

# LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE UNIVERSAL TSP ON THE PLANE

COSMAS KRAVARIS

**ABSTRACT.** We show a lower bound for the universal traveling salesman heuristic on the plane: for any linear order on the unit square  $[0, 1]^2$ , there are finite subsets  $S \subset [0, 1]^2$  of arbitrarily large size such that the path visiting each element of  $S$  according to the linear order has length  $\geq C \sqrt{\log |S| / \log \log |S|}$  times the length of the shortest path visiting each element in  $S$ . ( $C > 0$  is a constant that depends only on the linear order.) This improves the previous lower bound  $\geq C \sqrt[6]{\log |S| / \log \log |S|}$  of [HKL06]. The proof establishes a dichotomy about any long walk on a cycle: the walk either zig-zags between two far away points, or else for a large amount of time it stays inside a set of small diameter.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $(\mathcal{M}, d)$  be a metric space. For any linear order  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  and any finite subset  $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , indexed such that  $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n$ , the **cost** of visiting each point in the set according to  $\leq$  is

$$\text{cost}_{\leq}(\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}) := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(s_i, s_{i+1}).$$

The **traveling salesman problem (TSP)** asks for the smallest cost among all possible ways we can order the points  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ . We write

$$\text{tsp}(\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}) := \inf_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(s_{\pi(i)}, s_{\pi(i+1)}),$$

where  $\text{Sym}_n$  denotes the set of all permutations on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . The **TSP competitive ratio function** or **order ratio function** of a linear order  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is

$$OR_{\leq}(n) := \sup_{S \subset \mathcal{M}: |S| \leq n} \frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)}, \quad \text{where } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In [PBI89], Bartholdi and Platzman introduced the **universal traveling salesman problem**, a heuristic for the traveling salesman problem. Using the Sierpinski space-filling curve  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$  they defined a linear order  $\leq_{BP}$  on  $[0, 1]^2$  by

$$s \leq_{BP} s' \iff \min\{t \in [0, 1] \mid f(t) = s\} \leq \min\{t \in [0, 1] \mid f(t) = s'\}.$$

They proved that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$OR_{\leq_{BP}}(n) \lesssim \log n$$

and conjectured that  $OR_{\leq_{BP}}(n) \lesssim 1$ . (Recall that for two sequences  $\{a_n\}_n, \{b_n\}_n \subset \mathbb{R}^+$  one has  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  if and only if  $b_n \gtrsim a_n$  if and only if there exists  $0 < C < \infty$  such that  $a_n \leq C b_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Also, we write  $a_n \asymp b_n$  when  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $b_n \lesssim a_n$ .) Their conjecture was disproved by

Bertsimas and Grigni [BG89] who showed that

$$OR_{\leq BP}(n) \gtrsim \log n,$$

and conjectured that this lower bound holds for all linear orders on  $[0, 1]^2$ .

**Conjecture 1** (Bertsimas, Grigni). *For any linear order  $\leq$  on the unit square  $([0, 1]^2, \|\cdot\|_2)$*

$$OR_{\leq}(n) \gtrsim \log n.$$

In [HKL06], Hajiaghayi, Kleinberg and Leighton showed that any linear order  $\leq$  on  $[0, 1]^2$  has

$$OR_{\leq}(n) \gtrsim \sqrt[6]{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}.$$

In [EM20], Eades and Mestre proved the conjecture for a special family of orders called "hierarchical". The purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *For any linear order  $\leq$  on the unit square  $([0, 1]^2, \|\cdot\|_2)$*

$$OR_{\leq}(n) \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}},$$

*that is, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists an  $n$ -point set  $S \subset [0, 1]^2$  with*

$$cost_{\leq}(S) \geq C \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} tsp(S),$$

*where  $C > 0$  is a constant independent of  $n$  and  $S$ .*

Similar to [HKL06], there are two types of obstructions to a small competitive ratio function, backtracks and zig-zags, and we show that at least one of the two must occur. Each obstruction corresponds to a set  $S$  with  $cost_{\leq}(S) \geq C \sqrt{\log |S| / \log \log |S|} tsp(S)$ .

The first type is a **backtracking set**: all points are close to a line  $L$  and the ordering of  $S$  backtracks a lot for many relevant distance scales (the idea goes back to [BG89]). Each dyadic square in  $[0, 1]^2$  contains an individual backtrack in some direction, and the set  $S$  is the union of backtracks which are close to  $L$  and have the same direction as  $L$ . The key idea is the definition of a "backtrack" which allows us to improve the lower bound. We follow the method of [HKL06] which dealt with a different notion of backtrack, insufficient for our purposes.

