

# Differentiable Extensions with Rounding Guarantees for Combinatorial Optimization over Permutations

Robert R. Nerem<sup>1</sup>, Zhishang Luo<sup>1</sup>, Akbar Rafiey<sup>2</sup>, Yusu Wang<sup>1</sup>

Hacıoğlu Data Science Institute, University of California San Diego  
Tandon School of Engineering, New York University

**Abstract.** Continuously extending combinatorial optimization objectives is a powerful technique commonly applied to the optimization of set functions. However, few such methods exist for extending functions on permutations, despite the fact that many combinatorial optimization problems, such as the traveling salesperson problem (TSP), are inherently optimization over permutations. We present Birkhoff Extension (BE), an almost-everywhere-differentiable continuous polytime-computable extension of any real-valued function on permutations to doubly stochastic matrices. Our approach is based on Birkhoff decomposition (also referred to as Birkhoff von-Neumann decomposition) which allows construction of an extension that is always a convex combination of the objective’s values at permutations. We show how to construct a specific family of Birkhoff decompositions that are continuous. In addition to continuity, our extension has several nice properties making it appealing for optimization problems. First, BE provides a rounding guarantee, namely any solution to the extension can be efficiently rounded to a permutation without increasing the function value. Furthermore, an approximate solution in the relaxed case (with extension) will give rise to an approximate solution in the space of permutations. Second, using BE, any real-valued optimization objective on permutations can be extended to an almost everywhere differentiable objective function over the space of doubly stochastic matrices. This makes our BE amenable to not only gradient-descent based optimizations, but also unsupervised neural combinatorial optimization where training often requires a differentiable loss. Third, based on the above properties, we present a simple optimization procedure which can be readily combined with existing optimization approaches to offer local improvements (i.e., the quality of the final solution is no worse than the initial solution). Finally, we also adapt our extension to optimization problems over a class of trees, such as Steiner tree and optimization-based hierarchical clustering. We present preliminary experimental results to verify our theoretical results on several combinatorial optimization problems related to permutations.

# 1 Introduction

Continuously extending combinatorial objectives is a common technique in combinatorial optimization, e.g., relaxation through linear programming, which can offer efficient optimization algorithms. Continuous extensions are particularly useful if they are differentiable (in the decision variables), making them amenable to gradient-based optimization methods. However, it is often non-trivial to develop continuous extensions with theoretical guarantees that relate the optimization of the extension to the optimization of the combinatorial objective. In this paper, we consider combinatorial optimization problems where the goal is to minimize real-valued functions over **permutations**. We aim to develop extensions for functions on permutations with theoretical guarantees that allows for gradient-based optimization of these combinatorial objectives.

Optimization of functions on permutations is a setting that encompasses many combinatorial optimization problems with important applications. One of the most famous permutation optimization problems is the traveling salesman problem (TSP), where the aim is to find the order that a set of  $n$  cities should be visited in a tour to minimize the length of the tour. TSP is an example of a vertex ordering problem, a class that contains many permutation optimization problems, in which the goal is to find an order of vertices in a graph that minimizes some objective. Examples of such problems are, feedback arc set, graph cutwidth, and minimum linear arrangement. Another essential permutation optimization problem is the quadratic assignment problem, in which a bijection between  $n$  facilities and  $n$  locations is sought that minimizes a quadratic objective function (such bijections can be identified with permutations).

One extension that achieves theoretical guarantees that allow for improved optimization is the Lovász extension [28]. This extension extends a set function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to a function on the hypercube  $F : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by decomposing elements of  $[0, 1]^n$  as convex combinations of elements of  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . In particular, for any  $x \in [0, 1]^n$  a convex combination representation  $x = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k b_k$  is constructed where  $b_k \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $\alpha_k > 0$ , and  $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$ . Then, the extension is defined as  $F(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k f(b_k)$ . Rounding a  $x \in [0, 1]^n$  to some  $b \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is achieved by finding the  $b_k$  for  $k \in [n]$  that minimizes  $f(b_k)$ . This rounding scheme, which can be computed in linear time, ensures that  $f(b) \leq F(x)$ , i.e., no solution quality lost in rounding. However, many combinatorial optimization problems, such as the optimization of permutation functions, have no natural formulation as set function optimization, and the Lovász extension is not applicable. We use the convex decomposition-based framework of the Lovász extension as inspiration for our extension of permutation functions.

## 1.1 Our work

In this paper, we construct an extension for permutation functions  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_n$  denotes the set of  $n \times n$  permutation matrices (w.l.o.g. permutations are viewed as matrices), to the Birkhoff polytope  $\mathcal{D}_n$ , which is the set of doubly stochastic matrices. A doubly stochastic matrix (also called a bistochastic matrix) is a square matrix of nonnegative real numbers with rows and columns that sum to 1. The Birkhoff polytope is natural to extend to, as this space is the convex hull of permutation matrices [8]. Note that  $\mathcal{P}_n \subset \mathcal{D}_n$ .

The Birkhoff decomposition of doubly stochastic matrices (also referred to as Birkhoff von-Neumann or BvN decomposition) [8,45], shows that any matrix  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$  can be decomposed as  $A = \sum_{k=1}^{O(n^2)} \alpha_k P_k$  where  $P_k \in \mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$ , and  $\alpha > 0$ . We then define our extension as  $F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^{O(n^2)} \alpha_k f(P_k)$ . The challenge that arises in defining an extension in this way is that Birkhoff decomposition is not unique and the resulting extension may not be continuous and differentiable. Indeed, previous techniques for performing Birkhoff decomposition [8,15] are not continuous.

Our first theoretical contribution is a Birkhoff decomposition that is continuous and almost everywhere (a.e.) differentiable (Thm. 2), which gives rise to an extension that is also continuous and a.e. differentiable (Property 1). Continuity is achieved by utilizing an arbitrary but fixed total order of permutations  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  and decomposing according to this order. More importantly, such a *Birkhoff decomposition / extension* can be efficiently computed<sup>1</sup> (Property 2) if the total ordering of permutations is induced by a so-called *score matrix*  $S$  which we introduce.

Another appealing strength of Birkhoff extension is that minima of the extension  $F$  directly correspond to minima of the function  $f$  over permutations (Property 3). Moreover, Birkhoff extension admits a scheme (Property 4) for rounding a doubly stochastic matrix  $A$  to a permutation  $P$  that is guaranteed to not degrade the quality of the solution,

<sup>1</sup> While the classical Birkhoff decomposition can be computed in polynomial time, a priori, it is not clear how to compute such a decomposition induced by a given total order.

i.e.,  $f(P) \leq F(A)$ . These properties ensure that optimizing (or approximating) the extension  $F$  yields optimal (or approximate) solutions to the combinatorial function  $f$ .

Different choices for  $S$  yield different continuous Birkhoff extensions, which is a valuable flexibility. Interestingly, Property 4 implies that we can essentially choose any permutation  $P$  (e.g, an approximate solution produced by a comparatively fast algorithm) to produce an initial *score matrix* (note, not the initial doubly stochastic matrix), which can then be combined with optimization and rounding to produce solutions that are at least as good as  $P$ . Essentially, given any existing solution to the combinatorial optimization problem, we can then use that solution as the score matrix for a Birkhoff extension to further improve it. Hence, this gives us a local improvement procedure.

Given the a.e. differentiability of Birkhoff extension, we can compute its gradient (which we implement using standard auto-differentiation). Gradient decent cannot be directly applied to optimization over the Birkhoff polytope, since after each step the resulting matrix may not be doubly stochastic. Hence we propose a Frank-Wolfe-inspired algorithm, which only steps towards permutation matrices (vertices of the Birkhoff polytope). Given a doubly stochastic initialization, this approach preserves double stochasticity throughout optimization. Birkhoff extension is not necessarily convex and, thus, gradient-based optimization could converge to local suboptimal minima. We alleviate this issue by changing the score matrix whenever the optimization converges to a local minimum. Changing the score matrix changes the extension being optimized, potentially changing the extension to one where the current iterate is not at a local minimum, allowing further optimization. We further show that for specific changes to the score matrix (based on Property 4), we are guaranteed the quality of the rounded solution *does not decrease*.

Birkhoff extension can also be used for unsupervised neural combinatorial optimization where training often requires that the objective function is differentiable. Neural approaches are a promising new paradigm in combinatorial optimization as, unlike traditional techniques, they inherently leverage the distribution of problem instances being solved [7]. However, supervised neural combinatorial optimization is often prohibitively expensive as it requires computing exact solutions to create labels for training. Unsupervised learning, such as the set extension proposed in [24], circumvents this issue by removing the need for labels. In Appendix B, similar to [24], we propose an unsupervised neural approach based on our Birkhoff extension. The properties of Birkhoff extensions offer advantages for unsupervised learning in that rounding guarantees ensure the minima sought in training correspond well with the combinatorial objective.

It is compelling to consider when similar techniques can be applied to other combinatorial functions. In Appendix C, we present analysis for applying Birkhoff extension to functions on rooted binary trees over a fixed set of leaves. Optimization of these tree functions arises in many combinatorial optimization problems such as Steiner tree problems and hierarchical clustering.

In Section 4, we perform experiments on traveling salesperson, feedback arc set, and cutwidth problems problems, showing Birkhoff extension is an effective approach for optimizing permutation functions.

To summarize, our **main contributions** are:

- We introduce a novel Birkhoff decomposition based on a score-matrix, which has continuous and a.e. differentiable coefficients, and can be computed efficiently.
- We use this decomposition to construct a continuous a.e. differentiable extension of permutation functions to real-valued functions on the Birkhoff polytope that has rounding guarantees. We show that this extension and its associated rounding scheme have many nice properties that make it desirable for combinatorial optimization.
- We develop a theoretically justified optimization procedure that combines this extension with gradient-based optimization, as well as our dynamic score matrix method, to optimization permutation functions.
- Our Birkhoff extension can be combined with a neural network to yield an unsupervised neural optimizer (Appendix B). We also adapt it to optimization problems on rooted trees (Appendix C).

## 1.2 Related work

The optimization literature often focuses on building extensions with desirable optimization properties, particularly convexity and concavity [13,33,42]. A classical approach to extending a discrete set function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is by computing the convex closure, i.e., the point-wise supremum over linear functions that lower bound  $f$  [18,42]. A prominent example of successful application of these methods to combinatorial optimization is submodular functions. The convex closure for a submodular function is identical to the Lovász extension [28], also known as the Choquet integral in decision theory [10], which leads to polynomial-time algorithms for submodular minimization [21]. A series of works [9,46], introduced and studied multilinear extension of submodular functions which results in approximation

algorithms for certain constrained submodular maximization problems. See [4] for further details on extensions of submodular functions. Convex extensions have been applied to a broader class of set functions beyond submodular ones [17], as well as to combinatorial penalties with structured sparsity [16,34].

Unsupervised learning for combinatorial optimization problems has recently attracted great attention [2,23,39,43]. Many frameworks based on RL [25,27,14,6,48] or supervised learning [26,44,20], do not hold any special requirements on the formulation of combinatorial problems. However, these approaches often suffer from dependence on labeled data or unstable training, respectively. In contrast, unsupervised learning for combinatorial optimization problems, where continuous relaxations of discrete objectives are utilized, is superior in its faster training, good generalization, and strong capability of dealing with large-scale problems. The general idea is to use, as a loss function, a function on a continuous domain that extends the discrete function. Notable examples of these types of work are [23,47] where a probabilistic relaxation of discrete functions are used in the loss as a form of penalty.

