}$ and $w_{j,k}$ has a travel time of 1 for times at most two, and $M \geq 1$ otherwise. The same holds true for the two other respective edges.
3. The travel time of the edge connecting x_k and $v_{j,k}$ depends on whether x_k or \bar{x}_k appears in the clause Z_j . In the former case the travel time is always 1, whereas



(a) A component which queries whether a variable is set (b) A component which determines whether a clause is satisfied

Figure 1: Gadgets used in the proof of Theorem 3.4

in the latter it is given by

$$c_{x_k v_{j,k}}(\theta) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta \geq 2 \\ 2, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The instance including the components is depicted in Figure 2. Consider a satisfying truth assignment. For every literal x_i set to *true* we choose the path $0, s_i, x_i, t_i$ in component A_i . If the literal is set to *false* we choose the path $0, s_i, t_i, x_i$. Thus, the arrival time at x_i is 1 if x_i is set to *true* and 2 otherwise. For each clause Z_j we add the edges between the vertices corresponding to its literals and their respective v_j counterparts. Since the clause is satisfied, the arrival time at at least one v_j is 2. Thus, the remaining part of B_j can be spanned using three additional edges of cost 1 each. The resulting tree has costs of at most $2n + 6m$. Conversely, consider a tree with costs less than M . We first make the observation that any x_i is connected by a path leading past A_i to 0. Otherwise, the path from 0 to x_i would lead past the component B_j corresponding to some clause Z_j containing x_i or \bar{x}_i . In this case however, it would not be possible to reach vertex $w_{j,i}$ before time 2 and the cost of the tree would increase beyond M . Thus, any such tree corresponds to an assignment of variables. Every component B_j is connected by an edge with cost of 1. Therefore the assignment is also satisfying. Assume there was an α -approximation for the TDMST problem. We let $M := \alpha(2n + 6m) + 1$ and run the approximation. If the resulting tree has costs less than M , the 3SAT instance is satisfiable. Otherwise, the optimal TDMST has costs at least $M/\alpha > 2n + 6m$, i.e., the instance is not satisfiable. \square




Figure 2: The TDMST construction used to prove Theorem 3.4

4 Formulations

4.1 Time-expanded graphs

In the following, we will consider formulations based on time-expanded graphs. In order to introduce time-expanded graphs we first define a set of reachable points in time. We let $\mathcal{T} : V \rightarrow 2^\Theta$,

$$\mathcal{T}(v) := \{\theta \in \Theta \mid \exists(a_1, \dots, a_k), a_1 = (s, v_1), a_k = (u_k, v), \theta^{\text{arr}}(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \theta\} \quad (11)$$

The time-expanded graph $D^\mathcal{T} = (V^\mathcal{T}, A^\mathcal{T})$ has vertices $V^\mathcal{T} := \{v_\theta \mid v \in V, \theta \in \mathcal{T}(v)\}$ and arcs

$$A^\mathcal{T} := \{(u_\theta, v_{\theta'}) \mid u_\theta, v_{\theta'} \in V^\mathcal{T}, \theta' = \theta + c_{uv}(\theta)\}. \quad (12)$$

We will denote an arc $(u_\theta, v_{\theta'})$ by (u, v, θ) . We will from now on assume that $c_{uv}(\theta) > 0$ for all $(u, v) \in A, \theta \in \mathcal{T}(v)$. This directly implies that $D^\mathcal{T}$ is acyclic.

Example 4.1. Figure 3 shows a directed graph with travel times for each arc and its time expansion. Any tour on D can be embedded into $D^\mathcal{T}$ as a (s_0, s_θ) -path.

4.2 An Arc-based formulation

We consider an arc-based formulation based on the graph $D^\mathcal{T}$ consisting of binary variables $x_{uv, \theta}$ for each arc in $D^\mathcal{T}$. The resulting formulation is inspired by a three-index-formulation for STDTSP [27]. The formulation consists of a flow through the




Figure 3: A directed graph D and its time-expansion $D^{\mathcal{T}}$.

time-expanded graph $D^{\mathcal{T}}$, which has to cover each vertex exactly once.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{(u,v,\theta) \in A^{\mathcal{T}}} c_{uv,\theta} \cdot x_{uv,\theta} \\
& \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}(v)} \sum_{(v,w,\theta) \in \delta^+(v_\theta)} x_{vw,\theta} = 1 && \text{for all } v \in V \\
& \sum_{(v,w,\theta) \in \delta^+(v_\theta)} x_{uv,\theta} - \sum_{(u,v,\theta') \in \delta^-(v_\theta)} x_{uv,\theta'} = 0 && \text{for all } v \neq s, \theta \in \mathcal{T}(v) \\
& x_{uv,\theta} \in \{0, 1\} && \text{for all } v \neq w, \theta \in \mathcal{T}(v).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Remark 4.2. Any solution of the IP or its LP-relaxation can be decomposed into a set of paths leading from vertex s_0 to s_θ for $\theta > 0$. Thus, an equivalent cost function is given by $\sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}(s)} \sum_{(v,s,\theta') \in \delta^-(s_\theta)} \theta \cdot x_{vs,\theta}$.