The second type of obstruction is a **zig-zag**: all points in  $S$  lie close to one of three line segments, and the linear order on  $S$  jumps back and forth many times between the three segments. The construction of the zig-zag set here is new. It relies on a dichotomy about walks of length  $M^2$  on the  $M$ -cycle. For any  $1 \leq s \leq M^{1/3}$ , either there are two points of distance  $s^2$  apart such that the walk zig-zags between them  $M/2s$  many times, or else for  $s^3$  consecutive steps, the walk is confined within a set of diameter  $6s^2 + 2$ .

We remark that the universal traveling salesman problem can be studied on any metric space, not just the Euclidean plane. The reader may look at [JLN<sup>+</sup>05, GHR06, GKSS10, BCK11, CS17, EM23b, EM23a, Mit22] and references within for variations of the universal traveling salesman problem on other spaces in metric geometry.

## 2. The setting

We begin the proof of Theorem 1. We use the order gap property for doubling metric spaces due to Erschler and Mitrophanov [EM23a]: for any linear order  $\leq$  on  $[0, 1]^2$  either  $OR_{\leq}(n) \lesssim \log n$  or else  $OR_{\leq}(n) = n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . (Without this property we get the theorem for infinitely many values of  $n$ .)

Clearly, it suffices to prove the lower bound for powers of 2. Suppose the contrary: there exists a linear order  $\leq$  on  $[0, 1]^2$ , a sequence  $r_k \rightarrow \infty$  and a sequence  $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$OR(2^{r_k+2}) \leq \epsilon_k \sqrt{\frac{r_k}{\log r_k}}.$$

Fix two parameters:  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , the **number of scales**, and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , the **number of angles**. Assume that  $180^2 < M \leq 10^{-5}(r/\log r)^{1/9}$ . We will show that

**CASE A:** either there exists a subset of size  $\leq 2^{r+2}$  with competitive ratio  $\geq 10^{-4} \sqrt{\frac{r}{M^9 \log r}}$ ,

**CASE B:** or there exists a subset of size  $\lesssim M^{2/3}$  with competitive ratio  $\gtrsim M^{1/3}$ .

Once we show this dichotomy, we are done: choose any sequence  $M_k < \min\{10^{-5}(r/\log r)^{1/9}, (10^4 \epsilon_{r_k})^{-2/9}\}$  such that  $M_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . If CASE B holds for infinitely many  $k$ , then this contradicts the first scenario in the dichotomy of Erschler and Mitrophanov, meaning that  $OR(n) = n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Else CASE B holds only for finitely many  $k$ , in which case there exists  $k$  and a subset of size  $\leq 2^{r_k+1}$  with competitive ratio  $\geq 10^{-4} \sqrt{r_k/M^9 \log r_k} > \epsilon_k \sqrt{r_k/\log r_k}$  and we arrive at a contradiction.

**Definition 1.** A **backtrack**  $(p, L, \sigma, R_1, R_2)$  of length  $l > 0$  and width  $w > 0$  consists of:

a line  $L$  of slope  $\{\frac{2\pi}{M}, 2\frac{2\pi}{M}, 3\frac{2\pi}{M}, \dots, 2\pi\}$ ,

a point  $p \in [0, 1]^2$  of distance  $< w$  from  $L$ ,

a strip  $\sigma$  which is the  $w$ -neighborhood of line  $L$ ,

and two rectangular regions  $R_1, R_2 \subset [0, 1]^2$  of width  $w$  and length  $l$  which lie in  $\sigma$  in opposite sides of  $p$  satisfying:

$$p < q \quad \text{for all } q \in R_1 \cup R_2.$$

Fix two parameters, the **length**  $0 < l < 1$  and the **width**  $0 < w < l$  which depend on  $r$  and  $M$  (at the end of the proof we will optimize and take  $l \asymp M^{-4}$  and  $w \asymp \sqrt{M \log r/r}$ ).

For each scale  $t = 0, \dots, r$  consider all dyadic subsquares of  $[0, 1]^2$  of scale  $t$ . There are  $2^{2t}$  many squares  $Q$  in total and they partition  $[0, 1]^2$ . We say a dyadic square  $Q$  of scale  $t$  **contains a backtrack**  $(p, L, \sigma, R_1, R_2)$  when  $\{p\} \cup R_1 \cup R_2 \subset Q$  and  $(p, L, \sigma, R_1, R_2)$  is a backtrack of width  $2^{-t}w$  and length  $2^{-t}l$ . (Note that the width and length are scaled according to the sidelength of  $Q$ .) The proof now splits into the following two cases, corresponding to the same cases A and B above:

**CASE A: every dyadic square contains a backtrack.**

In this case, we get a backtracking set. We analyze it later.