Our work is inspired by the work by Karalias et al. [24], where they propose several novel continuous and a.e. differentiable extensions for *set functions*. They further apply these extensions as loss functions for training neural networks to solve combinatorial set function problems such as Max Clique and Max Independent Set problems. Our approach is similar in that we also use a convex combination structure to develop our extensions and to derive useful properties. However, our work is differentiated by our focus on permutation functions, which cannot be handled by the set-function framework of Karalias et al. Furthermore, our use of a score matrix to induce the Birkhoff extension provides a valuable flexibility that can be leveraged for improved rounding (Property 4-2) and for improved optimization algorithms (Algorithm 4).

## 2 Preliminaries

A *doubly stochastic*  $n \times n$  matrix is one with non-negative entries where each row and column sums to 1. A *permutation matrix* is a special doubly stochastic matrix with binary entries and a single 1 in every row and column. The class of  $n \times n$  doubly stochastic matrices is a convex polytope known as the Birkhoff polytope  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . The Birkhoff polytope lies in an  $(n-1)^2$ -dimensional affine subspace of  $n^2$ -dimensional Euclidean space defined by  $2n-1$  independent linear constraints specifying that the row and column sums all equal 1. Let  $\mathcal{P}_n$  denote the set of  $n \times n$  permutation matrices.

**Theorem 1 (Birkhoff decomposition [8]).** *Any doubly stochastic matrix  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , can be decomposed as*

$$A = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k P_k \quad (1)$$

where  $M < n^2 - n + 1$ ,  $\alpha_k > 0$ ,  $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$ , and  $P_k \in \mathcal{P}_n$ .

To construct this decomposition we view  $A$  as the biadjacency matrix of a bipartite graph with vertices  $[n] \sqcup [n]$  and edges  $(i, j)$  of weight  $A(i, j)$ . In this graph consider the following set of permutations, i.e. matching in this graph, that do not have edges of weight zero.

**Definition 1.** *A permutation matrix  $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$  is a matching of non-negative matrix  $A$  iff  $P(i, j) = 1$  implies  $A(i, j) > 0$ . We denote the space of permutations that are matchings of  $A$  as  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ .*

The standard algorithm [8] for constructing such a decomposition is given in Alg. 1. The approach of this algorithm is to, at each step  $k$  in the loop, take the matrix  $B_k$  resulting from the previous step, which is proportional to a doubly stochastic matrix, and find a permutation  $P$  that is a matching of  $B_k$ . The existence of such a matching is a consequence of  $B_k$  being proportional to a doubly stochastic matrix and Hall's marriage theorem. Furthermore, this matching  $P$  can be computed using a standard bipartite matching algorithm in  $O(n^3)$  time. If  $P$  is a matching of  $B_k$  and  $\alpha$  is the value of the smallest entry  $B_k(i, j)$  in  $B_k$  such that  $P(i, j) = 1$ , then  $B_{k+1} = B_k - \alpha P$  is a matrix proportional to a doubly stochastic matrix with one less non-zero entry than in  $B_k$ . Note that since  $P$  is a matching of  $B_k$ , we have  $\alpha > 0$ . This process is repeated until the resultant matrix is the zero matrix. We note that a Birkhoff decomposition obtained this way does not necessarily have continuity, which our approach in the following section addresses.

## 3 Birkhoff Extension

In this section we introduce our continuous and a.e. differentiable Birkhoff decomposition. We then use this decomposition to construct an extension of permutation functions to the Birkhoff polytope. Finally, we show this extension has many advantageous properties.

### 3.1 A continuous and a.e. differentiable Birkhoff decomposition

We extend a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on permutations to a function  $F : \mathcal{D}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on Birkhoff polytope via the Birkhoff decomposition:  $F(A) = \sum_k \alpha_k f(P_k)$ . However, Birkhoff decomposition is non-unique; there may be many different ways to represent a doubly stochastic matrix as a convex combination of permutations. This non-uniqueness is evident at each step of the decomposition in the multiple choices of which permutation matrix  $P \in \mathcal{P}(B_k)$  to subtract. We now describe how to fix a particular decomposition so that the coefficients  $\alpha_k$ , and, consequently, the extension  $F$ , are *continuous* functions of the matrix  $A$  being decomposed. Note that topology on  $\mathcal{D}_n$  is the standard one induced by the  $L_2$  norm.

The key insight that allows for this construction, is to fix an arbitrary total order over all permutation matrices and, at each step in the decomposition, always pick the valid permutation that comes first in the order. Previous decomposition algorithms fail to achieve continuity because small changes to the matrix  $A$  being decomposed could change which permutation is subtracted at each step, which can compound to greatly alter the trajectory of the decomposition. By fixing the order in which permutations are subtracted in the decomposition, we circumvent this issue. Below we introduce a continuous Birkhoff decomposition scheme, and prove its correctness (i.e., validity and continuity) in Thm. 2. Recall a function  $F$  is Lipschitz continuous if there is  $L > 0$  such that  $\|F(x) - F(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$  for all  $x$  and  $y$ .

**Definition 2 (Continuous Birkhoff Decomposition).** *Given an enumeration  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  (i.e, fix a total order of all permutations), and given  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , the continuous Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$  induced by  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  is  $(\alpha_\ell, P_\ell)_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  where the coefficients are defined recursively from  $\ell = 1$  to  $n!$  in order by*

$$\alpha_\ell = \min_{ij} \left\{ A(i, j) - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_m P_m(i, j) \mid P_\ell(i, j) = 1 \right\} \quad (2)$$

**Theorem 2.** *Given an enumeration  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  and given  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , the coefficients of the continuous Birkhoff decomposition  $(\alpha_\ell, P_\ell)_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  of  $A$  are (i) Lipschitz continuous functions from  $\mathcal{D}_n$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , (ii) all non-negative and sum to 1, and (iii) yield a valid decomposition of  $A$  via*

$$A = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n!} \alpha_\ell P_\ell. \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, (iv) there are **at most**  $n^2 - n + 1$  coefficients being non-zero.

*Proof.* We show continuity (i) by induction. Note that Eq. 2 makes reference to the order  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$ , which we now induct on. For the base case, we have that  $\alpha_1$  is a Lipschitz continuous function of  $A$  as the sum in Eq. 2 disappears. Now, assume  $\alpha_m$  for  $m < \ell$  is a Lipschitz continuous function of  $A$ . Then, by Eq. 2,  $\alpha_\ell$  is a Lipschitz continuous function of  $A$ , as  $\min$  is a Lipschitz continuous function.

Now for each  $\ell \in [n!]$ , set  $B^{(\ell)} = A - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \alpha_m P_m$ . Clearly, we have  $B^{(\ell)} = B^{(\ell-1)} - \alpha_\ell P_\ell$ , and  $\alpha_\ell = \min_{i,j} \{B^{(\ell-1)}(i, j) \mid P_\ell(i, j) = 1\}$ . Furthermore let  $Z^\ell$  denote the set of indices  $(i, j)$  of non-zero entries in  $B^{(\ell)}$ ; that is,  $Z^\ell = \{(i, j) \mid B^{(\ell)}(i, j) > 0\}$ . First, note that since  $A$  and every  $P_m$  are doubly stochastic,  $B^{(\ell)}$  must be proportional to some doubly stochastic matrix for any  $\ell$ . Indeed, for any  $\ell$  the matrix  $B^{(\ell)}$  has rows and columns summing to  $1 - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \alpha_m$ . Next, we use induction to show that (a)  $B^{(\ell)}$  has non-negative entries, (b)  $\alpha_\ell = 0$  or  $\alpha_\ell > 0$ , and (c) if  $\alpha_\ell > 0$ , then  $Z^\ell$  is a strict subset of  $Z^{\ell-1}$ ; i.e.  $Z^\ell \subset Z^{\ell-1}$ . Note that (c) implies that the number of non-zero entries in  $B^{(\ell)}$  is strictly smaller than that in  $B^{(\ell-1)}$  whenever  $\alpha_\ell > 0$ . We then use these properties to prove statements (ii) – (iv) in the theorem.

First, it is easy to see that properties (a) - (c) hold for the base case  $\ell = 1$ . Now consider  $\ell > 1$ , and assume they hold for any  $r < \ell$ . Since all entries in  $B^{(\ell-1)} = A - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_m P_m$  are non-negative, namely  $B^{(\ell-1)}(i, j) = A(i, j) - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_m P_m(i, j) \geq 0$  for any  $i, j \in [n]$ , we have  $\alpha_\ell \geq 0$ , proving property (b).

If  $\alpha_\ell = 0$ , then properties (a) and (c) trivially hold so assume  $\alpha_\ell > 0$ . Let  $i^*, j^*$  be indices that give rise to  $\alpha_\ell$ . That is,  $\alpha_\ell = B^{(\ell-1)}(i^*, j^*)$  and  $P_\ell(i^*, j^*) = 1$ . By definition of  $\alpha_\ell$ , for any other  $i, j$  such that  $P_\ell(i, j) = 1$ , we have that  $\alpha_\ell \leq B^{(\ell-1)}(i, j)$ . Since  $P_\ell$  is a binary matrix, this means that for all  $i, j \in [n]$ ,  $\alpha_\ell P_\ell(i, j) \leq B^{(\ell-1)}(i, j)$ . Hence all entries in  $B^{(\ell)} = B^{(\ell-1)} - \alpha_\ell P_\ell$  are non-negative, proving property (a).

Furthermore, note that by construction,  $B^{(\ell)}(i^*, j^*) = B^{(\ell-1)}(i^*, j^*) - \alpha_\ell P_\ell(i^*, j^*) = 0$ , while  $B^{(\ell-1)}(i^*, j^*) = \alpha_\ell > 0$ . As each entry in  $B^{(\ell)}$  is less than the corresponding entry in  $B^{(\ell-1)}$ , but are still non-negative, we can conclude  $Z^\ell \subset Z^{\ell-1}$ . In particular,  $(i^*, j^*) \in Z^{\ell-1}$  but not in  $Z^\ell$ . This proves property (c).

Hence by induction, properties (a), (b) and (c) hold for all  $\ell \in [n!]$ . We are now ready to prove statements (ii) - (iv).

To prove (iii) we aim to show that  $B^{(n!)} = 0$ . We proceed by contradiction so suppose  $B^{(n!)} \neq 0$ . Then  $B^{(n!)}$  is proportional to a doubly stochastic matrix and must have at least one matching, say  $P_{\ell^*}$ , by Hall's Marriage theorem. However, as all entries in  $B^{(\ell)}$  are non-decreasing as  $\ell$  increases, the set of non-zero entries in  $B^{(\ell^*-1)}$  is a super set of those in  $B^{(n!)}$  and, thus, super set of those in  $P_{\ell^*}$ . Therefore we must have  $\alpha_{\ell^*} > 0$ . Furthermore, let  $(i^*, j^*)$  be the pair of indices giving rise to  $\alpha_{\ell^*}$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_{\ell^*} = B^{(\ell^*-1)}(i^*, j^*)$  and  $P_{\ell^*}(i^*, j^*) = 1$ . Then  $B^{(\ell^*)}(i^*, j^*) = B^{(\ell^*-1)}(i^*, j^*) - \alpha_{\ell^*} P_{\ell^*}(i^*, j^*) = 0$ . As all entries can only decrease,  $B^{(n!)}(i^*, j^*) = 0$ . However, since  $P_{\ell^*}(i^*, j^*) = 1$ , this means that  $P_{\ell^*}$  cannot be a matching for  $B^{(n!)}$ , which is a contradiction. Hence our assumption that  $B^{(n!)}$  is non-zero cannot be true, and we must have that  $B^{(n!)} = 0$ , meaning  $A = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n!} \alpha_{\ell} P_{\ell}$ . This proves statement (iii).

