

Algorithmic strategies for finding the best TSP 2-OPT move in average sub-quadratic time

Giuseppe Lancia * Paolo Vidoni†

Abstract

We describe an exact algorithm for finding the best 2-OPT move which, experimentally, was observed to be much faster than the standard quadratic approach. To analyze its average-case complexity, we introduce a family of heuristic procedures and discuss their complexity when applied to a random tour in graphs whose edge costs are either uniform random numbers in $[0, 1]$ or Euclidean distances between random points in the plane. We prove that, for any probability p : (i) there is a heuristic in the family which can find the best move with probability at least p in average-time $O(n^{3/2})$ for uniform instances and $O(n)$ for Euclidean instances; (ii) the exact algorithm takes lesser time than the above heuristic on all instances on which the heuristic finds the best move. During local search, while the tour becomes less and less random, the speed of our algorithm worsens until it becomes quadratic. We then discuss how to fine tune a successful hybrid approach, made of our algorithm in the beginning followed by the usual quadratic enumeration.

Keywords: Traveling Salesman; Combinatorial Optimization; 2-OPT Neighborhood; Heuristics; Applied Probability.

1 Introduction

It is safe to say that there are very few acronyms in the Operations Research community more famous than TSP and 2-OPT. These acronyms indeed identify two among the most important subjects of our discipline, i.e., *combinatorial optimization* and *local search*. The TSP (Traveling Salesman Problem) is probably the most well-known combinatorial optimization problem ([14, 2, 10]). Its objective is to find a shortest Hamiltonian cycle in a complete graph of n nodes weighted on the arcs, and its importance stems from countless applications to all sorts of areas, like, e.g., scheduling, sequencing, routing, circuit printing, and so on up to computational biology and x-ray crystallography ([18]). Due to its relevance, the problem has been extensively studied over the years, and several programs have been designed for both its exact and heuristic solution ([17]). The most sophisticated algorithms (especially those based on mathematical programming formulations) have proved to be very effective, but at the price of a certain complexity, pertaining both to their logic and their implementation.


Much in the same way as TSP is emblematic of all combinatorial optimization problems, 2-OPT is a prominent example of the concepts of neighborhood and local search procedure for an NP-hard problem. Local search ([1, 20]) is a general paradigm for the minimization of an objective function f over a set \mathcal{S} of

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Informatica e Fisica, University of Udine, 33100 Udine, Italy, giuseppe.lancia@uniud.it

†Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Statistiche, University of Udine, 33100 Udine, Italy, paolo.vidoni@uniud.it

feasible solutions. The main ingredient characterizing a local search procedure is a map which associates to every solution $x \in \mathcal{S}$ a set $N(x) \subset \mathcal{S}$ called its *neighborhood*. Starting at a solution x^0 , local search samples the solutions in $N(x^0)$ looking for a solution x^1 better than x^0 . If it finds one such solution, it iterates the same step, this time looking for x^2 in $N(x^1)$, and then continues the same way until the current solution x^i satisfies $f(x^i) = \min\{f(x) | x \in N(x^i)\}$, i.e., it is a *local optimum*. Replacing x^i with x^{i+1} is called performing a *move* of the search, and the total number of moves applied to get from x^0 to a local optimum is called the *convergence length*. For a small-sized neighborhood, local search usually follows a *best-improvement* strategy, i.e., x^{i+1} is the the best solution possible in $N(x^i)$.

The 2-OPT neighborhood associates to each TSP solution (also called a *tour*) the set of all tours that can be obtained by removing two edges and replacing them with two new ones. Let us assume the set of vertices to be $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then a tour is defined by a permutation $T = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$ of $[n]$ and a 2-OPT move $\mu(i, j)$ is identified by two non-consecutive edges of the tour, namely $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$ and $\{\pi_j, \pi_{j+1}\}$, called the *pivots* of the move. The move removes $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$ and $\{\pi_j, \pi_{j+1}\}$ and replaces them with $\{\pi_i, \pi_j\}$ and $\{\pi_{i+1}, \pi_{j+1}\}$, yielding the new tour T' (see the figure below).



In this paper we consider the symmetric TSP, i.e., the graph is undirected, so that the distance between any two nodes is the same in both directions. Denote by $c(i, j) = c(j, i)$ the distance between two generic nodes i and j . The length $c(T)$ of a tour $T = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$ is the sum of the lengths of the tour edges, i.e., the edges $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (where we assume $\pi_{n+1} := \pi_1$). For a 2-OPT move $\mu(i, j)$, we define

$$\Delta(\mu(i, j)) := c(T) - c(T') = c(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}) + c(\pi_j, \pi_{j+1}) - (c(\pi_i, \pi_j) + c(\pi_{i+1}, \pi_{j+1})).$$

We say that the move is *improving* if $\Delta(\mu(i, j)) > 0$. An improving move is *best improving* if $\Delta(\mu(i, j)) = \max_{u,v} \Delta(\mu(u, v))$, and the goal is to find a best-improving move.

The introduction of the 2-OPT neighborhood for the TSP dates back to the late fifties ([9, 7]), and still today local search based on this neighborhood is probably the most popular approach for the TSP (especially on large instances), for reasons of simplicity, low time-complexity and overall effectiveness. Indeed, there are some more sophisticated heuristics for the TSP, such as, e.g., 3-OPT ([15]), or metaheuristics like genetic algorithms ([21, 19]), simulated annealing ([11]) and tabu search ([4]). The most effective heuristic procedure, i.e., the one for which the trade-off between quality of solutions found and time spent in finding them is the best, is a 3-OPT variant known as Lin-Kernighan's algorithm ([16, 3]). However, all these sophisticated heuristics are somewhat complex to understand and implement, especially in comparison with the simplicity of 2-OPT. This aspect is considered very important in a large part of the industrial world, where in-house software development and maintenance oftentimes lead to the adoption of simple, yet effective, solutions like some basic local search. Indeed, in the case of 2-OPT, the algorithm to find the best move $\mu(i, j)$ is trivial i.e., a nested-**for** cycle iterating over all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and taking $\Theta(n^2)$ time. Since, generally speaking, quadratic algorithms are considered very effective, not very much research went into trying to speed-up the algorithm for finding the best move. In this work, however, we will prove that speeding-up the standard quadratic procedure for 2-OPT is *extremely* simple, at least as far as implementation goes, since it amounts

to a trivial “hack” of the nested-`for` procedure consisting in the addition of just one `if()` statement. Besides this simple new version of the search procedure, we will also describe a slightly more sophisticated one, which achieves an even better performance. A probabilistic analysis shows that our strategies do in fact change the order of complexity from quadratic to sub-quadratic on average. In particular, for Euclidean TSP instances we manage to find the best move on a random tour in average time $O(n)$, i.e., the best possible complexity given that the tour has n edges that must be looked at.

Most of the literature on 2-OPT focuses on the study of the convergence length and the quality of the local optima that can be obtained. In particular, [5] (extending a result of [12]) have shown that the length of convergence is polynomial on average for random Euclidean instances, while [8] have shown how to build very particular Euclidean instances on which the length of the convergence is exponential. As for the local optima quality, [5] shows that they are, with high probability, within a constant factor from the global optimum for random Euclidean instances, while worst-case factors depending on n are given in [23].

With regard to the time spent in finding the best move at each local search iteration, the nested-`for` algorithm is not only worst-case $\Theta(n^2)$, but its average-case is $\Theta(n^2)$ as well. Building on our previous research ([13]) in which we studied how to speed-up some enumerative algorithms looking for a best solution in a polynomially-sized search space, we propose two variants of a new algorithm (one guided by a greedy criterion while the other “blind”), for finding the best 2-OPT move. We give empirical and theoretical evidence that our algorithm is better than quadratic, on average, when looking for the best move on a long sequence of the tours visited by local search (roughly, two thirds of the convergence length) starting at a random tour. In particular, at the initial stages of the local search, it takes us about $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}})$ to find the best move for graphs whose distances are drawn uniformly at random (u.a.r.) in $[0, 1]$, and about $O(n)$ for Euclidean graphs whose vertices are points drawn u.a.r. in the unit square. In order to perform an average-case analysis, we introduce a family of heuristics for finding the best 2-OPT move, and discuss both their average-case running time and their probability of success, describing how we can control both these aspects.

On medium- to large-sized instances, our procedure can achieve speedups of two to three orders of magnitude over the nested-`for` algorithm for most of the convergence. However, while the search progresses and we near the local optimum, our algorithm becomes less effective, so that at some point it might be better to switch back to the $\Theta(n^2)$ enumerative procedure since it does not have the overhead of dealing with our data structure (namely, a heap). Experimentally, we determined that this phenomenon happens in the final part of the convergence. It remains then an interesting research question the design of an effective algorithm to find the best 2-OPT move for a nearly locally optimum tour.

Paper organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the general idea for searching the best 2-OPT move, and present the algorithm, in its two versions. Section 3 is devoted to the probabilistic analysis of our algorithm and of a family of heuristics for the problem. In Section 4 we report on our computational experiments and the statistical results that we obtained. Some conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

2 Our strategy for moves enumeration

Without loss of generality, let us assume that the tour is $T = (1, \dots, n)$. For $\alpha > 0$ let us call α -large any edge $\{i, i + 1\}$ along the tour, such that $c(i, i + 1) > \alpha$. In this paper we are going to follow a strategy that allows us not to enumerate all moves, but only those which are “good candidates” to be the best overall. The idea is quite simple, and it relies on a sequence of iterative improvements in which, at each iteration, there is a certain move (the current “champion”) which is the best we have seen so far and which we want to beat.

Procedure 1 GREEDYHEAPBASEDALGORITHM \mathcal{A}_g

1. Build a max-heap with elements $[i, c(i, i + 1)] \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$ sorted by c -values;
 2. Set $\hat{\mu} := \emptyset$ and $\Delta(\hat{\mu}) := -\infty$; /* first undefined champion */
 3. **while** the c -value of the top heap element is $> \Delta(\hat{\mu})/2$ **do**
 4. Extract the top of heap, let it be $[i, c(i, i + 1)]$;
 5. **for** $j := 1, \dots, i - 2, i + 2 \dots n$ **do**
 6. **if** $\Delta(\mu(i, j)) > \Delta(\hat{\mu})$ **then**
 7. $\hat{\mu} := \mu(i, j)$; /* update the champion */
 8. **endwhile**
 9. **return** $\hat{\mu}$;
-

Assume the current champion is $\hat{\mu} := \mu(i, j)$. Then, for any move $\mu(i, j)$ better than $\hat{\mu}$ it must be

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\hat{\mu}) &< \Delta(\mu(i, j)) \\ &= c(i, i + 1) + c(j, j + 1) - (c(i, j) + c(i + 1, j + 1)) \\ &\leq c(i, i + 1) + c(j, j + 1) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left(c(i, i + 1) > \frac{\Delta(\hat{\mu})}{2} \right) \vee \left(c(j, j + 1) > \frac{\Delta(\hat{\mu})}{2} \right)$$

i.e., at least one of the move pivots must be $(\Delta(\hat{\mu})/2)$ -large. Based on this observation, we will set-up an enumeration scheme which builds the moves starting from pivots that are $(\Delta(\hat{\mu})/2)$ -large and then completing any such edge into a move by adding the second pivot of the move. For simplicity, from now on we will be often referring to $(\Delta(\hat{\mu})/2)$ -large edges simply as *large edges*.

