

Approximations for the Steiner Multicycle Problem

Cristina G. Fernandes¹[0000-0002-5259-2859], Carla N. Lintzmayer²[0000-0003-0602-6298], and Phablo F. S. Moura^{3,4}[0000-0002-8176-0874]

¹ Department of Computer Science. University of São Paulo. Brazil
`cris@ime.usp.br`

² Center for Mathematics, Computing and Cognition. Federal University of ABC. Santo André, São Paulo, Brazil
`carla.negri@ufabc.edu.br`

³ Computer Science Department. Federal University of Minas Gerais. Brazil

⁴ Research Center for Operations Research & Statistics. KU Leuven. Belgium
`phablo.moura@kuleuven.be`

Abstract. The STEINER MULTICYCLE problem consists of, given a complete graph, a weight function on its vertices, and a collection of pairwise disjoint non-unitary sets called terminal sets, finding a minimum weight collection of vertex-disjoint cycles in the graph such that, for every terminal set, all of its vertices are in a same cycle of the collection. This problem generalizes the TRAVELING SALESMAN problem and therefore is hard to approximate in general. On the practical side, it models a collaborative less-than-truckload problem with pickup and delivery locations. Using an algorithm for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem and T -joins, we obtain a 3-approximation for the metric case, improving on the previous best 4-approximation. Furthermore, we present an $(11/9)$ -approximation for the particular case of the STEINER MULTICYCLE in which each edge weight is 1 or 2. This algorithm can be adapted to obtain a $(7/6)$ -approximation when every terminal set contains at least 4 vertices. Finally, we devise an $O(\lg n)$ -approximation algorithm for the asymmetric version of the problem.

Keywords: Combinatorial optimization · Approximation algorithms · Steiner problems · Traveling salesman problem · Collaborative logistics

1 Introduction

In the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, one is given a complete graph G , a weight function $w: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, and a collection $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V(G))$ of pairwise disjoint non-unitary sets of vertices, called *terminal sets*. We say that a cycle C *respects* \mathcal{T} if, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$, either every vertex of T is in C or no vertex of T is in C , and a set \mathcal{C} of vertex-disjoint cycles *respects* \mathcal{T} if all cycles in \mathcal{C} respect \mathcal{T} and every vertex in a terminal set is in some cycle of \mathcal{C} . The cost of such set \mathcal{C} is the sum of the edge weights over all cycles in \mathcal{C} , a value naturally denoted by $w(\mathcal{C})$. The goal of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is to find a set of vertex-disjoint cycles of minimum cost that respects \mathcal{T} . We denote by $\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$ the cost of such a minimum cost set. Note that the number of cycles in a solution might be smaller than $|\mathcal{T}|$, that is, it might be cheaper to join some terminal sets in the same cycle.

We consider that, in a graph G , a cycle is a non-empty connected subgraph of G all of whose vertices have degree two. Consequently, such cycles have at least three vertices. Here, as a set $T \in \mathcal{T}$

can have only two vertices, we would like to consider a single edge as a cycle, of length two, whose cost is twice the weight of the edge, so that the problem also includes solutions that choose to connect some set from \mathcal{T} with two vertices through such a length-2 cycle. So, for each set $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $|T| = 2$, we duplicate in G the edge linking the vertices in T , and allow the solution to contain length-2 cycles.

The STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is a generalization of the TRAVELING SALESMAN problem (TSP), thus it is NP-hard and its general form admits the same inapproximability results as the TSP. It was proposed by Pereira *et al.* [21] as a generalization of the so-called STEINER CYCLE problem (see Salazar-González [23]), with the assumption that the graph is complete and the weight function satisfies the triangle inequality. We refer to such an instance of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem as *metric*, and to the problem restricted to such instances as the METRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE problem.

Pereira *et al.* [21] presented a 4-approximation algorithm for the METRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, designed Refinement Search and GRASP-based heuristics, and proposed an integer linear programming formulation for the problem. Lintzmayer *et al.* [16] then considered the version restricted to the Euclidean plane and presented a randomized approximation scheme for it, which combines some techniques for the EUCLIDEAN TSP [2] and for the EUCLIDEAN STEINER FOREST [5].

On the practical side, the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem models a collaborative less-than-truckload problem with pickup and delivery locations. In this scenario, several companies operating in the same geographic regions must periodically transport products between different locations. To reduce the costs of transporting their goods, these companies may collaborate to create routes for shared cargo vehicles that visit the places defined by them for the collection and delivery of their products (see Ergun *et al.* [9,10]).

This paper addresses three variations of the STEINER MULTICYCLE. The first is the metric case, for which we present a 3-approximation, improving on the previously best known. The proposed algorithm uses an approximate solution S for a derived instance of the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem and a minimum weight T -join in S , where T is the set of odd-degree vertices in S . The second one is the so-called $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, in which the weight of each edge is either 1 or 2. Note that this is a particular case of the metric one, and it is a generalization of the $\{1, 2\}$ -TSP, therefore it is also APX-hard [20]. In some applications, there might be little information on the actual cost of the connections between points, but there might be at least some distinction between cheap connections and expensive ones. These situations could be modeled as instances of the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE. For this variation, we design an $\frac{11}{9}$ -approximation following the strategy for the $\{1, 2\}$ -TSP proposed by Papadimitrou and Yannakakis [20]. The third variation is the asymmetric case, in which one is now given a complete digraph in which the weight of an arc (u, v) is not necessarily the same as the weight of the arc (v, u) , but the weights still satisfy the triangle inequality. For this case, we design an $O(\lg n)$ -approximation algorithm, where n is the

number of vertices in the graph, following some ideas for the Asymmetric TSP proposed by Frieze, Galbiati, and Maffioli [12].

Note that the three variations we consider are metric. In this case, we assume that the terminal sets partition the vertex set. Indeed, because the graph (or digraph) is complete and the weight function is metric, any solution containing non-terminal vertices does not have its cost increased by shortcutting these vertices (that is, removing them and adding the edge linking their neighbors in the cycle). Therefore, the set of cycles of any solution is a *2-factor that respects* the terminal sets. A *2-factor* is a set of vertex-disjoint cycles that spans all vertices of the graph.

A preliminary version of this paper was published in the LATIN 2022 proceedings [11]. In addition to the results presented there, this manuscript contains a new algorithm for the asymmetric version of the problem, improved proofs, more examples, and a detailed discussion on minimum weight triangle-free 2-factors.

The 3-approximation for the METRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE is presented in Section 2, together with a discussion involving the previous 4-approximation and the use of perfect matchings on the set of odd degree vertices of intermediate structures. The $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is addressed in Section 3. The asymmetric case is investigated in Section 4, and we make some final considerations in Section 5.

2 Metric Steiner Multicycle problem

An instance for the STEINER MULTICYCLE is also an instance for the well-known STEINER FOREST problem [28, Chapter 22], but the goal in the latter is to find a minimum weight forest in the graph that connects vertices in the same terminal set, that is, every terminal set is in some connected component of the forest. The optimum value of the STEINER FOREST is a lower bound on the optimum for the STEINER MULTICYCLE: one can produce a feasible solution for the STEINER FOREST from an optimal solution for the STEINER MULTICYCLE by throwing away one edge in each cycle without increasing its cost.

The existing 4-approximation [21] for the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is inspired by the famous 2-approximation for the metric TSP [22], and consists in doubling the edges in a Steiner forest for the terminal sets and shortcutting an Eulerian tour in each of its components to a cycle. As there are 2-approximations for the STEINER FOREST problem, this leads to a 4-approximation.

