This article was downloaded by: [106.51.226.7] On: 04 August 2022, At: 23:03 Publisher: Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences (INFORMS) INFORMS is located in Maryland, USA



# **Operations Research**

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:  $\underline{http://pubsonline.informs.org}$ 

Technical Note—Analysis of a Preference Order Traveling Salesman Problem

Moshe Sniedovich,

## To cite this article:

Moshe Sniedovich, (1981) Technical Note—Analysis of a Preference Order Traveling Salesman Problem. Operations Research 29(6):1234-1237. <u>https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.29.6.1234</u>

Full terms and conditions of use: <u>https://pubsonline.informs.org/Publications/Librarians-Portal/PubsOnLine-Terms-and-Conditions</u>

This article may be used only for the purposes of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval, unless otherwise noted. For more information, contact permissions@informs.org.

The Publisher does not warrant or guarantee the article's accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Descriptions of, or references to, products or publications, or inclusion of an advertisement in this article, neither constitutes nor implies a guarantee, endorsement, or support of claims made of that product, publication, or service.

© 1981 INFORMS

Please scroll down for article-it is on subsequent pages



With 12,500 members from nearly 90 countries, INFORMS is the largest international association of operations research (O.R.) and analytics professionals and students. INFORMS provides unique networking and learning opportunities for individual professionals, and organizations of all types and sizes, to better understand and use O.R. and analytics tools and methods to transform strategic visions and achieve better outcomes.

For more information on INFORMS, its publications, membership, or meetings visit http://www.informs.org

#### 1234

## Technical Notes

- GROSS, D., AND C. M. HARRIS. 1974. Fundamentals of Queueing Theory. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- HEYMAN, D. P. 1975. A Diffusion Model Approximation for the G1/G/1 Queue in Heavy Traffic. Bell System Tech. J. 54, 1637-1646.
- KARLIN, S., AND H. M. TAYLOR. 1975. A First Course in Stochastic Processes. Academic Press, New York.
- NEWELL, G. F. 1971. Applications of Queueing Theory. Chapman & Hall Ltd., London.

## Analysis of a Preference Order Traveling Salesman Problem

## MOSHE SNIEDOVICH

National Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Pretoria, South Africa (Received May 1980; accepted May 1981)

Application is made to the preference order dynamic programming solution procedure proposed by Kao for a stochastic traveling salesman problem. Although the procedure is flawed from the myopic interpretation of the monotonicity condition, it may be used as a convenient heuristic tool for solving stochastic problems.

**T**HE OBJECTIVE of this note is to report on certain difficulties the author encountered in trying to apply the preference order dynamic programming solution procedure proposed by Kao [1978] for a stochastic traveling salesman problem. The objective of Kao's procedure is to maximize the probability that the total travel time is equal to or smaller than a prespecified critical value. The analysis was motivated by the counterexample reported by Sniedovich [1979] showing that the procedure may yield nonoptimal solutions. This counterexample consists of n = 4 cities, the origin point 0, the critical completion time C = 70 and normal travel time variates whose means and variances are

	0	1	2	3	4		0	1	2	3	4
0	_	99	99	99	13	$\begin{cases} 0\\ 1\\ \{\sigma_{ij}^2\} = 2\\ 3 \end{cases}$		0	0	0	0
1	99	_	10	15	99	1	0	_	6	2	Õ
$\{\mu_{ij}\}=2$	8	99	—	20	99	$\{\sigma_{ij}^2\}=2$	2	0	<u> </u>	12	0
3	14	99	24		99	3	9	0	2	_	11
4	99	8	99	99		4	0	1	0	0	-

Subject classification: 111 preference order traveling salesman problem.

**Operations Research** Vol. 29, No. 6, November-December 1981 0030-364X/81/2906-1234 \$01.25 © 1981 Operations Research Society of America Published in Operations Research on December 01, 1981 as DOI: 10.1287/opre.29.6.1234. This article has not been copyedited or formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

#### Sniedovich

By inspection we observe that the tours  $t_1 = (0, 4, 1, 3, 2, 0)$  and  $t_2 = (0, 4, 1, 2, 3, 0)$  dominate all the other tours so that either  $t_1$  or  $t_2$  must be optimal. According to Kao's procedure the optimal tour is  $t_1$  while in fact  $t_2$  is a better tour. We shall discuss this observation and indicate where the pitfall in Kao's procedure lies.

#### 1. ANALYSIS

Under consideration is a problem of the general form

#### $\max_{t\in A}f(t)$

where A is the set of all the feasible tours and  $f(t) := P[T(t) \le C]$ , with P denoting the probability operator, C is the critical completion time, and T(t) is the travel time induced by tour t. Two observations should be made with regard to this problem. First, it constitutes a "regular" optimization problem, i.e. maximization of a real valued objective function, and second, since A is finite, the problem must have at least one optimal solution.

In view of the first observation, it is not clear why the problem should be treated as a preference order problem for, as indicated by Mitten [1974], the preference order model was designed to handle situations where the real-valued objective function is replaced by preference relations. The fact that the objective function has the probabilistic form  $P[T(t) \leq C]$  does not seem to justify the application of Mitten's model.

We consider the second observation because the proposed solution procedure is not guaranteed to be well defined, i.e. the dynamic programming recursion may fail to yield a solution, whether optimal or otherwise (see Kao, p. 1035). While it is true that Kao (pp. 1035–1038) shows that the procedure yields an optimal solution in certain cases, these cases are characterized by the property that they can be treated as simple additive deterministic problems. In this sense they should not be considered "legitimate" preference order problems, the reason being the same as why the standard deterministic traveling salesman problem should not be considered a "legitimate" preference order problem.