Our basic steps are the *selection* and the *expansion* of the tour edges. The selection of an edge is simply the choice of an edge $\{i, i + 1\}$ (which has not been selected before). The expansion of $\{i, i + 1\}$ is the evaluation of all moves $\mu(i, j)$, for $j \neq i$. Clearly an expansion costs $\Theta(n)$ while the selection cost depends on the criterion we adopt. In particular, we propose two versions of our algorithm, namely the *greedy* and the *blind* versions. In our greedy algorithm the cost for a selection will be $O(\log n)$, while in the blind algorithm it will be $O(1)$.

Each algorithm, at a high level, can be seen as a sequence of iterations, where each iteration is a selection followed, perhaps, by an expansion. We will discuss how, given a random starting tour, as long as we expand only large pivots we expect to have, overall, only $O(n^{1-\epsilon})$, with $\epsilon > 0$, expansions, even if we pick the pivots without following any particular criterion, i.e., blindly. If, on the other hand, we use the greedy criterion of selecting the pivots from the largest to the smallest, we still expand only $O(n^{1-\epsilon})$ pivots, but this time the multiplicative constant is better, i.e., we get a faster algorithm.

2.1 The greedy algorithm

The greedy algorithm \mathcal{A}_g is described in Procedure 1. In this algorithm we make use of a max-heap, in which we put each node $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ together with the value $c(i, i + 1)$, used to order the heap. Each entry of the heap is indeed a 2-field record $[i, c(i, i + 1)]$ (where, by convention, we define $n + 1$ to be 1). Building the

Procedure 2 BLINDALGORITHM \mathcal{A}_b

1. Set $\hat{\mu} := \emptyset$ and $\Delta(\hat{\mu}) := -\infty$; /* first undefined champion */
 2. **for** $i := 1, \dots, n$ **do**
 3. **if** $c(i, i+1) > \Delta(\hat{\mu})/2$ **then**
 4. **for** $j := 1, \dots, i-2, i+2, \dots, n$ **do**
 5. **if** $\Delta(\mu(i, j)) > \Delta(\hat{\mu})$ **then**
 6. $\hat{\mu} := \mu(i, j)$; /* update the champion */
 7. **return** $\hat{\mu}$;
-

heap (step 1) can be done in linear time with respect to the number of its elements (i.e., in time $\Theta(n)$ in our case) by using standard procedures ([6]).

At the beginning $\hat{\mu}$ is undefined, so we set $\Delta(\hat{\mu}) := -\infty$. Testing if there are still any large edges is done in step 3 and takes time $O(1)$ per test since we just need to read the value at the heap's root. The selection is done in step 4 and takes time $O(\log n)$ to maintain the heap property. The main loop 3–8 terminates as soon as there are no longer any large edges.

At the generic step, we pop the top of the heap, let it be $[i, c(i, i+1)]$. If $c(i, i+1) \leq \Delta(\hat{\mu})/2$, we stop and return $\hat{\mu}$ as the best possible move. Otherwise, $\{i, i+1\}$ is one of the two pivots of some move potentially better than $\hat{\mu}$. Knowing one pivot, we then run the expansion (steps 5–7) which, in linear time, finds the best completion of $\{i, i+1\}$ into a move $\mu(i, j)$. Each time we find a move better than the current champion, we update $\hat{\mu}$. This way the termination condition becomes easier to satisfy and we get closer to the end of the loop.

If, overall, there are N_g selections (and, therefore N_g expansions), the running time of the algorithm is $O(n + N_g(\log n + n))$ which is better than quadratic as long as $N_g = O(n^{1-\epsilon})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

2.2 The blind algorithm

The blind algorithm, called \mathcal{A}_b , is outlined in Procedure 2. The main loop consists of n iterations. At each iteration the selection of an edge $\{i, i+1\}$ has cost $O(1)$. The expansion is done in steps 4–6. Assuming there are N_b expansions altogether, the running time of this algorithm is $O(n + N_b n)$, which is better than quadratic as long as $N_b = O(n^{1-\epsilon})$. Notice that if we remove line 3, and start the **for**-cycle of line 4 at $j := i+2$ instead than $j := 1$, we obtain exactly the standard two-**for** quadratic procedure for 2-OPT optimization. It is then evident how simple it is to implement this procedure, since it basically requires just to add an **if** to the standard algorithm.

3 Probabilistic analysis

3.1 The general plan

In this section we discuss the average-case complexity of our greedy algorithm, obtaining some theoretical justification of the empirical evidence, i.e., that it is better than quadratic for a large portion of the convergence to a local optimum. In particular, at the very first steps, when the current solution is a random (or almost random) tour, we observed an average complexity of $O(n^{3/2})$ on uniform instances and $O(n)$ on Euclidean instances. (The latter is indeed an optimal result for this problem, since we should not expect to

be able to find the best move in a shorter time than that required to look at all the edges of the tour). Note that the blind algorithm \mathcal{A}_b was observed to have the same behavior, but with a slightly worse multiplicative constant, so we can focus on \mathcal{A}_g .

The following analysis is relative to the problem of finding the best move on a random tour. In order to explain the observed sub-quadratic complexity, we start by discussing weaker versions of the algorithm and prove that they run in average sub-quadratic time. These algorithms are heuristics, but we can make their probability of success as high as we please. We then show that the running time of any of these heuristics upper bounds the running time of the greedy algorithm on those instances on which the heuristic succeeds (which, as we already remarked, can be almost all).

Some preliminaries. In the average-case analysis of an algorithm one considers instances drawn at random according to a certain probability distribution. In our study an instance is given by $\binom{n}{2}$ non-negative reals (representing the edge lengths/costs of a complete undirected graph of n nodes) plus a permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ identifying a tour in the graph. The size of an instance can be characterized through a parameter n which, for us, is the number of nodes in the graph. By a *random tour* we denote a permutation drawn u.a.r. in the set including all the permutations. Hereafter, we assume $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $n \geq 4$, and, when we talk of a generic instance and of n in the same sentence, n is the instance size. As far as the edge costs are concerned, we consider two types of distributions:

1. **Uniform instances:** A random instance of this type is obtained by setting the cost of each edge $\{i, j\}$ to a value drawn u.a.r. in $[0, 1]$. Note that the edge lengths are independent random variables.
2. **Euclidean instances:** A random instance of this type is obtained by drawing u.a.r. n points P_1, \dots, P_n in the unit square and then setting the cost of each edge $\{i, j\}$ to the Euclidean distance between P_i and P_j . Note that the edge lengths are not independent random variables since triangle inequality must hold.

In the following analysis, we denote by $t_{\mathcal{A}}^n(I)$ the time (i.e., number of elementary steps) taken by the algorithm \mathcal{A} on an instance I of size n and we define the associated random variable $T_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ as the time taken by \mathcal{A} on a random instance of size n . The random instance is generated according to a suitable probability distribution corresponding to the uniform or to the Euclidean instances framework. The average-case complexity of the algorithm \mathcal{A} is then defined as

$$\bar{T}_{\mathcal{A}}(n) := \mathbb{E}[T_{\mathcal{A}}^n],$$

interpreted as a function of the size n . We count as the elementary steps yielding the complexity of an algorithm the number of moves that it evaluates (which, in turn, is a factor- n proportional to the number of edges expanded). Notice that, although an expansion for \mathcal{A}_g requires also a work of cost $O(\log n)$ to determine which edge is expanded and to rearrange the heap, this $O(\log n)$ factor is dominated by the $\Theta(n)$ work due to the moves evaluated by the expansion.

A family of “fixed threshold” heuristics. Let us consider a variant of our algorithm which works as follows: Given an input I of size n , the algorithm first computes a threshold δ_n (i.e., depending only on n , and constant for a fixed n) and then it expands all and only the edges $\{i, j\}$ of the tour such that $c(i, j) > \delta_n$. Notice that there is an algorithm of this type for each possible function δ_n , and hence we can talk of a family of algorithms. Let us call a generic algorithm of this family $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$. We remark that there is no heap, and

the algorithm is a simple loop like the blind version, but does not use the updated champions to set new thresholds to beat.

Each algorithm $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ can be seen as a heuristic for finding the best 2-OPT move. Indeed, there is no guaranteed that it will find the best move, but rather it will find it with a certain probability, depending on δ_n and on the distribution of instances. In particular, $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ may fail to find the best move because of one of two types of errors, i.e.,

ERR₀: when no edge is expanded (all arcs have cost $\leq \delta_n$) and hence no move will be found.

ERR₁: when some edges are expanded, but the optimal move did not remove any edges of length $> \delta_n$ and so it won't be found.

The probability of failure can be controlled by a proper setting of δ_n . Intuitively, by lowering (increasing) δ_n we decrease (respectively, increase) the probability of errors. At the same time, we increase (respectively, decrease) the average time complexity of the algorithm, since more (respectively, less) edges get expanded. We will describe a way to balance these two conflicting objectives, namely, having a δ_n large enough so as to guarantee an average sub-quadratic algorithm, but small enough so as the probability of errors can be upper-bounded by any given constant.

Let $\Delta^*(I)$ denote the value of an optimal 2-OPT move on an instance I . The following is a sufficient, but not necessary, condition for $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ to find the optimal solution:

Lemma 1 *For every instance I for which $\delta_n < \Delta^*(I)/2$, $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ finds an optimal solution.*

PROOF: Assume a best move is $\mu^*(i, j)$. Then either $c(i, i+1) \geq \Delta^*(I)/2$ or $c(j, j+1) \geq \Delta^*(I)/2$. Therefore one of the two edges will be expanded by $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ and μ^* will be found. ■

Given an instance I , let us call *good move* any move μ such that $\Delta(\mu) > 2\delta_n$ (notice that the property of being good for a move depends on δ_n , but, for simplicity, we assume that δ_n is implicit from the context). Let us also call *good instance* any instance for which there exists at least one good move. Then we have the following

Corollary 1 *For every good instance I , $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ finds an optimal solution.*

PROOF: Let μ be a good move in I . Then, $2\delta_n < \Delta(\mu) \leq \Delta^*(I)$ and the conclusion follows from Lemma 1. ■

Furthermore, under the conditions of Corollary 1, we are sure that \mathcal{A}_g runs faster than $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$.

