

# Recognising permuted Demidenko matrices

Eranda Çela\*  
 Vladimir Deineko†  
 Gerhard J. Woeginger‡

## Abstract

We solve the recognition problem (RP) for the class of Demidenko matrices. Our result closes a remarkable gap in the recognition of specially structured matrices. Indeed, the recognition of permuted Demidenko matrices is a longstanding open problem, in contrast to the efficiently solved RP for important subclasses of Demidenko matrices such as the Kalmanson matrices, the Supnick matrices, the Monge matrices and the Anti-Robinson matrices. The recognition of the permuted Demidenko matrices is relevant in the context of hard combinatorial optimization problems which become tractable if the input is a Demidenko matrix. Demidenko matrices were introduced by Demidenko in 1976, when he proved that the Travelling Salesman Problem (TSP) is polynomially solvable if the symmetric distance matrix fulfills certain combinatorial conditions, nowadays known as the *Demidenko conditions*. In the context of the TSP the recognition problem consists in deciding whether there is a renumbering of the cities such that the correspondingly renumbered distance matrix fulfills the Demidenko conditions, thus resulting in a polynomially solvable special case of the TSP. We show that such a renumbering of  $n$  cities can be found in  $O(n^4)$  time, if it exists.

**Keywords.** Combinatorial optimization, travelling salesman problem, Demidenko condition, permuted Demidenko matrices.

## 1 Introduction

Optimizing over permutations is a generic problem in combinatorial optimization. In an instance of size  $n$ , the set of feasible solution  $\mathcal{F}_n$  is a subset of the set  $\mathcal{S}_n$  of permutations of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}_n$ . The generic problem  $P$  is then given as  $\min\{f(\pi) : \pi \in \mathcal{F}_n\}$ , where  $f : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the objective function. Some fundamental NP-hard problems in combinatorial optimization can be cast in this way, as for example *the travelling salesman problem (TSP)*, *the quadratic assignment problem (QAP)* or *the path travelling salesman problem (PTSP)*. In all these cases the objective function  $f(\pi)$  is determined in terms of one or two matrices

---

\*cela@opt.math.tu-graz.ac.at. Department of Discrete Mathematics, TU Graz, Steyrergasse 30, A-8010 Graz, Austria

†Vladimir.Deineko@wbs.ac.uk. Warwick Business School, The University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

‡Deceased in April 2022. Lehrstuhl für Informatik 1 (Algorithmen und Komplexität), RWTH Aachen University, Erweiterungsbau 1 (2353), Ahornstr. 55, Germany

of coefficients. In the TSP we are given as input an  $n \times n$  distance matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  and the objective function  $f_{TSP}^C$  is given as

$$f_{TSP}^C(\pi) := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{\pi(i)\pi(i+1)} + c_{\pi(n)\pi(1)}, \text{ for } \pi \in \mathcal{F}_n := \mathcal{S}_n.$$

In the QAP the input consists of two  $n \times n$  matrices  $A = (a_{ij})$ ,  $B = (b_{ij})$  and the objective function  $f_{QAP}^{A,B}$  is given as

$$f_{QAP}^{A,B}(\pi) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{\pi(i)\pi(j)} b_{ij}, \text{ for } \pi \in \mathcal{F}_n := \mathcal{S}_n.$$

Finally, in the PTSP the input consists of an  $n \times n$  distance matrix  $D = (d_{ij})$ , a start index  $i$  and an end index  $j$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and the objective function  $f_{PTSP}^D$  is given as

$$f_{PTSP}^D(\pi) := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{\pi(i)\pi(i+1)}, \text{ for } \pi \in \mathcal{F}_n := \{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n : \pi(1) = i, \pi(n) = j\}.$$

All these problems are hard, both from the theoretical and from the practical point of view. In particular, the TSP is one of the best studied problems in combinatorial optimization and in operational research, not only because of its numerous practical applications, but also due to its special role in developing and testing new approaches in the above mentioned fields, see e.g. [1, 14, 17]. The TSP is NP-hard to solve exactly (see for instance [12]), and APX-hard to approximate (see for instance [20]). The QAP is a classical and well studied problem with numerous and relevant applications. It is NP-hard to solve exactly and NP-hard to approximate, see eg. [24], while also being very hard from the practical point of view. Indeed, solving to optimality general instances of size  $n = 35$  still remains challenging, see for example the recent paper [11]. Finally, the PTSP shares the (theoretical) hardness of the previously mentioned problems being NP-hard and APX-hard, see eg. [26, 27].

Given the intractability of these problems, the characterization of tractable special cases is of obvious interest and forms a well-established and vivid branch of research. Most of the tractable special cases arise if certain combinatorial conditions, as for example *four-point conditions* (see [7]), are imposed on the coefficient matrices of the problem. These conditions give rise to special classes of matrices such as for example *Monge*, *Kalmanson*, *Supnick*, *Anti-Robinson* and *Demidenko* matrices. There are quite a number of tractable special cases of the TSP related to these matrix classes, we refer to [7] and the references therein for a comprehensive survey. More recently, four point conditions based special cases have also been investigated for the QAP and the PTSP, see for example [4, 5] and the references therein.

Assume now that the generic problem  $P$  above is tractable (polynomially solvable) if its coefficient matrix (or matrices) belongs to some particular class (or classes) of matrices, say  $\mathcal{C}$  (or  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ ).

Further, consider an instance  $I$  of  $P$  with the following property: the coefficient matrix (coefficient matrices) of  $I$  can be permuted according to some permutation  $\varphi$  (or permutations  $\varphi, \psi$ ) so as to lie in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We refer to the instance of  $P$  with the permuted coefficient

matrix (coefficient matrices) as *the permuted instance*. Notice that the permuted instance is tractable if the permutation  $\varphi$  (the permutations  $\varphi, \psi$ ) is (are) known or can be efficiently computed. In this case an optimal solution of the original instance  $I$  can be easily obtained from the optimal solution of the permuted instance by using the permutation  $\varphi$  ( $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ ). Let us illustrate the idea in terms of the TSP. Assume that the special case of the TSP where the distance matrix belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$  is polynomially solvable. Consider an instance of the TSP with distance matrix  $C$  which can be permuted, say by a permutation  $\varphi$ , such that  $C^\varphi := (c_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)}) \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\pi^*$  be an optimal solution of the TSP instance with distance matrix  $C^\varphi$ . Then  $\varphi \circ \pi^*$  is an optimal solution of the TSP instance with distance matrix  $C$  because the following equality holds for any  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n$ :

$$f_{TSP}^{C^\varphi}(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{\pi(i)\pi(i+1)}^\varphi + c_{\pi(n)\pi(1)}^\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_{\varphi(\pi(i))\varphi(\pi(i+1))} + c_{\varphi(\pi(n))\varphi(\pi(1))} = f_{TSP}^C(\varphi \circ \pi)$$

Thus, the question whether there exists a permutation  $\varphi$  such that  $C^\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$  holds is relevant for the efficient solvability of the considered TSP instance. Being able to answer this question and to determine the corresponding permutation in the positive case would result in a larger class of polynomially solvable special cases of the problem.