It is tempting to try to use a perfect matching on the odd-degree vertices of the approximate Steiner forest solution, as Christofides' algorithm [6] does to achieve a better ratio for the METRIC TSP. However, the best upper bound we can prove so far on such a matching is the weight of the approximate Steiner forest solution, which implies that such a matching weights at most twice the optimum. With this bound, we also derive a ratio of at most 4.

Another problem that can be used with this approach is known as the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem [28, Chapter 23]. An instance of this problem consists of the following: a graph G , a weight function $w: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, and a non-negative integer r_{ij} for each pair of vertices i, j with $i \neq j$, representing a connectivity requirement. The goal is to find a minimum weight subgraph G' of G such that, for every pair of vertices $i, j \in V(G)$ with $i \neq j$, there are at least r_{ij} edge-disjoint paths between i and j in G' .

From an instance of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, we can naturally define an instance of the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem: set $r_{ij} = 2$ for every two vertices i, j in the same terminal set, and set $r_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. As all vertices are terminals, all connectivity requirements are defined in this way. The optimum value of the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem is also a lower bound on the optimum for the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem: indeed an optimal solution for the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is a feasible solution for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem with the same cost.

There also exists a 2-approximation for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem [15]. By applying the same approach of the 2-approximation for the metric TSP, of doubling edges and shortcutting, we achieve a ratio of 4 for the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE again. However, next, we will show that one can obtain a 3-approximation for the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, from a 2-approximate solution for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem, using not a perfect matching on the odd degree vertices of such solution, but the related concept of T -joins.

2.1 A 3-approximation algorithm for the metric case

Let T be a set of vertices of even size in a graph G . A set J of edges in G is a T -join if the collection of vertices of G that are incident to an odd number of edges in J is exactly T . Any perfect matching on the vertices of T is a T -join, so T -joins are, in some sense, a generalization of perfect matching on a set T . It is known that a T -join exists in G if and only if the number of vertices from T in each component of G is even. Moreover, there are polynomial-time algorithms that, given a connected graph G , a weight function $w: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, and an even set T of vertices of G , find a minimum weight T -join in G . For these and more results on T -joins, we refer the reader to the book by Schrijver [24, Chapter 29].

The idea of our 3-approximation is similar to Christofides [6]. It is presented in Algorithm 1. Let (G, w, \mathcal{T}) be a metric instance of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem. The first step is to build the corresponding SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem instance and to obtain a 2-approximate solution G' for this instance. The procedure 2APPROXSND represents the algorithm by Jain [15] for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN. The second step considers the set T of the vertices in G' of odd degree and finds a minimum weight T -join J in G' . The procedure MINIMUMTJOIN represents the algorithm by Edmonds and Johnson [8] for this task. Finally, the Eulerian graph H obtained from G' by doubling the edges in J is built and, by shortcutting an Eulerian tour for each component

of H , one obtains a 2-factor \mathcal{C} in G that is the output of the algorithm. The procedure `SHORTCUT` represents this part in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 STEINERMULTICYCLEAPPROX_METRIC(G, w, \mathcal{T})

Input: a complete graph G , a weight function $w: E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ satisfying the triangle inequality, and a partition $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ of $V(G)$

Output: a 2-factor \mathcal{C} in G that respects \mathcal{T}

- 1: $r_{ij} \leftarrow 2$ for every $i, j \in T_a$ for some $1 \leq a \leq k$
 - 2: $r_{ij} \leftarrow 0$ for every $i \in T_a$ and $j \in T_b$ for $1 \leq a < b \leq k$
 - 3: $G' \leftarrow 2\text{APPROXSND}(G, w, r)$
 - 4: Let T be the set of odd-degree vertices in G'
 - 5: Let w' be the restriction of w to the edges in G'
 - 6: $J \leftarrow \text{MINIMUMTJOIN}(G', w', T)$
 - 7: $H \leftarrow G' + J$
 - 8: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{SHORTCUT}(H)$
 - 9: **return** \mathcal{C}
-

Because the number of vertices of odd-degree in any connected graph is even, the number of vertices with odd degree in each component of G' is even. Therefore there is a T -join in G' . Moreover, the collection \mathcal{C} produced by Algorithm 1 is indeed a feasible solution for the STEINER MULTICYCLE.

Next, we prove that the proposed algorithm is a 3-approximation.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 is a 3-approximation for the METRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE problem.*

Proof. First, it suffices to prove that $w(J) \leq \frac{1}{2}w(G')$. Indeed, because G' is a 2-approximate solution for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem, and the optimum for this problem is a lower bound on $\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$, we have that $w(G') \leq 2 \text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$. Hence we deduce that $w(J) \leq \text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$, and therefore that $w(\mathcal{C}) \leq w(G') + w(J) \leq 3 \text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$. We now show that inequality $w(J) \leq \frac{1}{2}w(G')$ holds.

A *bridge* is an edge uv in a graph whose removal leaves u and v in different components of the resulting graph. First, observe that we can delete from G' any bridges and the remaining graph, which we still call G' , remains a solution for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN problem instance. Indeed a bridge is not enough to assure the connectivity requirement between two vertices in the same terminal set, so it will not separate any such pair of vertices, and hence it can be removed. In other words, we may assume that each component of G' is 2-edge-connected.

Edmonds and Johnson [8] gave an exact description of a polyhedra related to T -joins. This description will help us to prove the claim. For a set S of edges in a graph (V, E) , let $v(S)$ denote the corresponding $|E|$ -dimensional incidence vector (with 1 in the i -th coordinate if edge i lies in S and 0 otherwise). For a set X of vertices, let $\delta(X)$ denote the set of edges with one endpoint in X and the other in $V \setminus X$. An *upper T -join* is any superset of a T -join. Let $P(G, T)$ be the convex hull

of all vectors $v(J)$ corresponding to the incidence vector of upper T -joins J of a graph $G = (V, E)$. The set $P(G, T)$ is called the *up-polyhedra of T -joins*, and it is described by

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(W)} x(e) \geq 1 \text{ for every } W \subseteq V \text{ such that } |W \cap T| \text{ is odd,} \quad (1)$$

$$0 \leq x(e) \leq 1 \text{ for every edge } e \in E. \quad (2)$$

(For more on this, see [24, Chapter 29].)

So, as observed in [3], any feasible solution x to the system of inequalities above can be written as a convex combination of upper T -joins, that is, $x = \sum \alpha_i v(J_i)$, where $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$, leading to the following.

Corollary 1 (Corollary 1 in [3]). *If all the weights $w(e)$ are non-negative, then, given any feasible assignment $x(e)$ satisfying the inequalities above, there exists a T -join with weight at most $\sum_{e \in E} w(e)x(e)$.*

Recall that, for each component C of G' , $|V(C) \cap T|$ is even. Hence, for every $W \subseteq V(G')$ such that $|W \cap T|$ is odd, there must exist a component C of G' with $V(C) \cap W \neq \emptyset$, and $V(C) \setminus W \neq \emptyset$. As a consequence, it holds that $|\delta(W)| \geq 2$ because every component of G' is 2-edge-connected. Consider now the $|E(G')|$ -dimensional vector \bar{x} which assigns value $1/2$ to each edge of G' . From the discussion above, it is clear that \bar{x} satisfies inequalities (1) and (2) for G' and T . Then Corollary 1 guarantees that there is a T -join J in G' such that $w(J) \leq \frac{1}{2} w(G')$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

2.2 Matchings, T -joins, and Steiner forests

Because G is complete and w is metric, the proof of Theorem 1 in fact implies that a minimum weight perfect matching in the graph $G[T]$ weights at most $w(G')/2$, and therefore at most $\text{opt}(G, w, T)$. However, we have no direct proof for this fact; only this argument that goes through a minimum weight T -join. But this fact means that one can exchange line 6 to compute, instead, a minimum weight perfect matching J in $G[T]$.