To prove (ii), note that by (b), all  $\alpha_{\ell} \geq 0$ . Furthermore, as we mentioned earlier, for any  $\ell$  the matrix  $B^{(\ell)}$  has rows and columns summing to  $1 - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_m$ . Since  $B^{(n!)}$  is the zero-matrix, it follows that  $1 - \sum_{m=1}^{n!} \alpha_m = 0$ , proving (ii).

Finally, we bound the number of non-zero coefficients used in the decomposition and prove statement (iv). Consider an  $\ell^*$  for which there are  $n^2 - n + 1$  non-zero coefficients  $\alpha_m$  with  $m \leq \ell^*$ . If no such  $\ell^*$  exists we are done. If such  $\ell^*$  exists, then  $B^{(\ell^*)} = A - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell^*} \alpha_m P_m$  is either the zero matrix or is proportional to some doubly stochastic matrix. If  $B^{(\ell^*)}$  is the zero matrix, then we are done. So assume  $B^{(\ell^*)}$  proportional to some doubly stochastic matrix. Note that any doubly stochastic matrix necessarily has at least  $n$  non-zero entries (as each row-sum needs to be 1). Hence  $B^{(\ell^*)}$  has at least  $n$  non-zero entries. However, as the set of indices for non-zero entries  $Z^m$  strictly decreases each time  $\alpha_m > 0$  (property (c) proved above), and there are  $n^2 - n + 1$  such  $\alpha_m$  with  $m \leq \ell^*$ , this means that the number of non-zero entries in the original matrix  $A$  is at least  $n^2 - n + 1 + n = n^2 + 1$ , which is not possible (as there are only  $n^2$  entries in a  $n \times n$  matrix). Hence  $B^{(\ell^*)}$  must be a zero matrix, and there cannot be more than  $n^2 - n + 1$  non-zero coefficients in  $\{\alpha_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$ . This completes the proof of statement (iv).

The a.e. differentiability of the continuous Birkhoff decomposition follows from Lipschitz continuity and an application of Rademacher's theorem [38]. We give details of this argument in Appendix A.

**Theorem 3.** *The coefficients  $\{\alpha_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  of the continuous Birkhoff decomposition are almost everywhere differentiable functions from  $\mathcal{D}_n$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

Now that we have constructed a continuous Birkhoff decomposition, the next questions are how to represent that total order of all permutation matrices, and how to compute this decomposition efficiently. Indeed, for an arbitrary ordering of permutations, efficient computation is not feasible as it requires referencing the order of  $n!$  elements. We instead focus on orderings of permutations that arise from an inner product through a concept of *score matrix*, and we show that this leads to an efficient algorithm to compute the resulting decomposition.

**Definition 3 (Score-Induced Birkhoff Decompositions).** *Given an  $n \times n$  matrix  $S$ , the score of a permutation  $P$  is*

$$\langle S, P \rangle = \sum_{ij} S(i, j) P(i, j). \quad (4)$$

*We call  $S$  a score matrix, and say that  $S$  is identifying if it assigns a unique score to every permutation, thereby inducing a total order on  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Furthermore, given an identifying score matrix  $S$ , the Birkhoff decomposition as specified in Def. 2 with respect to an ordering of permutations by their score  $\{P_{\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  is called an  $S$ -induced Birkhoff decomposition.*

A simple example of an identifying score matrix is given by  $S(i, j) = 2^{(i+nj)}$ . The reason of using a score-matrix induced total order is because (i) a score matrix can be easily represented, and (ii) it turns out that for any  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , the permutation  $P \in \mathcal{P}(A)$  that comes first in this order can be found efficiently by solving a maximum weight matching problem. Consequently, decompositions with respect to this order can be constructed efficiently. More precisely, we have the following:

**Theorem 4.** *Given an identifying score matrix  $S$ , the  $S$ -induced Birkhoff decomposition can be computed in  $O(n^5)$  time by Alg. 2.*

*Proof.* Our algorithm for constructing the continuous Birkhoff decomposition is Alg. 2, which returns only the non-zero Birkhoff coefficients. This algorithm is the same as Alg. 1 except at each step, with  $B$  being the matrix to be

---

**Algorithm 1** Classical Birkhoff decomposition [8]**Require:**  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ **Ensure:**  $\{(\alpha_k, P_k)\}_{k=1}^M$  s.t.  $A = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k P_k$ ,  
 $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$ , and  $\alpha_k > 0$ . $k \leftarrow 1, B \leftarrow A$ **while**  $B \neq 0$  **do** $P_k \leftarrow P \in \mathcal{P}(B)$  $\alpha_k \leftarrow \min_{i,j} \{B(i,j) \mid P_k(i,j) = 1\}$  $B \leftarrow B - \alpha_k P_k$  $k++$ **end while** $M \leftarrow k$ **return**  $\{(\alpha_k, P_k)\}_{k=1}^M$ 

---

**Algorithm 2** Continuous Birkhoff decomposition**Require:**  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , identifying score matrix  $S$ **Ensure:**  $\{(\alpha_k, P_k)\}_{k=1}^M$  s.t.  $A = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k P_k$ ,  
 $\sum_k \alpha_k = 1$ , and  $\alpha_k > 0$ . $k \leftarrow 1, B \leftarrow A$ **while**  $B \neq 0$  **do** $P_k \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}(B)} \langle P, S \rangle$  $\alpha_k \leftarrow \min_{i,j} \{B(i,j) \mid P_k(i,j) = 1\}$  $B \leftarrow B - \alpha_k P_k$  $k++$ **end while** $M \leftarrow k$ **return**  $\{(\alpha_k, P_k)\}_{k=1}^M$ 

---

decomposed at this step, we subtract off the permutation of maximum score that is a matching of  $B$ , as opposed to an arbitrary matching of  $B$ . Recall that  $B$  is proportional to a doubly stochastic matrix, so it either has a matching or is the zero matrix (in which case the algorithm terminates). To compute  $\operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}(B)} \langle P, S \rangle$  we first construct a bipartite graph  $G$  that has an edge from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j$  with weight  $S(i,j)$  if and only if  $B(i,j) > 0$ . It is easy to see that (i) matchings of  $G$  correspond to the matchings of the scaled doubly stochastic matrix  $B$ ; and (ii) for any matching  $P$  in this graph, its weight is exactly  $\langle P, S \rangle$  which is the score of permutation  $P$ . Hence we can compute  $\operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}(B)} \langle P, S \rangle$  simply by computing the maximum-weight matching of this bipartite graph  $G$ . This computation takes  $O(n^3)$  time using the Hungarian algorithm, and since there are at most  $O(n^2)$  matchings to compute, the total time complexity is  $O(n^5)$ .

We show the correctness of Alg. 2. Recall our algorithm returns a collection of permutations  $P_1, \dots, P_M$ . First, let  $\Omega = \{\widehat{P}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$  denote the total ordering of all permutations induced by the score matrix  $S$ . Now let  $A = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n!} \widehat{\alpha}_\ell \widehat{P}_\ell$  denote the Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$  w.r.t. the total order  $\Omega$  as defined in Def. 2. Note the slight change in notation so that  $\widehat{\alpha}_\ell$  and  $\widehat{P}_\ell$  represent the permutations and coefficients in Def. 2 and  $\alpha_k$  and  $P_k$  represent the permutations and coefficients returned by Alg. 2. Let  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_R$  denote the set of indices whose corresponding coefficients  $\alpha_{i_k}$  are positive. That is, ignoring all zero coefficients in the decomposition, we have  $A = \sum_{k=1}^R \widehat{\alpha}_{i_k} \widehat{P}_{i_k}$  where each  $\widehat{\alpha}_{i_k} > 0$ . Our goal is for each  $k \in [M]$  to show (cond-A): that  $\alpha_k = \widehat{\alpha}_{i_k}$  and  $P_k = \widehat{P}_{i_k}$ . We do so via induction on the index  $k \in [M]$ .

We begin by showing the property that  $\widehat{P}_\ell$  is a matching of  $B^{\ell-1} = A - \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \widehat{\alpha}_m \widehat{P}_m$  if and only if  $\widehat{\alpha}_\ell > 0$ . Call this property (\*). This property holds since  $\widehat{\alpha}_\ell > 0$  if and only if every element in the minimum defining  $\widehat{\alpha}_\ell$  in Def. 2 is non-zero, which means for each  $i, j \in [n]$  with  $\widehat{P}_\ell(i, j) = 1$  we have  $B^{\ell-1}(i, j) > 0$ , i.e.,  $\widehat{P}_\ell$  is a matching of  $B^{\ell-1}$ .

The first permutation  $P_1$  returned by Alg. 2 is  $\operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}(A)} \langle P, S \rangle$  which is the matching of  $A$  with largest score. That is,  $P_1$  is the matching of  $A$  with smallest index in the total order  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, by (\*), the permutation  $\widehat{P}_{i_1}$  must be a matching of  $B^{i_1-1} = A$  since  $\widehat{\alpha}_{i_1} > 0$ . For  $j < i_1$  we have  $\widehat{\alpha}_j = 0$ , and again by (\*), each  $P_j$  is not a matching of  $B^{j-1} = A$ . We have shown  $\widehat{P}_{i_1}$  is the matching of  $A$  with smallest index in  $\Omega$  and, therefore, (cond-A) holds for the base case  $k = 1$ .

Now assume (cond-A) holds for all  $m < k$ ; we aim to show that it holds for  $k$ . Let  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{k-1}$  be the indices for the previous  $k-1$  non-zero coefficients. In the  $k$ th iteration of Alg. 2,  $B = A - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \alpha_m P_m = B^{i_{k-1}}$ , and  $P_k = \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}(B)} \langle P, S \rangle$ , which is the first permutation matrix in the total order  $\Omega$  that is a matching for  $B$ . Let  $j$  be the index of  $P_k$  in the total order  $\Omega$ , that is,  $P_k = \widehat{P}_j$ . Notice that  $j \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}$  as this would contradict  $P_k$  being a matching of  $B$ . We claim that  $j > i_{k-1}$ . If not, then by (\*),  $\widehat{\alpha}_j > 0$ , a contradiction to our inductive hypothesis that  $i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}$  are the first  $k-1$  indices whose coefficients are non-zero in the Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$ . Hence,  $P_j$  is the first permutation in the list  $\widehat{P}_{i_{k-1}+1}, \dots, \widehat{P}_{n!}$  that is a matching of  $B$ .

On the other hand, since  $i_k$  is the first index in  $i_{k-1} + 1, i_{k-1} + 2, \dots, n!$  such that  $\widehat{\alpha}_{i_k} > 0$ , by (\*), the index  $i_k$  is the first in this list such that the corresponding permutation is a matching of  $B^{i_{k-1}-1} = B$ . We can then conclude  $i_k = j$  and  $\widehat{P}_{i_k} = P_k$ . Furthermore,  $\widehat{\alpha}_{i_k} = \alpha_k$  since  $B = B^{i_{k-1}-1} = B^{i_k-1}$  so the definition of  $\alpha_k$  in Alg.