**CASE B: there exists a dyadic square with no backtrack.**

In this case, we get a zig-zag. Let's begin with this case.




FIGURE 1. Definition of a backtrack and a backtrack for each dyadic square

### 3. Constructing a spiral chain

Fix a square  $Q$  which contains no backtracks. By translating and scaling, without loss of generality this square is  $[0, 1]^2$ . Draw  $M$  many **radial rays**  $r_1, \dots, r_M$  starting at  $(1/2, 1/2)$  and having slopes  $\frac{2\pi}{M}, 2\frac{2\pi}{M}, \dots, 2\pi$ . The following basic observation is crucial in our construction. (It is uniform convexity in disguise.)

**Observation:** Suppose that  $q$  lies on one of the rays, say  $r_j$  and  $L$  is the line through  $q$  which is perpendicular to  $r_j$ . Then the points  $\{a\} = L \cap r_{j+1}$  and  $\{b\} = L \cap r_{j-1}$  are further away from  $(1/2, 1/2)$  than  $q$ :

$$\left\| a - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| = \left\| b - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| = \left\| q - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| \sec \left( \frac{2\pi}{M} \right) = \left\| q - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| \left( 1 + \frac{2\pi^2}{M^2} + o \left( \frac{1}{M^2} \right) \right).$$

In the next lemma, we construct a chain in  $\leq$  with large jumps slowly exiting the square, which resembles a spiral.

**Lemma 1** (Spiral chain construction). *Assume that  $[0, 1]^2$  has no backtrack of length  $l$  and width  $w$ . Suppose that  $l \leq 0.01M^{-4}$ . **Then** there exist*

$$p_1 > p_2 > p_3 > \dots > p_{M^2}$$

such that for each  $i \in [M^2]$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4} \sec \left( \frac{2\pi}{M} \right)^i - 2il \leq \left\| p_i - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{4} \sec \left( \frac{2\pi}{M} \right)^i + 2il,$$

$$\min_{j \in [M]} \text{dist}(p_i, r_j) \leq 2il, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{dist}(p_i, r_j) \leq 2il \implies \min\{\text{dist}(p_{i+1}, r_{j+1}), \text{dist}(p_{i+1}, r_{j-1})\} \leq 2(i+1)l.$$




FIGURE 2. The radial rays and construction of the spiral chain

**Note 1:** In words, the above 3 statements say that for each  $p_i$  the distance to the center of the square is roughly  $1/4(1 + 1/M^2)^i \approx 1/4 + i/4M^2$ ,  $p_i$  is very close to one of the rays  $r_1, \dots, r_M$ , and the next point in the sequence  $p_{i+1}$  is very close to a neighboring ray.

**Note 2:** We assume  $l \leq 0.01M^{-4}$  so that in the first inequality above, when  $i = M^2$ , the error is less than the increment:  $2il < 0.02/M^2$ .

*Proof.* Start from the point  $p_1 = (3/4, 1/2)$  which lies on the radial ray  $r_M$ , and inductively construct the next point. We strengthen the inductive assumption: along with the points  $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_{M^2}$  we also describe how to obtain  $q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots, q_{M^2}$  such that for each  $i$ :

- A. there is some  $j \in [M]$  with  $q_i \in r_j$
- B.  $\|p_i - q_i\| \leq 2il$
- C.  $\left\| q_i - \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\| = \sec \left( \frac{2\pi}{M} \right)^i$
- D.  $q_i \in r_j \implies q_{i+1} \in r_{j+1} \cup r_{j-1}$ .

Start by setting  $q_1 := p_1$ . Next, we describe a construction on how to get  $p_{i+1}, q_{i+1}$  from  $p_i, q_i$ .

**The construction:**

Let  $L$  be the line perpendicular to  $r_j$  which passes through  $p_i$  and  $L'$  the line perpendicular to  $r_j$  which passes through  $q_i$ . Since  $L \perp r_j$ ,  $L$  has one of the  $M$  specified slopes in the definition of a backtrack.

Let  $a$  and  $b$  be the intersections of  $L'$  with  $r_{j+1}$  and  $r_{j-1}$  respectively. Let  $c$  and  $d$  be the two points on  $L$  which have distance  $\|a - q_i\|$  and  $\|b - q_i\|$  from point  $p_i$  such that the vectors  $q_i a$  and  $p_i c$  have the same direction, and the vectors  $q_i b$  and  $p_i d$  also have the same direction.