Lemma 2 *For every good instance I , it is $t_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n(I) \leq t_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}^n(I)$.*

PROOF: Since there exist good moves, it is $\delta_n \leq \Delta^*(I)/2$. Let e_1, \dots, e_k be the sequence of edges expanded by \mathcal{A}_g . Note that $c(e_1) \geq \dots \geq c(e_k)$. Independently of which e_p , for $1 \leq p \leq k$, is the edge whose expansion yields the optimal move, since e_k was eventually expanded it must be $c(e_k) \geq \Delta^*(I)/2$. Therefore $c(e_i) \geq c(e_k) \geq \Delta^*(I)/2 > \delta_n$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Since $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ expands all edges of value $> \delta_n$, this implies that all edges expanded by \mathcal{A}_g are also expanded by $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$. ■

The following lemma is useful for evaluating the average-case complexity of $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ for every distribution over the instances.

Lemma 3 *Let C be the random variable representing the cost of the edge between two random nodes of the graph. If δ_n is chosen so that $\Pr[C > \delta_n] = \Theta(n^{-r})$, with $r \in (0, 1]$, then $\bar{T}_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n^{2-r})$.*

PROOF: For each $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, consider the indicator variable X_{ij} which is 1 if the edge $\{i, j\}$ is in the tour and its length is greater than δ_n . Since these two events are independent, it is

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{ij}] = \Pr[X_{ij} = 1] = \frac{n \Pr[C > \delta_n]}{\binom{n}{2}} \quad \text{for each } 1 \leq i < j \leq n.$$

Let $Y = \sum_{ij} X_{ij}$ be the random variable representing how many edges get expanded by $ALG(\delta_n)$. It is

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{ij} \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}] = \binom{n}{2} \times \frac{n \Pr[C > \delta_n]}{\binom{n}{2}} = n \Pr[C > \delta_n].$$

Since the expansion of a generic node i involves $n - 3$ nodes, namely all the nodes except $i - 1$, i and $i + 2$, $T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n = (n - 3)Y$. Then, we have

$$\bar{T}_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \mathbb{E}\left[T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n\right] = (n - 3) \times \mathbb{E}[Y] = \Theta(n^2) \Pr[C > \delta_n]$$

from which the conclusion follows. ■

In the next two sections, we study our algorithms with respect to uniform and Euclidean random instances. For both types of instance distributions, we will use the following approach:

1. We set δ_n so that $\Pr[C > \delta_n] = \alpha n^{-r}$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$ and $r \in (0, 1]$.
2. We describe a specific type of good moves and show that, asymptotically in n , the probability of having no good moves of our type tends to 0 for increasing α . This implies that for every $p \in [0, 1)$ we can find an α to set δ_n so that, asymptotically, the probability for an instance to be good is greater than p .
3. We conclude that $ALG(\delta_n)$ is a heuristic whose average-case running time is sub-quadratic that succeeds on at least a fraction p of instances. By Lemma 2, this implies that, for at least a fraction p of all instances, \mathcal{A}_g is dominated by an algorithm of sub-quadratic average-case running time, where p can be made as close to 1 as we want.

3.2 Uniform random costs

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 3 we have the following

Corollary 2 *Let $\alpha > 0$ be a constant and define*

$$\delta_n := 1 - \alpha n^{-1/2}.$$

Then, under the uniform distribution setting for random instances, the average-case complexity of $ALG(\delta_n)$ satisfies $\bar{T}_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n^{3/2})$.

PROOF: Since the cost of each edge is drawn u.a.r. in $[0, 1]$ it is

$$\Pr[C > \delta_n] = 1 - \delta_n = \alpha n^{-1/2} = \Theta(n^{-1/2}).$$

Then, by Lemma 3, it is $\bar{T}_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n^{2-1/2}) = \Theta(n^{3/2})$. ■

Let us call an edge $\{i, j\}$ *long* if

$$c_{ij} > \frac{1 + \delta_n}{2} = 1 - \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) n^{-1/2}$$

and *short* if

$$c_{ij} < \frac{1 - \delta_n}{2} = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) n^{-1/2}.$$

The specific type of good moves that we consider, called *Long-Short moves* (LS-moves), are those that replace two long edges with two short ones. Indeed, for any such move μ , it is

$$\Delta(\mu) > 2(1 + \delta_n)/2 - 2(1 - \delta_n)/2 = 2\delta_n.$$

Theorem 1 *For each $\alpha > 0$ denote by $P_0(\alpha, n)$ the probability that there is no LS-move in a random tour of n nodes on a random uniform instance. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(\alpha, n) \leq \frac{1}{e^{(\alpha/4)^4}}.$$

PROOF: Let $p_n := (\alpha/2)n^{-1/2}$ be the probability for an edge to be long, which is the same as the probability to be short. Let the tour be $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n, \pi_1)$. Then, $P_0(\alpha, n)$ is the probability that there is no cycle $(\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}, \pi_{j+1}, \pi_j, \pi_i)$ of four edges (two in the tour and two not in the tour) such that $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$ and $\{\pi_j, \pi_{j+1}\}$ are long while $\{\pi_{i+1}, \pi_{j+1}\}$ and $\{\pi_i, \pi_j\}$ are short.

We can then think of two Bernoulli trials, in sequence, where the first trials determine long edges along the tour and the second trials determine good moves for pairs of long edges along the tour. To obtain independence for the second trials, we will consider moves that remove either two odd-indexed edges or two even-indexed edges. Let us focus on the odd-indexed edges. The first set of Bernoulli trials is repeated $n/2$ times, i.e., for all edges $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$ where i is odd, and the probability of success is p_n . We have a success if the edge $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$ is long. Assume there have been k successes altogether. Then, the second Bernoulli trials are repeated $\binom{k}{2}$ times, one for each pair $\{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}\}$, $\{\pi_j, \pi_{j+1}\}$ of long edges. The probability of success is p_n^2 , and there is a success if both $\{\pi_{i+1}, \pi_{j+1}\}$ and $\{\pi_i, \pi_j\}$ receive a short length. Note that these trials are independent, since for every two pairs P and P' of long tour edges, the sets of non-tour edges that define the 2-OPT move for P and for P' are disjoint.

The probability of having no LS-moves at all is upper bounded by the probability of having no LS-moves of the above type, i.e., having zero successes in the second Bernoulli trials. By the laws of binomial distributions, this probability is

$$P'_0(\alpha, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n/2} \binom{n/2}{k} p_n^k (1 - p_n)^{\frac{n}{2} - k} (1 - p_n^2)^{\binom{k}{2}}.$$

Let $S_n \sim \text{Binomial}(n/2, p_n)$. Then $P'_0(\alpha, n)$ can be written as

$$P'_0(\alpha, n) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - \alpha^2 / (4n) \right)^{\binom{S_n}{2}} \right].$$

Now fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, and define $a_n = \alpha\sqrt{n}/4 - n^{1/4+\delta}$ and $b_n = \alpha\sqrt{n}/4 + n^{1/4+\delta}$. Also, consider the event $A_n = \{S_n \in [a_n, b_n]\}$, and let its complement be A_n^c . By the Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\Pr[A_n^c] \leq \frac{\mathbf{Var}(S_n)}{n^{\frac{1}{2}+2\delta}} \leq \frac{C}{n^{2\delta}}$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$ and hence $\Pr[A_n^c] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then by noting that $k \mapsto (1-p^2)^{\binom{k}{2}}$ is decreasing in k , we get

$$(1 - \alpha^2/(4n))^{\binom{b_n}{2}} \Pr[A_n] \leq P'_0(\alpha, n) \leq (1 - \alpha^2/(4n))^{\binom{a_n}{2}} \Pr[A_n] + \Pr[A_n^c],$$

and it is easy to check that both the lower and upper bound converge to $e^{-\alpha^4/2^8}$, which is the limit of $P'_0(\alpha, n)$. Since $P_0(\alpha, n) \leq P'_0(\alpha, n)$, the conclusion follows. \blacksquare

Corollary 3 *For each $p \in [0, 1)$ there exist a value for $\alpha > 0$ and an integer n_0 such that, for each $n \geq n_0$ and uniform random instance of size n , it is $\Pr[\text{The instance is good}] > p$.*

PROOF: Let $\alpha > 0$ be such that $e^{-(\alpha/4)^4} > 1 - p$, i.e., $\alpha > 4\sqrt[4]{\ln(1-p)^{-1}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[\text{There is a least one LS-move}] &= 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(\alpha, n) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{e^{(\alpha/4)^4}} \\ &> p \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, from some n_0 on, it is $\Pr[\text{There is a least one LS-move}] > p$. Since LS-moves are good moves, the conclusion follows. \blacksquare

Notice that we are discussing a lower bound to the probability of some specific good moves, and these are in turn a subset of all good moves, so that it is possible to obtain the same probability of no errors with an α smaller than that suggested by the corollary, as we will show in our computational experiments.

Finally, the following theorem bounds probabilistically the complexity of \mathcal{A}_g on uniform instances via $\Theta(n^{3/2})$ functions.

Theorem 2 *Consider the uniform distribution setting for random instances. Then, for each $p \in [0, 1)$ there exists an algorithm $ALG(\delta_n)$, with $\bar{T}_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n^{3/2})$, and an integer n_0 such that, for each $n \geq n_0$, it is*

$$\Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n] > p.$$

PROOF: By Corollary 3 we can find $\alpha > 0$ and n_0 such that, for $n \geq n_0$, the probability of a good instance is greater than p . If we set $\delta_n := 1 - \alpha n^{-1/2}$, by Corollary 2 we have $\bar{T}_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n^{3/2})$. Since $T_{\mathcal{A}}^n$ is defined as the (random) time taken by an algorithm \mathcal{A} on a (random) instance of size n , we can usefully distinguish between the case in which the instance is good and the case in which it is not good, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n] &= \Pr[\text{instance is good}] \times \Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n \mid \text{instance is good}] \\ &\quad + \Pr[\text{instance is not good}] \times \Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n \mid \text{instance is not good}]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, $\Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}^n \mid \text{instance is good}] = 1$ and then, $\forall n \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}^n] &\geq \Pr[\text{instance is good}] \times \Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}^n \mid \text{instance is good}] \\ &= \Pr[\text{instance is good}] \\ &> p. \end{aligned}$$

■

3.3 Random Euclidean instances

We start with a lemma whose proof is in Appendix A.

Lemma 4 *Let $1.055 < d \leq \sqrt{2}$ and let D be the distance between two random points drawn uniformly in the unit square. Then*

$$\Pr[D > d] \leq \frac{7}{16} \left(1 - \sqrt{d^2 - 1}\right)^4.$$

Since, by our computational experiments we observed that the algorithm \mathcal{A}_g has an average linear time complexity, it must expand a fraction $\Theta(n^{-1})$ of the edges.

Corollary 4 *Let $\alpha > 0$ be a constant and define*

$$\delta_n := \sqrt{2} - \alpha n^{-1/4}.$$

Then, under the Euclidean distribution setting for random instances, the average-case complexity of $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ satisfies $\bar{T}_{\text{ALG}(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n)$.

