Supplementary Materials for "Approximation Algorithms for the Min-Max Cycle Cover Problem with Neighborhoods"

Lijia Deng, Wenzheng Xu, Weifa Liang, Jian Peng, Yingjie Zhou, Lei Duan, and Sajal K. Das

1 ANALYSIS OF THE APPROXIMATION ALGORITH-M FOR THE ROOTLESS MIN-MAX CYCLE COVER PROBLEM WITH NEIGHBORHOODS

Lemma 1. The POIs served by each C_i^* of the optimal K tours must be contained in a single connected component CC_t , where $1 \le t \le T$.

Proof: We prove by contradiction. Assume that the POIs served by C_i^* are contained in multiple connected components. For simplicity, assume that a POI u served by tour C_i^* is contained in a connected component CC_t , while another POI v served by C_i^* is in $CC_{t'}$, where $t \neq t'$, and $1 \leq t, t' \leq T$. On one hand, since both disks D(u) and D(v) are visited by tour C_i^* , assume that they are visited at locations p_u^* and p_v^* , where p_u^* and p_v^* are in disks D(u) and D(v), respectively. Then, the traveling time $l(p_u^*, p_v^*)$ between p_u^* and p_v^* is no more than half the total consumed time $w(C_i^*)$ of tour C_i^* , i.e., $l(p_u^*, p_v^*) \leq \frac{w(C_i^*)}{2}$. Also, notice that the minimum traveling time l(D(u), D(v)) between disks D(u) and D(v) is no more than $l(p_u^*, p_v^*)$. We thus have

$$\begin{split} l(D(u), D(v)) &\leq l(p_u^*, p_v^*) \\ &\leq \frac{w(C_i^*)}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{OPT}{2}, \quad \text{as } w(C_i^*) \leq OPT, \\ &\leq \frac{B}{2}, \quad \text{as } OPT \leq B. \end{split}$$

On the other hand, as POIs u and v are contained in two different connected components, their minimum traveling time l(D(u), D(v)) must be strictly longer than $\frac{B}{2}$, by following the construction of graph G. This however con-

- W. Liang is with the Research School of Computer Science, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia. E-mail: wliang@cs.anu.edu.au
- S. K. Das is with the Department of Computer Science, Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri 65409, USA. E-mail: sdas@mst.edu

tradicts Eq.(1). Then, the assumption that the POIs served by C_i^* are contained in multiple connected components is incorrect. That is, the POIs served by each tour C_i^* must be contained in a single connected component CC_t . The lemma then follows.

2 ANALYSIS OF THE APPROXIMATION ALGORITHM FOR THE SINGLE-ROOTED MIN-MAX CYCLE COVER PROBLEM WITH NEIGHBORHOODS

Lemma 4. Algorithm approAlgOneRoot can find a solution with no more than K subtours and the consumed time of each subtour C_i does not exceed $\frac{1}{K}(w(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}$, where $c_{max} = \max_{p_i \in P} \{h(v_i) + 2 \cdot l(p_i, s)\}$, $h(v_i)$ is the service time of POI v_i , p_i is the location where v_i is served by a vehicle in the neighborhood of v_i , $l(p_i, s)$ is the traveling time between p_i and the root s, and $1 \le i \le K$.

Proof: Recall that, Algorithm approAlgOneRoot constructs K subtours C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_K from tour C', and the total weight of each subtour C_i $(1 \le i \le K)$ is upper bounded as follows.

For the first subtour C_1 , the total weight from depot s to p_{l_1} is no more than $\frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + \frac{c_{max}}{2}$, by following the proposed algorithm, where p_{l_1} is the last location of subtour C_1 . Since the edge weight $w'(p_{l_1}, s)$ between p_{l_1} and depot s does not exceed $\frac{c_{max}}{2}$, the total weight of subtour C_1 is no greater than $\frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}$, where $c_{max} = \max_{p_i \in P} \{h(v_i) + 2l(p_i, s)\}$.

For each subtour C_i with $2 \leq i \leq K-1$, the total weight of the *i*-th split path from locations $p_{l_{i-1}+1}$ to p_{l_i} is no greater than $\frac{i}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + \frac{c_{max}}{2} - (\frac{i-1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + \frac{c_{max}}{2}) = \frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max})$, by following Algorithm approAlgOneRoot. It also can be seen that both the edge weights $w'(s, p_{l_{i-1}+1})$ between s and $p_{l_{i-1}+1}$, and $w'(p_{l_i}, s)$ between p_{l_i} and depot s do not exceed $\frac{c_{max}}{2}$. The total weight of subtour C_i thus is no more than $\frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + 2\frac{c_{max}}{2} = \frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}$. Finally, the total weight of subtour C_K is

$$w'(C_K) \leq w'(C') - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + \frac{c_{max}}{2}\right) + \frac{c_{max}}{2}$$

