

# Solving the Close-Enough Arc Routing Problem

Minh Hoang Ha<sup>a,c</sup>, Nathalie Bostel<sup>b</sup>, André Langevin<sup>c</sup>, Louis-Martin Rousseau<sup>c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*École des Mines de Nantes, IRCCyN, 4 rue Alfred Kastler, 44307 Nantes Cedex 3, France*

<sup>b</sup>*IUT de Saint-Nazaire, IRCCyN, 58 rue Michel Ange, B.P. 420, 44606 Saint-Nazaire Cedex, France*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Industrial Engineering and CIRRELT, École Polytechnique de Montréal, C.P. 6079, Succursale Centre-ville, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3A7*

---

## Abstract

The close-enough arc routing problem (CEARP) has an interesting real-life application to routing for meter reading. In this article, we propose a new mathematical formulation for this problem. We analyze our formulation and compare it with two formulations in the literature. We also develop branch-and-cut algorithms to solve the problem to optimality. We present computational results for instances based on three types of graphs: directed, undirected, and mixed.

*Keywords:* close-enough arc routing problem, close-enough traveling salesman problem, automated meter reading, radio frequency identification, branch-and-cut algorithm

---

## 1. Introduction

Consider a directed graph  $G = (V, A)$ , with vertex set  $V = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$ , and arc set of size  $m$ ,  $A = \{(v_i, v_j) : v_i, v_j \in V\}$ . Numbering the arcs allows  $A$  to be expressed as  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$ . Let  $c_a$  be the cost associated with each arc of  $A$ . The well-known directed rural postman problem (DRPP) is the problem of determining a minimum-cost closed route traversing each arc in  $A_r \subset A$  (called required arcs) at least once. Several algorithms have been

---

\*Corresponding author: Tel.: (+1)514-340-4711 # 4569; fax:(514)340-4463  
*Email address:* louis-martin.rousseau@polymtl.ca (Louis-Martin Rousseau)

proposed to solve the DRPP (see [1], [2], and [3]). The closed-enough arc routing problem (CEARP) is a generalization of the DRPP in which the subset of required arcs  $A_r$  is not defined. Instead, there is a set of customers  $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l\}$  that must be covered. These customers can be located anywhere in the area covered by the network, not only in the network itself. As in the original version of this problem (see [4]), we consider the inclusion of a depot. By definition, vertex  $v_0$  is this depot. The CEARP consists in finding a minimum-cost tour, which begins and ends at the depot, such that every customer of  $W$  is covered by the tour, i.e., lies within a distance  $r$  of an *arc* of the tour.

The main application of this problem is to construct routes for meter reading (see [4] and [5] for further information). In this application, to measure customers' consumption information from a distance, a reading device is installed in a vehicle to collect the data sent by metering devices. The reader does not have to visit each customer to collect the data but must enter the meter's read range. The vehicle must traverse the service area and pass close enough to each meter so that they can all be read. The effective radius  $r$ , also called the read range, is normally between 150 and 300 m but may be as high as 381 m (see [4]).

The CEARP is clearly NP-hard because it contains the DRPP as a special case. The existing literature on the CEARP is limited. The earliest work on the CEARP is [4]. The authors call the problem a *close-enough traveling salesman problem (CETSP) over a street network* and propose four heuristics to solve eighteen real-life instances with an average of about 900 street segments and 9000 customers each. The read range  $r$  is tested with two values: about 100 and 150 m, respectively. Basically, the heuristics of [4] are implemented in a two-stage process. In stage one, the heuristic identifies a subset of arcs to be traversed, either with some simple greedy procedures or by solving an integer program. In stage two, the problem becomes the well-known DRPP and is solved by a sophisticated heuristic.

To the best of our knowledge, the only exact method for the CEARP is [5]. The authors propose an initial formulation for the problem in which there is a connectivity constraint, and they solve this optimally using a cutting-plane approach. The algorithm first solves the problem without the connectivity constraints. The violated connectivity constraints are then added to the model, and the process is repeated until the connectivity is satisfied. Computational results show that this algorithm can solve to optimality random instances of a realistic size, such as those introduced in [4].

The CEARP is equivalent to the generalized directed rural postman problem (GDRPP). In the GDRPP, there are several subsets of arcs (also called clusters) and the objective is to find a minimum-cost tour traversing at least one arc from each cluster. The clusters may be connected or disjoint. In the CEARP, the arcs covering a customer correspond to a subset in the GDRPP. The version of the GDRPP with no depot is described in [6], where both exact and heuristic methods are presented. The exact method is a branch-and-cut algorithm based on a mathematical formulation.