The generic recognition problem for a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of matrices (which could be described in terms of some combinatorial properties) is defined as follows:

**Problem:** RECOGNITION- $\mathcal{C}$

**Instance:**  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , an  $n \times n$  matrix  $C$ .

**Task:** Is there some permutation  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_n$  such that the permuted matrix  $C^\varphi$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}$ ? If yes, then determine such a  $\varphi$ .

In particular, the recognition problem for the class of Demidenko matrices is relevant in the context of the following two results. In 1976, Vitali Demidenko [10] proved that the TSP restricted to Demidenko matrices can be solved in  $O(n^2)$  time (cf. Gilmore, Lawler and Shmoys [13]). In the recent paper [5] it was shown that the PTSP on Demidenko matrices is also solvable in polynomial time.

While the recognition problem for the class of Demidenko matrices has been open for around forty years, it is known to be polynomially solvable for a number of proper subclasses of the class of Demidenko matrices such as the Kalmanson matrices, the Supnick matrices, the Monge matrices and the Anti-Robinson matrices, see [6, 8, 9, 19, 21]. All these classes of matrices give rise to polynomially tractable cases of combinatorial optimization problems over permutations, including the TSP, the QAP and/or the PTSP, see for example [2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 25]. In this paper we close the gap and solve the recognition problem for Demidenko matrices. More precisely, we show how to decide whether a given  $n \times n$  matrix  $D$  can be permuted to a Demidenko matrix and how to construct the corresponding permutation in  $O(n^4)$  time, in the positive case.

**Organization of the paper.** In the next section we introduce some basic notations and define the Demidenko matrices as well as the Anti-Robinson matrices which turn out to be

relevant in this paper. In Section 3 we discuss some properties of (permuted) Demidenko and (permuted) Robinson matrices and focus on the relationship between these matrix classes. Then, in Section 4, we present an algorithm for Recognition- $\mathcal{D}$ , the recognition problem for the class  $\mathcal{D}$  of Demidenko matrices. Finally we close the paper with a short summary in Section 5.

## 2 Definitions and notations

**Definition 2.1** *A symmetric  $n \times n$ -matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  is called a Demidenko matrix if its entries satisfy the inequalities*

$$c_{ji} + c_{kl} \leq c_{jl} + c_{ki}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n. \quad (1)$$

*A matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  is called a permuted Demidenko matrix if there is a permutation  $\varphi$  of its rows and columns such that the permuted matrix  $C^\varphi = (c_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)})$  is a Demidenko matrix. Such a permutation  $\varphi$  is called a Demidenko permutation for the matrix  $C$ .*

Note that the conditions (1) do not involve the entries  $c_{ii}$ ,  $c_{1i}$  and  $c_{ni}$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ , respectively.

The system (1) contains  $O(n^4)$  inequalities, but it can be easily seen that it is equivalent to the following system of  $O(n^3)$  inequalities

$$c_{ji} + c_{j+1,l} \leq c_{jl} + c_{j+1,i}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j < j+1 < l \leq n. \quad (2)$$

Further, it can be easily seen, that the later system (2) is equivalent to the following conditions which can be checked in  $O(n^2)$  time

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, j-1} \{c_{ji} - c_{j+1,i}\} \leq \min_{l=j+2, \dots, n} \{c_{jl} - c_{j+1,l}\}, \quad \text{for all } 2 \leq j \leq n-2. \quad (3)$$

Thus, it can be decided in  $O(n^2)$  time whether a given symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix  $C$  is a Demidenko matrix.

Next we define the Robinson matrices. They arise in combinatorial data analysis [23] and have some nice applications and implications in the context of combinatorial optimization problems, see e.g. [4, 18, 21].

**Definition 2.2** *A symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix  $A = (a_{ij})$  is called an Anti-Robinson matrix if it satisfies the following conditions:*

$$a_{ik} \geq \max\{a_{ij}, a_{jk}\}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j < k \leq n. \quad (4)$$

*In words, in each row and column of  $A$  the entries do not decrease when moving away from the main diagonal. A matrix  $C = (c_{ij})$  is called a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix if there is a permutation  $\varphi$  of its rows and columns such that the permuted matrix  $C^\varphi = (c_{\varphi(i)\varphi(j)})$  is an Anti-Robinson matrix. Such a permutation  $\varphi$  is called an Anti-Robinson permutation for the matrix  $C$ .*

Notice that the Anti-Robinson matrices build a subclass of the class of the Demidenko matrices. Indeed, the inequalities (4) imply  $a_{ji} \leq a_{ki}$  and  $a_{kl} \leq a_{jl}$ , for  $1 \leq i < j < k < l \leq n$ , and by summing up these inequalities we obtain the inequalities (1). It is easy to check that the inclusion mentioned above is proper, i.e. that there are Demidenko matrices which are not Anti-Robinson matrices. See for example the  $5 \times 5$  Demidenko matrix below and notice that similar  $n \times n$  matrices can be constructed for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $a_{13} < a_{12}$ ,  $A$  is not an Anti-Robinson matrix.

**Notations.** In the following we will introduce some notations used throughout the paper. For a given  $n \times n$  matrix  $C$  we identify each of its rows (columns) by the corresponding index. Thus  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the set of rows (columns) of  $C$ . A row  $i$  precedes a row  $j$  in  $C$  ( $i \prec j$ , for short), if row  $i$  occurs before row  $j$  in  $C$ . A set  $K_1$  of rows (columns) is said to precede a set  $K_2$  of rows (columns) iff  $k_1 \prec k_2$  for all  $k_1 \in K_1$  and for all  $k_2 \in K_2$ . In this case we write  $K_1 \prec K_2$ . Let  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$  be a subset of  $I$ . We denote by  $C[V]$  the  $r \times r$  submatrix of  $C$  which is obtained by deleting all rows and columns not contained in  $V$ .