Let  $\sigma$  be the  $w$ -neighborhood of  $L$  and denote by  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  the rectangles inside  $\sigma$  having  $w$  and length  $l$  and centers of mass  $c$  and  $d$  respectively.

Because we have no backtrack, there exists  $p_{i+1}$  in  $R_1$  or  $R_2$  such that  $p_i > p_{i+1}$ . If  $p_{i+1} \in R_1$ , put  $q_{i+1} := a$ . If  $p_{i+1} \in R_2$ , put  $q_{i+1} := b$ . Without loss of generality, say  $p_{i+1} \in R_1$ .

Conditions A and D are immediate. Condition C follows from the observation above. For condition B, we have

$$\|p_{i+1} - q_{i+1}\| \leq \|p_{i+1} - c\| + \|c - a\| = \|p_{i+1} - a\| + \|p_i - q_i\| \leq l + w + 2il = 2(i+1)l.$$

Finally, note that the point  $p_i$  stays inside the square  $[0, 1]^2$  so long as  $\frac{1}{4} \sec\left(\frac{2\pi}{M}\right)^i < \frac{1}{2} - 2il$ . Looking at the Taylor series of the secant function, we see that we can take  $i \asymp M^2$ . ■

To each  $p_1, \dots, p_{M^2}$  we can associate  $a_1, \dots, a_{M^2} \in \mathbb{Z}/M$  according to the index  $j$  of the radial ray  $r_j$  that  $p_i$  is close to. Thanks to the lemma in the next section, we can find sets of large competitive ratio, which **zig-zag** between three different rays.

#### 4. A long walk on a cycle must have a zig-zag

The following lemma is a dichotomy for any walk of length  $M^2$  on the  $M$ -cycle. For any  $1 \leq s \leq M^{1/3}$ , either there are two points of distance  $s^2$  apart such that the walk zig-zags between them  $M/2s$  many times, or else for  $s^3$  consecutive steps, the walk is confined within a set of diameter  $6s^2 + 2$ .

**Lemma 2** (a long walk on a cycle must have a zig zag). .

Let  $s, M \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq s \leq M^{1/3}$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_{M^2} \in \mathbb{Z}/M$  be such that  $a_{j+1} - a_j \in \{+1, -1\}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, M^2$ . **Then either** there exists  $m > \frac{M}{s}$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/M$ , and

$$1 \leq i_1 < j_1 < i_2 < j_2 < \dots < i_m < j_m \leq M^2 \quad \text{such that}$$

$$\{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_m}\} = \{a\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_m}\} = \{a + s^2, a - s^2\}$$

**or else** there exists an interval  $J \subset [M^2]$  of length  $< s^3$ ,  $m \geq \frac{s}{7}$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in J$  such that

$$a_{i_1} = \dots = a_{i_m}.$$

**Illustrating examples:** The sequence  $a_1, \dots, a_{M^2}$  is a path on the  $M$ -cycle, and we wish to distinguish between the above two scenarios. For the "winding walk":  $a_{j+1} = a_j + 1$  for every  $j$ , we get the first scenario. For the "constant walk":  $a_{j+1} = a_j + 1$  for even  $j$  and  $a_{j+1} = a_j - 1$  for odd  $j$ , we get the second scenario. There is also a constant walk which makes one complete revolution:  $a_{j+1} = a_j + 1$  for even  $j$  and  $a_{j+1} = a_j - 1$  for odd  $j$  with the exception that for every  $M$  steps we add a 1 two times in a row before oscillating again between  $+1$  and  $-1$ . This example also corresponds to the second scenario.

**A tight example:** Fix  $M$  and  $1 \leq s \leq M^{1/3}$ . The following example shows that the parameters in the dichotomy are tight (up to multiplicative factors). The walk starts at 0 and moves up to  $s^2$  in  $s^2$  steps. Then the walk moves down to 0 in the next  $s^2$  steps. We repeat this oscillation between 0 and  $s^2$  for  $\asymp s$  many steps and then move up to  $s^2$ . We get a sub-walk which takes  $\asymp s^3$  total steps, starts at 0 and ends at  $s^2$ . Now repeat the sub-walk starting at  $s^2$  and ending at  $2s^2$ . Then repeat the sub-walk from  $2s^2$  to  $3s^2$  and so forth for  $\asymp M^2/s^3$  total iterations. At the

end, we get a walk which winds around the circle  $\asymp M/s$  times. The details for checking tightness are left to the reader.