2,  $\alpha_k = \min_{ij} \{B(i, j) \mid P_k(i, j) = 1\}$  is equivalent to the definition of  $\hat{\alpha}_{i_k}$  in Eq. 2. This finishes the proof of the inductive step. Combining the base case with the inductive step, we have that (cond-A) holds for all  $k \in [M]$ , hence the set  $\{(\alpha_k, P_k)\}_{k=1}^M$  returned by Alg. 2 exactly corresponds to those terms in the Birkhoff decomposition (as computed by Def. 2) with non-zero coefficients.

In practice, we may wish to use score matrices other than  $S(i, j) = 2^{(i+nj)}$ . The following theorem (simple proof in Appendix A) shows that random assignment of  $S$  is sufficient for  $S$  to be identifying.

**Theorem 5.** *If the entries  $S$  are independent absolutely continuous random variables  $S(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}$  then  $S$  is identifying almost surely.*

### 3.2 Properties of Birkhoff extension

We begin by defining the Birkhoff extension. We then present several properties of Birkhoff extensions that make our score-induced Birkhoff extension a desirable candidate for unsupervised learning. Proofs of these properties are given in Appendix A

**Definition 4.** *Given  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$  and an ordering of permutations  $\{P_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$ , let  $(\alpha_k, P_k)_{k=1}^M$  be the non-zero Birkhoff coefficients defined in Def. 2 where  $M < n^2 - n + 1$  is the number of terms in the decomposition. For any  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the Birkhoff extension of  $f$  is the function  $F : \mathcal{D}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where*

$$F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k). \quad (5)$$

We say  $F$  is score induced or  $S$ -induced if the ordering of permutations is induced by  $S$ . We sometimes emphasize the dependence on  $S$  by using  $F_S$  to denote the  $S$ -induced Birkhoff extension.

Almost everywhere differentiability and continuity of  $F$  are essential for gradient-based optimization. These properties follow from continuity and a.e. differentiability of the coefficients  $\{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n!}$ . Furthermore, we show that when computing the gradient of  $F$  one only needs to consider the non-negative terms in the Birkhoff decomposition. For details of this proof, see Appendix A.

*Property 1.* Birkhoff extensions are Lipschitz continuous and almost everywhere differentiable. Furthermore, if  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^M$  are the non-zero Birkhoff coefficients at  $A$  then, almost everywhere,

$$\nabla_A F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M (\nabla_A \alpha_k) f(P_k). \quad (6)$$

Computing a Birkhoff extension reduces to computing the corresponding Birkhoff decomposition, thus, Alg. 2 gives efficient computation of score-induced Birkhoff extensions (see Thm. 4).

*Property 2.* Score-induced Birkhoff extensions  $F$  can be computed in  $O(n^5)$  time.

One concern when optimizing a continuous extension to a combinatorial function  $f$  is that the optimization reaches some minima in the extended space that does not correspond with minima of the combinatorial function (which is our true goal). Property 3 below shows that (global) minima of the extension  $F$  (i.e., over  $\mathcal{D}_n$ ) are related to those of  $f$  over the permutations (i.e,  $\mathcal{P}_n$ ). Property 4-1 shows that a simple rounding scheme always produces a valid permutation from  $\mathcal{P}_n$  whose quality is at least as good as a given doubly stochastic matrix in  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . Proofs of these results are in Appendix A. Denote the convex hull of a set  $S$  as  $\text{Hull}(S)$ .

*Property 3.* Let  $F$  be a Birkhoff extension of  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then

1.  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) = \min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A)$ ,
2.  $\text{argmin}_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A) \subseteq \text{Hull}(\text{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P))$ .

The Birkhoff decomposition leads to a simple rounding strategy:



**Definition 5.** Given a matrix  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$  and a score matrix  $S$  that induces a Birkhoff decomposition  $(\alpha_k, P_k)_{k=1}^M$ , we define

$$\text{round}_S(A) = \operatorname{argmin}_{k=1}^M (f(P_k)). \quad (7)$$

Note that  $\text{round}_S(A)$  can be computed in  $O(n^5)$  time by computing a Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$ . The rounding scheme is lossless in that it can *only improve* solution quality; see Property 4-1 below. Consequently, optimizing  $f$  reduces to optimizing the Birkhoff extension  $F$ , as any minimum of  $F$  can be used to derive a minimum of  $f$ . Furthermore, approximations to  $\min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F_S(A)$  can be rounded to approximations for  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$ .

*Property 4.* Let  $F_S$  be a score-induced Birkhoff extension of  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , then

1.  $f(\text{round}_S(A)) \leq F_S(A)$ . Furthermore, if  $A$  is a  $C$ -approximation for  $\min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F_S(A)$ , then  $\text{round}_S(A)$  is a  $C$ -approximation for  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$ .
2. For any  $P^* \in \mathcal{P}_n$  with  $\max_{i,j} |P^*(i,j) - S(i,j)| < \frac{1}{2n}$ ,

$$f(\text{round}_S(A)) \leq f(P^*). \quad (8)$$

Additionally, if  $F_{S'}$  is the Birkhoff extension induced by a score matrix  $S'$  with  $f(P^*) \leq f(\text{round}_{S'}(A))$  then

$$f(\text{round}_S(A)) \leq f(\text{round}_{S'}(A)). \quad (9)$$

Another useful quality of this rounding scheme, Property 4-2, is that if  $S$  is sufficiently close to some permutation  $P$ , then rounding always yields a solution at least as good as  $P$ . We note that this holds *independent of the matrix*  $A$  that is being rounded. This property gives useful flexibility to Birkhoff extension optimization which we elaborate below.

In particular, Property 4-2 shows that if the score  $S$  is close to an approximate solution to the combinatorial optimization problem, then rounding always produces a solution at least as good as the approximation. For example, we could choose the score matrix as  $S = P_{\text{approx}} + Q$  where  $P_{\text{approx}}$  is solution produced by a fast approximation algorithm and  $Q$  is a random noise matrix with entries in  $[0, 1/n^2]$ . (We add a random matrix to ensure that  $S$  is almost surely identifying by Thm. 5.) Then, gradient-based optimization of the Birkhoff extension associated with this score matrix  $S$  finds solutions that are guaranteed to be no worse than the approximation  $P_{\text{approx}}$ . This means that we can use Birkhoff extension as a *local improvement strategy* to potentially improve any given solution. It is important that  $P_{\text{approx}}$  is used as the **score matrix**, not as an initialization for the optimized matrix  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$ . In fact, initializing  $A$  at  $P_{\text{approx}}$  yields weaker guarantees as optimization may produce a solution of worse quality in this case.

Another application is the following. First, note that different score matrix induce different enumerations of permutations and, thus, different extensions. For example, the first permutation in a continuous Birkhoff decomposition is always the permutation of maximum score. If an optimization algorithm has converged to a local minimum at some location  $A$  w.r.t. a certain score matrix  $S$ , then the score matrix can be changed to  $S'$  so that hopefully the extension may no longer have a local minima at  $A$ . Property 4-2 gives conditions for this change to be made without harming the optimization. In particular, this occurs under the condition that the new score matrix  $S'$  is sufficiently close to a permutation  $P$  satisfying  $f(P) \leq f(\text{round}_S(A))$ . We leverage this in the optimization procedure described in the following section as well as in our preliminary experiments.

### 3.3 Optimization procedure with dynamic Score

Consider the optimization problem

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) \quad (10)$$

where the goal is to minimize a function  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on permutations. A natural relaxation for this optimization problem (10) is to optimize the Birkhoff extension of  $f$  over the set of doubly stochastic matrices; namely, the constrained optimization problem of the form

$$\min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A). \quad (11)$$

Here we propose an iterative first-order optimization algorithm that is concerned with optimizing an objective function over the Birkhoff polytope  $\mathcal{D}_n$ .

One difficulty in using gradient-based approaches to optimize constrained optimization problems, such as (11), is the risk of stepping outside of the feasible region. We address this difficulty using a method similar to the famous Frank-Wolfe approach [19]. In contrast to *projected gradient descent* approaches, the idea is to *not* follow the negative of the gradient but to follow an alternative direction of descent, which is best aligned with the negative of the gradient, ensures enough primal progress, and for which we can easily ensure feasibility by means of computing convex combinations. This is done via optimizing the negative of the gradient over the extreme vertices  $\mathcal{P}_n \subset \mathcal{D}_n$  and then taking the obtained permutation to form an alternative direction of descent. The overall process is outlined in Alg. 3, where the step size  $\lambda_t$  is a hyperparameter, potentially computed from some external algorithm. Note that  $\operatorname{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle \nabla F_S(A_t), P \rangle$  can be computed by finding a maximum weight matching in the bipartite graph  $G$  that has vertices  $[n] \sqcup [n]$  and an edge from vertex  $i$  to vertex  $j$  of weight  $\nabla F_S(A_t)(i, j)$ ; the weight of a matching  $P$  in  $G$  is  $\langle \nabla F_S(A_t), P \rangle$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** Static score Frank-Wolfe over  $\mathcal{D}_n$ 


---

**Require:**  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , random  $A_1 \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , score  $S$   
**for**  $t = 1 \dots T$  **do**  
     $P_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle \nabla F_S(A_t), P \rangle$   
     $A_{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \lambda_t)A_t + \lambda_t P_t$   
**end for**  
**return**  $\operatorname{round}_S(A_T)$

---



---

**Algorithm 4** Dynamic score Frank-Wolfe over  $\mathcal{D}_n$ 


---

**Require:**  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , random  $A_1 \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , score  $S$   
**for**  $t = 1 \dots T$  **do**  
     $P_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle \nabla F_S(A_t), P \rangle$   
     $A_{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \lambda_t)A_t + \lambda_t P_t$   
     $\mathcal{P}^* \leftarrow \mathcal{P}^* \cup \operatorname{Birkhoff}_S(A)$   
    **if** `update_score` **then**  
         $Q \sim \operatorname{Unif}([0, 1]^{n \times n})$   
         $P^* \leftarrow \frac{1}{2n}Q + \operatorname{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}^*} f(P)$   
         $S \leftarrow P^*$   
    **end if**  
**end for**  
**return**  $\operatorname{round}_S(A_T)$

---

**Dynamic score.** One issue with gradient-based optimization of a Birkhoff extension is that the extension is not necessarily convex, and thus, an optimization algorithm may converge to suboptimal local minima. As a remedy to alleviate this issue, we propose an optimization scheme in which the score matrix  $S$  is changed whenever the algorithm has converged. The key to the efficacy of this approach is that the score matrix can be changed without decreasing the quality of the rounded solution.

Property 4-2 gives that if  $A_t \in \mathcal{D}_n$  is the current iterate of the optimization algorithm and the score matrix is  $S$ , then updating the score to a matrix  $S'$  sufficiently close to a permutation  $P$  with  $f(P) \leq f(\operatorname{round}_S(A_t))$  will yield  $f(\operatorname{round}_{S'}(A_t)) \leq f(\operatorname{round}_S(A_t))$ . Hence if we use  $P$  as the new score matrix, then the rounded solution is no worse than before the score update. Specifically, let  $\operatorname{Birkhoff}_S(A)$  be the permutations with non-zero coefficients in the  $S$ -induced Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$  and for each iterate  $A_t$  let  $\mathcal{P}^* = \cup_{0 \leq t' \leq t} \operatorname{Birkhoff}_S(A_{t'})$ . We update the score to  $S' = \operatorname{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}^*} f(P) + \frac{1}{2n}Q$  where  $Q$  is a matrix with uniform random entries in  $[0, 1]$ . By Property 4-2 this update satisfies  $f(\operatorname{round}_{S'}(A_t)) \leq f(\operatorname{round}_S(A_t))$ . This procedure is outlined in Alg. 4, where `update_score` is a flag determined externally that indicates when convergence has occurred and the score should be updated.