For a permutation  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n$ , we denote  $\pi = \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle$  iff  $\pi(i) = x_i$  holds for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For two subset of indices  $K, L \subset I$  with  $K \cap L = \emptyset$  and a permutation  $\pi$  we say that  $K$  precedes  $L$  in  $\pi$  iff for any  $k \in K$  and for any  $l \in L$ , the indices  $i, j \in I$  with  $\pi(i) = k$ ,  $\pi(j) = l$  fulfill  $i < j$ . In this case we write  $K \prec_\pi L$  or simply  $K \prec L$ , whenever the permutation  $\pi$  is clear from the context. Finally, let  $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $K \subset I$  with  $K = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|K|}\}$  such that  $1 < |K| < n$  and  $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_{|K|}$ . We say that a permutation  $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_n$  and a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  coincide on  $K$  iff for any  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$ ,  $\tau(s_i) < \tau(s_j)$  implies  $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j)$  and vice-versa.

### 3 The relationship between permuted Demidenko matrices and permuted Anti-Robinson matrices

In this section we investigate the relationship between (permuted) Demidenko matrices and (permuted) Anti-Robinson matrices. The next lemma describes the relationship between some special Demidenko matrices and Anti-Robinson matrices.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $C$  be an  $n \times n$  Demidenko matrix such  $c_{1j} = c_{i1} = a$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $i, j \in I := \{2, \dots, n\}$ . Further, assume that for some  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-2\}$  there exists constant  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and a subset of indices  $K \subseteq I' := I \setminus \{1, 2, \dots, r, n\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^r c_{ij} - rc_{in} = b$  for any  $i \in K$ . Then the submatrix  $C[K]$  is an Anti-Robinson matrix.*

*Proof.* Consider first any two indices  $i_1, i_2 \in K$ ,  $i_1 < i_2$  and observe that

$$\sum_{j=1}^r c_{i_1 j} - rc_{i_1 n} = \sum_{j=1}^r c_{i_2 j} - rc_{i_2 n} \tag{5}$$

implies  $c_{i_1j} - c_{i_1n} = c_{i_2j} - c_{i_2n}$  for any  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ . Indeed, assume that at least one of these equalities does not hold and denote by  $j_1$  the smallest index in  $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  for which  $c_{i_1j_1} - c_{i_1n} \neq c_{i_2j_1} - c_{i_2n}$ . The Demidenko condition for the quadruple  $j_1 < i_1 < i_2 < n$  implies  $c_{i_1j_1} - c_{i_1n} < c_{i_2j_1} - c_{i_2n}$ . The latter inequality together with 5 implies the existence of a  $j_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ , such that  $c_{i_1j_2} - c_{i_1n} > c_{i_2j_2} - c_{i_2n}$  holds. But this is a violation of the Demidenko condition for the quadruple  $j_2 < i_1 < i_2 < n$ . In particular for  $j = 1$  denote  $c_{i_11} - c_{i_1n} = c_{i_21} - c_{i_2n} =: b'$  for any  $i_1, i_2 \in K$ . The latter equalities together with  $c_{i_11} = c_{i_21} = a$  imply  $c_{in} = c_{ni} = a - b'$  for any  $i \in K$ . Now consider a triple  $j, k, l \in K$  with  $j < k < l$  and apply (1) with  $i = 1$ :  $c_{j1} + c_{kl} \leq c_{k1} + c_{jl}$ . With  $c_{j1} = c_{k1}$  we get  $c_{kl} \leq c_{jl}$ . Analogously, for any triple  $i, j, k \in K$  with  $i < j < k$  we apply (1) with  $l = n$ :  $c_{ji} + c_{kn} \leq c_{jn} + c_{ki}$ . With  $c_{kn} = c_{jn} = a - b'$  we get  $c_{ji} \leq c_{ki}$ . Thus the submatrix  $C[K]$  fulfills the inequalities (4) in Definition (2.2), therefore it is an Anti-Robinson matrix.  $\square$

The relationship stated by the above lemma extends to a relationship between permuted Demidenko and permuted Anti-Robinson matrices as follows.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $C$  be an  $n \times n$  permuted Demidenko matrix and let  $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_n$  be a Demidenko permutation for  $C$ . Assume that  $\tau$  fulfills  $\tau(n) = q$  and  $\tau(j) = p_j$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and some  $r \leq n - 2$ , where  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r, q \in I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  are pairwise different indices. Moreover, let  $C$  have a constant first row (column), i.e.  $c_{1i} = c_{i1} = a$  hold for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ . Further, assume that there exist a constant  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and a subset of indices  $K \subseteq I' := I \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_r, q\}$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^r c_{\tau(i)p_j} - rc_{\tau(i)q} = b$  for any  $i \in K$ . Then, the submatrix  $C[K]$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix. In particular, the unique permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  which coincides with  $\tau$  on  $K$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for  $C[K]$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the Demidenko matrix  $C^\tau = (c_{ij}^\tau)$  with  $c_{ij}^\tau = c_{\tau(i)\tau(j)}$  for any  $i, j \in I$ . Clearly, all non-diagonal entries in its first row and column are equal to  $a$ . Further, for any  $i \in K$  we have  $\sum_{j=1}^r c_{ij}^\tau - rc_{in}^\tau = \sum_{j=1}^r c_{\tau(i)p_j} - rc_{\tau(i)q} = b$ . Lemma 3.1 implies that the matrix  $C^\tau[K^\tau]$  is an Anti-Robinson matrix. Now observe that  $C^\tau[K^\tau]$  results from  $C[K]$  by permuting its rows and columns according to the unique permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  which coincides with  $\tau$  on  $K$ .  $\square$

Next observe that we can simply transform a given Demidenko matrix into a Demidenko matrix with a constant first row (and first column).

**Observation 3.3** *Let  $C$  be an  $n \times n$  Demidenko matrix. Then the matrix  $C' = (c'_{ij})$  with  $c'_{ij} := c_{ij} - c_{1j} - c_{i1}$  for any  $i, j \in I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is a Demidenko matrix with  $c'_{i,1} = c'_{1,i} = -c_{11}$  for any  $i \in I$ .*

Let  $C$  be a given symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix. The goal is to decide whether there exists a Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for the matrix  $C$ , i.e. a permutation  $\tau$  such that  $C^\tau = (c_{\tau(i)\tau(j)})$  is a Demidenko matrix, and to compute  $\tau$ , if it exists. To this end, we will identify some simple combinatorial properties of Demidenko permutations for the matrix  $C$ .