*Proof.* We will fix an **oscillation window**  $\Delta > 0$  which we will take  $\Delta = s^2$ . For each  $j_1 \in [M^2]$  we let  $j_2 := \min\{j > j_1 : a_j = a_{j_1}\}$  be the next time the path visits again the point  $a_{j_1}$ . Call the time  $j_1$ :

a **time of no oscillation** if  $j_2 = \infty$ , i.e. the path never visits the point  $a_{j_1}$  again.

a **time of small oscillation** if the walk until the next visit stays within the oscillation window:

$$|a_j - a_{j_1}| \leq \Delta \text{ for all } j = j_1, \dots, j_2.$$

a **time of large oscillation** if the walk until the next visit exits the oscillation window:

$$|a_j - a_{j_1}| > \Delta \text{ for some } j_1 < j < j_2.$$

Denote the times of no oscillation by  $\mathcal{N}$  and the times of large oscillation by  $\mathcal{L}$ . Note that we always have  $|\mathcal{N}| \leq M$ . We split into two cases:

**CASE 1:**  $|\mathcal{L}| > \frac{M^2 s}{\Delta} = \frac{M^2}{s}$

Then by pigeonhole there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/M$  such that

$$m := |\{i \in \mathcal{L} : a_i = a\}| > \frac{Ms}{\Delta} = \frac{M}{s}.$$

Denote the elements of  $\{i \in \mathcal{L} : a_i = a\}$  by  $i_1 < \dots < i_m$ . Let  $j_\mu$  be the first index after  $i_\mu$  that exists in the  $\Delta$ -neighborhood of  $a$  for each  $\mu = 1, \dots, m$  ( $j_\mu$  exists by definition). This gives us the first scenario.

**CASE 2:**  $|\mathcal{L}| \leq \frac{M^2 s}{\Delta} = \frac{M^2}{s}$ .

Since  $|\mathcal{N}| \leq M \leq M^2/s$ , we have  $|\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}| \leq 2M^2/s$ . Split  $[M^2]$  into the union of  $\frac{M^2}{\Delta s}$  many intervals, each of length  $\Delta s = s^3$ . By pigeonhole, at least one of these intervals, call it  $J$  has a small number of points of no or of large oscillation:

$$|J \cap (\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N})| \leq \frac{2M^2/s}{M^2/s^3} = 2s^2.$$

We claim that the path during the interval  $J$  has not traveled far away:

$$\max\{|a - b| : a, b \in J\} \leq 6s^2 + 2$$

To see this, call  $a := a_{\min J}$  (where  $\min J$  is the smallest value/time in  $J$ ) and suppose that there is  $b \in \{a_j : j \in J\}$  such that  $|a - b| > 3s^2 + 1$ . Without loss of generality the geodesic on the  $M$ -cycle from  $a$  to  $b$  is  $a, a + 1, a + 2, \dots, b - 1, b$ . Let  $j_{\max}$  be the first time in  $J$  that  $b$  is visited. For each of the points  $c = a, a + 1, \dots, a + 2s^2 + 1$ , find the largest  $j < j_{\max}$  for which  $a_j = c$ . Then by definition  $j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}$ , which gives us  $|J \cap (\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N})| > 2s^2$ , a contradiction.

By pigeonhole there exists  $a \in \{a_j : j \in J\}$  such that  $|\{j \in J : a_j = a\}| \geq \frac{s^3}{7s^2} = \frac{s}{7}$  which gives us the second scenario. ■

### 5. Analyzing the competitive ratio of a zig-zag

Recall that to each  $p_1, \dots, p_{M^2}$  we can associate  $a_1, \dots, a_{M^2} \in \mathbb{Z}/M$  according to which radial rays that  $p_j$  is close to. Put  $s = \lfloor M^{1/3} \rfloor$ . We apply the previous lemma to  $p_1, \dots, p_{M^2} \in \mathbb{Z}/M$ . Observe that  $l < M^{-4}$  implies that each  $p_i$  has distance  $\leq M^{-2}$  to its corresponding ray. Also note that  $\|p_i - p_{i+1}\|_2 \geq 0.1/M$  for each  $i$ .




FIGURE 3. Applying the lemma: the first (left) and the second (right) scenario.

**In the first scenario**, put  $S := \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_m}, p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_m}\}$  and we may assume  $m = M/s$  (else discard some of the points in  $S$ ).

$$|S| = \frac{M}{s} \asymp M^{2/3}, \quad \text{cost}_{\leq}(S) \geq \frac{0.1}{M} s^2 \frac{M}{s} = 0.1s, \quad \text{tsp}(S) \leq 3 + \frac{M}{s} \frac{1}{M^2} \leq 4$$

which results in a competitive ratio

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq 0.025s \asymp \sqrt{|S|}.$$

**In the second scenario**, put  $S := \{p_{i_1}, p_{i_1+1}, p_{i_2}, p_{i_2+1}, \dots, p_{i_m}, p_{i_m+1}\}$  and we may assume that  $m = s/7$ . Observe:

$$|S| = 2s/7, \quad \text{cost}_{\leq}(S) \geq \frac{0.1s}{M}, \quad \text{tsp}(S) \leq \frac{s^3}{M^2} + \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{s}{7} \leq \frac{2}{M}$$

which results in a competitive ratio

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq \frac{0.01s/M}{2/M} = 0.01s \asymp |S|.$$

We are done with **CASE B** of the proof (some dyadic square contains no backtracks).

