

FOTO AFRATI

STAVROS COSMADAKIS

CHRISTOS H. PAPADIMITRIOU

GEORGE PAPAGEORGIOU

NADIA PAPAKOSTANTINO

## **The complexity of the travelling repairman problem**

*Informatique théorique et applications* , tome 20, n° 1 (1986), p. 79-87

[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ITA\\_1986\\_\\_20\\_1\\_79\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ITA_1986__20_1_79_0)

© AFCET, 1986, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Informatique théorique et applications » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

## THE COMPLEXITY OF THE TRAVELLING REPAIRMAN PROBLEM (\*)

by Foto AFRATI <sup>(1)</sup>, Stavros COSMADAKIS <sup>(2)</sup>,  
Christos H. PAPANIMITRIOU <sup>(3)</sup>, George PAPANAGEORGIU <sup>(1)</sup>  
and Nadia PAPANAKOSTANTINOY <sup>(1)</sup>

Communicated by J. E. PIN

---

*Abstract.* — *In the travelling repairman problem (TRP) we are given a finite set of points and the travel times between any two of them, and wish to find the route through them which minimizes the sum of the delays for reaching each point. We consider the TRP when all points are on the straight line, and give a polynomial-time algorithm for it. If we have deadlines (that is, bounds on the maximum delay for each point) the problem becomes NP-complete, but can be solved by a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm.*

*Résumé.* — *Le problème du réparateur itinérant consiste en la donnée d'un ensemble fini de points, et des temps de parcours entre ces points. Le but est de trouver une trajectoire qui passe par tous ces points, et qui minimise la durée totale du trajet. Nous étudions ce problème dans le cas où tous les points sont alignés, et nous en présentons une solution polynomiale. Si le retard maximum pour chaque point est borné, le problème devient NP-complet, mais il peut être résolu avec un algorithme pseudo-polynôme.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the following situation:  $n$  machines located at different points of a map have to be repaired, and there is only one repairman. We are given the time  $t[ij]$  required by the repairman in order to travel from machine  $i$  to machine  $j$ . We are interested in finding the route which minimizes the mean waiting time of the machines. We assume that the repair times are insignificant (or, equivalently, the same for all machines). We call this mean-flow variant of the travelling salesman problem the travelling repairman problem (TRP).

---

(\*) Received September 1984, revised March 1985.

<sup>(1)</sup> National Technical University of Athens.

<sup>(2)</sup> National Technical University of Athens and M.I.T.

<sup>(3)</sup> National Technical University of Athens and Stanford University.

Formally, an instance of the TRP can be described as follows: Given a distance matrix  $t [ij]$  between  $n$  locations, and a distinguished starting location  $s$ , find a permutation  $\pi (0) = s, \pi (1), \dots, \pi (n-1)$  such that the following cost function is minimized:

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^i t [\pi (j-1), \pi (j)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (n-i) t [\pi (i-1), \pi (i)].$$

Since this problem is so closely related with the travelling salesman problem, it is not surprisingly that the general version of the TRP is NP-complete [2]. Moreover it is straight-forward to show that the Euclidean version of the TRP (that is, the special case in which the locations are points on the plane, and the distances are the Euclidean metric) is also NP-complete (by observing that standard reductions to the Euclidians TSP also work for the TRP). Unlike the TSP, however, it is non-trivial to solve the one-dimensional further restriction of the problem, that is, the case in which the locations are all on a straight line. This is called the *line-TRP*. The problem becomes even more difficult, if we assign to each machine a deadline, that is, an upper bound on its delay which the repairman must not violate in his route.

In this paper we present certain complexity results regarding both versions of the line-TRP (with deadlines and without). In particular, in the next section we present a dynamic programming algorithm that solves the line-TRP without deadlines in  $O (n^2)$  time. In section 3 we prove that the line-TRP with deadlines is NP-complete, by reducing the 0-1 KNAPSACK to it; though further on, we prove that we can tell whether there exists a route preserving the deadline constraints in  $O (n^2)$  time, also by dynamic programming. Finally, in section 4 we present a pseudo-polynomial algorithm solving the line-TRP with deadlines in time  $O (n^2 D)$ , where  $D$  is the largest deadline of the instance.