**Extensions.** We provide two further extensions based on our Birkhoff decomposition. First we show how Birkhoff extension can be adapted to a class of rooted binary trees over a fixed leaf set. More precisely, we surjectively map this set of trees to a subset  $\mathcal{B}_n$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  with convex hull  $\mathcal{W}_n$ . We then show Birkhoff decomposition of elements in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  only contains permutations in  $\mathcal{B}_n$ . This allows the use of Birkhoff extension to extend functions on trees to functions on  $\mathcal{W}_n$ . We describe this application to trees in Appendix C.

Similar to [24], we also apply Birkhoff extension to train neural combinatorial optimization solvers. As Birkhoff extension is a.e. differentiable, it can be used as a loss function in unsupervised learning for neural combinatorial optimization. We can then use Birkhoff extension as a loss to train neural networks that map instances of a combinatorial optimization problem to their solutions. Details are given in Appendix B.

## 4 Preliminary Experiments

We carry out preliminary experiments on three different combinatorial optimization problems: (Euclidean) Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP), Directed Feedback Arc Set Problem (DFASP) with a *min-sum* objective, and Cutwidth Minimization Problem (CMP) with a *min-max* objective. Detailed definitions and linear integer programming for-

mulations for each problem are given in Appendix D. For each problem instance, we apply a variant of Alg. 4 to optimize and compare its performances with baselines. In particular, we update the score matrix every 10 epochs (i.e., `update_score = True` in Alg. 4 if and only if  $t \in \{10, 20, \dots, T\}$ ). To overcome the  $O(n^5)$  time complexity, we truncate the Birkhoff extension to only the first  $k = 5$  terms of the decomposition, which reduces the time complexity to  $O(n^3)$ .

**Brief summary of results.** We first summarize our preliminary experimental exploration and provide more details below as well as in Appendix E. We test on these three problems to show the generality of our Birkhoff-extension (BE) based optimization procedure. Regarding performance, Gurobi is highly effective for TSP and outperforms our BE-based approach both in terms of accuracy and efficiency. Nevertheless, we show that BE can still be used as a local improvement to further improve solutions provided by the minimum spanning tree (MST) approximation algorithm or by quadratic programming. Gurobi does not perform well for DFASP and CMP problems; in particular, our new approach provides superior solutions for large instances for DFASP. For CMP, Gurobi runs out of memory for the two datasets with large problem instances, and our BE-based approach outperforms Gurobi in this case. However, our approach performs worse than other heuristic algorithms specifically developed for this problem.

We now provide more details on these experiments. For TSP, given a set of cities, one aims to find the shortest possible tour  $\pi$  that visits each city once and returns to the starting city. We generate instances by sampling  $n$  vertices  $v_i \in [0, 1]^2$  from the uniform distribution. We generate instances of different sizes  $n$  and, for each size, generate  $N = 50$  instances. We compare our Alg. 4 with an approximation algorithm based on the MST [11], a quadratic programming (QP) relaxation, and Gurobi, which returns the optimal result for these instances. For Alg. 4 we test three different score matrix  $S$  initializations: uniform random in  $[0, 1]^{n^2}$ , MST approximation, and the QP relaxation solution. The learning rate used is  $\eta = 0.01$ . The maximum number of optimization steps is  $T = 10000$  and the patience hyperparameter is  $T_{\text{patience}} = 2000$ . Here,  $T_{\text{patience}}$  is the number of steps without improvement that triggers early stoppage. We observe that all optimization processes converge (see optimization curves and runtime for different heuristics in appendix E).

Results for TSP are presented in Table 1. Note that Gurobi is highly effective at solving TSP, always returns the optimal solution, and is quite fast (see Appendix E). This is not the case for the other two problems we analyze. Nevertheless, we note that our approach can still provide local improvements over QP and MST (see the last two rows in Table 1) by using those solutions as the input score matrix for Alg. 4. ts.

Method	TSP: Tour Length ↓				
	$n = 20$	$n = 30$	$n = 40$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
Gurobi	<b>3.889</b>	<b>4.531</b>	<b>5.190</b>	<b>5.707</b>	<b>7.748</b>
MST	4.746	5.784	6.835	7.410	10.288
QP	4.553	5.666	6.818	7.782	11.896
MCTS w. Rand. Simulation	4.558 (0.5s)	5.563 (1.7s)	6.706 (4.7s)	7.468 (9.8s)	11.781 (113.37s)
Random $S$ Init. Alg. 4	4.518	5.681	7.139	8.433	15.615
MST $S$ Init. Alg. 4 (Improv.)	4.345 (8.33 %)	5.290 (8.53 %)	6.328 (7.42 %)	6.892 (6.99 %)	9.836 (4.60 %)
QP $S$ Init. Alg. 4 (Improv.)	4.405 (3.25 %)	5.633 (0.58 %)	6.709 (1.60 %)	7.670 (1.45 %)	11.782 (0.96 %)

**Table 1.** Performances of methods for TSP in terms of tour length. Best results are marked as bold and the second best results are marked as blue. If score is initialized to an approximate solution, percentages indicate proportional improvement of Alg. 4 over initialization. See appendix E for optimization

In the DFASP problem, given a directed graph  $G$ , the goal is to find an ordering of vertices that minimizes the total number of edges directed against the order. For DFASP, we used a directed *Erdős-Rényi* model with  $p = 0.1$ ,  $p = 0.5$  and  $p = 0.9$  to generate instances. Again, for each problem size  $n = 20, 50$  and  $100$ , we generate  $N = 50$  instances. Note Gurobi is not able to find an optimal solution within a reasonable time for DFASP. Hence, to compare the quality of Gurobi vs. our approach, we limit the runtime of both algorithms to  $\frac{n}{10}$  minutes for equal comparison. Consequently, the number of steps  $T$  varies for different problem instances. (Additional experiments (Appendix E) show these optimization algorithms offer minimal improvement after the  $\frac{n}{10}$  minute time limit .) The learning rate used is  $\eta = 0.005$ . Results, given in Table 2, show our method is competitive with Gurobi, particularly for larger instances where it may offer superior performance.

Method	DFASP: Cardinality of Feedback Arc Set ↓								
	$p = 0.1$			$p = 0.5$			$p = 0.9$		
	$n = 20$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$	$n = 20$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$	$n = 20$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
Gurobi	<b>3.84</b>	<b>44.76</b>	<b>269.08</b>	<b>67.72</b>	<b>475.38</b>	2229.88	<b>156.74</b>	<b>1028.00</b>	4362.70
Random $S$ Init. Alg. 4	4.69	53.02	289.03	65.00	496.46	<b>2123.42</b>	157.50	1039.00	<b>4253.72</b>

**Table 2.** Performances of DFASP algorithms in terms of feedback arc set cardinality.  $p$  is the edge probability used to generate instances with the *Erdős-Rényi* model.

For CMP, we are given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n = |V|$ , and the aim is to find an ordering of vertices  $\pi : V \rightarrow [n]$  that minimizes the cutwidth

$$\max_{1 \leq k < |V|} |\{\{u, v\} \in E \mid \pi(u) \leq k < \pi(v)\}|. \quad (12)$$

The datasets we test on are Small [31], Grids [37], and the public-domain dataset Harwell-Boeing [35]. See details of each dataset in Appendix E.

We compared our Alg. 4 with scatter search [36], simulated annealing (SA) [12] and greedy randomized adaptive search procedure with path relinking (GPR) [3]. The maximum running steps for Alg. 4 is  $T = 10000$ , and the patience  $T_{\text{patience}} = 1000$ . A learning rate of  $\eta = 0.01$  is used. Results are reported in Table 3. If we use the output of either SA or GPR as initial score matrix, then there is still local improvement (shown in the last two rows of the table). However, the improvement is mild in this case.

Method	CMP: Cut Width ↓		
	Small [31]	Grids [37]	Harwell-Boeing [35]
Gurobi	5.15	-	-
Scatter Search	<b>4.92</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>315.22</b>
Simulated Annealing	5.15	15.52	417.17
GPR	4.93	15.49	566.11
Random $S$ Init. Alg. 4	6.81	128.83	581.20
SA $S$ Init Alg. 4 (Improv.)	5.02 (2.52%)	15.49 (0.19%)	<b>416.20 (0.23%)</b>
GPR $S$ Init Alg. 4 (Improv.)	<b>4.92 (0.20%)</b>	<b>15.41 (0.52%)</b>	542.85 (4.11%)

**Table 3.** Performances of algorithms for CMP in terms of cut width. Gurobi is unable to compute results for Grids and Harwell-Boeing datasets do to memory limitations. Best results are marked as bold and the second best results are marked as blue. If score is initialized to an approximate solution, percentages indicate proportional improvement of Alg. 4 over initialization.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

We present Birkhoff extension, a continuous a.e. differentiable extension of permutation functions to doubly stochastic matrices, which has rounding guarantees. Combining this extension with a gradient-based optimization algorithm, we develop an iterative optimization framework for permutation functions. We present some preliminary experiments to validate our approach for combinatorial optimization problems.

While we propose a neural optimizer based on our Birkhoff extension (with some very preliminary results in the appendix), we note that this direction requires much further exploration and far more extensive experiments. We leave this as a future direction to investigate. We also note that currently, in our experiments, we use a simple strategy to update the score matrix. It would be interesting to explore more effective update strategies. Finally, computing a Birkhoff extension is expensive ( $O(n^5)$  time complexity), although in practice, the number of permutations is usually far fewer than  $n^2$ . It will be interesting to investigate how to improve the time complexity, or how to obtain an updated Birkhoff decomposition efficiently as the input matrix changes, given that that one needs to compute this decomposition many times within a gradient-descent based optimization framework.