### 6. Analyzing the combination of many backtracks

We now deal with **CASE A** of the proof. Assume that every dyadic square has a backtrack. Fix a backtrack for each square. Fix a line  $L$  through  $[0, 1]^2$  (we will choose it later at random). For any scale  $t = 0, \dots, r$ , and any dyadic square of scale  $t$  with backtrack  $(p, L', \sigma, R_1, R_2)$  we say

that  $L$  passes through the backtrack of  $Q$  if  $L \cap Q$  is contained in the  $\frac{1}{2}w2^{-t}$  neighborhood of  $L' \cap Q$  and vice versa (i.e. Hausdorff distance). We denote by  $Bad_t$  the set of all dyadic squares of scale  $t$  such that  $L$  passes through the backtrack of  $Q$ . For each scale  $t$  and  $Q \in Bad_t$ , pick the point  $p_Q$  corresponding to the backtrack of  $Q$  (recall the definition in the second section).

We introduce another parameter, the **scale sparsity**  $c \in \mathbb{N}$  which we will optimize at the end to be  $c \asymp \log r \asymp \log 1/w$ . Define

$$S := \bigcup_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \bigcup_{Q \in Bad_{ct}} \{p_Q\}.$$

Clearly  $|S| \leq 2^{r+2}$ . We will estimate the competitive ratio of the set  $S$  using the following two lemmas:

**Lemma 3.**

$$tsp(S) \leq \sqrt{2} + 4w \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \left[ \sum_{Q \in Bad_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \right].$$

*Proof.* For any bad square  $Q \in Bad_{ct}$  of scale  $ct$ , the point  $p_Q$  of the backtrack has distance  $\leq 2w2^{-ct}$  from the line  $L$ . Therefore, a travelling salesman tour is to follow the length of the line segment of  $L$ , which is at most  $\sqrt{2}$  and make a detour for each backtrack point  $p$  in every bad square (moving back and forth costs at most  $4w2^{-ct}$  for each square). ■




FIGURE 4. The backtracking set and the charging argument

**Lemma 4** (Charging argument).

$$2cost_{\leq}(S) + 1 \geq l \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \left( \left[ \sum_{Q \in Bad_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \right] - \frac{18}{2^c} \right)$$

*Proof.* The idea is a *charging argument*. Order the points in  $S$  according to  $\leq$ :

$$s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_m \quad S = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$$

where  $m = |S|$ . For each  $t = 0, \dots, \lfloor r/c \rfloor$  and each square  $Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}$  we will assign the "charge"  $l2^{-ct}$  to some step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ . (We will then argue that for each step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ , the sum over all the charges assigned to it does not exceed  $2d(s_i, s_{i+1})$ .) We have three cases:

**CASE 1:** If  $s_1 \in Q$

In words, the path according to  $\leq$  begins from the box  $Q$ . In this case we do NOT assign the charge of  $Q$  to a step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ .

**CASE 2:**  $s_1 \notin Q$  and  $3Q \cap \bigcup_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{Bad}_{c\tau}} \{p_{Q'}\} \neq \emptyset$ .

In words, the square  $3Q$  contains the point  $p_{Q'}$  of a square  $Q'$  larger than  $Q$ . (Here  $3Q$  denotes scaling of  $Q$  by 3 which shares the same center as  $Q$ .) In this case, we also do NOT assign the charge of  $Q$  to a step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ .

**CASE 3:**  $s_1 \notin Q$  and  $3Q \cap S \subset \bigcup_{\tau=t}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{Bad}_{c\tau}} \{p_{Q'}\}$

Let  $(p, L', \sigma, R_1, R_2)$  be the backtrack of  $Q$  of scale  $ct$ , so  $\sigma$  be the strip which is the  $2^{-ct}w$  neighborhood of  $L'$ . Since  $3Q$  contains no  $p_{Q'}$  of scale  $c\tau < ct$ , we have  $S \cap 3Q \subset \sigma$ .