Relation to the static ATSP In the following, we will consider the relationship between the TDTSP and the static ATSP problem. To this end, we let $x : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the combined flow traversing an arc $(u, v) \in A$, i.e.

$$x_{uv} := \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}(u)} x_{uv,\theta} \tag{14}$$

where $(x_{uv,\theta})_{(u,v,\theta) \in A^{\mathcal{T}}}$ is a feasible solution of (13). Observe that the covering constraints and the flow conservation yield the well-known 2-matching equations $x(\delta^+(v)) =$

$x(\delta^-(v)) = 1$ for all $v \in V$. Similarly, integrality together with the condition $x_{uv} \leq 1$ follows from the integrality of the original solution. However, a correct static ATSP formulation still requires subtour elimination constraints (SECs) of the form

$$x(\delta^+(S)) \geq 1 \quad \forall S \subset V, S \neq \emptyset, V. \quad (15)$$

Since $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ is acyclic, any solution of (13) is guaranteed to satisfy the additional SECs¹. Still, SECs are not necessarily satisfied by fractional solutions. Thus, formulation (13) can be strengthened by separating SECs with respect to the underlying static ATSP.

We can produce fractional solutions to the static ATSP problem by computing the combined flow after having successfully separated all SECs. Consequently, we can use any ATSP separator to derive valid inequalities for the ATSP which we can then formulate in terms of the variables corresponding to $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ in order to strengthen our formulation.

Note that while any feasible TDTSP solution is feasible for the underlying ATSP, generic ATSP solutions do not necessarily produce feasible solutions of the TDTSP. Specifically, no tour $T = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ with $\theta^{\text{arr}}(T) > \theta^{\text{max}}$ can be embedded into $D^{\mathcal{T}}$. The complete description of the TDTSP in terms of combined variables can be obtained by adding *forbidden path* constraints of the form

$$\sum_{a \in P} x_a \leq k - 1 \quad \forall P = (a_1, \dots, a_k) : \theta^{\text{arr}}(P) > \theta^{\text{max}}. \quad (16)$$

As a result, facet-defining ATSP inequalities, while valid, are not necessarily facet-defining for the TDTSP.

Lemma 4.3 (Dimensionality). *Let $n^{\mathcal{T}} := |V^{\mathcal{T}}|$, $m^{\mathcal{T}} := |A^{\mathcal{T}}|$ be the number of vertices and arcs, respectively, of $D^{\mathcal{T}}$, and $V^s := \{s_\theta \in V^{\mathcal{T}}\}$ the $n^s := |V^s|$ many vertices corresponding to s . If c satisfies the time-dependent triangle inequality (2), then*

$$\dim(P) \leq m^{\mathcal{T}} - (n^{\mathcal{T}} - n^s) - (n - 1) \quad (17)$$

Proof. The dimension of P is trivially bounded by the difference between the number of variables $m^{\mathcal{T}}$ and the rank of the system of equations (13). Since $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ is acyclic, the system of equations ensuring flow conservation on the vertices in $V^{\mathcal{T}} \setminus V^s$ has full rank of $n^{\mathcal{T}} - n^s$. Consider a vertex $v \neq s$ contained in a tour $T = (v_1 = s, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_i = v, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n)$ given as a sequence of vertices in D . Assume that equation $x(\delta^+(v)) = 1$ is struck from system (13). Since c satisfies the time-dependent triangle inequality, the sequence $T' = (v_1 = s, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n)$ is a feasible solution to the reduced system of equations, yet it is not a feasible TDTSP solution. Therefore, none of the $n - 1$ equations corresponding to vertices other than s can be struck without increasing dimensionality. Thus, the combined system of equations has the required rank. \square

¹Equivalently, flow augmentation techniques such as [14] used to strengthen ATSP formulations are redundant for solutions of the TDTSP.

4.3 Pricing

The approach of time-expansion can be used to solve a variety of time-dependent problems [13, 29]. Unfortunately, the time-expansion of a problem quickly increases the size of the resulting formulations. Specifically, in case of the TDTSP, even moderately sized instances of less than one hundred vertices can result in millions of arcs in A^T , making it difficult to solve even the LP-relaxation of the TDTSP.

To alleviate the problem, an obvious approach is to use column-generation (see [23] for a summary on the topic). Nevertheless, there are a number of different variants of CG, especially regarding the pricing strategy. It is not immediately clear which one is the best for the TDTSP. We will present the tested approaches in the following.

Let $(\lambda_v)_{v \in V}$, $(\mu_{v_\theta})_{v \neq s, \theta \in \mathcal{T}(v)}$ be the dual variables of the respective constraints in (13). The reduced cost of an arc (v, w, θ) is then given by

$$\bar{c}_{vw, \theta} := c_{vw}(\theta) - (\lambda_v + \mu_{v_\theta} - \mu_{w_{\theta+c_{vw}(\theta)}}). \quad (18)$$

To obtain a feasible solution to populate the initial LP, we compute a heuristic tour, which we then add as a whole.

Lagrangian pricing While the pricing approach significantly reduces the formulation size and facilitates the solution of much larger instances, the approach can be significantly improved. Consider a single arc (v, w, θ) with negative reduced costs: The arc can only obtain a positive value in the subsequent LP-solution if it is part of a (s_0, s_θ) -path. It is therefore advisable to generate entire paths at once rather than single arcs. The pricing problem then becomes a shortest path problem in D^T . Even though the reduced costs are negative, the pricing problem can be solved using breadth-first search since D^T is acyclic. We also employ a technique known as *Lagrangian pricing* [24]. The technique is based on the observation that the pricing problem is a Lagrange relaxation of the full LP, which implies that the difference between the current LP value and the value of the full LP is bounded by the minimum reduced cost of, in this case, an (s_0, s_θ) -path. The pricing loop is aborted as soon as the cost rises above a value of $-\epsilon$. This approach helps to deal with the degeneracy often present in formulations of combinatorial optimization problems by avoiding to price variables which have negative reduced costs without attaining a nonzero value in the optimal basis of the LP relaxation. It is also the case that paths obtained from the pricing procedure occasionally correspond to tours in D and therefore to feasible TDTSP solutions.