There is another problem that can be seen as a *CETSP with vertex-covering constraints*. It is the *covering tour problem* (CTP) [7] and is similar to the CEARP except that a closed tour has to be determined so that every vertex of  $W$  lies within a distance  $r$  of a *vertex* of the tour. In [7], an exact algorithm and a heuristic are presented. A heuristic based on the scatter-search method has been proposed in [8]. Heuristics for the multi-vehicle version (m-CTP) are presented in [9]. Heuristics have also been proposed for problems belonging to the family of covering tour problems, such as *the CETSP in the plane*; see [10] and [11].

The aim of this paper is to design exact algorithms for the CEARP. Our main contributions are: 1) we introduce a new formulation for the CEARP; 2) we compare, both analytically and empirically, this formulation with two others, the first introduced in [5] and the second presented in [6] for the GDRPP; 3) we improve the branch-and-cut algorithm of [6] and propose a new algorithm for the CEARP; and 4) we propose a MIP-based constructive algorithm to solve the CEARP in practice.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents in detail our branch-and-cut algorithms and a MIP-based constructive algorithm to solve the CEARP. The computational results are reported and analyzed in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 summarizes our conclusions.

## 2. Branch-and-cut algorithms for CEARP

### 2.1. Mathematical formulations

Given a node subset,  $S \subseteq V$ , let  $\delta^+(S)$  denote the set of outgoing arcs of  $S$  and  $\delta^-(S)$  denote the set of incoming arcs of  $S$ . If  $S = \{v_k\}$ , we simply write  $\delta^+(k)$  (or  $\delta^-(k)$ ) instead of  $\delta^+(\{v_k\})$  (or  $\delta^-(\{v_k\})$ ).  $A(S)$  is the set of arcs with both endpoints in  $S$ . Each arc  $a$  is associated with a cost  $c_a$  (distance or travel time). We define the binary coefficients  $\lambda_{lk}$  to be equal

to 1 if and only if  $w_l \in W$  can be covered by  $a_k \in A$ . Given  $x \in N^{|A|}$  and  $T \subset A$ ,  $x(T)$  denotes  $\sum_{e \in T} x_e$ .

In [5], the following formulation, denoted by F1, was presented:

$$\text{F1:} \quad \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad x(\delta^+(0)) \geq 1 \quad (2)$$

$$x(\delta^+(i)) - x(\delta^-(i)) = 0 \quad \forall i \in V \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{wa} x_a \geq 1 \quad \forall w \in W \quad (4)$$

$$Mx(\delta^+(S)) - x_a \geq 0 \quad \forall S \subset V - \{v_0\} \\ \text{and } 2 \leq |S| \leq n - 2, a \in A(S) \quad (5)$$

$$x_a \in Z^+ \quad \forall a \in A \quad (6)$$

where  $M$  is a large number representing an upper bound on the number of times an arc is used. As in [6],  $M$  is set to  $|A| + 1$ .

The objective (1) minimizes total travel cost. Constraint (2) ensures that the depot belongs to the tour, and constraints (3) are the flow conservation constraints. Constraints (4) ensure that every customer of  $W$  is covered by the tour, and constraints (5) are the connectivity constraints. These constraints ensure the presence of at least one outgoing arc of any set  $S$ , for every possible subset  $S$  of  $V$  containing an arc belonging to the tour. Constraints (6) define the variables.

Since the CEARP is equivalent to the GDRPP, the formulation in [6] proposed for the GDRPP can be used for the CEARP. Because the formulation in [6] addresses the no-depot version of the problem, we modify it slightly. In this formulation,  $y_i$  is a binary variable that indicates the use of vertex  $i$  in the solution, and the integer variable  $x_a$  denotes the number of times that arc  $a$  is traversed. Let  $he_a$  be the head of arc  $a$ . The formulation for the CEARP is as follows:

$$\text{F2:} \quad \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{a \in A} c_a x_a \quad (7)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad y_0 = 1 \quad (8)$$

$$x(\delta^+(i)) - x(\delta^-(i)) = 0 \quad \forall i \in V \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{wa} x_a \geq 1 \quad \forall w \in W \quad (10)$$

$$x(\delta^+(S)) - y_i \geq 0 \quad \forall S \subset V - \{v_0\},$$

$$\text{and } 2 \leq |S| \leq n - 2, i \in S \quad (11)$$

$$x_a - My_i \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in V, a \in A \text{ with } he_a = i \quad (12)$$

$$x_a \text{ positive integer and } y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall a \in A \text{ and } \forall i \in V \quad (13)$$

where  $M$  is a large number representing an upper bound on the number of times an arc is used. In this formulation, constraints (8)–(11) have the same meaning as in formulation F1, and constraints (12) are used to express the relation between the two types of variables. As in [6],  $M$  is set to  $|A| + 1$ .