We investigated the possibility that one could achieve a ratio of 3 using a Steiner forest instead of a survivable network design solution. However, using a T -join does not work so well with the Steiner forest, once its components are not 2-edge-connected. Indeed, if T is the set of odd-degree vertices in a Steiner forest F , a bound as in the proof of Theorem 1 on a minimum weight T -join in F would not hold in general: there are examples for which such a T -join in F has weight $w(F)$.

In this paragraph, let opt_{SND} denote the optimum value for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN instance used in Algorithm 1, and opt_{SF} denote the optimum value for the STEINER FOREST instance used in the 4-approximation from the literature [21]. Let opt_{SMC} be the STEINER MULTICYCLE optimum value. Note that $\text{opt}_{\text{SF}} \leq \text{opt}_{\text{SND}} \leq \text{opt}_{\text{SMC}} \leq 2\text{opt}_{\text{SF}}$, where the last inequality holds

because a duplicated Steiner forest solution leads to a cheaper feasible solution for the SURVIVABLE NETWORK DESIGN and the STEINER MULTICYCLE instances. Let G' and J be the subgraph and the T -join used in Algorithm 1, respectively, and let M be a minimum weight perfect matching in $G[T]$. Then $w(M) \leq w(J) \leq \frac{1}{2}w(G') \leq \text{opt}_{\text{SND}} \leq w(G')$. (For the first inequality, recall that J is a T -join in G' while M is a minimum weight perfect matching in $G[T]$.) If T' is the set of odd-degree vertices in an optimal Steiner forest and M' is a minimum weight perfect matching in $G[T']$, then $w(M') \leq 2\text{opt}_{\text{SF}}$, and there are instances for which this upper bound is tight. So, as far as we know, there might be an instance where $w(M') > \text{opt}_{\text{SMC}}$. Even if this is not the case, in fact, what we can compute in polynomial time is a minimum weight perfect matching M'' for the set of odd-degree vertices in a 2-approximate Steiner forest solution, so it would still be possible that $w(M'') > \text{opt}_{\text{SMC}}$ for some instances. We tried to find an instance where this is the case, but we have not succeeded so far.

3 {1, 2}-Steiner Multicycle problem

In this section, we will address the particular case of the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE problem that allows only edge weights 1 or 2.

It is a well-known result that there exists a polynomial-time algorithm for finding a 2-factor of minimum weight in weighted graphs [17,27]. Specifically, for a complete graph on n vertices, one can find such a 2-factor by finding a maximum weight perfect matching in a graph with $O(n^2)$ vertices and edges. This can be done in time $O(n^4)$ using Orlin's maximum flow algorithm [19].

The algorithm for this case of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem starts from a minimum weight 2-factor of the given weighted graph, and then repeatedly joins two cycles until a feasible solution is obtained. The key to guaranteeing a good approximation ratio is a clever choice of the cycles to join at each step. To proceed with the details, we need the following definitions.

Let (G, w, \mathcal{T}) be an instance of the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem with $w: E(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$. Recall that $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T = V(G)$, and that, for each set $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $|T| = 2$, we duplicated in G the edge linking the vertices in T , to allow the solution to contain length-2 cycles. We say an edge $e \in E(G)$ is an *i -edge* if $w(e) = i$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. A cycle containing only 1-edges is called *pure*; otherwise, it is called *nonpure*.

All steps of the procedure are summarized in Algorithm 2. In what follows, we explain some auxiliary procedures used in the algorithm.

Procedure SPECIAL2FACTOR finds a minimum weight 2-factor \mathcal{F} of (G, w) with the two following properties:

- (i) \mathcal{F} contains at most one nonpure cycle; and
- (ii) if \mathcal{F} contains a nonpure cycle, no 1-edge in G connects an endpoint of a 2-edge in the nonpure cycle to a pure cycle in \mathcal{F} .

Algorithm 2 STEINERMULTICYCLEAPPROX_12WEIGHTS(G, w, \mathcal{T})

Input: a complete graph G , a weight function $w: E(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$, and a partition $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ of $V(G)$

Output: a 2-factor \mathcal{C} in G that respects \mathcal{T}

- 1: $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \text{SPECIAL2FACTOR}(G, w)$
 - 2: $B \leftarrow \text{BUILDBIPARTITEGRAPH}(G, w, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$
 - 3: $M \leftarrow \text{MAXIMUMMATCHING}(B)$
 - 4: Let D be a digraph such that $V(D) = \mathcal{F}$ and there is an arc $(C, C') \in E(D)$ if C is matched by M to a vertex of C'
 - 5: $D' \leftarrow \text{SPECIALSPANNINGGRAPH}(D)$
 - 6: $\mathcal{C}' \leftarrow \text{JOINCOMPONENTCYCLES}(\mathcal{F}, D')$ (see Section 3.1)
 - 7: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{JOINDISRESPECTINGCYCLES}(\mathcal{C}', D', \mathcal{T})$ (see Section 3.1)
 - 8: **return** \mathcal{C}
-

Given any minimum weight 2-factor \mathcal{F}' , one can construct in polynomial time a 2-factor \mathcal{F} from \mathcal{F}' having properties (i) and (ii) as follows. To ensure property (i), recall that the graph is complete, so we repeatedly join two nonpure cycles by removing one 2-edge from each and adding two appropriate edges that turn them into one cycle. This clearly does not increase the weight of the 2-factor and reduces the number of cycles. To ensure property (ii), while there is a 1-edge yz in G connecting a 2-edge xy of the nonpure cycle to a 1-edge wz of a pure cycle, we remove xy and wz and add yz and xw , reducing the number of cycles without increasing the weight of the 2-factor. The resulting 2-factor is returned by SPECIAL2FACTOR.

In order to modify \mathcal{F} into a 2-factor that respects \mathcal{T} , without increasing too much its weight, Algorithm 2 builds some auxiliary structures that capture how the cycles in \mathcal{F} attach to each other.

The second step of Algorithm 2 is to build a bipartite graph B (line 2) as follows. Let $V(B) = V(G) \cup \{C \in \mathcal{F} : C \text{ is a pure cycle}\}$ and there is an edge vC in $E(B)$ if (i) $v \notin V(C)$ and C does not respect \mathcal{T} , and (ii) there is a vertex $u \in V(C)$ such that uv is a 1-edge. Note that the only length-2 cycles in G , and thus in \mathcal{F} , are those connecting a terminal set of size 2. So such cycles respect \mathcal{T} and, hence, if they are in B (that is, if they are pure), they are isolated vertices in B . Procedure MAXIMUMMATCHING in line 3 computes in polynomial time a maximum matching M in B (e.g., using Edmonds' algorithm [7]).

Algorithm 2 then proceeds by building a digraph D where $V(D) = \mathcal{F}$ and there is an arc $(C, C') \in E(D)$ if C is matched by M to a vertex of C' . Note that the vertices of D have outdegree 0 or 1, and the cycles in B unmatched by M have outdegree 0 in D . In particular, all pure length-2 cycles in \mathcal{F} have outdegree 0 in D , because they are isolated in B , and therefore unmatched. If there is a nonpure cycle in \mathcal{F} , it also has outdegree 0 in D . Therefore, any length-2 cycle in \mathcal{F} , pure or nonpure, has outdegree 0 in D . However, these vertices with outdegree 0 in D might have an indegree different from 0. Next, Algorithm 2 applies procedure SPECIALSPANNINGGRAPH(D) to find a spanning digraph D' of D whose components are in-trees of depth 1, length-2 paths, or trivial components that correspond to isolated vertices of D . This takes linear time and consists of a

procedure described by Papadimitrou and Yannakakis [20], applied to each nontrivial component of D . See Figure 1 for an example of these constructions.