## 2. THE LINE-TRP

The instance of the line-TRP is best described as in figure 1, where  $s = x_0 = y_0$  is the starting location,  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  (resp.  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ ) are the machines to the left (resp. right) of the origin. Let us start with an elementary, although crucial, observation.

LEMMA 1: *If in the optimum route the repairman has visited machine  $x_i$ , then it has also visited machine  $x_j, j < i$ . Similarly for the machines to the right of  $s$ .*




Fig. 1

*Proof;* Trivial.  $\square$

In other words, it is suboptimal for the repairman to “pass by” a machine without repairing it. Therefore, the optimum route looks like the one shown in figure 1.

Let us represent by  $[x_i, y_j]$  the fact that the repairman is currently at  $x_i$ , which is also the leftmost location visited, while  $y_j$  is the rightmost location the repairman has visited. Similarly for  $[y_j, x_i]$ . By lemma 1, all locations between  $x_i$  and  $y_j$  are already visited. Thus, each such pair of locations represents a complete state of the route. The initial state is  $[x_0, y_0]$ , and the final is one of  $[x_m, y_n], [y_n, x_m]$ . Finally, it follows from the lemma that state  $[x_i, y_j]$  can be reached in an optimal route only from states  $[x_{i-1}, y_j]$  and  $[y_j, x_{i-1}]$ .

We let  $c[x_i, y_j]$  denote the minimum possible total delay accumulated by all locations during the time it took to visit all locations between  $x_i$  and  $y_j$  ending up in  $x_i$ . The above observations immediately lead to the following equations for computing this cost:

$$c[x_0, y_0] = c[y_0, x_0] = 0,$$

$$c[x_i, y_j] = \min \{ c[x_{i-1}, y_j] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[x_{i-1}, x_i],$$

$$c[y_j, x_{i-1}] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[y_j, x_i] \},$$

(2.1)

$$c[y_i, x_j] = \min \{ c[y_{i-1}, x_j] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[y_{i-1}, y_i],$$

$$c[x_j, y_{i-1}] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[x_j, y_i] \},$$

where, in order to save two more equations, we let  $c[x_i, y_{-1}] = c[y_j, x_{-1}] = \infty$ . To justify (2.1), the second and third equations state that the minimum total delay in order to reach a particular state is the minimum total delay for reaching one of the two preceding states, plus the distance of the last locations in the two states multiplied by the number of unvisited locations at the previous state. Finally, the minimum cost is

$$(2.2) \quad C = \min \{ c[x_m, y_n], c[y_n, x_m] \}.$$

Thus we have:

**THEOREM 1:** *The line-TRP can be solved in  $O(mn)$  time.*

*Proof:* We can compute all  $c[x, y]$  using equations (2.1) in constant time per value of  $c[x, y]$  computed, and thus in  $O(mn)$  time in total. In this estimate, our units of computation are arithmetic operations on integers of precision comparable to that of the largest integer in the cost matrix  $t$  (we shall later describe an algorithm whose *number of operations* depends exponentially on this precision). If we record at each computation which of the (at most two) candidate values was the optimum, we can reconstruct the optimum path.  $\square$

### 3. THE LINE-TRP WITH DEADLINES

Suppose now that each machine  $i$  has a deadline  $d_i$ , and we impose the additional constraint that each machine must be repaired before its deadline expires. We show below that this problem is NP-complete. We redefine the problem for this purpose as usual, by also introducing another bound  $M$ , and asking whether there is a route such that all deadlines are met, while the sum of delays is at most  $M$ .