PROOF: Since, by Lemma 4, it is $\Pr[C > \delta_n] = \Theta(n^{-1})$, by Lemma 3 the average-time complexity of $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$ is $\Theta(n^{2-1}) = \Theta(n)$. ■

Instead of discussing how the setting of the constant α affects the probability of having good moves, in the following we find it is easier to rewrite


$$\delta_n = \sqrt{2} - (5\sqrt{2})\lambda n^{-1/4}$$

for a constant $\lambda > 0$ and discuss the constant λ .

We first recall a very basic property of tours on Euclidean instances.

Lemma 5 *Let $T = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ be a tour on a Euclidean instance, where each P_i is a point in the plane. Assume that edges $\{P_i, P_{i+1}\}$ and $\{P_j, P_{j+1}\}$ cross. Then the 2-OPT move $\mu(i, j)$ has value > 0 . Furthermore if $\min\{c(P_i, P_{i+1}), c(P_j, P_{j+1})\} > l > u > \max\{c(P_i, P_j), c(P_{i+1}, P_{j+1})\}$, then $\Delta(\mu(i, j)) > 2(l - u)$.*

PROOF: Consider the following figure



Let P_\times be the point in which $\{P_i, P_{i+1}\}$ and $\{P_j, P_{j+1}\}$ intersect. By triangle inequality $\|P_i - P_\times\| + \|P_\times - P_j\| > \|P_i - P_j\| =: c(P_i, P_j)$ and $\|P_{i+1} - P_\times\| + \|P_\times - P_{j+1}\| > \|P_{i+1}, P_{j+1}\| =: c(P_{i+1}, P_{j+1})$, so that


$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mu(i, j)) &= c(P_i, P_{i+1}) + c(P_j, P_{j+1}) - c(P_i, P_j) - c(P_{i+1}, P_{j+1}) \\ &= \|P_i - P_\times\| + \|P_\times - P_{i+1}\| + \|P_j - P_\times\| + \|P_\times - P_{j+1}\| - c(P_i, P_j) - c(P_{i+1}, P_{j+1}) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second part of the claim is obvious. ■

Notice that a pair of crossing edges implies an improving move, but the move's value could be high or not so high, depending on how small or large the angle $\widehat{P_i P_\times P_j}$ is. In the previous figure, left, the angle is small and the move has a high value, while it is less so in the figure on the right.

Now we want to describe the specific type of good moves that we will use for the analysis. Consider Figure 1, showing the unit square which has been divided into $(n^{1/4}/\lambda) \times (n^{1/4}/\lambda) = \sqrt{n}/\lambda^2$ squares, each of side $\lambda n^{-1/4}$. Four of these squares are special, and they are labeled A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2 . An instance is a complete graph K_n made of n points and all line segments between them. In the figure, we show some of the points and edges.

Figure 1: Explaining D-edges and D-crosses



Call *D-edge* (for Diagonal-edge) an edge of K_n which is either $A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2$ or $B_1 \leftrightarrow B_2$. Furthermore, call *D-cross* (for Diagonal-cross) a pair of edges, one of which is $A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2$ and the other is $B_1 \leftrightarrow B_2$. Finally, call *C-edge* (for Corner-edge) an edge whose endpoints are both in $A_i \cup B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Intuitively, D-edges are “long” and C-edges are “short”.

In a random instance, the tour is identified by a random permutation $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n)$ of the nodes of K_n . For each D-cross contained in the tour, if the D-cross is traversed in the right order then there is a move which can replace two D-edges with two C-edges. For instance, a right order for the D-cross in the figure would be if the node in A_1 is labeled π_i , that in A_2 is π_{i+1} , the node in B_1 is π_j and that in B_2 is π_{j+1} , for some i and j . We denote this order as $(A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightsquigarrow B_1 \rightarrow B_2)$. In the analysis, we consider the specific type of good moves that replace a D-cross with two C-edges, which we call *D-uncrossing* moves. Since each

D-edge is long at least $\sqrt{2} - 3\sqrt{2}\lambda n^{-1/4}$ and each C-edge is long at most $2\sqrt{2}\lambda n^{-1/4}$, by Lemma 5 these moves would have value greater than

$$2(\sqrt{2} - 3\sqrt{2}\lambda n^{-1/4}) - 4\sqrt{2}\lambda n^{-1/4} = 2(\sqrt{2} - 5\sqrt{2}\lambda n^{-1/4}) = 2\delta_n, \quad (1)$$

i.e., they are in fact good moves.

Lemma 6 *Under the Euclidean distributional setting, consider the random points $P(1), \dots, P(n)$ and the random tour $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$. Then for each i ,*

$$\Pr[(P(\pi_i) \in A_1) \wedge (P(\pi_{i+1}) \in A_2)] = \lambda^4/n.$$

PROOF: The probability of a point drawn at random to fall in A_k , for $k = 1, 2$, is λ^2/\sqrt{n} . Since the points $P(k)$ were drawn independently of each other, the conclusion follows. ■

Lemma 7 *Under the Euclidean distributional setting, consider the random points $P(1), \dots, P(n)$, and the random tour $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$. Let \mathcal{E}_A be the event “ π does not traverse any $A_1 \rightarrow A_2$ D-edge”. Then*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_A] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^4}{n}\right)^{n/2}.$$

PROOF: For each i let us consider the event $D_i := (P(\pi_i) \in A_1) \wedge (P(\pi_{i+1}) \in A_2)$. By Lemma 6, it is $\Pr[\neg D_i] = 1 - \lambda^4/n$ for each i . Furthermore, it is $\mathcal{E}_A = \neg D_1 \wedge \neg D_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg D_n$.

Let us look at the odd-indexed edges of the tour, i.e., edges $(P(\pi_i), P(\pi_{i+1}))$ for $i = 1, 3, 5, \dots$. Since these edges are disjoint, the events D_1, D_3, D_5, \dots are independent. The probability that none of them occurs is

$$\Pr[\neg D_1 \wedge \neg D_3 \wedge \dots] = (1 - \lambda^4/n)^{n/2}.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_A \implies \neg D_1 \wedge \neg D_3 \wedge \dots$, the result follows. ■

Corollary 5 *Under the Euclidean distributional setting, consider the random points $P(1), \dots, P(n)$ and the random tour $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$. Let \mathcal{E}_{AB} be the event “ π does not contain any D-cross ($A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightsquigarrow B_1 \rightarrow B_2$)”. Then*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{AB}] \leq 2(1 - \lambda^4/n)^{n/2}.$$

PROOF: Let \mathcal{E}_A be the event “ π does not traverse any $A_1 \rightarrow A_2$ D-edge” and \mathcal{E}_B be the event “ π does not traverse any $B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ D-edge”. We have $\mathcal{E}_{AB} = \mathcal{E}_A \vee \mathcal{E}_B$. Furthermore, $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_A] = \Pr[\mathcal{E}_B]$ and so

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{AB}] = \Pr[\mathcal{E}_A] + \Pr[\mathcal{E}_B] - \Pr[\mathcal{E}_A \cap \mathcal{E}_B] \leq 2\Pr[\mathcal{E}_A].$$

Then the conclusion follows from Lemma 7. ■

Theorem 3 *For each $p \in [0, 1)$ there exist a value for $\lambda > 0$ and an integer n_0 such that, for each $n \geq n_0$ and Euclidean random instance of size n , it is $\Pr[\text{The instance is good}] > p$.*

PROOF: Let λ be such that $2/\sqrt{e^{\lambda^4}} < 1 - p$, i.e.,

$$\lambda > \sqrt[4]{2 \ln \left(\frac{2}{1-p} \right)}.$$

It is

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[\text{there are D-uncrossings}] &\geq 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2(1 - \lambda^4/n)^{n/2} \\ &= 1 - 2/\sqrt{e^{\lambda^4}} \\ &> p \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, from some n_0 on, it is $\Pr[\text{there are D-uncrossings}] > p$. Since the D-uncrossings are good moves, the conclusion follows. \blacksquare

Finally, the following theorem bounds probabilistically the complexity of \mathcal{A}_g on Euclidean instances via linear functions.

Theorem 4 *Consider the Euclidean distributional setting for random instances. Then, for each $p \in [0, 1]$ there exists an algorithm $ALG(\delta_n)$, with $T_{ALG(\delta_n)}(n) = \Theta(n)$, and an integer n_0 such that, for each $n \geq n_0$, it is*

$$\Pr[T_{\mathcal{A}_g}^n \leq T_{ALG(\delta_n)}^n] > p.$$

PROOF: The proof follows the exact same lines as the proof of Theorem 2. \blacksquare

4 Computational experiments and statistics

4.1 Best move from a random tour

In this section we compare experimentally the complete enumeration (CE), the greedy algorithm (\mathcal{A}_g), the blind algorithm (\mathcal{A}_b), and the algorithm $ALG(\delta_n)$ by looking at how many moves they evaluate on average over 1000 runs. In particular, we generate 100 random instances and for each of them we generate 10 random tours on which we determine the best 2-OPT move. Given that the bookkeeping costs are dominated by the number of evaluations, looking at the number of moves which are evaluated gives a pretty precise idea of the ratios between the running times as well.

Uniform instances. In Table 1 we report the average number of moves (rounded to integer) evaluated by CE, \mathcal{A}_g , \mathcal{A}_b , and $ALG(\delta_n)$. In the experiment, we set $\delta_n := 1 - 1.89/\sqrt{n}$, where $\alpha \simeq 1.9$ was chosen, after a little tuning, since it is a value large enough to guarantee a good probability of no errors. Indeed, out of 12,000 instances considered, the algorithm $ALG(\delta_n)$ *always* found the best move.