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $C$  be a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix and let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r, q \in I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , be pairwise different indices for  $r \leq n - 2$ . Let  $I' = I \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_r, q\}$  and  $m := \min\{\sum_{j=1}^r c_{ip_j} - rc_{iq} : i \in I'\}$ . Further let  $K := \{i \in I' : \sum_{j=1}^r c_{ip_j} - rc_{iq} = m\}$ . For any Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for  $C$  such that  $\tau(j) = p_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , and  $\tau(n) = q$  (if such a permutation exists) the following statements hold:*

(i) If  $K = \{s\}$  for some  $s \in I'$ , then  $\tau(r+1) = s$ .

(ii) If  $1 < |K| < n - r - 1$ , then  $K \prec L$  in  $\tau$ , where  $L := I' \setminus K$ . In other words,  $\{\tau(i) : i \in \{r+1, \dots, r+|K|\}\} = K$  holds.

*Proof.* Since  $C^\tau$  is a Demidenko matrix with  $\tau(j) = p_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , and  $\tau(n) = q$ , we apply (1) with  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ ,  $j, k \in I'$  such that  $j < k$ ,  $l = n$  and obtain

$$c_{ji}^\tau - c_{jn}^\tau \leq c_{ki}^\tau - c_{kn}^\tau \text{ or equivalently } c_{\tau(j)p_x} - c_{\tau(j)q} \leq c_{\tau(k)p_x} - c_{\tau(k)q}.$$

This inequalities imply

$$\sum_{x=1}^r c_{\tau(j),p_x} - r c_{\tau(j),q} \leq \sum_{x=1}^r c_{\tau(k),p_x} - r c_{\tau(k),q} \text{ for any } k > j, k, j \in I'. \quad (6)$$

The inequalities (6) imply  $\tau(r+1) \in K$ . Then, for  $K = \{s\}$  we get  $\tau(r+1) = s$  and thus (i) holds.

Assume now  $1 < |K| \leq n - 2$ . The inequalities (6) implies that  $\{s\}$  precedes  $\{s'\}$  in  $\tau$  for any  $s \in K$  and any  $s' \in L = I' \setminus K$ . Thus  $K \preceq L$  in  $\tau$  and (ii) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5** *Let  $C$  be a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix and let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r, q \in I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , be pairwise different indices for some  $r$  fulfilling  $1 \leq r \leq n - 3$ . Let  $m := \min\{\sum_{x=1}^r c_{ip_x} - r c_{iq} : i \in I' := I \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_r, q\}\}$ ,  $K := \{i \in I' : \sum_{x=1}^r c_{ip_x} - r c_{iq} = m\}$  and  $L := I' \setminus K$ . Let  $C' = (c'_{ij})$  be defined by  $c'_{ij} = c_{ij} - c_{ip_1} - c_{p_1j}$ , for  $i, j \in I$ . Assume further the existence of a Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  with respect to  $C$  such that  $\tau(j) = p_j$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and  $\tau(n) = q$ .*

(i) *If  $1 < |K| = n - (r+1)$ , then  $C'[K]$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix. Moreover, for any Anti-Robinson permutation  $\pi$  with respect to  $C'[K]$ , the permutation  $\tau' \in \mathcal{S}_n$  which coincides with  $\pi$  on  $K$  and fulfills  $\tau'(x) = p_x$  for  $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and  $\tau'(n) = q$ , is a Demidenko permutation for  $C$ .*

(ii) *Assume  $1 < |K| < n - (r+1)$ . Consider the symmetric  $(|K|+1) \times (|K|+1)$  matrix  $D = (d_{ij})$  obtained from  $C'[K]$  by appending to it a  $(|K|+1)$ -st column (row) with arbitrarily chosen  $d_{|K|+1,|K|+1}$  and  $d_{i,|K|+1} = d_{|K|+1,i} = M \sum_{j \in L} c_{ij}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$  and  $M$  being a positive large constant. Then,  $D$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix and an Anti-Robinson permutation  $\sigma'$  for matrix  $D$  is obtained by  $\sigma'(|K|+1) = |K|+1$  and  $\sigma'(i) = \sigma(i)$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is the unique permutation which coincides with  $\tau$  on  $K$ .*

*Vice-versa, for any Anti-Robinson permutation  $\pi'$  for matrix  $D$ , there exists a Demidenko permutation  $\tau'$  for matrix  $C$  such that  $\tau'(x) = p_x$  for  $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ ,  $\tau'(n) = q$  and  $\tau'$  concides with  $\pi'$  on  $K$ .*

*Proof of (i).* Assume first that  $|K| = n - (r+1)$ . Then, Lemma 3.2 implies that  $C'[K]$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix and that the uniquely defined permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  which coincides with  $\tau$  on  $K$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for matrix  $C'[K]$ .

Consider now any Anti-Robinson permutation  $\pi$  for matrix  $C'[K]$  and let  $\tau' \in \mathcal{S}_n$  be the uniquely defined permutation which coincides with  $\pi$  on  $K$  and fulfills  $\tau'(i) = p_i$ , for

$1 \leq i \leq r$ , and  $\tau'(n) = q$ . It can be easily checked that  $C'$  permuted by  $\tau'$  fulfills the Demidenko conditions (2). Indeed for any  $i, j, l$  in  $I'$  with  $r < i < j < j + 1 < l < n$  we have

$$c'_{\tau'(j)\tau'(i)} \leq c'_{\tau'(j+1)\tau'(i)} \text{ and } c'_{\tau'(j+1)\tau'(l)} \leq c'_{\tau'(j)\tau'(l)}, \quad (7)$$

because  $\tau'$  coincides with  $\pi$  on  $K$  and  $C'[K]$  permuted by  $\pi$  is an Anti-Robinson matrix. The inequalities (7) clearly imply (2) in this case. Further, for any  $i \leq r$ , and for any  $j, l \in I'$  with  $i < j < j + 1 < l < n$  the leftmost inequality in (7) is fulfilled by equality, whereas for any  $i, j \in I'$  with  $r < i < j < j + 1 < l = n$  the rightmost inequality in (7) is fulfilled by equality. Finally for any  $i \leq r$  and for any  $j \in I'$  with  $i < j < j + 1 < l = n$  both inequalities in (7) are fulfilled by equality. Thus  $C'$  permuted by  $\tau'$  fulfills the Demidenko conditions for any  $i, j, l$  in  $I$  with  $1 \leq i < j < j + 1 < l \leq n$  and this completes the proof of (i).