**THEOREM 2:** *The line-TRP with deadlines is NP-complete.*

**THEOREM 2:** *The line-TRP with deadlines is NP-complete.*

*Proof:* We reduce 0-1 KNAPSACK to line-TRP with deadlines. In this problem we are given a set  $[I]$  of  $n$  objects. For each  $i \in I$  we are given its size  $s_i$ , and its value  $v_i$ , both integers. Finally, we are given two positive integers  $B$  and  $K$ . We are asked if there exist  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$  such that:

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_i \geq K,$$

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n s_i x_i \leq B.$$

In fact, we shall need a slightly modified version of the 0-1 KNAPSACK in which no two  $v_i$  are equal. It is trivial to prove that this version of the problem still remains NP-complete. We can also assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_i < v_{i+1}$  for all  $i$ .

Given an instance of 0-1 KNAPSACK, we construct an instance of the line-TRP with deadlines as follows: For each element in  $i \in I$  we add to our

instance three locations. Two of these,  $z_i$  and  $z'_i$ , are to the right of  $s$  at a distance of  $l_i$  and  $l'_i$  from  $s$ , respectively, and the third,  $Z_i$ , to the left at a distance of  $L_i$  (see fig. 2). Also, we add a point  $z_{n+1}$  to the right of  $s$ , at a




Fig. 2

distance  $l_{n+1}$ . All these lengths are defined below in terms of the parameters of the instance of 0-1 KNAPSACK:

$$(3.3) \quad a_i = \frac{1}{2} s_i,$$

$$(3.4) \quad a = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i,$$

$$(3.5) \quad l_1 = a,$$

$$(3.6) \quad l'_i = l_i + a_i,$$

$$(3.7) \quad l_{i+1} = l'_i + a,$$

$$(3.8) \quad L_i = Gv_i + 2 a_i + 3 (n-i) a_i - l_i.$$

Here  $G$  is a very large constant, whose role will be clear later. As for the deadlines:

$$(3.9) \quad d_i = a_i,$$

$$(3.10) \quad d'_i = d_i + a_i + 2 l_i + 2 L_i,$$

$$(3.11) \quad D_i = d_i + 2 a_i + l_i + L_i,$$

$$(3.12) \quad d_{i+1} = d_i + 2 a_i + l_i + 2 L_i + l_{i+1},$$

$$(3.13) \quad d_{n+1} = B + l_{n+1} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (l_i + L_i),$$

and finally:

$$(3.14) \quad M = N - 2 GK,$$

where  $N$  stands for:

$$(3.15) \quad N = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)(l_i + L_i) + 2 a + 8 \sum_{i=1}^n l_i + 5 \sum_{i=1}^n L_i + l_{n+1}.$$

We claim that, there exists a legal route with cost  $C \leq M$  which achieves all deadlines if and only if there is a solution to the given instance of 0-1 KNAPSACK.

Suppose that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  is the solution to the knapsack. We construct a route as follows: We first visit location  $z_1$ , then, if  $x_1 = 1$  we repair machine  $z'_1$ , change direction, visit  $Z_1$ , change again, and visit  $z_2$ . On the other hand, if  $x_1 = 0$ , after  $z_1$  we go to  $Z_1$  first, and then to  $z'_1$  and  $z_2$ . In general, we proceed in the same way, always changing direction at the locations on the left, while we change direction at the machine  $z_i$  (resp.  $z'_i$ ) if  $x_i = 0$  (resp.  $x_i = 1$ ). Thus the route ends at  $z_{n+1}$ . We have to prove two things: (a) That the route is legal, in that it makes all the deadlines, and (b) that the corresponding cost is less than or equal to  $M$ . To prove (a), we have to show that no deadline is violated. For machines  $z_i, z'_i$ , and  $Z_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , this will be proved by induction on  $i$ . Denote by  $t_i, t'_i$  and  $T_i$  the time the repairman arrives at machine  $z_i, z'_i$ , and  $Z_i$ , respectively. For the basis step, it is obvious that  $t_1 \leq d_1$ .