Column $\bar{f}(n)$ reports the theoretical expected complexity of $ALG(\delta_n)$, i.e., $\alpha(n-3)n^{1/2}$. It can be seen how this column is very close to the actual averages observed in the experiments. Column $\frac{CE}{\mathcal{A}_g}$ gives the ratio between the number of moves of complete enumeration and of the greedy algorithm, showing that we can achieve speed-ups of up to $60\times$ over instances of size ≤ 24000 . The table also reports the ratios between the number of moves of the blind and of the greedy algorithm (column $\frac{\mathcal{A}_b}{\mathcal{A}_g}$). Since this ratio stays pretty much constant (around 1.22) it appears from the table that \mathcal{A}_g and \mathcal{A}_b both evaluate a sub-quadratic number of moves of the same asymptotic growth but with a smaller constant for \mathcal{A}_g . In Figure 2 we have plotted the same values and we have fitted the dots with functions $\Theta(n^{3/2})$, namely $\alpha n^{3/2}$ for $ALG(\delta_n)$, and (estimated by power regression) $1.20 n^{\frac{3}{2}}$ for the greedy algorithm and $1.46 n^{\frac{3}{2}}$ for the blind algorithm.

n	CE	\mathcal{A}_g	\mathcal{A}_b	ALG(δ_n)	$\bar{f}(n)$	$\frac{CE}{\mathcal{A}_g}$	$\frac{\mathcal{A}_b}{\mathcal{A}_g}$
2,000	1,999,000	106,462	133,049	170,190	169,447	18.78	1.25
4,000	7,998,000	304,987	377,135	481,079	479,629	26.22	1.24
6,000	17,997,000	560,647	682,285	881,361	881,356	32.10	1.22
8,000	31,996,000	871,001	1,057,508	1,355,070	1,357,106	36.73	1.21
10,000	49,995,000	1,201,409	1,468,602	1,886,631	1,896,756	41.61	1.22
12,000	71,994,000	1,567,947	1,918,657	2,497,627	2,493,476	45.92	1.22
14,000	97,993,000	1,986,524	2,425,136	3,137,567	3,142,251	49.33	1.22
16,000	127,992,000	2,453,347	2,981,419	3,857,294	3,839,197	52.17	1.22
18,000	161,991,000	2,910,420	3,525,385	4,576,299	4,581,189	55.66	1.21
20,000	199,990,000	3,368,334	4,111,101	5,345,312	5,365,643	59.37	1.22
22,000	241,989,000	3,963,375	4,779,938	6,206,599	6,190,371	61.06	1.21
24,000	287,988,000	4,486,287	5,465,894	7,052,514	7,053,497	64.19	1.22


Table 1: Average number of moves evaluated for finding the best move on a random tour. Results for uniform instances.

Euclidean and TSPLIB geometric instances. We have performed a similar set of experiments on random Euclidean instances. In Table 2 we can see that the greedy algorithm is from *two to three orders of magnitude* faster than complete enumeration when looking for the best move on a random tour on graphs with up to 24,000 nodes. The values are averages over 1,000 experiments for each size n , exactly as before. The blind algorithm exhibits a similar time complexity, but it is roughly 2.5 times slower than greedy. The fixed threshold algorithm has been run with $\delta_n = \sqrt{2} - 2.5/\sqrt[4]{n}$, corresponding to $\lambda = 1/(2\sqrt{2})$. We remark that the algorithm ALG(δ_n) found the optimal move, over *all* the 12,000 trials. In Figure 3 we can see the data of Table 2 plotted in a graph. The linear behavior of \mathcal{A}_g and \mathcal{A}_b can be appreciated by looking at the interpolating functions, respectively, $7.7n$ and $19.3n$.

n	CE	\mathcal{A}_g	\mathcal{A}_b	ALG(δ_n)	$\bar{f}(n)$	$\frac{CE}{\mathcal{A}_g}$	$\frac{\mathcal{A}_b}{\mathcal{A}_g}$
2,000	1,999,000	15,786	34,874	63,626	63,100	126.63	2.21
4,000	7,998,000	32,811	73,709	119,614	119,846	243.76	2.25
6,000	17,997,000	46,710	110,513	173,905	176,063	385.29	2.37
8,000	31,996,000	61,073	149,504	232,322	231,907	523.90	2.45
10,000	49,995,000	78,926	189,164	285,921	287,487	633.44	2.40
12,000	71,994,000	93,552	227,500	340,711	342,869	769.56	2.43
14,000	97,993,000	110,450	269,611	397,165	398,093	887.21	2.44
16,000	127,992,000	124,632	308,551	457,667	453,189	1026.95	2.48
18,000	161,991,000	141,852	350,996	513,313	508,177	1141.97	2.47
20,000	199,990,000	156,056	386,363	569,531	563,072	1281.52	2.48
22,000	241,989,000	169,574	423,487	618,985	617,886	1427.03	2.50
24,000	287,988,000	181,513	464,918	675,163	672,629	1586.59	2.56

Table 2: Average number of moves evaluated for finding the best move on a random tour. Results for Euclidean instances.

Figure 2: Plots of possible fittings of the average time complexity for finding the best move on a random tour (uniform instances). $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$, fit $\alpha n^{\frac{3}{2}} = 1.89 n^{\frac{3}{2}}$. \mathcal{A}_b , fit is $1.46 n^{\frac{3}{2}}$. \mathcal{A}_g , fit is $1.20 n^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Each dot corresponds to the average over 1000 trials of size n .




Some test-bed instances on the repository TSPLIB ([22]) are of geometric nature, and we have tested our algorithm on those as well. In particular, there are some Euclidean instances (but they are not random, they correspond to some networks of world cities), and other are metric, not Euclidean, instances. We have selected the largest such instances (with the exception of `pla85900`, that, with $\geq 85,900$ nodes, was too big for our computer setting). The results are reported in Table 3. It can be seen that our method achieves a speed-up of two to three orders of magnitude in finding the best move on a random tour.

name	n	\mathcal{A}_g	\mathcal{A}_b	CE	$\frac{CE}{\mathcal{A}_g}$	$\frac{\mathcal{A}_b}{\mathcal{A}_g}$
<code>euc2d/r15915</code>	5,915	59,258	113,747	17,490,655	295.16	1.92
<code>euc2d/r15934</code>	5,934	51,261	101,539	17,603,211	343.40	1.98
<code>ceil2d/pla7397</code>	7,397	48,665	127,695	27,354,106	562.08	2.62
<code>euc2d/r111849</code>	11,849	98,457	223,416	70,193,476	712.93	2.27
<code>euc2d/usa13509</code>	13,509	104,147	232,979	91,239,786	876.06	2.24
<code>euc2d/brd14051</code>	14,051	170,286	345,863	98,708,275	579.66	2.03
<code>euc2d/d15112</code>	15,112	195,385	375,611	114,178,716	584.37	1.92
<code>euc2d/d18512</code>	18,512	174,374	409,420	171,337,816	982.58	2.34
<code>ceil2d/pla33810</code>	33,810	371,561	832,667	571,541,145	1538.21	2.24

Table 3: Finding the best move on a random tour on TSPLIB instances.

Figure 3: Plots of possible fittings of the average time complexity for finding the best move on a random tour (Euclidean instances). $\text{ALG}(\delta_n)$: fit is $28.2n$. \mathcal{A}_b : fit is $19.3n$. \mathcal{A}_g : fit is $7.7n$. Each dot corresponds to the average over 1000 trials of size n .



4.2 Convergence to a local optimum


Given that finding the best move at the beginning of the local search is much faster with our algorithm than with the standard approach, we were optimistic about the fact that the time for the whole convergence would have been much shorter as well. Unfortunately, this is not the case, since the effectiveness of our approach decreases along the path to the local optimum. Indeed, at some point, our procedure can in fact become slower than complete enumeration given that, although they are both quadratic, the multiplicative constant factor for the n^2 term is worse in our procedure (for some minor technical details, see Appendix B).

The slow-down phenomenon can be explained as follows. When we approach the local optimum, the value of the best move decreases dramatically. While at the beginning of the convergence there are many improving moves, and some of them have a really big value, near the local optimum most moves are worsening, and the few improving moves have a small value. At this point, also the thresholds which determine which pivots are large become pretty low and hence almost all nodes are large and get expanded.

To counter the effect that our method could become slower than complete enumeration, we propose a very elementary switch-condition to perform a full local search, namely: *start the search looking for the best move with our algorithm, but at each iteration count how many moves are evaluated. If at any step the number of moves evaluated is “too large” (in a way that we will define soon), then switch to complete enumeration for the rest of the convergence.*

A first, natural threshold for this switch could be simply to switch as soon as our algorithm evaluates as many moves as complete enumeration. For a graph of 1,000 nodes, we have observed empirically that this happens more or less at two thirds of the convergence. For example, in Figure 4 we plot the number of moves evaluated by \mathcal{A}_g in a local search convergence on a random graph, which took almost 1,200 moves on a uniform instance (left) and almost 1,300 moves on a Euclidean instance (right). For the uniform instance, it can be seen that until move 400 the algorithm takes more or less always the same time to find the best

Figure 4: Number of moves evaluated by CE and the greedy algorithm in the convergence to a local optimum on a random graph of $n = 1000$ nodes. x -axis is iteration number, y -axis is number of moves evaluated to find the best. (Left:) Uniform instance. (Right:) Euclidean instance.




move, evaluating around 50,000 candidates, i.e., ten times less than complete enumeration. From move 400 to around 800 the algorithm starts to take longer and longer to find the best move, although, occasionally, the move is still found by examining much fewer candidates than complete enumeration. In the last third of the convergence, the number of candidates examined by the greedy algorithm is comparable to, or exceeds, that of complete enumeration, and so a switch is performed.

In Figure 4 (right) we see the same type of plot for the convergence on a random Euclidean instance. Although finding the starting move takes fewer evaluations than for the uniform instance (i.e., 5,994 vs 22,977), soon finding the best move on the Euclidean instance becomes somewhat harder than for the uniform one. At any rate, also in this case, until step 400 there is no significant increase in the work needed for finding the best move. At this point the trend becomes a steady increase until about move 800, when we switch to complete enumeration.

As far as the running times for these two instances, in Figure 5 we can see how the greedy algorithm is initially much faster than complete enumeration, but then its performance starts to deteriorate and eventually there is the switch. From that point on, the time complexity becomes that of complete enumeration. Overall, there is an improvement of about 50% for the time needed by the uniform instance and of 33% for the Euclidean instance.

Determining the best switch-point. The first, simple, idea for switching from A_g to brute force was that of counting the number c of moves that are evaluated at each iteration, and switch as soon as they are more than those evaluated by complete enumeration, i.e., $c \geq \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$. In this paragraph we address the problem of determining if this strategy is indeed a good one, or if switching at some other moment could

Figure 5: Time (ms) taken by CE and the greedy algorithm on a convergence to a local optimum on a random graph of $n = 1000$ nodes. Switch made when greedy evaluates as many moves as CE. Left: Uniform instance. Right: Euclidean instance.



have been better.

Notice that, since with our method there is an overhead in computing each move, the time to evaluate k moves with our method is larger than evaluating k moves with CE and so to account for this we might switch to CE when $c \geq \beta n(n-1)$ even if $\beta < 1/2$. To find the best β , we have set up the following experiment. For a fixed n :

1. We generated a random instance and a random starting permutation π^0 .
2. We ran local search with our algorithm up to the point when our algorithm evaluates $\frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$ moves. Let this iteration be s . This is the point when we would have reverted to CE anyway, and so all our savings can only be made in the iterations $1, \dots, s$.
3. We ran local search with CE, starting from the same permutation π^0 as before up to the iteration s . Let t_s be the time taken by CE to get to iteration s .
4. We divided the interval $(0, 1/2)$ in 5 parts, and considered setting β to h fifths of the interval. Since we quickly observed that the smallest values of β yielded the worst results, we limited the search of the best β to $h = 3, 4, 5$. For each such $\beta := h/10$, we ran our algorithm to determine the time $t(\beta)$ that it takes to arrive at iteration s if the switch is done as soon as $\beta n(n-1)$ moves are evaluated, as well as the total completion time t_{tot} .