## References

1. Ryan P. Adams and Richard S. Zemel. Ranking via Sinkhorn propagation. *ArXiv*, abs/1106.1925, 2011.
2. Saeed Amizadeh, Sergiy Matussevych, and Markus Weimer. Learning to solve circuit-SAT: An unsupervised differentiable approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
3. Daniel V. Andrade and Mauricio G. C. Resende. GRASP with path-relinking for network migration scheduling. In *Proceedings of International Network Optimization Conference*, 2007.
4. Francis Bach. Submodular functions: from discrete to continuous domains. *Mathematical Programming*, 175:419–459, 2019.
5. Ali Baharev, Hermann Schichl, Arnold Neumaier, and Tobias Achterberg. An exact method for the minimum feedback arc set problem. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)*, 26:1–28, 2021.
6. Irwan Bello, Hieu Pham, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, and Samy Bengio. Neural combinatorial optimization with reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
7. Yoshua Bengio, Andrea Lodi, and Antoine Prouvost. Machine learning for combinatorial optimization: a methodological tour d’horizon. In *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2018.
8. Garrett Birkhoff. Three observations on linear algebra. *Univ. Nac. Tucumán. Revista A.*, 5:147–151, 1946.
9. Gruiă Calinescu, Chandra Chekuri, Martin Pal, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1740–1766, 2011.
10. Gustave Choquet. Theory of capacities. In *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, volume 5, pages 131–295, 1954.
11. Nicos Christofides. Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the travelling salesman problem. Technical Report Report 388, Carnegie-Mellon University, Management Sciences Research Group, 1976.
12. James Cohoon and Sartaj Sahni. Heuristics for the board permutation problem. *Journal of VLSI and Computer Systems*, 2:37–61, 1987.
13. Yves Crama. Concave extensions for nonlinear 0–1 maximization problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 61:53–60, 1993.
14. Arthur Delarue, Ross Anderson, and Christian Tjandraatmadja. Reinforcement learning with combinatorial actions: An application to vehicle routing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:609–620, 2020.
15. Fanny Dufossé and Bora Uçar. Notes on Birkhoff-von Neumann decomposition of doubly stochastic matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 497:108–115, 2016.
16. Marwa El Halabi, Francis Bach, and Volkan Cevher. Combinatorial penalties: Which structures are preserved by convex relaxations? In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1551–1560. PMLR, 2018.
17. Marwa El Halabi and Stefanie Jegelka. Optimal approximation for unconstrained non-submodular minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3961–3972. PMLR, 2020.
18. James E Falk and Karla R Hoffman. A successive underestimation method for concave minimization problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 1(3):251–259, 1976.
19. Marguerite Frank and Philip Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
20. Maxime Gasse, Didier Chételat, Nicola Ferroni, Laurent Charlin, and Andrea Lodi. Exact combinatorial optimization with graph convolutional neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
21. Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 1:169–197, 1981.
22. Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Traveling salesman problem (TSP) example in python. [https://www.gurobi.com/documentation/current/examples/tsp\\_py.html](https://www.gurobi.com/documentation/current/examples/tsp_py.html), 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-05.
23. Nikolaos Karalias and Andreas Loukas. Erdos goes neural: an unsupervised learning framework for combinatorial optimization on graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6659–6672, 2020.
24. Nikolaos Karalias, Joshua Robinson, Andreas Loukas, and Stefanie Jegelka. Neural set function extensions: Learning with discrete functions in high dimensions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15338–15352, 2022.
25. Elias Khalil, Hanjun Dai, Yuyu Zhang, Bistra Dilkina, and Le Song. Learning combinatorial optimization algorithms over graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
26. Elias Khalil, Pierre Le Bodic, Le Song, George Nemhauser, and Bistra Dilkina. Learning to branch in mixed integer programming. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30, 2016.
27. Wouter Kool, Herke Van Hoof, and Max Welling. Attention, learn to solve routing problems! *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08475*, 2018.
28. László Lovász. Submodular functions and convexity. *Mathematical Programming The State of the Art: Bonn 1982*, pages 235–257, 1983.
29. J. Luttamaguzi, M. Pelsmajer, Z. Shen, and B. Yang. Integer programming solutions for several optimization problems in graph theory. Technical report, DIMACS, 2005.
30. Haggai Maron, Heli Ben-Hamu, Nadav Shami, and Yaron Lipman. Invariant and equivariant graph networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
31. Rafael Martí, Vicente Campos, and Estefanía Piñana. Branch and bound for the matrix bandwidth minimization. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 186(2):513–528, 2008.

32. C. E. Miller, A. W. Tucker, and R. A. Zemlin. Integer programming formulation of traveling salesman problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 7(4):326–329, Oct 1960.
33. Kazuo Murota. Discrete convex analysis. *Mathematical Programming*, 83:313–371, 1998.
34. Guillaume Obozinski and Francis Bach. Convex relaxation for combinatorial penalties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.1240*, 2012.
35. National Institute of Standards and Technology. Harwell-boeing sparse matrix collection. <https://math.nist.gov/MatrixMarket/data/Harwell-Boeing/>, 1993.
36. José J. Pantrigo, Rafael Martí, Antonio Duarte, and Emilio G. Pardo. Scatter search for the cutwidth minimization problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 199(1):285–304, 2012.
37. André Raspaud, Hans Schröder, Ondrej Sýkora, László Török, and Imrich Vrt’o. Antibandwidth and cyclic antibandwidth of meshes and hypercubes. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309:3541–3552, 2009.
38. Walter Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. 1964.
39. Martin JA Schuetz, J Kyle Brubaker, and Helmut G Katzgraber. Combinatorial optimization with physics-inspired graph neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(4):367–377, 2022.
40. Hadar Serviansky, Nimrod Segol, Jonathan Shlomi, Kyle Cranmer, Eilam Gross, Haggai Maron, and Yaron Lipman. Set2graph: learning graphs from sets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
41. Richard Sinkhorn. A relationship between arbitrary positive matrices and doubly stochastic matrices. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35:876–879, 1964.
42. Mohit Tawarmalani and Nikolaos V Sahinidis. Convex extensions and envelopes of lower semi-continuous functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 93(2):247–263, 2002.
43. Jan Toenschhoff, Martin Ritzert, Hinrikus Wolf, and Martin Grohe. Graph neural networks for maximum constraint satisfaction. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 3:580607, 2021.
44. Oriol Vinyals, Meire Fortunato, and Navdeep Jaitly. Pointer networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
45. John von Neumann. A certain zero-sum two-person game equivalent to the optimal assignment problem. In Harold W. Kuhn and Albert W. Tucker, editors, *Contributions to the Theory of Games, Volume II*, volume 28 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, pages 5–12. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1953.
46. Jan Vondrák. Optimal approximation for the submodular welfare problem in the value oracle model. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 67–74, 2008.
47. Haoyu Peter Wang, Nan Wu, Hang Yang, Cong Hao, and Pan Li. Unsupervised learning for combinatorial optimization with principled objective relaxation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31444–31458, 2022.
48. Runzhong Wang, Zhigang Hua, Gan Liu, Jiayi Zhang, Junchi Yan, Feng Qi, Shuang Yang, Jun Zhou, and Xiaokang Yang. A bi-level framework for learning to solve combinatorial optimization on graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:21453–21466, 2021.

## A Deferred Proofs

*Proof (proof of Thm. 3).*

$\mathcal{D}_n$  lies in an  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  dimensional affine subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$  defined by all  $n \times n$  matrices with rows and columns summing to 1. We can parameterize this subspace with the linear map

$$\phi : \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n^2} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1} & \cdots & a_{1,n-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1} & \cdots & a_{1,n-1} & 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{1,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & \vdots \\ 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_{i,1} & \cdots & \cdots & 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{i,j}\right) \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

Note that  $X = \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_n)$  is the subset of  $R^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$  containing matrices with rows and column sums in  $[0, 1]$ . This is a closed set whose boundary has measure zero since it has dimension less than  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ . The Lipschitz continuity of  $\phi$  and  $\alpha_\ell$  gives that  $\alpha_\ell \circ \phi$  is Lipschitz continuous. Applying Rademacher's theorem [38] to the interior  $\text{int}(X)$  of  $X$  yields that  $\alpha_\ell \circ \phi$  is an a.e. differentiable function from  $\text{int}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $X \setminus \text{int}(X)$  has measure zero, we have that  $\alpha_\ell \circ \phi$  is an a.e. differentiable function on  $X$ . Let  $N \subset X$  be the set of points for which  $\alpha_\ell \circ \phi$  is not differentiable. Then  $\phi(N)$  is the set of points such that  $\alpha_\ell$  is not differentiable. Furthermore,  $\phi(N)$  has Lebesgue measure zero in  $\mathcal{D}_n$  since  $N$  has measure zero and  $\phi$  is a surjective linear map to  $\mathcal{D}_n$ .

*Proof (proof of Thm. 5).* Consider two distinct permutations  $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Let  $I$  and  $I'$  contain the pairs  $(i, j)$  of indices such that  $P(i, j) = 1$  and  $P'(i, j) = 1$  respectively. The score of these permutations  $\langle P, S \rangle = \sum_{(i,j) \in I} S(i, j)$  and  $\langle P', S \rangle = \sum_{(i,j) \in I'} S(i, j)$ , are equal if and only if

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in I \setminus I'} S(i, j) = \sum_{(i,j) \in I' \setminus I} S(i, j). \quad (15)$$

The left hand side and the right hand side of this equation are independently distributed absolutely continuous random variables, so they are equal with probability zero. Since any pair of permutations have different scores almost surely, all permutations have different scores almost surely by the union bound.

*Proof (proof of Property 1).* Lipschitz continuity and a.e. differentiability of  $F$  follow from the Lipschitz continuity and a.e. differentiability of  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^M$  (theorems 2 and 3).

Now we show that the gradient  $\nabla_A F(A)$  is equivalent to

$$\nabla_A F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M (\nabla_A \alpha_k) f(P_k). \quad (16)$$

We start with a dimensionality argument showing there are never more than  $n^2 - 2n + 2$  terms in a Birkhoff decomposition. First we show the set  $\{P_k\}_{k=1}^M$  of permutations with positive coefficients is linearly independent.

Suppose some  $P_\ell \in \{P_1, \dots, P_M\}$  can be written as a linear combination  $P_\ell = \sum_{k \in [M] \setminus \{\ell\}} c_k P_k$  for  $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$ . We first show all  $c_k$  with  $k < \ell$  must be zero. The proof is by induction. We have  $c_1 = 0$  as there must be some  $i, j \in [n]$  such that  $P_1(i, j) = 1$  but  $P_k(i, j) = 0$  for  $k > 1$ . Now consider some  $k < \ell$  and suppose  $c_1 = \dots = c_{k-1} = 0$ . Then  $c_k = 0$  as there is a  $i, j \in [n]$  such that  $P_k(i, j) = 1$  but for  $k' > k$ ,  $P_{k'}(i, j) = 0$ . We can then conclude  $c_1 = \dots = c_{\ell-1} = 0$ . Finally, since there is  $i, j \in [n]$  such that  $P_\ell(i, j) = 1$  but  $P_k(i, j) = 0$  for  $k > \ell$  we can conclude  $P_\ell = \sum_{k \in [M] \setminus \{\ell\}} c_k P_k = \sum_{k=\ell+1}^M c_k P_k$  cannot hold. We have, thus, shown that the set of permutations with positive coefficients is linearly independent.

Since this set of permutations is linearly independent, the maximum number of permutations with positive coefficient is one more than the dimension of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  which is  $n^2 - 2n + 2$ . Suppose that  $A$  has a full Birkhoff decomposition, that is, there are  $n^2 - 2n + 2$  positive terms in its Birkhoff decomposition. Then, by continuity of  $\{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n^2-2n+2}$ , there is an open ball in  $\mathcal{D}_n$  containing  $A$  such that all decompositions of points in the ball have the same positive coefficients. Thus, the gradient of the zero coefficients at  $A$  is zero.

It now remains to show that a.e.  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$  has a full Birkhoff decomposition. For each subset  $E \subset \mathcal{P}_n$  with  $|E| = n^2 - 2n + 1$ , note that the convex hull  $\text{Hull}(E)$  of  $E$  has dimension  $n^2 - 2n$  and, therefore, has measure zero in the space  $\mathcal{D}_n$ , which has dimension  $n^2 - 2n + 1$ . Consider the union of such convex hulls

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{\substack{E \subset \mathcal{P}_n \\ |E|=n^2-2n+1}} \text{Hull}(E). \quad (17)$$

The space  $\mathcal{E}$  also has measure zero. Suppose  $A$  does not have full Birkhoff decomposition. Then  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  as it can be represented as the convex combination of at most  $n^2 - 2n + 1$  permutation matrices. We can then conclude that a.e.  $A \in \mathcal{D}_n$  has a full Birkhoff decomposition.