Fig. 1: Auxiliar graphs and structures built by Algorithm 2.

At last, Algorithm 2 joins some cycles of \mathcal{F} in order to obtain a 2-factor that respects \mathcal{T} . This will happen in two phases. In the first phase, we join cycles that belong to the same component of D' . In the second (and last) phase, we repeatedly join cycles if they have vertices from the same set in \mathcal{T} , to obtain a feasible solution to the problem. This final step prioritizes joining cycles that have at least one 2-edge.

Details of these two phases, done by procedures JOINCOMPONENTCYCLES and JOINDISRESPECTINGCYCLES, as well as the analysis of the cost of joining cycles, are given in Section 3.1. For

now, observe that all cycles at the end of this process respect \mathcal{T} . Also, note that length-2 cycles exist in the final solution only if they initially existed in \mathcal{F} and connected terminals of some set $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $|T| = 2$. The analysis of the approximation ratio of the algorithm is discussed in Section 3.2.

3.1 Joining cycles

In the first phase, we join cycles in \mathcal{F} if they belong to the same component of D' , which can be either an in-tree of depth 1 or a length-2 path.

An in-tree of depth 1 of D' consists of a root C and some other cycles $\{C_j\}_{j=1}^t$, with $t \geq 1$. Note that each arc (C_j, C) can be associated with a 1-edge from G such that no two edges are incident on the same vertex in C , because they came from the matching M . Also, note that if the nonpure cycle or a length-2 cycle appears in some in-tree, it could only be the root C . Let v_j be the endpoint in C of the edge associated with arc (C_j, C) , for every $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Rename the cycles $\{C_j\}_{j=1}^t$ so that, if we go through the vertices of C in order, starting from v_1 , these vertices appear in the order v_1, \dots, v_t . We join all cycles in this in-tree into one single cycle in the following manner. For each v_i in C , if v_{i+1} is adjacent to v_i in C , then we join C_i and C_{i+1} with C as in Figure 2a. Otherwise, we join C and C_i as in Figure 2b. We shall consider that the new cycle contains at least one 2-edge.




Fig. 2: Joining cycles that belong to in-trees of D' into a unique cycle. The bold red edges will be considered as 2-edges even if they are 1-edges.

As for a component of D' which is a length-2 path, let C_i , C_j , and C_k be the three cycles that compose it, being C_i the beginning of the path and C_k its end. Note that if the nonpure cycle appears in some length-2 path, it could only be C_k . The arcs (C_i, C_j) and (C_j, C_k) are also associated with

1-edges of G , but now it may be the case that such edges share their endpoint in C_j . If that is not the case, then we join these three cycles as shown in Figure 3a. Otherwise, we join the three cycles as shown in Figure 3b. We shall also consider that the new cycle contains at least one 2-edge.




Fig. 3: Joining cycles that belong to length-2 paths of D' into a unique cycle. The bold red edges will be considered as 2-edges even if they are 1-edges.

Let \mathcal{C}' be the resulting 2-factor after the first phase. This is the output of procedure JOINCOMPONENTCYCLES. It may still be the case that two separated cycles in \mathcal{C}' contain terminals from the same set $T \in \mathcal{T}$. So, in the last phase, while there are two such cycles, join them in the following order of priority: both cycles contain a 2-edge, precisely one of the cycles contains a 2-edge, and none contains a 2-edge. The resulting 2-factor of this phase, denoted by \mathcal{C} , is computed by JOINDISRESPECTINGCYCLES and is the one returned by Algorithm 2.

Now we proceed to analyze the cost increase caused by joining cycles in these two phases. Note that $w(\mathcal{C})$ is equal to $w(\mathcal{F})$ plus some value due to the increases caused by joining cycles.

For the first phase, we charge the increment of the cost for joining cycles to some of the vertices in the cycles being joined. This is done in such a way that each vertex is charged at most once according to the following.

Claim 2 *Each vertex not incident to a 2-edge of \mathcal{F} is charged at most $2/9$ during the first phase, and no other vertex is charged.*

Proof. Consider an in-tree of depth 1 with root C and cycles C_1, \dots, C_t with $t \geq 1$. When we join cycles C_i and C_{i+1} with C , as in Figure 2a, note that the increase on the cost is at most 1. We charge this cost to the vertices in C_i and C_{i+1} , which are at least 6 (3 per cycle), thus costing at most $1/6$ per vertex. When we only join a cycle C_i with C , as in Figure 2b, the increase is also at most 1. We charge this cost to the vertices in C_i and also to the two vertices involved in C . Since

there are at least 3 vertices in C_i , each of these vertices is charged at most $1/5$. Note that, indeed, each vertex is charged at most once. Moreover, if C is the nonpure cycle, then, by property (ii), the edges in C incident to v_i and to the next vertex in C must be 1-edges.

Consider now a length-2 path with vertices C_i , C_j , and C_k . The cycles C_i , C_j , and C_k were joined as in Figures 3a and 3b, so the extra cost is at most 2, which is charged to the at least 9 vertices that belong to these cycles, giving a cost of at most $2/9$ per vertex. \square

As for the last phase, the increase in the cost will be considered for each pair of cycles being joined. If both cycles contain 2-edges, joining them will not increase the cost of the solution. If only one of the cycles contains a 2-edge, then the increase in the cost is at most 1. Joining cycles that do not contain 2-edges may increase the cost by 2.

Claim 3 *The increase in the last phase is at most c_p , where c_p is the number of pure cycles in F that do not respect \mathcal{T} and are isolated in D' .*

Proof. In the last phase, note that cycles generated in the first phase will always contain a 2-edge. Therefore, the only possible increases in cost come from joining one of these c_p cycles. The increase is at most 2 if two such cycles are joined and at most 1 if one such cycle is joined to some cycle other than these c_p ones. So the increase in this phase is at most c_p . \square

3.2 Approximation ratio

Theorem 4 shows how Algorithm 2 guarantees an $11/9$ approximation ratio while Corollary 2 shows a case in which Algorithm 2 can be adapted to guarantee a $7/6$ approximation ratio.

Theorem 4. *Algorithm 2 is an $\frac{11}{9}$ -approximation for the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE problem.*

Proof. Let (G, w, \mathcal{T}) be an instance of the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE problem. Let $n = |V(G)|$ and denote by $e_2(X)$ the total amount of 2-edges in a collection X of cycles.

We start with two lower bounds on $\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T})$. Let \mathcal{F} be the 2-factor used in Algorithm 2 when applied to (G, w, \mathcal{T}) . The first one is $w(\mathcal{F})$, because any solution for STEINER MULTICYCLE problem is a 2-factor in G . Thus

$$\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}) \geq w(\mathcal{F}) = n + e_2(\mathcal{F}). \quad (3)$$

The other one is related to pure cycles in \mathcal{F} . Consider an optimal solution \mathcal{C}^* for instance (G, w, \mathcal{T}) . Thus $\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}) = n + e_2(\mathcal{C}^*)$. Let C_1^*, \dots, C_r^* be the cycles of \mathcal{C}^* , where $C_i^* = (v_{i0}, \dots, v_{i|C_i^*|})$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, with $v_{i0} = v_{i|C_i^*|}$. Let $U = \{v_{ij} : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, j \in \{0, \dots, |C_i^*| - 1\}, \text{ and } v_{ij}v_{i,j+1} \text{ is a 2-edge}\}$ and note that $|U| = e_2(\mathcal{C}^*)$. Let ℓ be the number of pure cycles in the 2-factor \mathcal{F} that contain vertices in U . Clearly $e_2(\mathcal{C}^*) \geq \ell$, which gives us

$$\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}) \geq n + \ell. \quad (4)$$

Now let \mathcal{C} be the 2-factor produced by Algorithm 2 for input (G, w, \mathcal{T}) . Let us show an upper bound on the cost of \mathcal{C} . Solution \mathcal{C} has cost $w(\mathcal{F})$ plus the increase in the cost made in the first phase, and then in the final phase of joining cycles. Let us start bounding the total cost increase in the first phase. Let c_p be as in Claim 3. Recall that these c_p cycles are not matched by M . Let $n(c_p)$ be the number of vertices in these c_p cycles, and note that $n(c_p) \geq 3c_p$, because each such cycle does not respect \mathcal{T} and hence has at least three vertices. By Claim 2, the vertices incident to 2-edges of \mathcal{F} are never charged. So there are at least $e_2(\mathcal{F})$ vertices of the nonpure cycle of \mathcal{F} not charged during the first phase. Thus, at most $n - n(c_p) - e_2(\mathcal{F}) \leq n - 3c_p - e_2(\mathcal{F})$ vertices were charged in the first phase. Also, by Claim 2, each such vertex was charged at most $2/9$.