We have repeated the above experiment 5 times for each $n = 2000, 4000, 6000, 8000$ and we obtain the following tables (Table 4 – 7). The tables should be read as follows. Columns “ t_{100} ” (time in seconds for the first 100 steps of the convergence) and “ impr_{100} ” (improvement over CE in the first 100 steps) are included to

show the big gain of our method with respect to complete enumeration in the first stages of the convergence. Column “ t_{tot} ” is the total time of the convergence and column “ $impr_{tot}$ ” is the overall savings over CE. Column “ L ” is the total number of LS iterations (i.e., the length of the convergence). Column “ s ” is the iteration no. at which the greedy algorithm switches to CE. “ $t(\beta)$ ” is the time taken by \mathcal{A}_g up to the switch iteration s , while “ t_s ” is the time taken by Complete Enumeration up to iteration s . Finally, “avgMpl” is the average number of moves evaluated per iteration.

Each table is divided into two halves, where the first half refers to the algorithm as we have presented it, while the second half is relative to a minor variant (discussed in Appendix B) that yields a very small improvement, on some instances. In the tables we have highlighted in boldface the setting yielding the best running time for each instance. From the experiments, it appears that the best setting, for instances of the size considered, would be to switch when $\beta = 4/10$, corresponding to when the greedy algorithm evaluates 80% of all possible moves. This setting is the winner for 11 out of 20 cases, for the basic greedy version, and 10 out of 20 cases for the variant we mentioned. The overall savings are around 50% of the time of complete enumeration. Setting $\beta = 5/10$ is the best option in 6 out of 20 cases, while $\beta = 3/10$ is definitely the worst option.

Minor improvements and technical details. For the sake of simplicity, in this paper we have presented the algorithm in a basic form although some small improvements are still possible. In particular, we can strengthen the definition of a large edge in such a way that it becomes more difficult for an edge to be expanded. Furthermore, in the basic form discussed so far, some moves $\mu(i, j)$ could be evaluated twice, and this happens when both edges $\{i, i + 1\}$ and $\{j, j + 1\}$ are large. There is a simple workaround to avoid this double evaluation, and it is described in Appendix B, together with the stricter definition of large edges. We remark that the theoretical results, in particular the good average-case complexity, are already obtained by the basic form. Furthermore, we ran some computational experiments to evaluate the possible improvements and found out that their impact is quite minor (say, less than 10% of time savings) while the algorithm becomes definitely less readable. For this reason, we have chosen to briefly describe these minor improvements only in the Appendix.

5 Conclusions

In this work we have described a new exact strategy for finding the best 2-OPT move in a given tour. A nice feature of this strategy is, generally speaking, its simplicity. In particular, the blind version of our algorithm amounts to a 1-line code change to the standard 2-OPT procedure which is sufficient to lower the complexity of this step for many local search iterations. Improving the 2-OPT search (a popular algorithm) for the TSP (a fundamental problem) can have a certain impact, especially since this “hack” is so trivial that can be readily incorporated in many simple applications previously based on the basic 2-OPT local search. We have also described a family of sub-quadratic average-case heuristics for the same problem, which can be tuned in such a way that they succeed with very high probability. Computational experiments and theoretical analysis have shown that our strategies outperform the classical two-nested-for algorithm for a good part of a local search convergence starting from a random tour. In particular, on a starting random uniform instance, we determine the best move in average time $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}})$, while on a Euclidean instance, our procedure takes average linear time, which is the best possible complexity for this problem.

We have then discussed how to adjust our procedure to obtain an effective local search algorithm, given that the performance worsens while we approach the local optima. We have therefore proposed a hybrid

algo	t_{100}	impr_{100}	T_{tot}	impr_{tot}	L	s	$t(\beta)$	t_s	avgMpl
CE	1.321s	0.0	31.38s	0.0	2421	-	-	-	1999000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.178s	86.6%	18.70s	40.4%	2421	1411	5.43s	18.28s	1026947
$\beta = 4/10$	0.177s	86.6%	19.63s	37.4%	2421	1568	7.80s	20.34s	982218
$\beta = 5/10$	0.143s	89.2%	18.64s	40.6%	2421	1765	10.07s	22.90s	953043
CE	1.301s	0.0	32.47s	0.0	2432	-	-	-	1999000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.149s	88.6%	18.08s	44.3%	2432	1463	5.49s	19.02s	1020521
$\beta = 4/10$	0.153s	88.3%	18.18s	44.0%	2432	1653	8.09s	21.46s	970851
$\beta = 5/10$	0.175s	86.5%	18.93s	41.7%	2432	1771	10.18s	23.02s	955734
CE	1.379s	0.0	33.34s	0.0	2438	-	-	-	1999000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.157s	88.6%	18.23s	45.3%	2438	1423	4.99s	19.03s	1034536
$\beta = 4/10$	0.169s	87.7%	18.46s	44.6%	2438	1630	7.74s	21.82s	977569
$\beta = 5/10$	0.232s	83.2%	20.01s	40.0%	2438	1778	10.28s	23.95s	958197
CE	1.270s	0.0	31.81s	0.0	2463	-	-	-	1999000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.134s	89.4%	18.31s	42.4%	2463	1421	4.92s	18.27s	1044769
$\beta = 4/10$	0.148s	88.3%	18.57s	41.6%	2463	1566	6.93s	20.07s	1005130
$\beta = 5/10$	0.152s	88.0%	19.30s	39.3%	2463	1745	9.96s	22.40s	982087
CE	1.298s	0.0	31.30s	0.0	2409	-	-	-	1999000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.176s	86.5%	19.13s	38.9%	2409	1457	5.36s	18.80s	1003174
$\beta = 4/10$	0.163s	87.5%	17.76s	43.3%	2409	1628	7.47s	21.06s	952764
$\beta = 5/10$	0.176s	86.5%	18.50s	40.9%	2409	1792	10.40s	23.16s	931831
CE	1.267s	0.0	31.02s	0.0	2421	-	-	-	1999000
SF5-3/5	0.164s	87.1%	17.63s	43.2%	2421	1438	4.91s	18.33s	1012032
SF5-4/5	0.150s	88.2%	17.78s	42.7%	2421	1616	7.06s	20.59s	961722
SF5-5/5	0.270s	78.7%	18.64s	39.9%	2421	1830	11.08s	23.38s	930478
CE	1.279s	0.0	34.94s	0.0	2432	-	-	-	1999000
SF5-3/5	0.156s	87.8%	17.63s	49.5%	2432	1493	5.65s	20.76s	1003384
SF5-4/5	0.152s	88.1%	17.83s	49.0%	2432	1670	8.03s	23.50s	955736
SF5-5/5	0.155s	87.9%	18.40s	47.3%	2432	1813	10.47s	26.10s	936685
CE	1.275s	0.0	31.25s	0.0	2438	-	-	-	1999000
SF5-3/5	0.164s	87.1%	17.72s	43.3%	2438	1450	5.09s	18.52s	1018747
SF5-4/5	0.161s	87.4%	17.86s	42.8%	2438	1667	7.96s	21.26s	958047
SF5-5/5	0.159s	87.5%	18.61s	40.4%	2438	1838	10.89s	23.47s	936531
CE	1.278s	0.0	32.00s	0.0	2463	-	-	-	1999000
SF5-3/5	0.138s	89.2%	18.09s	43.5%	2463	1440	4.95s	18.78s	1031720
SF5-4/5	0.139s	89.1%	18.16s	43.2%	2463	1624	7.44s	21.14s	982368
SF5-5/5	0.145s	88.6%	19.55s	38.9%	2463	1758	9.99s	22.88s	963758
CE	1.278s	0.0	30.81s	0.0	2409	-	-	-	1999000
SF5-3/5	0.249s	80.5%	21.51s	30.2%	2409	1516	7.21s	19.36s	975039
SF5-4/5	0.174s	86.4%	17.83s	42.1%	2409	1652	7.84s	21.10s	936786
SF5-5/5	0.160s	87.5%	18.01s	41.5%	2409	1852	10.83s	23.63s	910122

Table 4: Runs to determine the best β . Above: \mathcal{A}_g . Below: stronger \mathcal{A}_g . Five instances, $n = 2000$.

algo	t_{100}	impr_{100}	T_{tot}	impr_{tot}	L	s	$t(\beta)$	t_s	avgMpl
CE	7.406s	0.0	375.68s	0.0	4986	-	-	-	7998000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.677s	90.9%	199.56s	46.9%	4986	3069	56.44s	229.64s	3938640
$\beta = 4/10$	0.663s	91.0%	197.68s	47.4%	4986	3509	86.25s	263.10s	3704082
$\beta = 5/10$	0.653s	91.2%	198.04s	47.3%	4986	3821	108.90s	286.97s	3614730
CE	7.428s	0.0	378.77s	0.0	5031	-	-	-	7998000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.690s	90.7%	206.21s	45.6%	5031	3023	54.66s	227.25s	4012509
$\beta = 4/10$	0.616s	91.7%	199.83s	47.2%	5031	3439	79.72s	258.22s	3786022
$\beta = 5/10$	0.634s	91.5%	202.53s	46.5%	5031	3692	102.32s	277.05s	3727908
CE	7.444s	0.0	373.32s	0.0	4977	-	-	-	7998000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.661s	91.1%	198.35s	46.9%	4977	3077	55.02s	230.38s	3919739
$\beta = 4/10$	0.648s	91.3%	195.83s	47.5%	4977	3377	75.92s	252.77s	3760499
$\beta = 5/10$	0.646s	91.3%	199.62s	46.5%	4977	3681	101.06s	275.37s	3677210
CE	7.594s	0.0	379.57s	0.0	5062	-	-	-	7998000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.641s	91.6%	197.88s	47.9%	5062	3023	49.27s	225.96s	4029621
$\beta = 4/10$	0.643s	91.5%	194.83s	48.7%	5062	3353	70.62s	250.52s	3855573
$\beta = 5/10$	0.619s	91.8%	200.40s	47.2%	5062	3748	101.70s	281.25s	3750503
CE	7.156s	0.0	365.01s	0.0	5028	-	-	-	7998000
$\beta = 3/10$	0.591s	91.7%	203.34s	44.3%	5028	3027	52.67s	218.98s	3993228
$\beta = 4/10$	0.599s	91.6%	200.59s	45.0%	5028	3413	78.90s	247.73s	3789793
$\beta = 5/10$	0.606s	91.5%	198.76s	45.5%	5028	3688	100.55s	267.98s	3716365
CE	7.805s	0.0	390.01s	0.0	4986	-	-	-	7998000
SF5-3/5	0.666s	91.5%	206.84s	47.0%	4986	3094	58.16s	240.01s	3903740
SF5-4/5	0.664s	91.5%	204.76s	47.5%	4986	3556	91.27s	275.95s	3649850
SF5-5/5	0.708s	90.9%	205.94s	47.2%	4986	3883	117.66s	301.67s	3554548
CE	8.202s	0.0	394.16s	0.0	5031	-	-	-	7998000
SF5-3/5	0.634s	92.3%	212.59s	46.1%	5031	3061	56.73s	237.46s	3966810
SF5-4/5	0.643s	92.2%	208.34s	47.1%	5031	3470	83.32s	269.28s	3742725
SF5-5/5	0.608s	92.6%	208.76s	47.0%	5031	3727	106.17s	289.32s	3679137
CE	8.156s	0.0	387.92s	0.0	4977	-	-	-	7998000
SF5-3/5	0.675s	91.7%	207.46s	46.5%	4977	3125	59.41s	242.44s	3868544
SF5-4/5	0.671s	91.8%	203.30s	47.6%	4977	3421	79.83s	265.60s	3712166
SF5-5/5	0.643s	92.1%	205.79s	46.9%	4977	3719	106.31s	288.86s	3624778
CE	7.927s	0.0	395.69s	0.0	5062	-	-	-	7998000
SF5-3/5	0.662s	91.6%	213.31s	46.1%	5062	3058	54.95s	238.39s	3988324
SF5-4/5	0.731s	90.8%	210.17s	46.9%	5062	3385	77.36s	263.75s	3813221
SF5-5/5	0.684s	91.4%	213.29s	46.1%	5062	3766	110.47s	293.89s	3696991
CE	7.802s	0.0	391.04s	0.0	5028	-	-	-	7998000
SF5-3/5	0.632s	91.9%	210.46s	46.2%	5028	3045	54.67s	235.51s	3963106
SF5-4/5	0.765s	90.2%	206.85s	47.1%	5028	3442	82.39s	266.24s	3746261
SF5-5/5	0.617s	92.1%	208.99s	46.6%	5028	3772	109.00s	291.92s	3654401