Pricing cycle-free paths Unfortunately, many paths which are generated throughout the pricing do not share much resemblance with tours in the underlying graph D : On the one hand certain paths only contain few vertices and lead almost immediately back to s_θ . We will address this problem using the propagation of lower bounds. On the other hand, paths frequently contain cycles with respect to D , i.e., they contain two different versions $v_\theta, v_{\theta'}$ of the same vertex $v \neq s$. It is of course possible to generate inequalities in order to cut off a fractional solution \tilde{x} containing a cycle in its path decomposition (see Subsection 4.4). However, ideally we would like not to have

paths containing cycles in the LP in the first place. Obviously, the problem of finding an acyclic path of negative reduced cost is equivalent to finding the optimal solution to the TDTSP problem. It is however possible to find k -cycle free paths, i.e., paths not containing a cycle with at most k arcs using Dijkstra-like labeling schemes [17]. Specifically, avoiding 2-cycles merely increases computation time by a factor of two, while significantly improving the resulting lower bounds. It is also possible to avoid k -cycles for arbitrary k ; however, the proposed algorithm takes $\mathcal{O}((k!)^2)$ time, which quickly makes the approach intractable for increasing values of k .

4.4 Valid inequalities

In order to strengthen the formulation, a number of additional inequalities can be included in the formulation. We give a brief summary of valid inequalities, some of which are well-known ATSP inequalities, whereas others are either adaptations of STDTSP inequalities or newly derived ones.

ATSP inequalities Apart from the subtour elimination constraints, the probably best-known family of facet-defining inequalities for the ATSP goes by the name of D_k^+ -inequalities [15, 16]. D_k^+ -inequalities are defined on a complete directed graph $D = (V, A)$ with n vertices. To simplify notation, for sets $S, T \subseteq V$ we let $[S : T] := \{(u, v) \in A \mid u \in S, v \in T\}$. The D_k^+ -inequality for a sequence (v_1, \dots, v_k) of $2 \leq k < n$ distinct vertices is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} x_{v_j, v_{j+1}} + x_{v_k, v_1} + 2x([\{v_1\} : \{v_3, \dots, v_k\}]) \\ & + \sum_{j=4}^k x([\{v_j\} : \{v_3, \dots, v_{j-1}\}]) \leq k - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The separation of D_k^+ -inequalities involves the enumeration of possible sequences in a branch and bound-like fashion. Nonetheless, the separation works well in practice, since many of the possible sequences can be pruned. Note that in the special case $k = 2$ the inequality becomes $x_{uv} + x_{vu} \leq 1$.

Incompatibilities Since any feasible solution to an integer program is a stable set with respect to its incompatibility graph \mathcal{I} , cliques and odd cycles in \mathcal{I} are the basis for many strong inequalities for arbitrary integer programs, a fact which is often used in MIP solvers. While the incompatibility graph of the symmetric TSP problem is empty, the ATSP problem already has a significant amount of incompatibilities. Specifically, the arcs $(u, v) \neq (u', v')$ are incompatible if $v = v'$ or $u = u'$ or both $u = v'$ and $u' = v$. Clique inequalities are implied by the constraints $x(\delta^+(v)) = x(\delta^-(v)) = 1$ and $x_{uv} + x_{vu} \leq 1$. However, it is possible to derive inequalities from odd cycles in \mathcal{I} . These *odd closed alternating trails* [7] (odd CATS for short) can be separated heuristically by computing shortest paths in an auxiliary bipartite graph. Note that

with respect to the incompatibility graph of the TDTSP, the cuts correspond to odd cycles of cliques rather than odd cycles of vertices. As a result the obtained cuts are stronger than ordinary odd cycle cuts and easier to separate due to the small size of the incompatibility graph of the underlying ATSP.

Odd path-free inequalities Consider a set $S \subseteq V \setminus \{s\}$ of vertices of the original graph. Let $V^{\mathcal{T}}(S) := \{u_{\theta} \in V^{\mathcal{T}} \mid u \in S\}$ be the corresponding vertices in $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ and $A^{\mathcal{T}}$ the induced subgraph:

$$A^{\mathcal{T}}(S) := \{(u, v, \theta) \in A^{\mathcal{T}} \mid u, v \in S\}. \quad (20)$$

The intersection of any tour with the set $A^{\mathcal{T}}$ can contain at most $|S| - 1$ arcs, the corresponding inequality is equivalent to a subtour elimination constraint. If $|S| = 2k + 1$ is odd, another inequality can be obtained by considering certain subsets of $A^{\mathcal{T}}$. Specifically, $A' \subseteq A^{\mathcal{T}}$ is called *path-free*, if it does not contain a path consisting of at least three different vertices in S . The intersection of a path-free set A' with any tour can contain at most k arcs, yielding the following *odd path-free* inequality (see Figure 4):

$$\sum_{(u,v,\theta) \in A'} x_{uv,\theta} \leq k. \quad (21)$$

In order to separate an odd path-free inequality we first have to find some *promising* subset S , i.e. a set of odd size forming a clique of sufficient weight. For such a set S the separation problem is equivalent to finding a stable set of maximum weight in the (undirected) line graph of $(V^{\mathcal{T}}(S), A^{\mathcal{T}}(S))$.