We now describe a new formulation for the CEARP, which we call F3. Let  $y_a$  be a binary variable that represents the use of arc  $a$  with service. The integer variable  $x_a$  denotes the number of times that arc  $a$  is used without service. Then the CEARP can be stated as:

$$\text{F3:} \quad \text{Minimize} \quad \sum_{a \in A} c_a (x_a + y_a) \quad (14)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad x(\delta^+(0)) + y(\delta^+(0)) \geq 1 \quad (15)$$

$$x(\delta^+(i)) + y(\delta^+(i)) - x(\delta^-(i)) - y(\delta^-(i)) = 0 \quad \forall i \in V \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} \lambda_{wa} y_a \geq 1 \quad \forall w \in W \quad (17)$$

$$x(\delta^+(S)) + y(\delta^+(S)) - y_a \geq 0 \quad \forall S \subset V - \{v_0\},$$

$$\text{and } 2 \leq |S| \leq n - 2, a \in A(S) \quad (18)$$

$$x_a \text{ positive integer and } y_a \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall a \in A. \quad (19)$$

	F1	F2	F3
No. variables	$ A $	$ A  +  V $	$2 \cdot  A $
No. constraints	$ V  +  W  + 1$	$ V  +  A  +  W  + 1$	$ V  +  W  + 1$
Big-M	Yes	Yes	No

Table 1: Comparison of the three formulations

The meaning of each constraint in F3 is as in F1. Constraints (15)–(18) imply constraints (2)–(5), respectively.

It is easy to see that the three formulations F1, F2, and F3 are equivalent. Table 1 gives a comparison of the three formulations. F1 has the smallest number of variables and constraints (we do not consider the connectivity constraints here because of their exponential number). The most important disadvantage of F1 is that it uses a large number  $M$  in the connectivity constraint. Because we can not find an efficient way to closely estimate  $M$ , an exact procedure to separate this constraint is useless. Experiments show that the performance of the branch-and-cut algorithm based on this formulation is poor compared to that of the other two formulations. F3 has the largest number of variables, but it also has some strong advantages. First, it does not contain the Big-M constraints that are known to weaken the linear relaxation and to decrease the performance of MILP models. Second, the set covering polytope with binary variables has received more attention than that with integer variables. Hence, the identification of violated constraints of type (17) in F3 seems to be more favorable than that for (4) in F1 or (10) in F2. Formulation F2 has fewer variables but more constraints than F3. Moreover, it contains Big-M constraints.

## 2.2. Valid equalities and inequalities

In this subsection, we introduce several valid equalities and inequalities for F3. Let  $A' \subset A$  be a set of arcs that can not cover any customer. The following dominance relation is valid for the CEARP:

$$y_a = 0 \quad \forall a \in A'. \quad (20)$$

**Lemma 1.** *Without loss of generality, we can assume that in an optimal solution  $x_a > 0$  implies  $y_a = 1 \forall a \notin A'$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(x^*, y^*)$  is an optimal solution such that  $x_{a'}^* > 0$  and  $y_{a'}^* = 0$  for some arc  $a' \notin A'$ . Define  $(x_a, y_a) = (x_a^*, y_a^*), \forall a \neq a'$  and  $(x_{a'}, y_{a'}) =$

$(x_{a'}^* - 1, 1)$ . It is easy to prove that this new solution is also optimal because it satisfies the constraints (15), (16), (17), (18) and has the same objective value (14).  $\square$

We can derive from Lemma 1 the following dominance property:

$$My_a \geq x_a \quad \forall a \in A \setminus A' \quad (21)$$

where  $M$  is a large number representing an upper bound on the number of times an arc  $a$  is used. Its value can be taken as  $|A|$ .