By Claim 3, the increase in this phase is at most c_p . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{C}) &\leq w(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2}{9}(n - 3c_p - e_2(\mathcal{F})) + c_p \\ &= n + e_2(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{2}{9}(n - 3c_p - e_2(\mathcal{F})) + c_p \\ &= \frac{11}{9}n + \frac{7}{9}e_2(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{1}{3}c_p \\ &\leq \frac{11}{9}n + \frac{7}{9}e_2(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{1}{3}\ell \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{7}{9}(n + e_2(\mathcal{F})) + \frac{4}{9}(n + \ell) \\ &\leq \frac{7}{9}\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}) + \frac{4}{9}\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}) = \frac{11}{9}\text{opt}(G, w, \mathcal{T}), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where (5) holds by Claim 5, and (6) holds by (3) and (4). It remains to prove the following.

Claim 5 $c_p \leq \ell$.

Proof. Recall that c_p is the number of pure cycles in \mathcal{F} that are isolated in D' and do not respect \mathcal{T} , and observe that $\ell \leq |U|$.

We will describe a matching in the bipartite graph B with at most ℓ unmatched cycles. From this, because M is a maximum matching in B and there are at least c_p cycles not matched by M , we conclude that $c_p \leq \ell$.

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, go through the vertices of C_i^* from $j = 0$ to $|C_i^*| - 1$ and if, for the first time, we find a vertex $v_{ij} \notin U$ that belongs to a pure cycle C (which does not respect \mathcal{T}) such that $v_{i,j+1}$ is not in C , we match C to $v_{i,j+1}$ in B . Note that, as $v_{ij} \notin U$, the edge between C and $v_{i,j+1}$ is indeed in B . Every pure cycle that does not respect \mathcal{T} will be matched by this procedure, except for at most ℓ . \diamond

□

This analysis is tight. Consider the instance depicted in Figure 4a, with 9 vertices and $\mathcal{T} = \{\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}, \{b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2\}\}$. There is a Hamiltonian cycle in the graph with only 1-edges, so

the optimum costs 9. However, there is also a 2-factor of cost 9 consisting of the three length-3 cycles C_1 , C_2 and C_3 , as in Figure 4a. The matching in the graph B might correspond to the 1-edge between C_2 and C_1 , and the 1-edge between C_3 and C_2 , as in Figure 4b. This leads to a length-2 path in D' , as in Figure 4c. The process of joining these cycles, as the algorithm does, might lead to an increase of 2 in the cost, resulting in the solution of cost 11 depicted in Figure 4e, which achieves a ratio of exactly $11/9$. This example can be generalized to have $n = 9k$ vertices, for any positive integer k .




Fig. 4: Tight example for Algorithm 2.

Similarly to what Papadimitrou and Yannakakis [20] achieve for the $\{1, 2\}$ -TSP, we also derive the following.

Corollary 2. *Algorithm 2 is a $\frac{7}{6}$ -approximation for the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE problem when $|T| \geq 4$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. For weights 1 and 2, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a minimum-weight 2-factor that contains no triangle [13, Section 3, Chapter 3]. (See Appendix A for a discussion on references to this algorithm in the literature.) Using this algorithm within SPECIAL2FACTOR in Algorithm 2, we can guarantee that there are at least 4 vertices per cycle in the produced 2-factor C . The charging argument presented in Claim 2 can use the fact that the cycles have length at least 4, which increases the number of vertices to distribute the cost increase. For instance, when we join a cycle C_i with C , as in Figure 2b, the increase is at most 1, and we charge this cost to the vertices in C_i and also to the two vertices involved in C . Now there are at least 4 vertices in C_i , so each of these vertices is charged at most $1/6$. The other case in which the charged cost was more than $1/6$

was when three cycles were joined, as in Figures 3a and 3b. In this case, the extra cost is at most 2, which is now charged to the at least 12 vertices that belong to these cycles, giving a cost of at most $1/6$ per vertex. So the value charged per vertex is at most $1/6$ in all cases, and the result follows. \square

4 Asymmetric Steiner Multicycle problem

In this section, we consider a version of the STEINER MULTICYCLE in which the input graph is a complete digraph D on n vertices with arc set $A(D)$, and the weight function $w: A(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ does not necessarily satisfy $w(u, v) = w(v, u)$ for all $u, v \in V(D)$ with $u \neq v$. We shall assume that the arc weights still satisfy the triangular inequality: $w(a, c) \leq w(a, b) + w(b, c)$ for all distinct $a, b, c \in V(D)$. As before, we also have a collection \mathcal{T} of terminal sets which partitions $V(D)$, and the goal now is to find a minimum weight *directed* 2-factor of D that respects \mathcal{T} .

We next devise an $O(\lg n)$ -approximation algorithm for this problem that is inspired by the algorithm with the same approximation ratio for the Asymmetric TSP, proposed by Frieze, Galbiati, and Maffioli [12]. At each iteration, their algorithm proceeds as follows. It starts with an induced subdigraph D' of D and what we call a *strongly Eulerian* spanning subdigraph \mathcal{C} of D (initially $D' = D$ and \mathcal{C} has no arcs). Then, it finds a minimum weight 2-factor \mathcal{F} in D' , and makes $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$. If \mathcal{F} has only one cycle, then \mathcal{C} is connected, and their algorithm outputs a Hamiltonian cycle obtained from shortcutting \mathcal{C} into a cycle. If \mathcal{F} has more than one cycle, then their algorithm chooses a vertex in each cycle of \mathcal{F} , called its *representative*, it lets D' be the subdigraph of D induced on these representatives, and it starts the next iteration with the new D' and \mathcal{C} . The authors observed that each 2-factor \mathcal{C} has weight bounded by the length of the optimal TSP tour, and the number of iterations is bounded by $\lg n$, because the number of components of \mathcal{C} is divided by two in each iteration. This implies the $O(\lg n)$ approximation ratio.

Our algorithm aims at obtaining a 2-factor that respects \mathcal{T} . Hence it stops once each terminal set is contained in a component of \mathcal{C} . It also differs from the algorithm due to Frieze, Galbiati, and Maffioli [12] in the way it chooses the representatives. At each iteration of our algorithm, one has to guarantee that the 2-factor \mathcal{F} has weight bounded by the optimal value, and that the number of iterations is still $O(\lg n)$. We shall see that this can be done using a minimal edge cover of an auxiliary graph to find *good* representatives. Recall that an *edge cover* in a graph is a set M of edges such that every vertex is incident to an edge in M . A minimal edge cover on a graph with n vertices can be computed in time $O(n^{2.5})$ using the algorithm for the maximum matching problem in general graphs due to Micali and Vazirani [18].