Since both problems are *NP*-hard themselves, we make several restrictions in order to decrease the computational costs. First, note that larger values of k result in larger line graphs making the computation of stable sets much more challenging. We therefore chose to restrict ourselves to the case of $k = 1$ (in which odd path-free sets correspond to cliques in the incompatibility graph \mathcal{I}). This restriction also enables us to find promising sets in polynomial time by enumerating all 3-sets of vertices in D . In order to avoid separating very similar inequalities we consider only the largest promising 3-set containing each vertex $v \in D \setminus \{s\}$. The separation for each set is performed using an integer program.

Lifted subtour elimination inequalities As discussed above, subtour elimination constraints can be used to cut off fractional TDTSP solutions. SECs can be separated in polynomial time by solving a series of flow problems on the underlying graph, ultimately yielding a set $S \subseteq V$, $S \neq \emptyset, V$ maximizing $x(\delta^+(S))$. In the following we will assume w.l.o.g that $s \in S$. SECs can be strengthened by imposing an upper limit on the time of the initial departure from the set S . After all, any tour has to leave S sufficiently early to be able to reach the vertices in $V \setminus S$ and return to s . More formally, let $\hat{\theta}$ be such that

$$\hat{\theta} \geq \max\{\theta \mid \text{There exists a tour } T \text{ leaving } S \text{ for the first time at } \theta\}. \quad (22)$$




Figure 4: A path-free set of arcs on three vertices

Then, the following *lifted* subtour elimination constraint (LSEC) is valid for all tours:

$$\sum_{\substack{(u,v,\theta) \in A^T \\ u \in S, v \notin S, \\ \theta \leq \hat{\theta}}} x_{uv,\theta} \geq 1 \quad (23)$$

Clearly, $\hat{\theta}$ is maximized for a tour which first serves S , then $V \setminus S$ and returns to s immediately afterwards. Thus, maximizing $\hat{\theta}$ would involve the solution of a series of TDTSP problems on $V \setminus S$, an approach which is clearly intractable in practice. We propose to compute a larger value of $\hat{\theta}$ given by $\theta^{\max} - \check{\theta}$ with a lower bound $\check{\theta}$ on the length of the shortest tour on $V \setminus S$. We derive $\check{\theta}$ by considering an ATSP on $V \setminus S$ with costs given by suitably chosen lower bounds on the travel times $c_{uv,\theta}$. The ATSP itself can be bounded from below by computing an arborescence of minimum weight.

Cycle inequalities While the formulation (13) does not contain any subtours it is possible that a path in the LP-relaxation visits a vertex at several different points in time. Specifically, a path P in D^T can be of the form $P = (\dots, (u, v, \theta), (v, w, \theta'), \dots)$, forming a cycle of length 2 in D (where $v \neq s, \theta' = \theta + c_{uv}(\theta)$). We know that if a tour visits v at θ' , it has to go on using an arc (v, w, θ') such that $w \neq u$. Hence the following inequality is valid:

$$x_{uv,\theta} \leq \sum_{w \neq u,v} x_{vw,\theta'} \quad (24)$$

More generally, consider a path which contains the sequence $(u_1, v_1, \theta_1), \dots, (u_k, v_k, \theta_k)$ such that $v_1 = v_k$. In this case it makes sense to add the following inequality:

$$x_{u_1 v_1, \theta_1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{v \notin \{u_1, v_1, \dots, v_j\}} x_{v_j v, \theta_{j+1}} \quad (25)$$

In order to separate these r -cycle inequalities it is convenient to consider a path-decomposition of the flow through the network and to eliminate r -cycles from the individual paths.

Unitary AFCs Unitary AFCs (admissible flow constraint) were introduced in [1] for the STDTSP. In the context of the TDTSP they can be explained as follows: Consider an arc (u, v, θ) with $u, v \neq s$ carrying a nonzero flow. The flow enters some set of vertices which has to be left again in order to reach the source s . Specifically, let $X \subseteq V^T$ such that

1. X contains $v_{\theta+c_{uv}(\theta)}$.
2. Every vertex $(v', \theta') \in X$ is reachable from $(v, \theta + c_{uv}(\theta))$ using only arcs in the graph induced by X .
3. The set X contains no copies of the vertices u, v, s .

In this case we can add the following inequality:

$$x_{uv, \theta} \leq \sum_{\substack{(u', v', \theta') \in \delta^+(X) \\ v' \neq u, v}} x_{u'v', \theta'} \quad (26)$$

In order to separate these types of inequalities we consider for a fixed arc (u, v, θ) all vertices which are reachable from $(v, \theta + c_{uv}(\theta))$. We then solve a series of min-cut problems with capacities according to the fractional solution. If we find a cut with a value of less than one we add it to the LP.