Dominance constraints can also be derived, based on covering considerations. Let  $a_i, a_j \in A \setminus A'$ . Arc  $a_i$  is said to dominate arc  $a_j$  if for all  $w_l \in W$ ,  $\lambda_{il} \geq \lambda_{jl}$ . The following constraints proposed in [7] are valid for the CEARP:

$$y_i + y_j \leq 1 \quad \forall a_i, a_j \in A \setminus A' \\ \text{and if } a_i \text{ dominates } a_j, \text{ or conversely.} \quad (22)$$

We also note that the constraints (21) and (22) can not be used at the same time because of contrary properties. The reason is that the former implies that if an arc that can cover a customer is traversed, then it is always used with service while the latter limits the use of arcs with service only when necessary.

All the valid inequalities of the set covering polytope  $\text{conv}\{x : \sum b_a \cdot y_a \geq 1, y_a \in \{0, 1\}\}$  are valid for the CEARP. Balas and Ng [12] proposed the facets with coefficients in  $\{0, 1, 2\}$  and Sánchez-García et al. [13] introduced the more complex facets with coefficients in  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ . Here, we recall the first inequality that was used in [7]. Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $W$  and define for each  $a \in A$  the coefficient

$$\alpha_a^S = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lambda_{al} = 0 \text{ for all } w_l \in S, \\ 2 & \text{if } \lambda_{al} = 1 \text{ for all } w_l \in S, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the following inequality is valid for the CEARP:

$$\sum_{a \in A} \alpha_a^S y_a \geq 2 \quad \forall a \in A \setminus A' \text{ and } \forall S \subset W : |S| > 0. \quad (23)$$

The connectivity constraints (18) can be strengthened by adding information about the covering constraint. The following constraint is a stronger form of connectivity:

$$x\left(\delta^+(S)\right) + y\left(\delta^+(S)\right) \geq 1 \quad (24)$$

where  $S \subset V$  and at least one customer of  $W$  is not covered by any arc in  $A(V \setminus S)$ .

### 2.3. Separation of cuts

We now present separation procedures for each class of valid inequalities described in the previous subsection. To simplify the presentation, we give the details only for F3. The separation of cuts for F2 is similar. Let  $(x^*, y^*)$  be a fractional solution to be separated. Let  $G^*$  be the weighted graph induced by  $(x^*, y^*)$  such that the capacity of each arc  $C_a = x_a^* + y_a^*$ .

The detection of constraints of type (20), (21), and (22) is straightforward. Although these constraints help to reduce the number of vertices in the branch-and-bound tree, constraints (21) contain the Big-M that decreases the performance of the branch-and-cut algorithm. Since  $M$  is determined by the number of arcs, the larger the instance, the more important the negative impact of  $M$ . Our tests show that when  $M$  can not be closely estimated, a branch-and-cut algorithm without Big-M constraints is normally more efficient than one with Big-M. This is why we use the constraints (20) and (22) in the general case where  $M$  can not be estimated effectively. The constraints (21) are only used if we can find the way to bound  $M$  strictly. Whenever these dominance constraints are used, they are directly included in the initial model because they are almost certainly violated.

For constraints (23), we tested  $|S| = 3$ , as in [7], to reduce the computational effort. The process was still time-consuming because of the large number of customers in the CEARP instances. However, we observe that the zero-half cut of CPLEX can generate this type of constraint. Our tests show that using the CPLEX cut is more effective and faster than directly applying (23).

We will present an example to show how a zero-half cut can generate the constraints (23). Suppose there is a graph with three arcs  $a_1, a_2$ , and  $a_3$  serving three customers  $w_1, w_2$ , and  $w_3$ . These customers can be served by the arcs  $(a_2, a_3)$ ,  $(a_1, a_3)$ , and  $(a_1, a_2)$ , respectively. The covering constraints (17) for three customers are as follows:  $y_2 + y_3 \geq 1, y_1 + y_3 \geq 1$ , and  $y_1 + y_2 \geq 1$ .



By considering the sum of these three constraints, dividing the resulting constraint by 2, and rounding its right-hand side, we get the zero-half cut:  $y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \geq 2$ . This constraint has the same form as (23). Hence, the CPLEX zero-half cut can generate the constraints (23).