*Proof of (ii).* Consider now the case  $1 < |K| < n - (r + 1)$ . Let  $K = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|K|}\}$  and  $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_{|K|}$ . Consider the Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for matrix  $C$  with  $\tau(x) = p_x$  for  $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and  $\tau(n) = q$ . Then, obviously,  $\tau$  is also a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$ . Moreover  $c'_{\tau(1)i} = c'_{i\tau(1)} = -c_{pp}$  for any  $i \in I$ . Further,  $\sum_{x=1}^r c'_{\tau i p_x} - r c'_{\tau(i)q} = m$  for any  $i \in K$  due to the definition of  $K$ . Then, Lemma 3.2 implies that  $C'[K]$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix and the uniquely defined  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  which coincides with  $\tau$  on  $K$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for  $C'[K]$ . Consider now the  $(|K| + 1) \times (|K| + 1)$  matrix  $D$ . We show that it is permuted Anti-Robinson matrix. More precisely, we show that the permutation  $\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|+1}$  given by  $\sigma'(i) = \sigma(i)$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$  and  $\sigma'(|K| + 1) = |K| + 1$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for  $D$ . To this end it is enough to show the following two families of inequalities

$$d_{\sigma'(i+1), |K|+1} \leq d_{\sigma'(i), |K|+1} \text{ for any } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K| - 1\} \quad (8)$$

and

$$d_{\sigma'(i)\sigma'(|K|)} \leq d_{\sigma'(i), |K|+1} \text{ for any } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K| - 1\}. \quad (9)$$

Notice that for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K| - 1\}$  we have

$$d_{\sigma'(i+1), |K|+1} = d_{\sigma(i+1), |K|+1} = d_{\tau(s_{i+1}), |K|+1} = M \sum_{j \in L} c'_{\tau(s_{i+1})\tau(j)}, \quad (10)$$

and analogously

$$d_{\sigma'(i), |K|+1} = M \sum_{j \in L} c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(j)}. \quad (11)$$

Since  $K \preceq L$  and the matrix  $(C')^\tau$  (obtained through the permutation of  $C'$  by  $\tau$ ) is a Demidenko matrix with a constant first column, the Demidenko conditions for  $(C')^\tau$  with  $1 < i < i + 1 < j$  imply  $c'_{\tau(s_{i+1})\tau(j)} \leq c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(j)}$  for any  $j \in L$ . The latter inequalities together with (10) and (11) imply (8). Finally, (9) is equivalent to  $c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(s_{|K|})} \leq M \sum_{j \in L} c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(j)}$  and the latter inequality can be guaranteed by choosing  $M$  large enough.



Now assume that  $D$  is an Anti-Robinson matrix and consider an Anti-Robinson permutation  $\pi' \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|+1}$  for matrix  $D$ . By choosing  $M$  large enough we can ensure that  $\pi'(|K|+1) = |K|+1$ . Then,  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  with  $\pi(i) = \pi'(i)$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for  $C'[K]$ . Consider the Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for  $C$  with  $\tau(j) = p_j$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and  $\tau(n) = q$  which exists according to the assumptions of the lemma. Clearly,  $\tau$  is also a Demidenko permutation for matrix  $C'$ . Hence, Lemma 3.4 implies that  $K \preceq L$  in  $\tau$ , i.e.  $\{\tau(i) : i \in K\} = \{r+1, \dots, |K|+r\}$  holds. If  $\tau$  coincides with  $\pi$  on  $K$  we are done. Otherwise, we modify  $\tau$  by permuting the entries  $\tau(s_i)$ ,  $i \in K$ , so as to obtain a new permutation  $\tau' \in \mathcal{S}_n$  which coincides with  $\pi$  on  $K$  and fulfills  $\tau'(j) = p_j$ , for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ , as well as  $\tau'(n) = q$ . The proof is completed by showing that  $\tau'$  is a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$  and hence also for  $C$ .

Assume w.l.o.g. that  $\tau'$  is obtained by applying to  $\tau$  a transposition  $(s_i, s_j)$  for some  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, |K|\}$ , with  $i \neq j$ . This means that  $\tau'(s_i) = \tau(s_j)$ ,  $\tau'(s_j) = \tau(s_i)$  and  $\tau(l) = \tau'(l)$  for any  $l \in I \setminus \{s_i, s_j\}$ . We show that the rows (columns)  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  of  $C'$  coincide except for maybe the diagonal entries; this coincidence would then imply that  $\tau'$  is a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$  and also for  $C$ .

Assume by contradiction that there exist an  $l \in I \setminus \{s_i, s_j\}$  such that  $c'_{s_i, l} \neq c'_{s_j, l}$ . Let  $\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|+1}$  and  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{|K|}$  be defined from  $\tau$  as in the already proved direction of (ii). Thus  $\tau$  coincides with  $\sigma$  on  $K$ ,  $\sigma$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for matrix  $C'[K]$  and  $\sigma'$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation for matrix  $D$ . Since  $\tau'$  is obtained by applying to  $\tau$  a transposition  $(s_i, s_j)$ , then  $\sigma$  is obtained from  $\pi$  and  $\sigma'$  is obtained from  $\pi'$  by applying the transposition  $(i, j)$ , respectively. Observe that  $l \notin K$ . Indeed, under the assumption  $l \in K$  and by assuming w.l.o.g.  $\tau(s_i) < \tau(s_j) < \tau(l)$  we get  $c'_{\tau(s_j)\tau(l)} \leq c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l)}$  and  $c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l)} = c'_{\tau'(s_j)\tau(l)} \leq c'_{\tau'(s_i)\tau(l)} = c_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l)}$ , hence  $c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l)} = c'_{\tau(s_j)\tau(l)}$ , a contradiction to  $c'_{s_i, l} \neq c'_{s_j, l}$ . Thus  $l \notin K$ , implying  $l \in L$ . Since  $\pi'$  and  $\sigma'$  are both Anti-Robinson permutations for  $D$  and  $\pi'(k) = \sigma'(k)$  for any  $k \notin \{i, j\}$  we get by an analogous argument that  $d_{i, |K|+1} = d_{j, |K|+1}$ , or equivalently,  $\sum_{t \in L} c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(t)} = \sum_{t \in L} c'_{\tau(s_j)\tau(t)}$ . Assume w.l.o.g. that  $c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l)} < c'_{\tau(s_j)\tau(l)}$ . Then, there exists a  $l' \in L \setminus \{l\}$  such that  $c'_{\tau(s_i)\tau(l')} > c'_{\tau(s_j)\tau(l')}$ . Since  $l \neq l'$ , then  $\tau(l) = \tau'(l) \neq \tau'(l') = \tau(l')$ . Assume w.l.o.g.  $\tau(l) < \tau(l')$ . Then, the Demidenko condition (1) for  $(C')^\tau$  is violated by the indices  $\tau(s_i) < \tau(s_j) < \tau(l) < \tau(l')$ , contradicting the selection of  $\tau$  as a Demidenko permutation with respect to  $C'$ . Analogously the assumption  $\tau(l') < \tau(l)$  leads to a contradiction to  $\tau'$  being a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$ . Thus there exists no entry  $l$  in which the columns of  $C'$  indexed by  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  differ, except may be for the diagonal entries.  $\square$ .