A digraph D' is said to be *strongly Eulerian* if, for every $v \in V(D')$, the indegree and outdegree of v in D' are each equal to some $k(v) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $D' - v$ contains precisely $k(v) - 1$ more components than D . We say that a component K of $D' - v$ is *adjacent* to v if there is a vertex in K which is a

neighbor of v in D' . Analogously to the observation in [12], one may notice that, for every $v \in V(D')$ and each connected component K of $D' - v$ which is adjacent to v , there exist distinct vertices $u, w \in V(K)$ such that (u, v) and (v, w) belong to $A(D')$. Procedure DIRECTEDSHORTCUT shows how to obtain a directed 2-factor \mathcal{F} of D from a strongly Eulerian spanning subdigraph D' of D so that \mathcal{F} has the same connected components as D' . If there is an underlying weight function $w: A(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ satisfying the triangular inequality, then $w(\mathcal{F}) \leq w(D')$. For each iteration of the while loop in line 1, D' is a strongly Eulerian digraph with the same connected components. We remark that this algorithm corresponds to the shortcutting procedure described in [12] applied to every component of D' . For the sake of completeness, procedure DIRECTEDSHORTCUT is presented in Algorithm 3. Note that this takes polynomial time.

Algorithm 3 DIRECTEDSHORTCUT(D')

Input: a strongly Eulerian digraph D'

Output: a directed 2-factor with the same connected components as D'

- 1: **while** D' is not a directed 2-factor **do**
 - 2: Let $v \in V(D')$ be such that with $k(v) > 1$
 - 3: Let C_1, C_2 be distinct components of $D' - v$ that are adjacent to v
 - 4: Let $u_i, w_i \in V(C_i)$ such that $(u_i, v), (v, w_i) \in A(D)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$
 - 5: $A(D') \leftarrow [A(D') \setminus \{(u_1, v), (v, w_2)\}] \cup \{(u_1, w_2)\}$
 - 6: **return** D'
-

Let $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$ denote the number of cycles in a 2-factor \mathcal{C} that do not respect \mathcal{T} . The procedure REPRESENTATIVES takes as input \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{T} , and it creates an auxiliary undirected graph G with vertex set being the $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$ cycles in \mathcal{C} that do not respect \mathcal{T} and edge set $\{\{C, C'\}: C \neq C', V(C) \cap T \neq \emptyset, \text{ and } V(C') \cap T \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } T \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Then, it computes a minimal edge cover M of G and, for each edge $\{C, C'\} \in M$, it chooses a pair of vertices $\{r_C, r_{C'}\}$ such that $r_C \in V(C) \cap T$ and $r_{C'} \in V(C') \cap T$ where T is a terminal set in \mathcal{T} that intersects both C and C' . The procedure then returns the set of vertices $R = \bigcup_{\{C, C'\} \in M} \{r_C, r_{C'}\}$.

We next argue that Algorithm 4 produces a set R satisfying

- (i) $R \cap V(C) \neq \emptyset$ for every $C \in V(G)$;
- (ii) $|R \cap T| \neq 1$ for every terminal set $T \in \mathcal{T}$; and
- (iii) $|R \cap V(C)| = 1$ for at least $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})/2$ cycles C in \mathcal{C} .

The first property holds because M is an edge cover of G , thus, for every $C \in V(G)$, at least one vertex from $V(C)$ was included in R . The second property follows from the fact that, for each edge in M , two distinct vertices of the same terminal set were simultaneously included in R . For a terminal set $T \in \mathcal{T}$ contained in a cycle $C \in V(G)$, we have $|R \cap T| = 0$. The last property holds because, in every minimal edge cover, at least half of the vertices are covered exactly once. Indeed, every edge of

Algorithm 4 REPRESENTATIVES(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{T})

Input: a directed 2-factor \mathcal{C} of an induced subdigraph of D and \mathcal{T}

Output: a set of vertices $R \subseteq V(D)$

- 1: Let $E = \{\{C, C'\} : C \neq C', V(C) \cap T \neq \emptyset, \text{ and } V(C') \cap T \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } T \in \mathcal{T}\}$
 - 2: Let G be the graph with vertex set $\{C \in \mathcal{C} : C \text{ does not respect } \mathcal{T}\}$ and edge set E
 - 3: $M \leftarrow \text{MINIMALEEDGECOVER}(G)$
 - 4: $R \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 5: **for** each edge $\{C, C'\} \in M$ **do**
 - 6: Let $T \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $T \cap C \neq \emptyset$ and $T \cap C' \neq \emptyset$
 - 7: Let $r_C \in V(C) \cap T$ and $r_{C'} \in V(C') \cap T$
 - 8: $R \leftarrow R \cup \{r_C, r_{C'}\}$
 - 9: **return** R
-

a minimal edge cover is incident to a vertex that is only covered by this edge, and there are at least $|V(G)|/2 = \eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})/2$ edges in any edge cover of G . Every cycle $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $|R \cap V(C)| = 1$ is said to be *lonely*. Note that property (iii) guarantees that there are at least $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})/2$ lonely cycles.

Algorithm 5 formalizes the steps of our algorithm for the ASYMMETRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE problem. It uses an auxiliary procedure that computes a minimum weight directed 2-factor in a weighted digraph. See Figure 5 for an example.


Algorithm 5 STEINERMULTICYCLEAPPROX_ASYMMETRIC(G, w, \mathcal{T})

Input: a complete digraph D , a weight function $w: A(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$, and a partition \mathcal{T} of $V(D)$


Output: a directed 2-factor \mathcal{C} in D that respects \mathcal{T}

- 1: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{MINIMUMDIRECTED2FACTOR}(D, w)$
 - 2: **while** $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) > 0$ **do**
 - 3: $R \leftarrow \text{REPRESENTATIVES}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{T})$
 - 4: Let D' be the complete digraph induced by R on D
 - 5: Let w' be the restriction of w to $A(D')$
 - 6: $\mathcal{C}' \leftarrow \text{MINIMUMDIRECTED2FACTOR}(D', w')$
 - 7: Let D'' be the digraph induced by $\mathcal{C}' \cup \mathcal{C}$
 - 8: $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{DIRECTEDSHORTCUT}(D'')$
 - 9: **return** \mathcal{C}
-


The way of choosing representatives in this algorithm is more complex than the way used in [12]. This is because deriving an upper bound on the weight of \mathcal{C}' in terms of an optimal 2-factor is more challenging than in terms of a minimum weight TSP tour. Specifically, a TSP tour can be shortcut into a 2-factor for any set R of representatives. However, this might not be the case for an optimal 2-factor. Indeed, in [12], only one representative vertex is (arbitrarily) chosen from each cycle. However, in the example in Figure 5, suppose a_1, a_2 , and a_3 are alone in a cycle in any optimal 2-factor, and vertex a_1 was chosen as the representative of C_1 , while vertex e_1 is chosen as the




(a) Minimum directed 2-factor \mathcal{C} obtained at line 1.




(b) Edge cover obtained from \mathcal{C} for $R = \{a_1, a_3, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2, d_4, f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2, h_1, h_2\}$.



(c) Minimum directed 2-factor \mathcal{C}' restricted to D' .



(d) Strongly Eulerian digraph D'' .



(e) New 2-factor obtained from shortcutting an Eulerian tour in D'' .