Table 5: Runs to determine the best β . Above: \mathcal{A}_g . Below: stronger \mathcal{A}_g . Five instances, $n = 4000$.

algo	t_{100}	impr_{100}	T_{tot}	impr_{tot}	L	s	$t(\beta)$	t_s	avgMpl
CE	20.334s	0.0	1564.66s	0.0	7631	-	-	-	17997000
$\beta = 3/10$	1.576s	92.2%	813.16s	48.0%	7631	4703	210.29s	965.96s	8764537
$\beta = 4/10$	1.623s	92.0%	776.44s	50.4%	7631	5205	279.39s	1068.07s	8367592
$\beta = 5/10$	1.427s	93.0%	780.06s	50.1%	7631	5690	379.84s	1166.74s	8186185
CE	20.485s	0.0	1561.55s	0.0	7615	-	-	-	17997000
$\beta = 3/10$	1.502s	92.7%	831.81s	46.7%	7615	4584	196.41s	940.10s	8897723
$\beta = 4/10$	1.490s	92.7%	805.01s	48.4%	7615	5172	290.37s	1060.82s	8418623
$\beta = 5/10$	1.363s	93.3%	775.14s	50.4%	7615	5707	382.87s	1170.40s	8208940
CE	20.643s	0.0	1602.77s	0.0	7809	-	-	-	17997000
$\beta = 3/10$	1.274s	93.8%	858.89s	46.4%	7809	4746	209.29s	972.95s	8961183
$\beta = 4/10$	1.471s	92.9%	833.04s	48.0%	7809	5242	304.18s	1074.07s	8591764
$\beta = 5/10$	1.304s	93.7%	817.93s	49.0%	7809	5688	380.26s	1167.16s	8426212
CE	20.376s	0.0	1586.51s	0.0	7740	-	-	-	17997000
$\beta = 3/10$	1.302s	93.6%	821.90s	48.2%	7740	4664	190.58s	955.46s	8956251
$\beta = 4/10$	1.296s	93.6%	796.41s	49.8%	7740	5320	298.60s	1089.72s	8443221
$\beta = 5/10$	1.293s	93.7%	803.48s	49.4%	7740	5765	390.54s	1180.86s	8283301
CE	20.220s	0.0	1572.16s	0.0	7679	-	-	-	17997000
$\beta = 3/10$	1.310s	93.5%	807.43s	48.6%	7679	4692	195.04s	960.19s	8861558
$\beta = 4/10$	1.314s	93.5%	784.95s	50.1%	7679	5228	282.75s	1069.80s	8441652
$\beta = 5/10$	1.390s	93.1%	785.08s	50.1%	7679	5714	383.28s	1170.17s	8250685
CE	21.537s	0.0	1568.48s	0.0	7631	-	-	-	17997000
SF5-3/5	1.536s	92.9%	807.99s	48.5%	7631	4743	214.28s	976.33s	8690485
SF5-4/5	1.441s	93.3%	767.28s	51.1%	7631	5245	275.83s	1080.12s	8289026
SF5-5/5	1.445s	93.3%	766.23s	51.1%	7631	5759	382.25s	1185.20s	8080917
CE	20.306s	0.0	1564.66s	0.0	7615	-	-	-	17997000
SF5-3/5	1.315s	93.5%	801.33s	48.8%	7615	4633	185.37s	949.92s	8816084
SF5-4/5	1.364s	93.3%	773.51s	50.6%	7615	5214	278.38s	1068.87s	8339003
SF5-5/5	1.426s	93.0%	773.02s	50.6%	7615	5762	390.19s	1182.55s	8106742
CE	20.198s	0.0	1599.82s	0.0	7809	-	-	-	17997000
SF5-3/5	1.286s	93.6%	828.43s	48.2%	7809	4769	203.89s	975.64s	8906264
SF5-4/5	1.262s	93.7%	804.81s	49.7%	7809	5279	285.02s	1080.09s	8517504
SF5-5/5	1.261s	93.8%	807.95s	49.5%	7809	5739	381.82s	1174.57s	8338816
CE	21.275s	0.0	1588.44s	0.0	7740	-	-	-	17997000
SF5-3/5	1.358s	93.6%	837.70s	47.3%	7740	4767	213.47s	978.97s	8819357
SF5-4/5	2.897s	86.4%	793.45s	50.0%	7740	5337	300.70s	1095.57s	8371821
SF5-5/5	1.261s	94.1%	786.02s	50.5%	7740	5837	396.37s	1197.37s	8175083
CE	20.884s	0.0	1577.89s	0.0	7679	-	-	-	17997000
SF5-3/5	1.333s	93.6%	809.86s	48.7%	7679	4749	203.14s	975.79s	8771193
SF5-4/5	1.323s	93.7%	778.68s	50.7%	7679	5303	291.59s	1089.19s	8342284
SF5-5/5	1.275s	93.9%	784.07s	50.3%	7679	5814	402.00s	1193.69s	8136053

Table 6: Runs to determine the best β . Above: \mathcal{A}_g . Below: stronger \mathcal{A}_g . Five instances, $n = 6000$.

algo	t_{100}	impr_{100}	T_{tot}	impr_{tot}	L	s	$t(\beta)$	t_s	avgMpI
CE	39.623s	0.0	4144.64s	0.0	10310	-	-	-	31996000
$\beta = 3/10$	2.794s	92.9%	2156.99s	48.0%	10310	6338	533.90s	2549.07s	15535904
$\beta = 4/10$	2.532s	93.6%	2080.01s	49.8%	10310	7060	752.10s	2839.14s	14778140
$\beta = 5/10$	2.503s	93.7%	2039.32s	50.8%	10310	7720	997.89s	3104.02s	14428083
CE	40.107s	0.0	4148.15s	0.0	10273	-	-	-	31996000
$\beta = 3/10$	2.469s	93.8%	2077.86s	49.9%	10273	6399	515.50s	2583.15s	15321545
$\beta = 4/10$	2.442s	93.9%	2030.09s	51.1%	10273	7041	725.01s	2842.31s	14675128
$\beta = 5/10$	2.436s	93.9%	2035.16s	50.9%	10273	7621	962.40s	3075.25s	14387203
CE	40.706s	0.0	4186.00s	0.0	10325	-	-	-	31996000
$\beta = 3/10$	3.009s	92.6%	2156.82s	48.5%	10325	6284	509.45s	2545.75s	15620156
$\beta = 4/10$	2.691s	93.4%	2070.03s	50.5%	10325	7073	751.12s	2864.03s	14835548
$\beta = 5/10$	2.669s	93.4%	2073.94s	50.5%	10325	7684	997.36s	3111.89s	14511706
CE	40.999s	0.0	4389.51s	0.0	10476	-	-	-	31996000
$\beta = 3/10$	3.009s	92.7%	2198.15s	49.9%	10476	6396	543.12s	2597.42s	15711939
$\beta = 4/10$	2.691s	93.4%	2119.14s	51.7%	10476	7178	779.27s	2914.66s	14924554
$\beta = 5/10$	2.727s	93.3%	2128.44s	51.5%	10476	7769	1029.95s	3155.46s	14636145
CE	39.897s	0.0	4198.46s	0.0	10452	-	-	-	31996000
$\beta = 3/10$	2.377s	94.0%	2183.58s	48.0%	10452	6301	504.86s	2528.06s	15801765
$\beta = 4/10$	2.663s	93.3%	2144.16s	48.9%	10452	7027	761.81s	2820.49s	15056845
$\beta = 5/10$	2.503s	93.7%	2122.64s	49.4%	10452	7701	1015.08s	3091.68s	14743092
CE	40.621s	0.0	4211.89s	0.0	10310	-	-	-	31996000
SF5-3/5	2.892s	92.9%	2183.92s	48.1%	10310	6394	557.21s	2608.32s	15407270
SF5-4/5	3.283s	91.9%	2079.49s	50.6%	10310	7117	775.28s	2904.39s	14645139
SF5-5/5	2.591s	93.6%	2054.86s	51.2%	10310	7827	1043.87s	3194.56s	14268398
CE	40.189s	0.0	4201.60s	0.0	10273	-	-	-	31996000
SF5-3/5	2.468s	93.9%	2079.91s	50.5%	10273	6434	513.44s	2638.89s	15221943
SF5-4/5	2.395s	94.0%	2026.34s	51.8%	10273	7121	743.18s	2920.47s	14528187
SF5-5/5	2.444s	93.9%	2024.17s	51.8%	10273	7720	982.99s	3163.26s	14224719
CE	40.854s	0.0	4256.59s	0.0	10325	-	-	-	31996000
SF5-3/5	4.029s	90.1%	2165.45s	49.1%	10325	6329	514.73s	2605.41s	15510828
SF5-4/5	2.856s	93.0%	2100.96s	50.6%	10325	7151	796.75s	2943.48s	14687474
SF5-5/5	2.739s	93.3%	2107.66s	50.5%	10325	7792	1066.36s	3209.07s	14335403
CE	41.832s	0.0	4276.16s	0.0	10476	-	-	-	31996000
SF5-3/5	2.696s	93.6%	2200.29s	48.5%	10476	6442	544.56s	2629.27s	15602750
SF5-4/5	2.992s	92.8%	2167.29s	49.3%	10476	7241	837.21s	2956.36s	14783414
SF5-5/5	4.052s	90.3%	2123.13s	50.3%	10476	7877	1062.49s	3217.01s	14457500
CE	41.828s	0.0	4269.96s	0.0	10452	-	-	-	31996000
SF5-3/5	2.426s	94.2%	2192.43s	48.7%	10452	6370	519.82s	2598.16s	15665979
SF5-4/5	3.408s	91.9%	2134.77s	50.0%	10452	7099	762.58s	2897.57s	14920109
SF5-5/5	2.397s	94.3%	2139.26s	49.9%	10452	7812	1059.19s	3188.45s	14578944

Table 7: Runs to determine the best β . Above: \mathcal{A}_g . Below: stronger \mathcal{A}_g . Five instances, $n = 8000$.

approach, made by our procedure for the first part followed by the standard algorithm for the rest of the convergence, and we have studied the best point at which we should make the switch.