4.5 Speedup techniques

The addition of cutting planes already significantly strengthens formulation (13). There are however several other techniques which can be used to speed up the computation of the optimal tour in a branch-cut-and-price framework:

Propagation At any given step in the solution process we have a (local) dual bound $\underline{\theta}$ given by the value of the LP-relaxation (of the current node in the branch-and-bound tree) and a primal bound $\bar{\theta}$ given by the currently best known integral solution. Clearly, any arc (v, w, θ) with $\theta > \bar{\theta}$ can be fixed to zero, as can any arc (v, s, θ) with

$$\theta + c_{vs}(\theta) < \underline{\theta}. \quad (27)$$

As these bounds become more accurate, more and more arcs can be discarded. The relaxation can often be strengthened significantly by employing this technique since the LP-relaxations frequently consists of paths which send an amount of flow for s_θ back to s_θ via a path with containing very few vertices and leading back into s at a time lower than $\underline{\theta}$.

Compound branching Traditionally, a branch-and-bound approach would branch on individual variables $x_{uv,\theta}$, leading to a highly unbalanced branch-and-bound tree. We instead propose to branch on the combined flow $(x_{uv})_{(u,v) \in A}$. We incorporate the incompatibilities with respect to the underlying ATSP in order to increase the dual bounds in child nodes. Specifically, whenever an arc (u, w) is fixed to one during the branching, we fix every incompatible arc (u', v') to zero. We incorporate the branching rule into the pricing loop by ignoring arcs fixed to zero and incorporating the dual costs of arcs which have been fixed to one.

Primal heuristics In order to obtain improved primal solutions we use a simple heuristic based on the current LP-solution $(x_{uv,\theta}^*)_{(u,v,\theta) \in A\mathcal{T}}$. Specifically, we construct a path P traversing $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ starting at s_0 by appending arcs to vertices whose counterparts in D are still unexplored by P until the path forms a tour in D . During the construction of the tour we disregard arcs fixed to zero by the compound branching rule introduced above. If there are multiple arcs to choose from, we compute scores using the following metrics:

1. We score arc (u, v, θ) by the inverse of its travel time $c_{uv}(\theta)$.
2. We evaluate (u, v, θ) according to the value of $x_{uv,\theta}^*$ using travel times to break ties.
3. We measure (u, v, θ) using the combined value x_{uv}^* using a similar tie-breaking rule.

Note that the iterative construction of paths in $D^{\mathcal{T}}$ is computationally inexpensive. Thus, to increase the chance of finding an improved tour, we randomize the selection of arcs based on probabilities proportional to the different score functions and perform several runs using different random seeds.

4.6 A path-based formulation

Recall that any feasible solution of the TDTSP problem (13) can be decomposed into paths from s_0 to s_θ for some $\theta \in \Theta$. With respect to D these paths correspond to cycles containing vertex s . We let \mathcal{P} be the set of paths, let $\alpha_{v,P} := |\{\theta \mid (v, w, \theta) \in P\}|$ and reformulate the problem in terms of individual paths:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} c_P x_P \\
& \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \alpha_{v,P} \cdot x_P = 1 \quad \text{for all } v \in V \\
& x_P \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } P \in \mathcal{P}
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Note that any solution of this IP consists of a single variable x_P set to 1 and all others set to 0, in which case P must correspond to a tour. Any fractional solution consists of at most n different paths which need not be tours in D . The resulting system is small




Figure 5: A sample plot of the travel time function for costs of 10, a time horizon of $\theta^{\max} = 100$ and $M = 10$ break points. The cost is constrained by a factor of $\lambda = 3$

in terms of the number of constraints at the expense of the number of variables. Thus, a pricing approach is absolutely necessary in this case. Since arc-based and path-based solutions are equivalent, all previously discussed techniques can be easily adapted to the path-based formulation.

5 Computational experiments

5.1 Instances

In order to test different formulations and techniques we generated several problem instances, each given by a directed complete graph and cost functions associated with its arcs. We embedded the vertices of the graph into $\{0, \dots, 100\}^2$ and introduced (symmetric) costs c_a using rounded-down euclidean distances between the points of the embedding.

We then augmented the static costs to time-dependent functions $c_a(\theta)$. We first added $M \in N$ time steps $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \dots < \theta_M$ within the range $\{0, \dots, \theta^{\max}\}$ and used these time steps to construct a piecewise linear function $f_a(\theta) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$:

1. We let $f_a(0) := 0$ and fixed the slope at zero to $+1$.
2. The slope alternates between $+1$ and -1 with break points at θ_i for $i = 1, \dots, M$.

We let $\lambda > 1$ and define the cost function $c_a : \{0, \dots, \theta^{\max}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as

$$c_a(\theta) := c_a + \max(\min(f_a(\theta), \lambda c_a), 0) \quad (29)$$

The parameter λ controls the multiple of $c_a(\theta)/c_a$ which can be attained. We generally let $\lambda = 3$ (see Figure 5 for an example) and distribute $M = 100$ break point over an interval of 1000 points in time.

Note that the functions defined above satisfy the FIFO property. By using shortest-path distances we ensure that the time-dependent triangle inequality is satisfied as well.

5.2 Formulations

We implemented the different formulations based on the SCIP[2] IP solver². We ran all experiments on an Intel Core i7 CPU clocked at 3.20 GHz on a system with 8 GB of RAM. We started with 50 relatively small instances containing 20 vertices each. We first computed optimal tours with respect to the static costs and used the resulting travel times with respect to the time-dependent cost to derive smaller time horizons to decrease the size of the corresponding time-expanded graphs. Despite their relatively small size, the time-expansions were quite large, each containing between 80 000 and 170 000 arcs.