In short, from a computational, and certainly from a methodological point of view, Kao's procedure is of no interest to us in the context of problems in which it degenerates to the regular dynamic programming recursion. This is the situation, for example, in the Poisson variates case and the normal variates case where the variances are a constant multiple of their means, i.e.  $\sigma_{ij}^2 = \alpha \mu_{ij}$  for all cities *i*, *j* ( $\alpha > 0$ ). In these cases the problem can be formulated and solved as a regular additive dynamic programming problem (pp. 1036–1038).

1235

#### 1236

## **Technical Notes**

#### 2. DIFFICULTIES

In nontrivial cases the completeness of the preference ordering operator  $\perp$  is quite difficult to verify as its definition involves  $\mathcal{D}$ , the set of all the distribution functions defined on  $\mathcal{R}^+$  (Kao, p. 1035). Moreover, it is highly questionable whether the original preference ordering operator as specified by Eq. (1), p. 1035 can ever be implemented in a nontrivial problem. The procedure suggested by Kao (p. 1036) to resolve this difficulty is based upon the following argument. "The implication is that, if we are in city *i* at stage *k*, we must select the next destination from a set  $S_k$  in such a way that, whatever the city leading into *i*, the selection constitutes an optimal choice. This is essentially the monotonicity requirement underlying the preference-order dynamic programming."

On the basis of this argument Kao (p. 1036) proposes to replace  $\mathcal{D}$  in (1) by a finite set  $\mathcal{D}^*$  consisting of all the cities that can lead into *i*, i.e. the set  $S_k^c = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} - S_k - \{i\}$ . Unfortunately, this is a myopic interpretation of the monotonicity condition. In order to comply with Mitten's monotonicity condition the set  $\mathcal{D}^*$  should be extended to include all subtours from the origin point to city i through all the cities in  $S_k^{c}$ . If we attempt to make this correction in Kao's model we create a procedure which is essentially based on brute force enumeration, i.e. at stage k = 1we have for each i the following situation:  $S_1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} - \{i\}$ ,  $S_1^c = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} - \{i, s_1\}$ , and consequently it is necessary to generate all the (n-2)! feasible permutation of the elements of  $S_1^c$ . Since there are n possible values for i and n-1 possible values for  $s_1$ , at stage k=1we have to generate  $n \cdot (n-1) \cdot (n-2)!$  tours. This is equal to n! tours, which is the total number of feasible tours. Thus, it would not be necessary to execute the algorithm beyond stage k = 1, and we end up using brute force enumeration.

To see what the consequences of using Kao's myopic interpretation of the monotonicity condition might be, consider again the tours  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ specified above. From  $t_1$  take the subtour  $t_1' = (1, 3, 2, 0)$  and from tour  $t_2$  the subtour  $t_2' = (1, 2, 3, 0)$ . In the context of the preference order procedure we are at k = 2, i = 1,  $S_k = \{2, 3\}$  so that  $\mathcal{D}^* = \{4\}$ . The subtours  $t_1$  and  $t_2'$  generate normal variates with parameters (44, 27) and (47, 6), respectively and by convoluting them with (8, 1), the travel time from 4 to 1, we obtain, according to Kao's procedure,

$$(70 - (44 + 8))/\sqrt{27 + 1} = 9/\sqrt{7} \le \frac{15}{\sqrt{7}} = (70 - (47 + 8))/\sqrt{6 + 1}.$$

Thus, we select  $t_1'$  as the optimal subtour. This decision finally yields  $t_1$  as the optimal tour. Now, if we also consider the travel time from 0 to 4, we obtain

$$(70 - (44 + 8 + 13))/\sqrt{27 + 1 + 0} = 2.5/\sqrt{7}$$
  
> (70 - (47 + 8 + 13))/\sqrt{6 + 1 + 0} = 2/\sqrt{7}.

#### Sniedovich

1237

This implies (a) that the monotonicity condition is not satisfied, and (b) that  $t_1$  is not optimal. It should be emphasized that in this example Kao's procedure (p. 1037) is well defined yet the solution it yields is not optimal.

#### 3. SUMMARY

For nontrivial problems it is difficult to verify the completeness of the proposed preference ordering operator, and an attempt to replace  $\mathcal{D}$  by  $\mathcal{D}^*$  may result in nonoptimal solutions. Therefore the procedure should be used with caution, unless it is possible to verify the monotonicity condition.

The flaw in the procedure stems from the myopic interpretation of the monotonicity condition. Unfortunately, an attempt to correct the procedure transforms it into brute force enumeration. Despite these difficulties, it has been the author's experience that, at least in the normal variates case, the procedure often yields optimal, or nearly optimal solutions. It may then be used as a convenient heuristic tool for solving stochastic problems.

#### REFERENCES

KAO, E. P. C. 1978. A Preference Order Dynamic Program for a Stochastic Traveling Salesman Problem. Opns. Res. 26, 1033-1045.

SNIEDOVICH, M. 1979. Preference Order Stochastic Traveling Salesperson Problems: A Counter Example, RC7905 IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, N.Y.

MITTEN, L. C. 1974. Preference Order Dynamic Programming. Mgmt. Sci. 21, 43-46.

Copyright 1981, by INFORMS, all rights reserved. Copyright of Operations Research is the property of INFORMS: Institute for Operations Research and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.