## 4 A recognition algorithm for permuted Demidenko matrices

In this section we present an  $O(n^4)$  algorithm to solve the recognition problem for Demidenko matrices. The pseudocode is given in Algorithm 1 and involves the procedure `CheckCandidateDP` presented below. The basic idea is to exploit the relationship between Demidenko matrices and Anti-Robinson matrices described in Section 3 and to use some algorithm for the recognition of permuted Anti-Robinson matrices known in the literature, see [19, 21] and the references therein. More concretely, we use the  $O(n^2)$  algorithm of Pr ea and Fortin [21] for the recognition of  $n \times n$  Anti-Robinson matrices. In the following

this algorithm is denoted by ALG. ALG takes as input a symmetric matrix and its size and outputs a logical variable with the value TRUE, if the input is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix, and FALSE otherwise. ALG also has a second output, which is an Anti-Robinson permutation for the input matrix, if the logical output is TRUE. If the logical output is FALSE, the second output of ALG is obsolete and can be anything. Notice that the time complexity  $O(n^2)$  of ALG is the best possible given that the size of the input is  $O(n^2)$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** A recognition algorithm for permuted Demidenko matrices

---

```

1: procedure RECOGNPD( $C, n$ )
2:   for  $p = 1$  to  $n$  do
3:     for  $q = 1$  to  $n, p \neq q$  do
4:       Set  $r = 0, \pi(1) = p, \pi(n) = q$ .
5:       Set  $\pi(i) = 0$  for  $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n - 1\}$ .
6:       for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
7:         for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
8:           Set  $c'_{ij} = c_{ij} - c_{pj} - c_{ip}$ .
9:         end for
10:      end for
11:      ( $\text{IsDPCandidate}, \pi$ ) =  $\text{CheckCandidateDP}(C' = (c'_{ij}), n, r, \pi)$ 
12:      if  $\text{IsDPCandidate} = \text{TRUE}$  then
13:        if  $(C')^\pi$  fulfills conditions (3) then
14:          Return “ $C$  is a permuted Demidenko matrix with a Demidenko per-
15:          mutation  $\pi$ ” and stop.
16:        end if
17:      end if
18:    end for
19:  Return “ $C$  is not a permuted Demidenko matrix”
20: end procedure

```

---

Algorithm 1 takes as input a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix  $C$  and its size  $n$  and checks the existence of a Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for  $C$  such that  $\tau(1) = p$  and  $\tau(n) = q$  for each fixed pair of indices  $p, q \in I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, p \neq q$ . This is done by calling the procedure `CheckCandidateDP` (see line 11 of Algorithm 1) which has four inputs. The two first inputs are the matrix  $C'$  (computed as specified in Lemma 3.5) and its size  $n$ . The third input is a *partial permutation*  $\pi$ . `CheckCandidateDP` checks whether  $\pi$  can be completed to a candidate Demidenko permutation for  $C$ . At the first call of `CheckCandidateDP`  $\pi$  is initialized by setting  $\pi(1) = p, \pi(n) = q$  and  $\pi(i) = 0$ , for  $i \notin \{2, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Thus, at initialization only two entries of the partial permutation  $\pi$  are fixed. During (recursive) calls of `CheckCandidateDP` further entries of  $\pi$  are fixed. Indeed, the third input of `CheckCandidateDP` is the number  $r$  of fixed entries of  $\pi$  besides  $\pi(n)$ . `CheckCandidateDP`( $C', n, r, \pi$ ) returns two values, a logical value `IsDPCandidate` which is TRUE, if it is possible to complete  $\pi$  to a candidate Demidenko permutation for  $C$ , and FALSE otherwise. The second output is  $\pi$ ; it is the candidate Demidenko permutation for matrix  $C'$  (and also  $C$ ), if `IsDPCandidate` is returned TRUE, and an (obsolete) par-

tial permutation, if `IsDPCandidate` is returned `FALSE`. Assume that `CheckCandidateDP` returns `(TRUE,  $\pi$ )`. In this case Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 guarantee that  $\pi$  is a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$  (and thus for  $C$ ) provided that there exists a Demidenko permutation for  $C$  which maps 1 and  $n$  to the current values of  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Thus, Algorithm 1 checks whether  $\pi$  is a Demidenko permutation for  $C'$  and stops with the corresponding message in the positive case (see line 14 of Algorithm 1). In the negative case, there is no Demidenko permutation for  $C$  which maps 1 to  $p$  and  $n$  to  $q$  (cf. Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5). Then, `CheckCandidateDP` is called for the next pair  $(p, q)$ . If `IsDPCandidate` still equals `FALSE` at the end of the double for-loop, then there is no Demidenko permutation for  $C$  and Algorithm 1 stops with the corresponding message in line 19.

The procedure `CheckCandidateDP` first computes the quantities  $m := \min\{\sum_{x=1}^r c_{i\pi(x)} - rc_{i\pi(n)} : i \in I'\}$  and  $K := \{i \in I' : \sum_{x=1}^r c_{i\pi(x)} - rc_{i\pi(n)} = m\}$  where  $I' = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(i) : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\} \cup \{n\}\}$  (as specified in Lemma 3.4). Then, the following three cases are distinguished:  $|K| = 1$ ,  $|K| = n - r - 1$  and  $1 < |K| < n - r - 1$ .