We started by comparing the different combinations of formulations and pricing approaches. We were for the most part not able to determine the optimal solutions within the prescribed time limit of 3600 s. There are however significant differences between the different formulations (see Table 1 for details).

- The different pricing approaches differ significantly performance-wise. Specifically, the arc-based pricing approach fails to solve even a single root LP.
- The path-based formulation (28) generally yields smaller LPs than the full arc-based formulation. However, similarly to the arc-based pricing approach, many root LPs are not solved within the time limit.
- The path-based pricing approaches reduce the average size of the solved LPs by about 90 %. As a result, almost all of the root LPs are solved successfully.
- Using a dual stabilization approach does not result in smaller gaps compared to the simple path-based pricing.
- The most successful approach is based on pricing 2-cycle free paths. While the average LP size does not change much, the remaining gap after the exhaustion of the computation time is decreased furthest when pricing 2-cycle free paths. This is due to the fact that, as mentioned above, the improved dual bound more than makes up for the increased computational time required to avoid 2-cycles during the pricing of new paths.

5.3 Valid inequalities and primal heuristics

We proceed to study the effect of adding valid inequalities in order to increase dual bounds. To this end we restrict ourselves to the arc-based formulation with 2-cycle free path pricing, which performed best in the experiments conducted this far. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of different classes of valid inequalities we again consider the remaining gap after 3600 s of computations. The remaining gap is a good measure of the overall effectiveness of the different classes of inequalities, since it strikes a balance between the increase of the dual bound and the required separation time. The latter

²SCIP version 4.0.0 with SoPlex 3.0.0 as an LP-solver

Table 1: Solving statistics for different formulations, based on 50 different instances consisting of 20 vertices each.

	Number of instances solved		Number of root LPs solved		Remaining gap	Number of columns	Number of rows
Arc-based	0	46	0.42 / 0.40	130774 / 129047	7916 / 7849		
Arc-based pricing	0	0	–	–	–		
Path-based pricing	0	50	0.40 / 0.36	10984 / 10912	6798 / 6748		
Stabilizing pricing	0	49	0.42 / 0.38	10547 / 10479	6293 / 6244		
2-cycle free pricing	1	50	0.33 / 0.29	11198 / 11114	6829 / 6770		
Path-based formulation	0	38	0.41 / 0.39	29046 / 27934	400 / 400		

can be substantial, in particular if the separation involves the solution of \mathcal{NP} -hard problems. We make the following observations (see the details in Table 2):

- The separation of cycle inequalities actually increases the gap compared to the formulation without any separation. It is therefore inefficient to consider these inequalities at all.
- There is no significant decrease with respect to the remaining gap when separating unitary AFC, odd path-free, and odd CAT inequalities. Apparently, the separation time for these classes of inequalities does not merit the increased dual bounds.
- By far the most efficient classes of inequalities are (lifted) subtour elimination constraints. Few inequalities suffice to significantly decrease the remaining gap.
- Adding primal heuristics decreases the remaining gap by a considerable margin. It is particularly efficient to construct tours based on the combined flow x_{uv}^* of the current LP relaxation. Apparently the LP is able to accurately determine the underlying arcs which are contained in tours with small travel times. In contrast the built-in heuristics seem to be unable to take advantage of this fact.
- The propagation of upper and lower bounds yields an additional improvement on the running times. The combination of the speedup techniques makes it possible to solve more than ten percent of the instances to optimality.

Table 2: Solving statistics for different combinations of speedup techniques, based on 50 different instances consisting of 20 vertices each.

		Number of instances solved	Remaining gap	Running time
Cycle	1	0.36 / 0.32	1641.93 / 1641.93	
D_k^+	0	0.28 / 0.21		–
LSEC	2	0.25 / 0.18	1798.09 / 1540.06	
Odd CAT	1	0.31 / 0.26	1812.84 / 1812.84	
Odd path-free	0	0.32 / 0.26		–
SEC	1	0.23 / 0.17	1970.24 / 1970.24	
Unitary AFC	1	0.31 / 0.24	1266.08 / 1266.08	
LSEC + Primal heuristics	2	0.08 / 0.07	1696.23 / 1609.36	
LSEC + Primal heuristics + Propagation	8	0.06 / 0.04	837.60 / 625.21	

5.4 Combinations of inequalities

It is clear from the previous experiments that the addition of SECs / LSECs is the most effective approach to improve the improve dual bounds. Together with primal heuristics and objective value propagation it is possible to reduce gaps to the point of being able to solve a significant part of all instances. We go on to study the effect of combining SECs / LSECs with other classes of inequalities. To this end we first separate SECs / LSECs to strengthen the LP-relaxation before applying separation procedures for different classes on inequalities while employing both primal heuristics and objective value propagation. The results are depicted in Table 3. Unfortunately, the effects of separating additional inequalities from the strengthened relaxation has no significant effect on either the amount of instances solved to optimality or the remaining gap for unsolved instances.

5.5 Learning to branch

While tailoring the solver lead to significant improvements in the running times, it is still not possible in a reasonable amount of time to solve real world instances to

Table 3: Solving statistics for different combinations of speedup techniques, based on 50 different instances consisting of 20 vertices each.