Assume that  $t_i \leq d_i$ . Then, since  $z'_i$  will be visited first iff  $x_i = 1$ :

$$t'_i \leq d_i + a_i + (2l_i + 2L_i)(1 - x_i)$$

and, by (3.10)  $t'_i < d'_i$ .

Next, for  $Z_i$ :

$$T_i = t_i + 2a_i x_i + l_i + L_i \leq d_i + 2a_i + l_i + L_i$$

and by (3.11),  $T_i \leq D_i$ .

Last, for  $z_{i+1}$ :

$$t_{i+1} = T_i + L_i + l_{i+1} \leq D_i + L_i + l_{i+1}$$

and by (3.11), and (3.12)  $t_{i+1} \leq d_{i+1}$ .

For the machine  $z_{n+1}$ , the time  $t_{n+1}$  can be recursively computed to:

$$(3.16) \quad t_{n+1} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (l_i + L_i) + l_{n+1} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$$

By (3.3), (3.2) and (3.13) we obtain  $t_{n+1} \leq d_{n+1}$ .

To prove part (b) we first compute the cost  $C$ . Notice that  $z_i$  is reached at time  $t_i = l_i + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (l_j + L_j + a_j x_j)$ ,  $z'_i$  at time  $t'_i = t_i + a_i + 2(l_i + L_i)(1 - x_i)$ , and  $Z_i$  at time  $T_i = t_i + l_i + L_i + 2a_i x_i$ . The total contribution of the  $i$ th round of

visits to the cost is then  $C_i = a_i + 3t_i + 3(l_i + L_i) - 2(Gv_i + 3(n-i+1)a_i)x_i$ . In adding the  $C_i$ 's, notice that the  $a_i x_i$  terms cancel, and thus:

$$(3.17) \quad C = N - 2G \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_i.$$

Now, by (3.1) and (3.14),  $C \leq N - 2GK = M$ , which complexes the proof in this direction.

Suppose now that we have a legal route with cost  $C \leq M$ . First, we claim that the route has the form described above, that is, after  $z_i$ , we visit either  $z'_i, Z_i, z_{i+1}$  in this order, or  $Z_i, z'_i, z_{i+1}$ , in this order. Suppose not. Take the first time this form is violated. This can be done in four different ways:

- (a)  $z_i \rightarrow z'_i \rightarrow z_{i+1} \rightarrow Z_i$ ;
- (b)  $z_i \rightarrow z'_i \rightarrow Z_{i+1} \rightarrow z_{i+1}$ ;
- (c)  $z_i \rightarrow Z_i \rightarrow Z_{i+1} \rightarrow z'_i$ ;
- (d)  $z_i \rightarrow Z_i \rightarrow z'_i \rightarrow Z_{i+1}$ .

Each one of the preceding four cases leads to a contradiction, because the deadlines are defined in such a way, that they forbid exactly these kinds of routes. We shall prove only case (b) as an example:

$$\begin{aligned} t_{i+1} &= t_i + 2a_i + l_i + 2L_{i+1} + l_{i+1} \\ &\geq d_i + 2a_i + l_i + 2L_{i+1} + l_{i+1} \\ &= d_{i+1} + 2(L_{i+1} - L_i) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$2(L_{i+1} - L_i) \leq t_{i+1} - d_{i+1}.$$

In equation (3.8), however, the  $v_i$ 's are strictly increasing and we can take  $G$  to be as large as needed. Therefore, we can make the  $L_i$ 's strictly increasing as well (say, by choosing  $G > 4na$ ), and thus  $t_{i+1} > d_{i+1}$ . Thus, the deadline is violated.

Once we have established this "normal form" of the route, we can construct a solution of the 0-1 KNAPSACK by taking  $x_i = 1$  whenever the route goes from  $z_i$  to  $z'_i$ , and  $x_i = 0$  otherwise. It remains to be proved that such an assignment satisfies (3.1) and (3.2).