*Proof (proof of Property 3).* (1.) Note that for  $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$  we have  $f(P) = F(P)$  since all Birkhoff coefficients of  $P$  have only one term. Thus,  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) \geq \min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A)$ . Now suppose  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) > \min_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A)$  and let  $A \in \text{argmin}_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A)$ . Note  $F(A)$  is a convex combination  $F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k)$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k = 1$ . We can then conclude that since  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) > \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k)$  there must be some  $P_k$  such that  $f(P_k) \leq \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$ , a contradiction.

(2.) Suppose  $A$  minimizes  $F(A)$  over  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . Then  $F(A) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$ , which occurs only if for each  $P_k$  in the convex combination  $F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k)$  we have  $f(P_k) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$ . Since  $A = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k P_k$  and  $P_k \in \text{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P)$  the claim  $\text{argmin}_{A \in \mathcal{D}_n} F(A) \subseteq \text{Hull}(\text{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P))$  holds.

*Proof (proof of Property 4).* (1) If  $f(\text{round}_S(A)) > F(A)$  then  $\text{argmin}_{k=1}^M (f(P_k)) > F(A)$  so for each  $P_k$  in the decomposition  $F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k)$  we have  $f(P_k) > F(A)$ . However, since  $\sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k = 1$  this implies  $\sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k) > F(A)$ , a contradiction.

(2) Let the decomposition of  $F$  be  $F(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k f(P_k)$ . Recall by Thm. 4 that Alg. 2 produces this decomposition. Through Alg. 2 we have  $P_1 = \text{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle P, S \rangle$ . Next we show  $\text{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle P, S \rangle = P^*$ . Since each entry of  $S$  is within  $1/2n$  of  $P^*$  we have

$$\langle S, P^* \rangle > n \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2n} \right) \quad (18)$$

$$= n - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (19)$$

Also, any  $P' \neq P^*$ , must differ from  $P^*$  by at least one entry so  $\langle P', P^* \rangle \leq (n-1)$  and the inner product with  $S$  is

$$\langle S, P' \rangle \leq (n-1) + n \left( \frac{1}{2n} \right) \quad (20)$$

$$= n - \frac{1}{2} \quad (21)$$

where the second term accounts for the entry wise differences between  $S$  and  $P^*$ . We have then shown  $P_1 = \text{argmax}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \langle P, S \rangle = P^*$  which implies  $f(\text{round}_S(A)) \leq f(P^*)$ .

## B Unsupervised Neural optimizer

Since Birkhoff extensions are a.e. differentiable, they can be useful for training neural networks for unsupervised neural combinatorial optimization. In particular, similar to [24], we can train a neural network  $N_\theta$  with parameters  $\theta$  that maps an instance  $I$  of a problem to a doubly stochastic matrix  $A_I$ , which we aim to train for the optimization of the combinatorial objective  $f$ . See the illustration in Figure 1.

For example, for TSP in the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  the instance is a set of cities, represented by a vector  $X_I \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  representing  $n$  points  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

The output of  $N_\theta$  is a  $n \times n$  doubly stochastic matrix  $A_I = N_\theta(X_I)$ , and the neural network is trained in an unsupervised manner to optimize  $F(A_I)$ . Note that once trained, when a new instance  $I'$  is given with input  $X_{I'}$ , we can simply return  $\text{round}_S(N_\theta(X_{I'}))$  as the TSP tour. Essentially,  $N_\theta$  can be viewed as a neural optimizer for the



given optimization problem over the extended space  $\mathcal{D}_n$ . Once a solution in  $\mathcal{D}_n$  is identified, it can be rounded to a permutation without lowering the quality of the solution (Property 4).

Having a differentiable Birkhoff extension allows us to train such a neural network model in an unsupervised manner. In particular, first, suppose we have a score matrix  $S$  – this score matrix can be chosen simply as a random stochastic matrix; or it can also be a canonical choice depending on the input problem instance. For example, in the case of TSP, we can choose  $S$  to be a perturbation of the permutation derived from the MST. With this choice of  $S$ , let  $A = N_\theta(X_I)$  be the output of the neural network. We have that (computed by Alg. 2)


$$F_S(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k(A) f(P_k(A)). \quad (22)$$

Here, note that both  $\alpha_k$  and  $P_k$  depend on  $A$ , and  $A$  itself depends on the parameters  $\theta$  of the neural network  $N_\theta$ . We simply minimize  $F_S(A)$  w.r.t. the parameters  $\theta$  via backpropagation. More precisely, computing  $\frac{\partial F_S(A)}{\partial \theta}$  boils down to computing  $\frac{\partial \alpha_k}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \alpha_k}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{\partial A}{\partial \theta}$  for each positive Birkhoff coefficient  $\alpha_k$ .

The above description is for training  $N_\theta$  only for a single instance. Usually one wishes to train  $N_\theta$  over a family of instances  $\mathcal{I}$ , so that once trained, it can be used to produce solutions to new instances. In particular, during training, the loss is  $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} F_S(N_\theta(I))$ . Once trained, given a new instance  $I$ , we can simply compute  $A_I = N_\theta(X_I)$  and return the permutation  $\text{round}_S(A_I)$  as a candidate solution. In practice, we found that for a test instance it makes sense to optimize  $N_\theta$  for a few more iterations at testing (as a fine-tuning) to further improve the quality  $A_I$ .

We also note that for the case where we have a score matrix that depends on the problem instance (e.g. using MST to induce a score matrix for the TSP problem), it is beneficial to also take this score matrix  $S_I$  as input to the neural network  $N_\theta$  to better inform the output matrix  $A_I = N_\theta(X_I, S_I)$ . This input is optional.

Finally, in the simplest form,  $N_\theta : \mathbb{R}^{nd} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  maps an  $n$ -vector  $X$  with each entry from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to a  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ . In particular, again using TSP as an example, here we represent a set of points as a vector  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ , which assumes an ordering of these points. The output matrix assumes the same ordering of input points. In other words, this map  $N_\theta$  needs to be *permutation equivariant*, namely, if we permute the order of input points in  $X$ , then the output should permute in the same way. Mathematically, this means that  $N_\theta$  satisfies  $N_\theta(PX) = PN_\theta(X)P^T$  for any permutation matrix  $P$  over  $n$  elements. Such a permutation equivariant neural network can be implemented using models such as the set2graph neural network of [40] and the equivariant-graph network of [30].



**Fig. 1.** The pipeline of training a neural network  $N_\theta$  for a single instance. For a given problem instance  $I$ , its representation  $X_I$  and a score matrix  $S_I$  are the input to the neural network  $N_\theta$ . The output of the neural network is a matrix  $A = N_\theta(X_I, S_I)$ . The loss is comprised of the Birkhoff extension is computed  $F_S(A) = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k(A) f(P_k(A))$  and the penalty term (23). In the figure above, for example,  $M = 3$  and rounding produces the permutation  $P_2 = \text{round}_{S_I}(A_I)$ , highlighted in red.

We found the approach used in Alg. 4 to maintain double stochasticity required too much runtime to handle the large number of instances needed for training a neural network. Sinkhorn iterations [41], a commonly used approach to enforce double stochasticity in neural networks, was similarly prohibitively expensive. Therefore, we turn to the use of a penalty term to create double stochasticity and train the neural network  $N_\theta$  using the loss

$$\text{loss}_S(A) = F_S(A) + \lambda \left( \sum_i \left( \sum_j A_{ij} - 1 \right)^2 + \sum_j \left( \sum_i A_{ij} - 1 \right)^2 \right) \quad (23)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter.

We use the dynamic score approach of Alg. 4 to update the score during training. The complete description of this new algorithm is given in Alg. 5. Although  $A$  may not be exactly doubly stochastic, since the penalty term does not strictly enforce this constraint, the initial terms of the continuous Birkhoff decomposition can still be computed. In particular, if  $A$  is only approximately doubly stochastic then Alg. 2 may fail to reach the  $B = 0$  terminating condition. However, for this experiment we only compute the first  $k = 5$  terms of the decomposition, and so this issue does not arise. The set containing the first  $k$  permutations in the Birkhoff decomposition of  $A$  is given by  $\text{Birkhoff}_S^k(A)$  in Alg. 5.

We use the Adam optimizer [1] to train the model. We generate a training dataset with  $N = 6000$  instances and with a mixture of instance sizes,  $n = 20, 30,$  and  $40$ . The input to  $N_\theta$ , for each instance, is the vector  $X_I$  and the MST-derived score matrix  $S_I$ . We trained  $N_\theta$  for  $T = 100$  epochs, and selected a learning rate of  $\eta = 0.001$  using a hyperparameter search of the set  $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.001, 0.0005\}$ . At testing we optimize the trained neural network  $N_\theta$  for a few more iterations as a fine-tuning. We compare the performance of this fine-tuned model (labeled *MST S Init. NN w. Alg. 2*) with the corresponding untrained model (labeled *MST S Init. Alg. 4*) in Table 4. We show that in most of the cases, the trained neural network model can achieve similar solution quality to the untrained model with much less runtime. This result holds even for problem instances that are larger than the instances seen in training

---

**Algorithm 5** Dynamic score with penalty term

---

**Require:**  $f : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , random  $A_1 \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , MST score  $S = S_I$ ,  $N_\theta$ , problem instance  $X_I$ , number of terms  $k$

```

for  $t = 1 \dots T$  do
   $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \lambda_t \nabla_\theta \text{loss}_S(N_\theta(X_I, S))$ 
   $\mathcal{P}^* \leftarrow \mathcal{P}^* \cup \text{Birkhoff}_S^k(A)$ 
  if update_score then
     $Q \leftarrow Q \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1]^{n \times n})$ 
     $P^* \leftarrow \frac{1}{2^n} Q + \text{argmin}_{P \in \mathcal{P}^*} f(P)$ 
     $S \leftarrow P^*$ 
  end if
end for
return  $\text{round}_S(A_T)$ 

```

---

Method	TSP: Tour Length ↓									
	n = 20		n = 30		n = 40		n = 50		n = 100	
	Obj.	Time	Obj.	Time	Obj.	Time	Obj.	Time	Obj.	Time
MST	4.746	< 1s	5.784	< 1s	6.835	< 1s	7.410	< 1s	10.288	< 1s
Random $S$ Init. Alg. 4	4.518	192s	5.681	259s	7.139	612s	8.433	671s	13.560	967s
MST $S$ Init. Alg. 4 (Improv.)	4.345	156s	5.290	214s	6.328	571s	6.892	640s	9.836	1318s
MST $S$ Init. Alg. 4 (100 steps)	4.541	2.71s	5.512	5.30s	6.529	8.29s	7.333	9.72s	10.239	24.56s
MST $S$ Init. NN w. Alg. 2 (Fine-tuned)	4.180	1.75s	5.206	2.15s	6.219	2.59s	7.170	3.02s	10.220	5.42s

**Table 4.** Performances of trained neural network and pure optimization both with Birkhoff extension on TSP.

## C Extensions for Optimization over Trees

In this section we consider how a parallel framework can be applied to optimization over rooted binary trees with  $n$  labeled leaves. Problems such as the Steiner minimum tree problem and optimization-based hierarchical clustering reduce to optimization over this space. For instance, given a fixed rooted binary tree with leaves the set of terminals, the optimal Steiner tree with this topology can be computed efficiently. Therefore, computing the Steiner minimum tree reduces to optimizing the topology.