In the case  $|K| = 1$   $K = \{s\}$ , the algorithm sets  $\tau(r+1) = s$ . In this case, Lemma 3.4 implies that  $\tau(r+1) = s$  must hold for every Demidenko permutation  $\tau$  for  $C$  mapping the indices  $\{1, 2, \dots, r, n\}$  as specified by the incomplete permutation  $\pi$ . Then  $\pi$  and  $r$  are updated accordingly and a recursive call of `CheckCandidateDP` follows.

In the case  $|K| = n - r - 1$ , `ALG` is applied to check whether  $C'[K]$  defined as in Lemma 3.5(i) is an Anti-Robinson matrix. In the negative case, i.e. if `ALG` returns `FALSE`, Lemma 3.5(i) implies that there exists no Demidenko permutation for  $C$  which maps the indices  $\{1, 2, \dots, r, n\}$  as specified by the incomplete permutation  $\pi$ . Accordingly, `CheckCandidateDP` returns `FALSE`. If `ALG` returns `TRUE`, then  $\psi \in \mathcal{S}_{n-r-1}$  is an Anti-Robinson permutation with respect to  $C'[K]$ . According to Lemma 3.5(i) the partial permutation  $\pi$  can then be completed to a candidate Demidenko permutation for  $C$  which coincides with  $\psi$  on  $K$ . `CheckCandidateDP` returns `TRUE` and the candidate Demidenko permutation  $\pi$  for  $C$ .

Finally, in the case  $1 < |K| < n - r - 1$ , with  $K = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|K|}\}$  and  $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_{|K|}$ , the  $(|K| + 1) \times (|K| + 1)$  matrix  $D$  is constructed as specified in Lemma 3.5(ii) (lines 22 to 30 in procedure `CheckCandidateDP`). Then, `ALG` is applied to check whether  $D$  is a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix. In the negative case, Lemma 3.5(ii) implies that there is no Demidenko permutation for  $C$  which maps the indices  $\{1, 2, \dots, r, n\}$  as specified by the incomplete permutation  $\pi$ . Accordingly, `CheckCandidateDP` returns `FALSE`. In the positive case `CheckCandidateDP` fixes the values of  $\pi$  for further  $|K|$  indices (line 34 of `CheckCandidateDP`) in accordance with the second statement in Lemma 3.5(ii). Then  $\pi$  and  $r$  are updated accordingly and a recursive call of `CheckCandidateDP` follows.

Summarizing, we conclude that Algorithm 1 correctly decides whether its input is a permuted Demidenko matrix and outputs a Demidenko permutation for the input matrix in the positive case.

```

1: procedure CHECKCANDIDATEDP( $C, n, r, \pi$ )
2:   Set  $I' := \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\pi(i) : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\} \cup \{n\}\}$ .
3:   Set  $m := \min\{\sum_{x=1}^r c_{i\pi(x)} - rc_{i\pi(n)} : i \in I'\}$ .
4:   Set  $K := \{i \in I' : \sum_{x=1}^r c_{i\pi(x)} - rc_{i\pi(n)} = m\}$ .
5:   if  $|K| = 1$  then
6:     Set  $\pi(r+1) = x$  for  $x \in K$ .
7:     Set  $r := r + 1$ .
8:     (IsDPCandidate, $\pi$ )=CheckCandidateDP( $C, n, r, \pi$ )
9:   end if
10:  if  $|K| = n - r - 1$  then
11:    Compute  $C[K]$  for  $K = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|K|}\}$ .
12:    (IsDPCandidate, $\psi$ )=ALG( $C[K], |K|$ )    ▷ Check whether  $C[K]$  is a permuted
Anti-Robinson matrix
13:    if IsDPCandidate=TRUE then
14:      for  $i = 1$  to  $n - r - 1$  do
15:        Set  $\pi(r+i) = s_{\psi(i)}$ .
16:      end for
17:    end if
18:    Return (IsDPCandidate, $\pi$ )
19:  end if
20:  if  $1 < |K| < n - r - 1$  then
21:    Set  $M := 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |c_{ij}|$     ▷ Generate a large number  $M$ 
22:    for  $i = 1$  to  $|K|$  do    ▷ Construct the matrix  $D$  as in Lemma 3.5
23:      for  $j = 1$  to  $|K|$  do
24:        Set  $d_{ij} := c_{s_i, s_j}$ 
25:      end for
26:    end for
27:    for  $i = 1$  to  $|K|$  do
28:       $d_{i, |K|+1} := M \sum_{l \in I' \setminus K} c_{s_i, l}$ ,  $d_{|K|+1, i} := d_{i, |K|+1}$ 
29:    end for
30:    Set  $d_{|K|+1, |K|+1} := M$ 
31:    (IsDPCandidate, $\psi$ )=ALG( $D, |K| + 1$ )    ▷ Check whether  $D$  is a permuted
Anti-Robinson matrix
32:    if IsDPCandidate=TRUE then
33:      for  $i = 1$  to  $|K|$  do
34:        Set  $\pi(r+i) = s_{\psi(i)}$ 
35:      end for
36:      Set  $r := r + |K|$ 
37:      (IsDPCandidate, $\pi$ )=CheckCandidateDP( $C, n, r, \pi$ )
38:    end if
39:    Return (IsDPCandidate, $\pi$ )
40:  end if
41: end procedure

```

**The complexity of the algorithm.** We observe that Algorithm 1 can be implemented to run in  $O(n^2)$  time for each fixed pair of indices  $(p, q)$ , thus implying a total time complexity of  $O(n^4)$ . Indeed, consider the computational effort needed for a fixed pair of indices  $(p, q)$ . The computation of  $C'$  trivially takes  $O(n^2)$  time. `CheckCandidateDP` includes two major operations: the identification of the index set  $K$  and the recognition of a permuted Anti-Robinson matrix ( $C[K]$  or  $D$ ). The identification of  $K$  relies on the computation of the sums in line 3 of `CheckCandidateDP`. Notice that during `CheckCandidateDP` new values of the partial permutation  $\pi$  are fixed, but existing values are never changed. Thus, the sums mentioned above can be incrementally computed in a total of  $O(n^2)$  time for all recursive calls of `CheckCandidateDP`. The computation of  $m$  and  $K$  can be clearly done in  $O(n)$  time for every single call of `CheckCandidateDP`. By observing that the recursive calls of `CheckCandidateDP` operate with pairwise disjoint subsets  $K$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we conclude that there are at most  $n$  such calls. Consequently, the computation of  $m$  and  $K$  can be done in a total of  $O(n^2)$  time. Consider finally the computational effort incurred by all calls of `ALG`. Since `ALG` is applied to pairwise disjoint submatrices of  $C'$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^l n_i = n$ , and runs in quadratic time, we get an overall time of  $O(n^2)$ .