A direction for future research would be to integrate our algorithm, which is extremely fast in the first local search iterations, with some ad-hoc improvements for the second part, in order to further improve its overall performance.

References

- [1] E. Aarts and J. K. Lenstra, editors. *Local Search in Combinatorial Optimization*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 1997.
- [2] D. Applegate, R. Bixby, V. Chvátal, and W. Cook. *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Computational Study*. Princeton University Press, 2006.
- [3] D. Applegate, W. Cook, and A. Rohe. Chained lin-kernighan for large traveling salesman problems. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 15(1):82–92, 2003.
- [4] S. Basu. Tabu search implementation on traveling salesman problem and its variations: A literature survey. *American Journal of Operations Research*, 2:163–173, 2012.
- [5] B. Chandra, H. Karloff, and C. Tovey. New results on the old k-OPT algorithm for the traveling salesman problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(6):1998–2029, 1999.
- [6] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Third Edition*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2009.
- [7] G. Croes. A method for solving traveling-salesman problems. *Operations Research*, 6(6):791–812, 1958.
- [8] M. Englert, H. Roglin, and B. Vocking. Worst case and probabilistic analysis of the 2-OPT algorithm for the TSP. *Algorithmica*, 68(1):190–264, 2014.
- [9] M. M. Flood. The traveling-salesman problem. *Operations Research*, 4(1):61–75, 1956.
- [10] G. Gutin and A. Punnen, editors. *The Traveling Salesman Problem and Its Variations*. Combinatorial Optimization. Springer US, 2007.
- [11] I. Ilhan and G. Gokmen. A list-based simulated annealing algorithm with crossover operator for the traveling salesman problem. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 34:7627–7652, 2022.
- [12] W. Kern. A probabilistic analysis of the switching algorithm for the euclidean TSP. *Mathematical Programming*, 44:213–219, 1989.
- [13] G. Lancia and P. Vidoni. Finding the largest triangle in a graph in expected quadratic time. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 286(2):458–467, 2020.
- [14] E. L. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra, A. H. G. R. Kan, and D. B. Shmoys, editors. *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Guided Tour of Combinatorial Optimization*. Wiley, 1991.
- [15] S. Lin. Computer solutions of the traveling salesman problem. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 44(10):2245–2269, Dec 1965.

- [16] S. Lin and B. W. Kernighan. An effective heuristic algorithm for the traveling-salesman problem. *Oper. Res.*, 21(2):498–516, Apr. 1973.
- [17] A. Lodi and A. P. Punnen. *TSP Software*, pages 737–749. Springer US, in *The Traveling Salesman Problem and Its Variations*, Gutin G and Punnen AP eds., 2007.
- [18] R. Matai, S. P. Singh, and M. L. Mittal. Traveling salesman problem: an overview of applications, formulations, and solution approaches. In D. Davendra, editor, *Traveling Salesman Problem, theory and applications*, pages 1–24, 2010.
- [19] Y. Nagata and S. Kobayashi. A powerful genetic algorithm using edge assembly crossover for the traveling salesman problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 25(2):346–363, 2012.
- [20] C. Papadimitriou and K. Steiglitz. *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*. Prentice Hall, 01 1982.
- [21] J.-Y. Potvin. Genetic algorithms for the traveling salesman problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 63:339–370, 1996.
- [22] G. Reinelt. TSPLIB - a traveling salesman problem library. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, 3:376–384, 1991.
- [23] J. J. A. Slootbeek. Average-case analysis of the 2-OPT heuristic for the TSP. *Master Thesis – Applied Mathematics, University of Twente*, pages 1–45, 2017.

APPENDIX A: On the distance between random points

Lemma 8 *Let $1.055 < d \leq \sqrt{2}$, let X, X' be two random points in the unit square and $D = \|X - X'\|$. Then*

$$\Pr [D > d] \leq \frac{7}{16} \left(1 - \sqrt{d^2 - 1}\right)^4.$$

PROOF: Consider Figure 6. In order for two points to have distance greater than d , they must not fall within a circle of ray $d/2$. We draw such a circle with center in $(0, 0)$ and look at the intersections of the circle and the unit square. From Pythagoras’ theorem, we get

$$y = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{d^2 - 1}$$


and then

$$z = \frac{1}{2} - y = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{d^2 - 1}\right).$$

For two points to have distance greater than d at least one of them should fall out of the circle, i.e., in the corners, each of which is an area of “triangular” shape but with a curve basis. We are going to relax this, and require that the point must fall within one of the four triangles with two sides of length z in the corners (this way we are overestimating the probability). Let us call T^1, \dots, T^4 these squares, starting from the top-left and proceeding counter-clockwise.

Once a point is in $T \in \{T^1, \dots, T^4\}$, the other point must be at distance greater than d from it. The distance between two points in triangles which are not opposite to each other is at most d , as it can be

Figure 6: Study of $\Pr [D > d]$.



checked by noticing that $\sqrt{1+z^2} \leq d$ is always satisfied for $d \geq 1.055$ (where $\sqrt{1+z^2}$ is the maximum distance between two non-opposite triangles T). Therefore we have to look for the second point in the opposite corner.

Since in T the farthest from other points is precisely the corner vertex, say V , we draw a circle C_V of ray d and center V . Let V' be the opposite corner, and let l be the distance between V' and the intersection of the circle C_V with the square. By Pythagoras' theorem we get

$$l = 1 - \sqrt{d^2 - 1} = 2z.$$

Let L^1, \dots, L^4 be the triangle with two sides of length l in the corners. From the previous discussion, if we pick a sequence X, X' of two points at random, in order to have $D > d$ there must exist opposite corners i and j such that either X in T^i and X' is in L^j , or X is in $L^i \setminus T^i$ and X' is in T^j (notice that since we used chords instead of circle arcs in these areas, these are necessary, but not sufficient conditions, and so we are overestimating the probability that $D > d$). For fixed opposite i, j , we have

$$\Pr [(X \in T^i \wedge X' \in L^j) \vee (X \in L^i \setminus T^i \wedge X' \in T^j)] = \frac{z^2}{2} \cdot \frac{4z^2}{2} + \frac{3z^2}{2} \cdot \frac{z^2}{2} = \frac{7}{4}z^4.$$

Therefore, for the probability that the above situation is realized at one of the 4 possible pairs of opposite corners, we obtain

$$\Pr [D > d] \leq 7z^4 = \frac{7}{16} \left(1 - \sqrt{d^2 - 1}\right)^4.$$

■

APPENDIX B: Minor improvements to the procedure

A slightly stronger condition for expansion. In our research, we also investigated a stronger threshold to define a pivot as “large”. For each vertex u , let us then denote by

$$c_{\min}(u) := \min_v c(u, v)$$

the minimum weight of any edge incident in u . Notice that for each edge $\{u, v\}$ it is

$$c(u, v) \geq \frac{c_{\min}(u) + c_{\min}(v)}{2}$$

Given the tour $(1, 2, \dots, n)$, let us define for all i

$$c'(i, i+1) := c(i, i+1) - \frac{c_{\min}(i) + c_{\min}(i+1)}{2}$$

Assume the current champion is $\hat{\mu} = \mu(\hat{i}, \hat{j})$. Then, for any move $\mu(i, j)$ better than $\hat{\mu}$ it must be

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\hat{\mu}) &< \Delta(\mu(i, j)) \\ &= c(i, i+1) + c(j, j+1) - (c(i, j) + c(i+1, j+1)) \\ &\leq c(i, i+1) + c(j, j+1) - \frac{c_{\min}(i) + c_{\min}(j) + c_{\min}(i+1) + c_{\min}(j+1)}{2} \\ &= c'(i, i+1) + c'(j, j+1) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\left(c'(i, i+1) > \frac{\Delta(\hat{\mu})}{2} \right) \vee \left(c'(j, j+1) > \frac{\Delta(\hat{\mu})}{2} \right)$$

i.e., the move must be $(\Delta(\hat{\mu})/2)$ -large with respect to the values $c'(v, v+1)$, rather than to the values $c(v, v+1)$ that were used before, and, clearly, $c'(v, v+1) < c(v, v+1)$.

As far as the complexity of this strategy is concerned, notice that computing the values $c_{\min}(\cdot)$ takes $\Theta(n^2)$ time, but can be amortized since we need do it only once, at the beginning of a local search convergence. Once the $c_{\min}(\cdot)$ values have been computed in this preprocessing step, computing $c'(v, v+1)$ is $O(1)$.

Avoiding double evaluation of moves. If no precaution is taken, any move $\mu(i, j)$ could be possibly evaluated twice, namely, when both $\{i, i+1\}$ and $\{j, j+1\}$ are large. In order to avoid this, we can keep a partially-filled array `neverExp[]` and a counter `c` giving its current size. The idea is that `neverExp[1..c]` contains all pivots that were not expanded so far. Initially, `c = n` and `neverExp[]` contains all indices $1, \dots, n$. In general, assume an edge $\{i, i+1\}$ is being expanded. Then, to create the moves $\mu(i, j)$, instead of considering $j \leftarrow k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ we consider $j \leftarrow \text{neverExp}[k]$ for $k = 1, \dots, c$. When $j \neq i$, then we create the move $\mu(i, j)$ and increase `k`, but when $j = i$, we simply overwrite `neverExp[k]` with `neverExp[c]`, decrease `c` and stay at the same `k`. This way the array always contains indices that were never expanded, and so no moves can be evaluated twice. Furthermore, since the order of the pivots is irrelevant, we were able to make this update in time $O(1)$ and so the complexity of an expansion remains $\Theta(n)$ for all expansions.