(Why? If  $L''$  is a line corresponding to a backtrack of scale  $> ct$ , then the  $w2^{-ct}/2$ -neighborhood of  $L \cap Q$  contains  $L'' \cap Q$  and the  $w2^{-ct}/2$ -neighborhood of  $L' \cap Q$  contains  $L \cap Q$ ).

Consider the rectangular region between  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  and call it  $R$  (which is disjoint from  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ ). Find the smallest  $i$  such that  $s_i \notin R \cup R_1 \cup R_2$  while  $s_{i+1} \in R$ . (Such an  $i$  exists by the definition of a backtrack; in particular  $s_{i+1}$  is the smallest element in  $R \cap S$ .) Assign the charge of  $Q$  to the step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ .

We split the sum according to the corresponding cases

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}} = \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct} \text{ CASE 1}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}} + \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct} \text{ CASE 2}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct} \text{ charges } \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}}.$$

**For the first sum**, for each fixed  $t$ ,  $s_1$  can only belong to at most one square of scale  $t$ . Thus

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct} \text{ CASE 1}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \frac{l}{2^{t+1}} \leq 1.$$

**For the second sum**, we do not estimate it. For each fixed  $t = 0, \dots, \lfloor r/c \rfloor$ , the number of boxes in the second sum is at most

$$9 \left| \bigcup_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \bigcup_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{c\tau}} \{p_Q\} \right| \leq 9 \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} 2^{c\tau} = 9 \frac{2^{ct} - 1}{2^c - 1} \leq 18 \frac{2^{ct}}{2^c}.$$

(Why? For each  $p_Q$  of scale  $< t$  we get at most 9 boxes of scale  $t$  that fall into case 2 due to  $p_Q$ .) We simply subtract the largest amount of charge we could have obtained if all these squares were in case 3.

**For the third sum**, fix a step  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ . For each scale  $t$ , there can only be one bad square of scale  $t$  which contains  $s_{i+1}$  and hence there can only be one square of scale  $t$  which assigns its charge to  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ . Moreover, it  $t$  is too small so as to satisfy  $l2^{-t} > d(s_i, s_{i+1})$  and  $Q$  is the

square of scale  $t$  which contains  $s_{i+1}$ , then it is impossible to assign the charge of  $Q$  to  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$  since the lengths of the rectangles corresponding a backtrack of type B in  $Q$  would need to be  $\geq l2^{-t}$ . Let  $t_0$  be such that  $l2^{-t_0} \leq d(s_i, s_{i+1}) < l2^{-t_0+1}$ . We have:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct} \text{ charges } \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}} \frac{l}{2^{ct}} \leq \sum_{t=t_0}^r \frac{l}{2^t} \leq \frac{2l}{2^{t_0}} \leq 2d(s_i, s_{i+1}).$$

Summing over all steps  $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$ :

$$l \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_t \text{ charges}; \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}} \frac{1}{2^t} \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} d(s_i, s_{i+1}).$$

■

We write  $\Sigma := \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \left[ \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \right]$  and combine the above two lemmas to obtain:

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq \frac{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{l}{2}\Sigma - l\frac{r}{c}\frac{9}{2^c}}{\sqrt{2} + 4w\Sigma}.$$

Now, if

$$\Sigma > \frac{1}{w} + 90\frac{r}{c2^c}$$

then we obtain

$$1 + \frac{l}{10}\Sigma \geq \frac{l}{10w} + l\frac{9r}{c2^c}$$

which implies that

$$1 + \frac{l}{2}\Sigma - \frac{9lr}{c2^c} \geq \frac{l}{10w} + \frac{4l}{10}\Sigma = \frac{l}{20w}(2 + 4w\Sigma)$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq \frac{l}{20w}.$$

So we need  $\Sigma = \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \left[ \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \right]$  to be large. In the final section we sample a line which satisfies this condition and optimize all the relevant constants.

## 7. Taking a random line and optimizing the parameters

We take random line and use linearity of expectation. Here is how we construct a random line through a  $[0, 1]^2$ . First, pick an angle uniformly at random from the angles  $\theta \in \{\frac{2\pi}{M}, 2\frac{2\pi}{M}, \dots, 2\pi\}$ . Secondly, pick a random  $y$ -intercept uniformly at random among all possible  $y$ -intercepts which intersect  $[0, 1]^2$ , i.e.

$$b \in \{y\cos(\theta) + x\cos(\theta) \mid (x, y) \in v + [0, r]^2\}$$

and consider the random line  $L : y\cos(\theta) + x\cos(\theta) = b$ .