Since the route is a legal one,  $t_{n+1} \leq d_{n+1}$ . However, by (3.16) and (3.13) we conclude that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n s_i x_i \leq B.$$



Finally, we know that  $C \leq M$ , and by (3.17) and (3.14), we immediately obtain:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_i \geq K.$$

Thus the  $x_i$ 's constructed constitute a solution of the knapsack problem, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

As an interesting aside, suppose that we wish to determine whether the given deadlines can be satisfied *at all*, no matter with how much total delay. The problem then is polynomial:

**THEOREM 3:** *Given an instance of the line-TRP with deadlines, we can tell whether there is some route that satisfies all the deadlines in  $O(mn)$  time.*

*Sketch:* We can do this by a dynamic programming recurrence, as in theorem 1. One key observation is that a lemma analogous to lemma 1 holds here as well, in that it is suboptimal for the repairman to “pass by” machines, and thus pairs  $[x, y]$  are adequate states. The recurrence now computes, for each pair  $[x, y]$  as in theorem 1, the shortest time within which the repairman can visit all locations between  $x$  and  $y$ , ending up at  $y$ , *meeting all deadlines so far*. If no such route exists, this value is  $\infty$ . Our task is over once this time for  $[x_m, y_n]$  or  $[y_n, x_m]$  is finite.  $\square$

#### 4. A PSEUDO-POLYNOMIAL ALGORITHM

We now attack the question of finding the optimum route, satisfying the deadlines (despite the fact that we proved it NP-complete in the previous section). Let us denote by  $[x_i, y_j, t]$  the state at which the repairman at time  $t$  is currently at machine  $x_i$ , and has travelled at the opposite direction till machine  $y_j$ . Now we assign to each state the cost:

$$c[x_i, y_j, t] = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } t > dx_i, \\ \min \{ c[x_{i-1}, y_j, t - t[x_{i-1}, x_i]] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[x_{i-1}, x_i], \\ c[y_j, x_{i-1}, t - t[y_j, x_i]] + (m+n+1-i-j)t[y_j, x_i] \} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The optimum total cost is given by:

$$C = \min \{ c[x_m, y_n, t], c[y_n, x_m, t]; t=0, 1, \dots, D \},$$

where  $D$  is the longest deadline.

**THEOREM 4:** *The line-TRP with deadlines can be solved in  $O(mnD)$ .*

*Sketch:* By the straightforward implementation of the equations above.  $\square$

As usual, once we have a pseudo-polynomial algorithm, we can derive an algorithm which, given an instance of the TRP with deadlines and a “desired accuracy”  $\varepsilon$ , finds a route with relative error (that is, distance from the optimum, divided by the optimum) at most  $\varepsilon$ , in time polynomial in the size of the instance and  $1/\varepsilon$ . Such algorithms are called *fully polynomial-time approximation schemes* [GJ].

*Corollary:* *There is a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme for the TRP with deadlines, with time bound  $O(mn(m+n)/\varepsilon)$ .*

*Sketch:* We round off the deadlines to the next smaller multiple of  $[D\varepsilon/(m+n)]$ , and the travel times to the next larger multiple of  $[D\varepsilon/(m+n)]$ . The pseudo-polynomial algorithm then gives the desired accuracy and time bound.  $\square$

## 5. AN OPEN PROBLEM

When we have, not deadlines, but *repair times*, the problem seems to become more complex. Naturally, it may now be better for the repairman to “pass by” a machine with a long repair time, in order to reach and repair some easy ones first. When the repair times are insignificant compared to the travel times, we have shown that the problem is in  $P$ . When the travel times are insignificant, then it is easy to see that it is optimum to visit the machines in order of increasing repair times. It is not clear, however, how to extend either of these ideas to the general case.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the Hellenic Ministry of Research and Technology.

## REFERENCES

1. M. R. GAREY and D. S. JOHNSON, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W. H. Freeman and co., San Francisco, 1979.
2. S. SAHNI and T. GONZALES, *P-Complete Approximation Problems*, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach., Vol. 23, 1976, pp. 555-565.