Summarizing we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1** *Algorithm 1 correctly solves the recognition problem for the class of Demidenko matrices. It can be implemented to run in  $O(n^4)$  time where  $n$  is the size of the input matrix.*

## 5 Summary

In this paper we have presented an  $O(n^4)$  algorithm for the recognition of permuted Demidenko matrices of size  $n$ , thus resolving a problem which has been open for several decades. This algorithm closes a remarkable gap in the context of recognition problems. Indeed, the recognition problem has already been solved for quite a number of subclasses of the class Demidenko matrices, e.g. the Kalmanson matrices, the Supnick matrices, the Monge matrices and the Anti-Robinson matrices, while remaining open for their common superclass, namely the Demidenko matrices.

Our algorithm is theoretically based on the relationship between Demidenko matrices and Anti-Robinson matrices. It makes use of known algorithms for the recognition of permuted Anti-Robinson matrices, in particular [21]. The efficient recognition of permuted Demidenko matrices enlarges the class of polynomially solvable cases of some well known combinatorial optimization problems such as the TSP or the Path-TSP.

## References

- [1] D.L. APPLEGATE, R.E. BIXBY, V. CHVATAL, W.J. COOK (2006). The traveling salesman problem. A computational study. Princeton University Press.
- [2] R.E. BURKARD, V. DEINEKO, R. VAN DAL, J.A.A. VAN DER VEEN AND G.J. WOEGINGER (1998). Well-solvable special cases of the TSP: A survey. *SIAM Review*, **40(3)**, 496–546.

- [3] R.E. BURKARD, B. KLINZ AND R. RUDOLF (1996). Perspectives of Monge Properties in Optimization. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **70(2)**, 95–161.
- [4] E. ÇELA, V. DEINEKO AND G.J. WOEGINGER (2018). New special cases of the quadratic assignment problem with diagonally structured coefficient matrices. *European Journal of Operations Research*, 267, 818–834.
- [5] E. ÇELA, V. DEINEKO AND G.J. WOEGINGER (2022). Travelling salesman paths on Demidenko matrices, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, in press. Available online 10 December, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2021.11.019>
- [6] V. DEINEKO AND V.L. FILONENKO (1979). On the reconstruction of specially structured matrices. *Aktualnyje Problemy EVM i programirovaniye*, Dnepropetrovsk, DGU, (in Russian).
- [7] V. DEINEKO, B. KLINZ, A. TISKIN AND G.J. WOEGINGER (2014). Four-point conditions for the TSP: The complete complexity classification. *Discrete Optimization*, 14, 147–159.
- [8] V. DEINEKO, R. RUDOLF AND G.J. WOEGINGER (1996). On the recognition of permuted Supnick and incomplete Monge matrices. *Acta Informatica* **33**, 559–569.
- [9] V. DEINEKO, R. RUDOLF AND G.J. WOEGINGER (1998). Sometimes traveling is easy: The master tour problem, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 11(1), 81–93.
- [10] V.M. DEMIDENKO (1976). A special case of the traveling salesman problem. *Izv. Akad. Nauk. BSSR, Ser. Fiz.-mat. Nauk*, **5**, 28–32, (in Russian).
- [11] K. FUJII, N. ITO, S. KIM, M. KOJIMA, Y. SHINANO AND K.-C. TOH (2021), Solving Challenging Large Scale QAPs, ZIB Report 21-02, January 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.09629v1>.
- [12] M.R. GAREY AND D.S. JOHNSON (1979). *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. Freeman, San Francisco.
- [13] P.C. GILMORE, E.L. LAWLER AND D.B. SHMOYS (1985). Well-solved special cases. Chapter 4 in [17], 87–143.
- [14] G. GUTIN AND A.P. PUNNEN (2002). *The travelling salesman problem and its variations*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- [15] S.N. KABADI (2002). Polynomially Solvable Cases of the TSP. Chapter 11 in [14], 489–576.
- [16] K. KALMANSON (1975), Edgeconvex circuits and the travelling salesman problem, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 27, 1000–1010.
- [17] E.L. LAWLER, J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN AND D.B. SHMOYS (1985). *The Travelling Salesman Problem*. Wiley, Chichester, 1985.
- [18] M. LAURENT AND M. SEMINAROTI (2015). The quadratic assignment problem is easy for Robinsonian matrices with Toeplitz structure. *Operations Research Letters*, **43(1)**, 103–109.
- [19] M. LAURENT AND M. SEMINAROTI (2017). Similarity-First Search: a new algorithm with application to Robinsonian matrix recognition. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, **31(3)**, 1765–1800.

- [20] C.H. PAPADIMITRIOU AND M. YANNAKAKIS (1993). The travelling salesman problem with distances one and two. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 18, 1–11.
- [21] P. PRÉA AND D. FORTIN. (2014). An optimal algorithm to recognize Robinsonian dissimilarities. *Journal of Classification*, 31, 1–35.
- [22] S. POLYAKOVSKIY, F.C.R. SPIEKSMAN AND G.J. WOEGINGER (2013). The three-dimensional matching problem in Kalmanson matrices. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 26(1), 1–9.
- [23] W.S. ROBINSON (1951). A method for chronologically ordering archaeological deposits. *American Antiquity*, 16, 293–301.
- [24] S. SAHNI AND T. GONZALEZ (1976). P-complete approximation problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 23, 555–565.
- [25] F. SUPNICK (1957). Extreme Hamiltonian lines. *Annals of Math.*, 66, 179–201
- [26] V. TRAUB, J. VYGEN AND R. ZENKLUSEN (2020). Reducing Path TSP to TSP. *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2020)*, 14–27. To appear in *SIAM Journal on Computing*. (see also arXiv:arXiv:1907.10376[cs.DM])
- [27] R. ZENKLUSEN (2019). A 1.5-Approximation for path TSP. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA-2019)*, 1539–1549. (see also arXiv:1805.04131v2[cs.DM])