Fig. 5: Auxiliar digraphs and structures built by Algorithm 5.

representative of C_2 (hence a_2 and a_3 , which are also in C_2 , would not be representatives). In this case, no shortcut of any optimal 2-factor would result in a 2-factor on the chosen representatives: a_1

would be isolated in a shortcut of any optimal 2-factor on the chosen representatives. This means we cannot guarantee that the optimal cost is an upper bound on the minimum weight $w(\mathcal{C}')$ of a 2-factor on the representatives. So we needed to develop a way to guarantee that the shortcut of an optimal 2-factor on R is a 2-factor, keeping the property that \mathcal{C}' joins a good amount of cycles of \mathcal{C} that do not respect \mathcal{T} . In the other extreme, one could consider including in R all vertices in unhappy terminal sets because then the shortcut on R of any optimal solution would be a 2-factor. But this 2-factor might not join unhappy terminal sets: indeed, all terminal sets might be unhappy in \mathcal{C} , and in this case R would be the whole set of vertices and $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}$, leading the algorithm to loop forever.

Theorem 6. *Algorithm 5 is an $O(\lg n)$ -approximation for the ASYMMETRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE problem, where n is the number of vertices in the given digraph.*

Proof. Let (D, w, \mathcal{T}) be an instance of the ASYMMETRIC STEINER MULTICYCLE, where D has n vertices. We first show that the solution produced by Algorithm 5 is indeed feasible for (D, w, \mathcal{T}) . It follows from its construction that the digraph D'' (computed at line 7) is a strongly Euclidean spanning subdigraph of D , and so \mathcal{C} is indeed a directed 2-factor in D with the same components as D'' . By the condition in line 2, the set \mathcal{C} returned by Algorithm 5 respects \mathcal{T} , and thus \mathcal{C} is a valid solution for (D, w, \mathcal{T}) .

We now prove that the weight of each minimum weight 2-factor computed at line 6 is upper bounded by the weight of an optimal solution for (D, w, \mathcal{T}) . Consider the complete digraph D' and the weight function w' used in line 6, and let \mathcal{C}' be the minimum weight directed 2-factor of D' obtained in line 6. Consider an optimal 2-factor \mathcal{C}^* for the instance (D, w, \mathcal{T}) , that is, a minimum weight 2-factor in (D, w) that respects \mathcal{T} . Now consider a shortcutting on \mathcal{C}^* to go only through the vertices of R , say \mathcal{C}_R^* . Note that \mathcal{C}_R^* is certainly a 2-factor in D' because no cycle in \mathcal{C}_R^* has only one terminal in R . Also, \mathcal{C}_R^* has weight at most $\text{opt}(D, w, \mathcal{T})$, since w satisfies the triangular inequalities. As \mathcal{C}' is a minimum 2-factor in D' , we have that $w(\mathcal{C}') \leq w(\mathcal{C}_R^*)$, leading to $w(\mathcal{C}') \leq \text{opt}(D, w, \mathcal{T})$.

Consider an iteration of the while loop in line 2. Let \mathcal{C} be the directed 2-factor at the beginning of this iteration, R be the set from line 3, and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ be the directed 2-factor obtained in line 8. The following assertion holds.

Claim 7 $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \frac{3}{4}\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. It suffices to argue that the difference $\Delta := \eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) - \eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}})$ is at least half the number of lonely cycles in \mathcal{C} . Let C be a lonely cycle in \mathcal{C} and let C' be the cycle in \mathcal{C}' containing the single representative in $R \cap V(C)$. If C' contains a representative of a cycle that is not a lonely cycle in \mathcal{C} , then C contributes with 1 to Δ . Otherwise, every vertex in C' is a representative of a lonely cycle in \mathcal{C} , and so C contributes with $(|C'| - 1)/|C'|$ to Δ . As $|C'| \geq 2$, we conclude that every lonely cycle in \mathcal{C} contributes with at least $1/2$ to Δ . Because there are at least

$\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})/2$ lonely cycles in \mathcal{C} by property (iii) of R , we have $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) - \eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \frac{1}{4}\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$, which implies $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) - \frac{1}{4}\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{3}{4}\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$. \diamond

As $\eta_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}_0) \leq n$ for the initial directed 2-factor \mathcal{C}_0 from line 1, it follows from the previous claim that the maximum number of iterations of the while loop in line 2 is $O(\lg n)$. This implies that the weight of the solution produced by Algorithm 5 is at most $O(\lg n) \text{opt}(D, w, \mathcal{T})$. \square

5 Final remarks

When there is only one terminal set, the STEINER MULTICYCLE turns into the TSP. There is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for the metric TSP, so the first natural question is whether there is also a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE, or at least some approximation with a ratio better than 3.

The difficulty in the Steiner forest is also a major difficulty in the STEINER MULTICYCLE problem: how to find out what is the right way to cluster the terminal sets. Indeed, if the number k of terminal sets is bounded by a constant, then one can use brute force to guess the way an optimal solution clusters the terminal sets, and then, in the case of the STEINER MULTICYCLE, apply any approximation for the TSP to each instance induced by one of the clusters. This leads to a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for any metric instance with bounded number of terminal sets. It also leads to better approximations for hereditary classes of instances for which there are better approximations for the TSP.

It would be nice to find out whether or not the cost of a minimum weight perfect matching on the set of odd vertices of a minimum weight Steiner forest is at most the optimum value for the STEINER MULTICYCLE.

Observe that, for the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE, we can achieve the same approximation ratio than the modified algorithm for the $\{1, 2\}$ -TSP, but for the more general metric case, our ratio is twice the best ratio for the metric TSP. This comes from the fact that the backbone structure used in the solution for the metric TSP (the MST and the minimum weight 2-factor) can be computed in polynomial time. For the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE we can still use the 2-factor, but the two adaptations of the MST for the metric STEINER MULTICYCLE (the Steiner forest and the survivable network design) are hard problems, for which we only have 2-approximations, not exact algorithms.

In fact, for the $\{1, 2\}$ -TSP, better approximation algorithms are known: there is an $\frac{8}{7}$ -approximation by Berman and Karpinski [4], and a $\frac{7}{6}$ -approximation and a faster $\frac{8}{7}$ -approximation by Adamaszek et al. [1]. The latter algorithms rely on some tools that we were not able to extend to the $\{1, 2\}$ -STEINER MULTICYCLE. On the other hand, the $\frac{8}{7}$ -approximation due to Berman and Karpinski seems to be more amenable to an adaptation.

Recently, constant-factor approximations were presented for the asymmetric TSP [25,26]. Thus a natural direction for further research is to design constant-factor approximation algorithms also for the Asymmetric STEINER MULTICYCLE.

Acknowledgements

C. G. Fernandes was partially supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – CNPq (Proc. 310979/2020-0 and 423833/2018-9). C. N. Lintzmayer was partially supported by CNPq (Proc. 312026/2021-8). P. F. S. Moura was partially supported by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG (APQ-01040-21). This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001, and by Grant #2019/13364-7, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Cristina G. Fernandes: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Writing.

Carla N. Lintzmayer: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Writing.

Phablo F. S. Moura: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Writing.