			Number of instances solved	Remaining gap	Running time
LSEC +	D_k^+	3	0.067 / 0.043	1324.42 / 1241.39	
Primal heuristics +	Odd CAT	3	0.067 / 0.043	1323.42 / 1237.86	
Propagation	Odd path-free	4	0.069 / 0.049	2099.57 / 2073.44	
	Unitary AFC	4	0.068 / 0.050	2440.61 / 2362.65	
SEC +	D_k^+	3	0.063 / 0.042	2003.70 / 1795.30	
Primal heuristics +	Odd CAT	3	0.063 / 0.042	2004.71 / 1792.86	
Propagation	Odd path-free	4	0.065 / 0.044	2607.33 / 2517.95	
	Unitary AFC	3	0.063 / 0.039	1366.55 / 1210.92	

optimality.

A key problem regarding Branch-and-Bound schemes (and by extension, Branch-Price-and-Cut schemes) is the selection of the branching candidate in the presence of several fractional variables. To this end, multiple branching rules have been proposed in the literature, among these the *strong branching* rule. Strong branching chooses the "best" possible fractional variable with respect to a certain score, based on LP-relaxations related to the current Branch-and-Bound node (see [3] for details). Strong branching usually yields much smaller Branch-and-Bound trees. However, the computational costs to evaluate the score of variables is rather high. As a result, strong branching is usually only employed at the root node of the Branch-and-Bound tree.

Khalil et al. [20] suggested to employ machine learning techniques to learn a branching rule yielding a similar size of the Branch-and-Bound tree, while avoiding the computational overhead. The authors used an SVM-based approach to learn a branching rule based on several generic MIP features, such as fractionality, pseudocost, and various variable statistics. Labels were assigned based on strong branching scores. While the results were promising, the authors were not able to beat the CPLEX-default branching rule with respect to running time or Branch-and-Bound tree size.

Still, they suggest that the selection and weighing of different features may be advan-

tageous in order to obtain improved instance-specific branching models. Furthermore, there has been rapid development regarding rank learning techniques, mainly driven by web search engine development (see [22] for a summary). As a result, the SVM-based ranking approach [18] has been superseded by different approaches. Specifically, the lambdaMART [9] algorithm, a boosted tree version of LambdaRank seems to perform significantly better on web search related test data.³

In this paper, we use the lambdaMART algorithm to learn a ranking of branching candidates depending on some of the features from [20] and some features specific to the TDTSP. We generated 20 to 30 training instances. For each of these, we collected training data from several branching nodes, yielding slightly more than 5000 data samples to learn the ranking function. Labels were assigned based on strong branching scores. The following features were collected for each arc $a = (u, v) \in A$ depending on the value of the current LP-value Z_{LP} and the cost Z^* of the best feasible solution available:

- cost relative to the current LP value: c_a/Z_{LP}
- cost relative to the best feasible solution: c_a/Z^*
- cost relative to the current gap: $c_a/(Z^* - Z_{LP})$
- distance to one and zero: $x_{uv}, 1 - x_{uv}$
- variable slack: $\min(x_{uv}, 1 - x_{uv})$
- number of arcs (u, v, θ) in A^T divided by $|A^T|$
- number of arcs (u, v, θ) in A^T which have been priced into the current LP divided by $|A^T|$
- pseudocost of arc x_{uv}
- the (four) sizes relative to $|V|$ of the connected components containing u or v of the subgraph containing only the arcs branched to one or zero

We trained two different ranking functions; one based on small instances, each containing $|V| = 10$ vertices, one based large instances, each containing $|V| = 20$ vertices. We compared the resulting branching rules with the one built into SCIP. To this end, we generated 20 small, respectively large, random instances different from the training instances and compared the branching rules with respect to running time and remaining gap. The results can be found in Table 4.

Unfortunately, these first tests were not successful, since the running times got worse.

³A lambdaMART implementation is readily available as part of the Quickrank [10] C++ library.

Table 4: Solving statistics for different branching rules, averaged over twenty small and large instances, respectively

			Number of instances solved	Remaining gap	Running time
Small instances	MC-branching, trained on large instances	19	0.10 / 0.10	305.73 / 51.12	
	MC-branching, trained on small instances	19	0.14 / 0.14	220.66 / 47.84	
	Built-in branching	20	–	58.93 / 22.78	
Large instances	MC-branching, trained on large instances	0	0.49 / 0.45		–
	MC-branching, trained on small instances	0	0.49 / 0.44		–
	Built-in branching	0	0.44 / 0.38		–

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have discussed several theoretical and empirical properties of the TDTSP. Since the TDTSP is a generalization of the ATSP, many of the complexity-specific theoretical results, such as \mathcal{NP} -hardness and inapproximability, carry over to the TDTSP.

Unfortunately, several positive results regarding the ATSP are not retained in the TDTSP. Specifically, the TDTSP remains inapproximable even if a generalized triangle inequality is satisfied. Furthermore, even simple relaxations, such as time-dependent trees cannot be used to determine combinatorial lower bounds on the TDTSP.

From a practitioner’s point of view, the increase in problem size poses significant problems when trying to solve even moderate-sized instances of the TDTSP. The authors of [1] conclude that there are challenging instance of the STDTSP with less than one hundred vertices. While the results date back some years, the increase in computational complexity is apparent even in the case of the STDTSP.