= $\frac{w'(C')}{K} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{K}\right) \cdot c_{max} - \frac{c_{max}}{2} + \frac{c_{max}}{2}$
= $\frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}.$ (2)

L. Deng, W. Xu (Corresponding author), J. Peng, Y. Zhou, and L. Duan are with College of Computer Science, Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610065, P.R. China. E-mail: denglijia542@163.com, wenzheng.xu3@gmail.com, jianpeng@scu.edu.cn, yjzhou09@gmail.com, leiduan@scu.edu.cn

Therefore, the total consumed time $w(C_i)$ of each subtour C_i is no greater than $\frac{1}{K}(w'(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}$ with $1 \leq i \leq K$. Also, recall that w(C') = w'(C'), we have $w(C_i) \leq \frac{1}{K}(w(C') - c_{max}) + c_{max}$ with $1 \leq i \leq K$. \Box

3 ANALYSIS OF THE APPROXIMATION ALGORITHM FOR THE MULTI-ROOTED MIN-MAX CYCLE COVER PROBLEM WITH NEIGHBORHOODS

- *Lemma 6.* Assume that a tour node u_i is not matched to any depot in the maximum matching M of graph $G = (U \cup S, E)$. Construct a maximal u_i -rooted tree $T_A = (U_A \cup S_A, E_A)$ in G, so that each path from node u_i to any leaf node in tree T_A is an alternating path. We have that
 - (i) Each leaf node in tree T_A is matched in M.
 - (ii) Each leaf in T_A is a tour node but not a depot.
 - (iii) There is at least one depot in set S_A , i.e., $|S_A| \ge 1$.
 - (iv) The number of tour nodes is one more than the number of depots in tree T_A , i.e., $|U_A| = |S_A| + 1$.
 - (v) Assume that the tour nodes in U_A represent n'_U tours $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{n'_U}$, where $n'_U = |U_A|$. For each disk D(v) visited by one of the n'_U tours, assume that D(v) is visited by an optimal tour C_k^* that contains depot s_k , where D(v) is the disk that centers at POI v. Then, depot s_k must be contained in set S_A if $B \ge OPT_m$.

Proof: We only prove the first three claims here. The proofs for claims (iv) and (v) are in the main body of the paper.

We first show claim (i) that each leaf node in tree T_A is matched in M by contradiction. Assume that there is a leaf that is not matched in M. Consider the alternating path from u_i to the leaf. Since both u_i and the leaf node are not matched, we can construct another matching M' from the path and matching M, such that the number of matched edges in M' is one more than the number in M (i.e., |M'| = |M| + 1), by following the Lemma 1 in [11]. This however contradicts that M is the maximum matching in G. Thus, each leaf must be matched in M.

We then prove claim (ii) that each leaf in T_A is a tour node. Assume that there is a leaf that is a depot. Consider the path from u_i to the leaf in T_A . Since the path is an alternating path and the first node u_i in the path represents an unmatched tour C_i , we know that the odd order (i.e., 1st, 3rd, 5th, ...) nodes in the path are tour nodes, while the even order (i.e., 2nd, 4th, 6th, ...) nodes are depots. Also, assume that a depot s_k is the (2j)th node in the path, where $j \ge 1$. Then, depot s_k must be matched to the (2j + 1)th tour node in the path, if the path has at least 2j + 1 nodes. Since the last node in the path is a depot, it is not matched in M. This contradicts claim (i) that each leaf node is matched. Then, we know that each leaf is a tour node.

We prove claim (iii) that there is at least one depot in set S_A , i.e., $|S_A| \ge 1$. Consider any disk D(v) visited by the tours that are represented by the nodes in U_A . Following the proposed algorithm, any guess B of OPT_m is no less than twice the traveling time

 $\min_{k=1}^{K} \{l(D(v), s_k)\}$ between disk D(v) and its nearest depot in S, i.e., $B \geq 2 \min_{k=1}^{K} \{l(D(v), s_k)\}$. Assume that $s_{k'} = \arg\min_{k=1}^{K} \{l(D(v), s_k)\}$. Also, assume that POI v is served at a location $p \in D(v)$ in a tour C of C. Then, the traveling time $l(p, s_{k'})$ between location p and depot $s_{k'}$ is no larger than $l(D(v), s_{k'}) + 2r$, as p is in D(v). Then, we have

$$l(C, s_{k'}) \leq l(p, s_{k'}), \text{ as location } p \text{ is in tour } C$$

$$\leq l(D(v), s_{k'}) + 2r$$

$$\leq \frac{B}{2} + 2r. \qquad (3)$$

Following the construction of graph G, we know that there is an edge between the tour node u (representing tour C) and depot $s_{k'}$. Therefore, there is at least one depot in S_A . The lemma then follows.