For each dyadic square  $Q$  of scale  $t$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}(L \text{ passes through backtrack in } Q) \geq \frac{w2^{-t}}{2M}$$

(Why? With probability  $1/M$ ,  $L$  has the same angle as the backtrack in  $Q$ . Next there is probability  $\geq w2^{-t}/2$  that the random line will be  $w2^{-t}$ -far away from the line of the backtrack). We conclude that:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \right] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} 2^{2ct} \frac{w2^{-ct}}{2M} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} = \frac{rw}{2cM},$$

so there exists a line  $L$  with  $\Sigma = \sum_{t=0}^{\lfloor r/c \rfloor} \sum_{Q \in \text{Bad}_{ct}} \frac{1}{2^{ct}} \geq \frac{rw}{2cM}$ . The estimate

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq \frac{l}{20w}$$

follows as long as the parameters satisfy the two constraints:

$$\frac{rw}{4cM} \geq \frac{1}{w} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{rw}{4cM} \geq 90 \frac{r}{c2^c}.$$

The only other constraints that appear in our construction are:

$$0 < w < l \leq \frac{M^{-4}}{100} < 1.$$

In summary, we optimize the parameters  $l > 0$ ,  $w > 0$ , and  $c \in \mathbb{N}$  in the program

$$\max \left\{ \frac{l}{20w} \mid \sqrt{\frac{4cM}{r}} \leq w < l \leq \frac{1}{100M^4} \text{ and } w \geq \frac{360M}{c2^c} \right\},$$

so we take  $l = \frac{1}{100M^4}$  and  $w \asymp \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{cM}{r}}, \frac{M}{c2^c} \right\}$ . We choose  $c \in \mathbb{N}$  to equate (up to constant multiplicative factors) the two constraints on  $w$  so:

$$\sqrt{\frac{cM}{r}} \asymp \frac{M}{c2^c} \implies c \asymp \log r.$$

In particular, choosing

$$c = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 r + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 M - \log_2 360 < \log r \quad \text{and} \quad w = \sqrt{\frac{4M \log r}{r}},$$

both constraints of  $w$  are satisfied, (check!) and we arrive at the promised bound:

$$\frac{\text{cost}_{\leq}(S)}{\text{tsp}(S)} \geq \frac{1}{20} \frac{1}{100M^4} \sqrt{\frac{r}{4M \log r}} \geq 10^{-4} \sqrt{\frac{r}{M^9 \log r}}.$$

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Assaf Naor for suggesting this problem to me, for insightful discussions, guidance, and encouragement.

## REFERENCES

- [BCK11] Anand Bhalgat, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, and Sanjeev Khanna. Optimal lower bounds for universal and differentially private steiner trees and tsps. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 75–86. Springer, 2011.
- [BG89] Dimitris Bertsimas and Michelangelo Grigni. Worst-case examples for the spacefilling curve heuristic for the euclidean traveling salesman problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 8(5):241–244, 1989.
- [CS17] George Christodoulou and Alkmini Sgouritsa. An improved upper bound for the universal tsp on the grid. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1006–1021. SIAM, 2017.
- [EM20] Patrick Eades and Julián Mestre. An optimal lower bound for hierarchical universal solutions for tsp on the plane. In *International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 222–233. Springer, 2020.
- [EM23a] Anna Erschler and Ivan Mitrofanov. Assouad–nagata dimension and gap for ordered metric spaces. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 98(2):217–260, 2023.
- [EM23b] Anna Erschler and Ivan Mitrofanov. Spaces that can be ordered effectively: virtually free groups and hyperbolicity. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 217(4):68, 2023.
- [GHR06] Anupam Gupta, Mohammad T Hajiaghayi, and Harald Räcke. Oblivious network design. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 970–979, 2006.
- [GKSS10] Igor Gorodezky, Robert D Kleinberg, David B Shmoys, and Gwen Spencer. Improved lower bounds for the universal and a priori tsp. In *International Workshop on Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science*, pages 178–191. Springer, 2010.
- [HKL06] Mohammad T Hajiaghayi, Robert Kleinberg, and Frank Thomson Leighton. Improved lower and upper bounds for universal tsp in planar metrics. In *SODA*, volume 6, pages 649–658, 2006.
- [JLN<sup>+</sup>05] Lujun Jia, Guolong Lin, Guevara Noubir, Rajmohan Rajaraman, and Ravi Sundaram. Universal approximations for tsp, steiner tree, and set cover. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 386–395, 2005.
- [Mit22] Ivan Mitrofanov. Total orders on compact metric spaces and covering dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06099*, 2022.
- [PBI89] Loren K Platzman and John J Bartholdi III. Spacefilling curves and the planar travelling salesman problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 36(4):719–737, 1989.

*Email address:* ck6221@princeton.edu

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON, NJ 08544-1000, USA