References

1. Adamaszek, A., Mnich, M., Paluch, K.: New approximation algorithms for $(1, 2)$ -TSP. In: Chatzigiannakis, I., Kaklamanis, C., Marx, D., Sannella, D. (eds.) 45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018). Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 107, pp. 9:1–9:14. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.9>
2. Arora, S.: Polynomial time approximation schemes for Euclidean Traveling Salesman and other geometric problems. *Journal of the ACM* **45**(5), 753–782 (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1145/290179.290180>
3. Bansal, N., Bravyi, S., Terhal, B.M.: Classical approximation schemes for the ground-state energy of quantum and classical Ising spin Hamiltonians on planar graphs. *Quantum Information & Computation* **9**(7), 701–720 (2009)
4. Berman, P., Karpinski, M.: $8/7$ -approximation algorithm for $(1, 2)$ -TSP. In: Proc. of the 17th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm (SODA). pp. 641–648 (2006)
5. Borradaile, G., Klein, P.N., Mathieu, C.: A polynomial-time approximation scheme for Euclidean Steiner forest. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* **11**(3), 19:1–19:20 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2629654>
6. Christofides, N.: Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the traveling salesman problem. Technical Report 388, Carnegie Mellon University (1976)

7. Edmonds, J.: Paths, trees, and flowers. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **17**, 449–467 (1965). <https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1965-045-4>
8. Edmonds, J., Johnson, E.L.: Matchings, Euler tours and the Chinese postman problem. *Math. Programming* **5**, 88–124 (1973)
9. Ergun, O., Kuyzu, G., Savelsbergh, M.: Reducing truckload transportation costs through collaboration. *Transportation Science* **41**(2), 206–221 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.1060.0169>
10. Ergun, O., Kuyzu, G., Savelsbergh, M.: Shipper collaboration. *Computers & Operations Research* **34**(6), 1551–1560 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2005.07.026>
11. Fernandes, C.G., Lintzmayer, C.N., Moura, P.F.S.: Approximations for the Steiner Multicycle Problem. In: Castañeda, A., Rodríguez-Henríquez, F. (eds.) *LATIN 2022: Theoretical Informatics*. pp. 188–203. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20624-5_12
12. Frieze, A.M., Galbati, G., Maffioli, F.: On the worst-case performance of some algorithms for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. *Networks* **12**(1), 23–39 (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1002/net.3230120103>
13. Hartvigsen, D.: An extension of matching theory. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mathematics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA (1984), https://david-hartvigsen.net/?page_id=33
14. Hartvigsen, D., Li, Y.: Polyhedron of triangle-free simple 2-matchings in subcubic graphs. *Mathematical Programming* **138**(1–2), 43–82 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-012-0516-0>
15. Jain, K.: A factor 2 approximation algorithm for the generalized Steiner network problem. *Combinatorica* **21**(1), 39–60 (2001)
16. Lintzmayer, C.N., Miyazawa, F.K., Moura, P.F.S., Xavier, E.C.: Randomized approximation scheme for Steiner Multi Cycle in the Euclidean plane. *Theoretical Computer Science* **835**, 134–155 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2020.06.022>
17. Lovász, L., Plummer, M.D.: *Matching Theory*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol. 121. Elsevier (1986)
18. Micali, S., Vazirani, V.V.: An $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|V|}|E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In: 21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (SFCS 1980). pp. 17–27. IEEE (1980)
19. Orlin, J.B.: Max flows in $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ time, or better. In: Proc. of the 45th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC). pp. 765–774 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488608.2488705>
20. Papadimitriou, C.H., Yannakakis, M.: The Traveling Salesman Problem with distances one and two. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **18**(1), 1–11 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.18.1.1>
21. Pereira, V.N.G., Felice, M.C.S., Hokama, P.H.D.B., Xavier, E.C.: The Steiner Multi Cycle Problem with applications to a collaborative truckload problem. In: 17th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms (SEA’2018). pp. 26:1–26:13 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SEA.2018.26>
22. Rosenkrantz, D.J., Stearns, R.E., Lewis, P.M.: An analysis of several heuristics for the traveling salesman problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **6**, 563–581 (1977)
23. Salazar-González, J.J.: The Steiner cycle polytope. *European Journal of Operational Research* **147**(3), 671–679 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(02\)00359-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00359-4)
24. Schrijver, A.: *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer-Verlag (2003)
25. Svensson, O., Tarnawski, J., Végh, L.A.: A constant-factor approximation algorithm for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. *Journal of the ACM* **67**(6) (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3424306>
26. Traub, V., Vygen, J.: An improved approximation algorithm for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **51**(1), 139–173 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1339313>
27. Tutte, W.T.: A short proof of the factor theorem for finite graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **6**, 347–352 (1954)
28. Vazirani, V.V.: *Approximation Algorithms*. Springer (2002)

A Minimum-weight triangle-free 2-factor

Hartvigsen, in his PhD thesis [13, Section 3, Chapter 3], described an algorithm that finds, in a given graph, a triangle-free simple 2-matching with the maximum number of edges. In this appendix, we detail how to use his algorithm to find a minimum-weight triangle-free 2-factor in a complete graph with all edge weights 1 or 2. Let us start by clarifying the notation involved, as it is used differently throughout the literature.

Let H be a graph (not necessarily complete, and without weights). A subgraph of H whose maximum degree is 2 is sometimes called a *2-matching*, and it differs from a 2-factor as it allows for degree-1 and degree-0 vertices. That is, a 2-matching is a collection of vertex-disjoint paths and cycles in H .

Sometimes, in the literature, a 2-matching is used to refer to a weight function that assigns weight 0, 1, or 2 to each edge of a simple graph H so that the sum of the weights of the edges incident to each vertex is at most 2. An edge that is assigned a weight of 2 works essentially as a length-2 cycle. For this reason, sometimes in the literature, the 2-matching as we defined is referred to as a *simple* 2-matching (as it does not allow for these parallel edges). Also, a 2-factor is sometimes called a perfect simple 2-matching. Indeed, a simple 2-matching F is *perfect* if every vertex is incident to exactly two edges from F .

There are polynomial-time algorithms that find a minimum-weight 2-factor in a complete graph with arbitrary edge weights. Such an algorithm can be used to find a simple 2-matching in a given graph H with the maximum number of edges: just consider the edges of H as having weight 1, and the non-edges as having weight 2, and throw away the weight-2 edges of the obtained 2-factor.

On the other hand, as far as we know, no polynomial-time algorithm is known to find a minimum-weight *triangle-free* 2-factor in a complete graph with arbitrary edge weights. Indeed, Hartvigsen and Li [14] explicitly mention this as an open problem.

There are some statements in the literature [1,20], when discussing the $\frac{7}{6}$ -approximation for TSP, that might lead one to think that Hartvigsen's algorithm for finding a maximum-size triangle-free simple 2-matching could be used to find a minimum-weight triangle-free 2-factor for general weights. But that does not seem to be the case. What is true, and stated explicitly in [14], is that Hartvigsen's algorithm can be used to find a *maximum*-weight triangle-free 2-factor in a complete graph G with edge weights 0 and 1. For completeness, we detail how this can be achieved.

One can apply the original algorithm of Hartvigsen [13, Section 3, Chapter 3] on the graph H obtained from G by removing all edges of weight 0. Hartvigsen's algorithm returns a triangle-free collection \mathcal{C} of cycles and paths in H , and by joining the paths in \mathcal{C} into a single cycle, using edges of weight 0 (possibly an artificially and momentarily added loop or parallel edge), we obtain a 2-factor whose weight is the number of edges in \mathcal{C} . If all cycles in this 2-factor have length at least 4, then we are done. If not, then the only cycle C of length at most 3 is the cycle obtained from joining the

paths in \mathcal{C} . If there is an appropriate weight-1 edge in G connecting C to one of the other cycles in the 2-factor, then we can exchange a weight-1 and a weight-0 edge in the current 2-factor for this weight-1 edge and another weight-0 edge, to obtain a triangle-free 2-factor in G with the same weight. If no appropriate weight-1 edge exists connecting C to the rest of the graph, then we can do a similar exchange, but replacing a weight-1 and a weight-0 edge with two weight-0 edges. By a case analysis, one can verify that this leads to a maximum-weight triangle-free 2-factor in G .

In Corollary 2, the given graph G has edge weights 1 or 2, and we want to find a *minimum*-weight triangle-free 2-factor in G . That can be solved similarly using Hartvigsen's algorithm on the graph with only the weight-1 edges.