To be able to tackle the TDTSP, a sophisticated pricing routine is absolutely necessary. The path-based structure of the formulation is helpful in devising a pricing routine which employs the technique of Lagrangean relaxations. The connection between TDTSP and ATSP yields a variety of feasible classes of inequalities which help to

significantly improve dual bounds. Unfortunately, the generalizations of STDTSP-type inequalities do not perform equally well in comparison. Objective value propagation and primal heuristics decrease the gap even further. The primal heuristics profit from the connection to the ATSP, significantly outperforming the heuristics built into the solver itself.

Similar to the results in [20], the learned branching rule does not surpass the conventional methods. Still, better features, a reinforcement learning approach, or learning parts of a solution directly might change the picture.

References

- [1] H. Abeledo, R. Fukasawa, A. Pessoa, and E. Uchoa. The time dependent traveling salesman problem: polyhedra and algorithm. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 5(1):27–55, 2013.
- [2] T. Achterberg. SCIP: solving constraint integer programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 1(1):1–41, 2009.
- [3] T. Achterberg, T. Koch, and A. Martin. Branching rules revisited. *Operations Research Letters*, 33(1):42–54, 2005.
- [4] D. L. Applegate, R. E. Bixby, V. Chvatal, and W. J. Cook. *The traveling salesman problem: a computational study*. Princeton university press, 2011.
- [5] N. Ascheuer, M. Fischetti, and M. Grötschel. A polyhedral study of the asymmetric traveling salesman problem with time windows. *Networks*, 36(2):69–79, 2000.
- [6] N. Ascheuer, M. Fischetti, and M. Grötschel. Solving the asymmetric travelling salesman problem with time windows by branch-and-cut. *Mathematical Programming*, 90(3):475–506, 2001.
- [7] E. Balas. The asymmetric assignment problem and some new facets of the traveling salesman polytope on a directed graph. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 2(4):425–451, 1989.
- [8] L.-P. Bigras, M. Gamache, and G. Savard. The time-dependent traveling salesman problem and single machine scheduling problems with sequence dependent setup times. *Discrete Optimization*, 5(4):685–699, 2008.
- [9] C. J. Burges. From ranknet to lambdarank to lambdamart: An overview. *Learning*, 11(23-581):81, 2010.
- [10] G. Capannini, D. Dato, C. Lucchese, M. Mori, F. M. Nardini, S. Orlando, R. Perego, and N. Tonello. Quickrank: A C++ suite of learning to rank algorithms. In *IIR*, 2015.

- [11] N. Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. Technical report, Carnegie-Mellon Univ Pittsburgh Pa Management Sciences Research Group, 1976.
- [12] D. Delling and D. Wagner. Time-dependent route planning. *Robust and online large-scale optimization*, 5868(1):207–230, 2009.
- [13] L. Fleischer and M. Skutella. Quickest flows over time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(6):1600–1630, 2007.
- [14] L. Gouveia and S. Voß. A classification of formulations for the (time-dependent) traveling salesman problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 83(1):69–82, 1995.
- [15] M. Grötschel and M. W. Padberg. Lineare charakterisierungen von travelling salesman problemen. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 21(1):33–64, 1977.
- [16] G. Gutin and A. P. Punnen. *The traveling salesman problem and its variations*, volume 12. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [17] S. Irnich and D. Villeneuve. The shortest-path problem with resource constraints and k-cycle elimination for k 3. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 18(3):391–406, 2006.
- [18] T. Joachims. Training linear svms in linear time. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 217–226. ACM, 2006.
- [19] D. E. Kaufman and R. L. Smith. Fastest paths in time-dependent networks for intelligent vehicle-highway systems application. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 1(1):1–11, 1993.
- [20] E. B. Khalil, P. Le Bodic, L. Song, G. L. Nemhauser, and B. N. Dilkina. Learning to branch in mixed integer programming. In *AAAI*, pages 724–731, 2016.
- [21] B. Korte and J. Vygen. *Combinatorial optimization: Theory and algorithms*, pages 557–592. Springer, 5 edition, 2012.
- [22] H. Li. Learning to rank for information retrieval and natural language processing. *Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies*, 4(1):1–113, 2011.
- [23] M. E. Lübbecke and J. Desrosiers. Selected topics in column generation. *Operations Research*, 53(6):1007–1023, 2005.
- [24] A. Lbel. Vehicle scheduling in public transit and lagrangean pricing. *Management Sci*, 44:1637–1649, 1998.

- [25] A. Pessoa, E. Uchoa, M. P. de Aragão, and R. Rodrigues. Exact algorithm over an arc-time-indexed formulation for parallel machine scheduling problems. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 2(3):259–290, 2010.
- [26] J.-C. Picard and M. Queyranne. The time-dependent traveling salesman problem and its application to the tardiness problem in one-machine scheduling. *Operations Research*, 26(1):86–110, 1978.
- [27] J.-C. Picard and M. Queyranne. The time-dependent traveling salesman problem and its application to the tardiness problem in one-machine scheduling. *Operations Research*, 26(1):86–110, 1978.
- [28] D. J. Rosenkrantz, R. E. Stearns, and I. Philip M. Lewis. An analysis of several heuristics for the traveling salesman problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6(3):563–581, 1977.
- [29] F. Schulz, D. Wagner, and K. Weihe. Dijkstra’s algorithm on-line: an empirical case study from public railroad transport. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)*, 5:12, 2000.
- [30] P. Toth and D. Vigo. *The vehicle routing problem*. SIAM, 2002.