We begin by representing the space of rooted binary trees as matrices.

**Definition 6.** Let  $\mathcal{T}_n$  be the space of rooted binary trees with leaf set  $[n]$ , which we represent by a directed graph with edges directed away from the root. Let  $\mathcal{W}_{2n-2} \subset \mathcal{D}_{2n-2}$  be the space of  $(2n-2) \times (2n-2)$  doubly stochastic matrices  $W$  that satisfy  $W(i, j) = 0$  if either

1.  $i > n - 1$  and  $i \leq j$ , or
2.  $i \leq n - 1$  and  $i + (n - 1) \leq j$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}_{2n-2} \subset \mathcal{W}_{2n-2}$  be matrices in  $\mathcal{W}_n$  that have binary entries. We relate these spaces by the map

$$\tau : \mathcal{B}_{2n-2} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n \quad (24)$$

$$B \mapsto T \quad (25)$$

where  $T$  is the tree with vertices  $[2n - 1]$ , leaves  $[n]$ , and for  $n - 1 < i \leq 2n - 1$  and  $j < 2n - 1$  the tree  $T$  has an edge  $(i, j)$  iff  $B(i, j) = 1$  or  $B(i - (n - 1), j) = 1$ .

**Lemma 1.**  $\tau$  is well-defined and surjective.

*Proof.* First, we claim that for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{2n-2}$  the image  $\tau(B)$  is indeed a tree in  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . Note that since the column of  $B$  sum to 1, each vertex of  $\tau(B)$  other than the root, which is vertex  $2n - 1$ , has in-degree 1. Similarly, since the row sums of  $B$  are 1, each of the internal vertices (non-leaf vertices), which are the vertices  $\{n + 1, \dots, 2n - 1\}$ , has out-degree 2. (For each internal vertex, there are two rows in  $B$  that give its children.) Furthermore,  $\tau(B)$  has no edges  $(i, j)$  where  $i \leq j$  as the only entries in  $B$  that can give rise to such edges are zero by (1.) and (2.) of Def. 6. We can then conclude that  $\tau(B)$  is a directed acyclic graph. Furthermore,  $\tau(B)$  has no cycles (regardless of direction) since for such a cycle to not be a directed cycle it must contain a vertex with in-degree greater than 1.

For surjectivity, consider an arbitrary  $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$ . Let  $\phi : \{n + 1, \dots, n - 1\} \rightarrow \{n + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$  be an enumeration of the internal vertices of  $T$  that respects topological order, i.e.,  $\phi(i) > \phi(j)$  implies  $j$  is not a descendent of  $i$ . For each internal vertex  $i$  in  $T$  with children  $j, k$  let  $B(i, j) = 1$  and  $B(i + n - 1, k) = 1$ . Since  $\phi$  respects the topological order, we can guarantee there are no entries  $B(i, j) > 0$  with either  $i \leq j$  and  $i > n - 1$  or  $i + (n - 1) \leq j$  and  $i \leq n - 1$ , so (1.) and (2.) of Def. 6 are satisfied and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{2n-2}$ . This  $B$  satisfies  $\tau(B) = T$ , thus,  $\tau$  is surjective.

Matrices in the space  $\mathcal{W}_{2n-2}$  can be decomposed using Birkhoff decomposition as  $\mathcal{W}_{2n-2} \subset \mathcal{D}_{2n-2}$ . Additionally, if  $W \in \mathcal{W}_{2n-2}$  then its Birkhoff decomposition only contains permutations in  $\mathcal{B}_{2n-2} \subset \mathcal{P}_{2n-2}$ . By this fact, we are then free to apply Birkhoff extension to extend any function on  $\mathcal{B}_{2n-2}$  to a function  $F : \mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , even if  $f$  is not defined for  $\mathcal{P}_{2n-1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{2n-1}$ .

Additionally, we can extend functions on trees  $\mathcal{T}_n$  to functions on  $\mathcal{W}_{2n-2}$ ; the procedure is as follows. First  $f$  is composed with  $\tau$  to yield a function  $\tau \circ f : \mathcal{B}_{2n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then Birkhoff extension is used to extend this function to  $F : \mathcal{W}_{2n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If the extension  $F$  is optimized to find some solution  $W \in \mathcal{W}_{2n-2}$  the Birkhoff extension rounding scheme can be used to find a  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{2n-2}$  such that  $f(\tau(B)) \leq F(W)$ . Here,  $\tau(B)$  is a tree  $T$  satisfying  $f(T) \leq F(W)$ , so this procedure can be used to optimize  $f$ .

## D Problems Details

In this section we give more detailed problem definitions and show the integer linear programs we employ for optimization using Gurobi. Each of these problems can be formulated as an unconstrained optimization problem over the set of orderings of  $n$  items. Thus, these problems reduce to unconstrained permutation optimization.

## D.1 Traveling Salesperson Problem

**Definition 7.** Given a set of  $n$  cities  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and a distance  $d_{i,j}$  between each pair of cities  $i$  and  $j$ , the Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP) is to find the permutation  $\pi : [n] \rightarrow [n]$  that minimizes

$$\sum_{k=1}^n d_{\pi(k), \pi(k+1 \pmod{n})} \quad (26)$$

TSP can be formulated as a integer linear program using subtour elimination constraints such as in the Miller-Tucker-Zemlin formulation [32]. For optimization with Gurobi we use the formulation given in [22].

Our experiments use the integer quadratic program  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} P^T(i)DP(i+1) + P^T(n)DP(1)$  and its relaxation  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} P^T(i)DP(i+1) + P^T(n)DP(1)$  for TSP. Here  $P(i)$  denotes the  $i$ -th column of the square matrix  $P$ .

## D.2 Directed Feedback Arc Set Problem

**Definition 8.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a directed graph where  $V$  is the set of vertices and  $E$  is the set of directed edges. A feedback arc set in  $G$  is a subset of edges  $F \subseteq E$  such that the subgraph  $G' = (V, E \setminus F)$  is acyclic. The Directed Feedback Arc Set Problem (DFASP) is to find the minimum feedback arc set, i.e., the smallest subset of edges  $F$  whose removal makes the graph  $G$  acyclic.

Alternatively, DFASP can be formulated as a vertex ordering (i.e. permutation) problem, where the goal is to find an enumeration of vertices  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^n$  that minimizes the cardinality of the set of backward edges. Here we give an LP formulation. Let  $x_{ij}$  be a binary variable that equals 1 if the edge  $(i, j) \in E$  is a backward edge, and 0 otherwise. Let  $y_i$  be an integer variable for each vertex  $i \in V$  representing the position of vertex  $i$  in a topological ordering. DFASP can be formulated using the following integer linear program of [5].

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_{ij} \\ & \text{subject to} && x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} && \forall (i, j) \in E, \\ & && y_i \in \mathbb{Z} && \forall i \in V, \\ & && y_i + 1 \leq y_j + |V| \cdot x_{ij} && \forall (i, j) \in E \end{aligned}$$

## D.3 Cutwidth Minimization Problem

**Definition 9.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with vertices  $V$  and edges  $E$ , let  $\pi : V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, |V|\}$  be a permutation of the vertices, the maximum cutwidth of the ordering  $\pi$  is defined as

$$\max_{1 \leq k < |V|} |\{\{u, v\} \in E \mid \pi(u) \leq k < \pi(v)\}|. \quad (27)$$

The Cutwidth Minimization Problem (CMP) is to find an ordering  $\pi$  that minimizes this maximum cutwidth.

The CMP can be formulated using the following integer linear program, given in [29].

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && b \\
& \text{subject to} && x_i^k \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\
& && \sum_{k=1}^n x_i^k = 1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\
& && \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^k = 1 \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\
& && y_{i,j}^k \leq x_i^k, \\
& && y_{i,j}^k \leq x_j^k, \\
& && x_i^k + x_j^k \leq y_{i,j}^k + 1, \\
& && \sum_{\substack{k < c \\ l > c}} y_{i,j}^{k,l} \leq b \quad \forall c \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}
\end{aligned}$$


## E Experiments Details

In this section we provide additional experimental results for the TSP, DFASP and CMP.


### E.1 Optimization Curves

Here, we show the optimization curves for each experiment.


Below are plots of the averaged optimization curves for TSP on problem instances of different scales. The  $x$ -axis gives the number of steps  $t$  and the  $y$ -axis gives solution tour length, averaged over the  $N = 50$  instances.



Below are plots of the optimization curves for DFASP. The  $x$ -axis gives the number of steps  $t$  and the  $y$ -axis gives the average cardinality of the feedback arc set returned by the optimization algorithm. The runtime limit for both methods is  $\frac{n}{10}$  minutes (e.g. 2 minutes for  $n = 20$ , 5 minutes for  $n = 50$  and 10 minutes for  $n = 100$ ). Results are averaged across  $N = 50$  instances.



Below we show the optimization curves for different datasets of CMP. The  $x$ -axis gives the number of steps  $s$  and  $y$ -axis gives the cutwidth of the permutation solutions returned by the algorithms. Results are averaged across each dataset.



## E.2 Timing

We are using CentOS Linux 7 system on a Intel Xeon CPU E5-2650L processor. Gurobi is run on a single thread per process. We report average runtime for each method for different scales of TSP and CMP problems, see Table 5 and Table 6 below. DFASP is not included as we fix runtime for this problem

## E.3 CMP Datasets

Here we provide more details of the CMP datasets we used: Small[31], Grids[37], and the public-domain dataset Harwell-Boeing[35].

Method	TSP				
	n = 20	n = 30	n = 40	n = 50	n = 100
Gurobi	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s
MST	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s	< 1s
QP	36s	50s	69s	95s	240s
Random <i>S</i> Init. Alg. 4	192s	259s	612s	671s	967s
MST <i>S</i> Init. Alg. 4	156s	214s	571s	640s	1318s
QP <i>S</i> Init. Alg. 4	135s	249s	532s	615s	953s

**Table 5.** Average runtime of TSP algorithms in seconds.

Method	CMP		
	Small [31]	Grids [37]	Harwell-Boeing
Gurobi	126s	-	-
Scatter Search	< 1s	210.07s	430.45s
SA	< 1s	216.13s	435.41s
GPR	< 1s	235.16s	557.48s
Random <i>S</i> Init. Alg. 4	46s	433s	1630s
SA <i>S</i> Init Alg. 4	< 1s	< 1s	570s
GPR <i>S</i> Init Alg. 4	< 1s	< 1s	742s

**Table 6.** Average runtime of CMP heuristics in seconds. For Grids and Harwell-Boeing datasets Gurobi runs out of memory.

The Small dataset contains 84 graphs and the number of vertices for each graph ranges from 16 to 24, and number of edges ranges from 18 to 49. The Grids dataset contains 81 graphs, and for each graph vertices are arranged on a grid with varying width and height. The Harwell-Boeing dataset is available through the Harwell-Boeing Sparse Matrix Collection, and contains 87 graphs with number of vertices  $30 \leq n \leq 700$ , and number of edges  $46 \leq m \leq 41686$ .

All datasets can be found at [Opticom Project](#). The Harwell-Boeing dataset is a public dataset which is available at [Matrix Market](#).