The connectivity constraints (18) can be separated by both heuristic and exact methods. In the heuristic method, we first compute the connected components  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_q$  of the subgraph  $G^*$ . If the number of connected components is at least two (i.e.,  $q \geq 2$ ) then  $x(\delta^+(S_i)) + y(\delta^+(S_i)) \geq y_a$ , for each component  $i$  and each  $a \in A(S_i)$ , is a violated inequality. We can also separate these constraints exactly in polynomial time by applying the following algorithm:

- For each node  $i \in V \setminus \{v_0\}$ : Compute the maximum flow from  $i$  to depot  $v_0$ . Let  $\delta^+(S_i)$ ,  $S_i \subseteq V \setminus \{v_0\}$  be the min-cut and let  $f_i$  be the value of this flow.
- For each arc  $a = (v_i, v_j) \in A$  and  $x_a \neq 0$ : If  $f_i < x_a$ , then a violated connectivity constraint has been found.

Let  $f_a$  be the maximum flow passing through arc  $a = (v_i, v_j)$ . To ensure connectivity from the depot to arc  $a$ , there must be at least a flow of  $x_a$  passing through  $a$ . Note that  $f_i \geq f_a$ . Then, if  $f_i < x_a$ , we have  $f_a < x_a$ . Hence,  $f_i < x_a$  is a violated constraint. On the other hand, if  $f_i \geq x_a$ , we can always send a flow of at least  $x_a$  through  $a$  and connectivity is ensured. If the Edmonds-Karp algorithm, which runs in  $\mathcal{O}(|V||A|^2)$  time, is used to solve the maximum flow problems, the running time of this procedure is  $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2|A|^2)$ .

Finally, constraints (24) can be generated by a heuristic similar to that proposed for (18). Compute the connected components  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_q$  of the subgraph  $G(x^*, y^*)$  induced by the arcs  $a \in A$  with  $x^* + y^* \geq \epsilon$ , where  $0 \leq \epsilon < 1$  is a given parameter. If the number of connected components is at least two (i.e.,  $q \geq 2$ ), and the arcs with two endpoints in  $V \setminus S$  can not cover all the customers and  $x^*(\delta^+(S_i)) + y^*(\delta^+(S_i)) < 1$  then  $x(\delta^+(S_i)) + y(\delta^+(S_i)) \geq 1$  for each component  $i = 1, \dots, q$  is a violated inequality.

#### 2.4. Upper bound for CEARP

In this subsection, we introduce a fast heuristic called UB1 that gives feasible solutions for the CEARP. This heuristic is used in the exact algorithm

to provide an initial upper bound. It is based on the algorithm proposed for the DRPP [2] and is as follows:

**Step 1.** Solve an integer program including the constraints (1), (3), (4), and (6) using CPLEX. The solution of this MIP is rapid even for the large instances in our tests.

**Step 2.** Construct a directed graph  $G_R = (V_R, A_R)$  induced by the solution from Step 1, adding the depot if it is not already present. If  $G_R$  is connected then stop; the solution found in Step 1 is also a feasible solution for the CEARP. Otherwise, go to Step 3.

**Step 3.** Compute the connected components  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k$  of the graph  $G_R$ . Let  $K_i$  be the set of vertices corresponding to the connected component  $i$ . Build the undirected graph  $\bar{G} = (N, E)$  with set of vertices  $N = 1, \dots, k$  and set of edges  $E = \{(i, j), i, j \in N, i \neq j\}$ . The corresponding edge costs are  $c_{ij} = \min\{c(p, q) + c(q, p), p \in K_i, q \in K_j\}$  for each edge  $(i, j) \in E$ , where  $c(p, q)$  is the length of the shortest path from vertex  $p$  in component  $i$  to vertex  $q$  in component  $j$ . Determine a minimum-cost spanning tree in  $\bar{G}$ . Let  $A_T$  be the set of arcs in the original graph corresponding to the edges in the tree. Add to  $\bar{G}$  all the arcs of  $A_T$ .

### 2.5. Branch-and-cut algorithms

We first introduce a procedure that can reduce the number of customers. Given  $w_l \in W$ , let  $Z(w_l)$  be the set of arcs that can cover  $w_l$ . For each pair of customers  $w_i$  and  $w_j$ , if  $Z(w_i) \subseteq Z(w_j)$  then customer  $w_i$  can be ignored. This is because when  $w_j$  is served,  $w_i$  is covered at the same time. Note that the number of customers remaining is also the maximum number of arcs that must be activated for covering purposes. This procedure eliminates at least 50% of the customers in our tests.

We solve the CEARP exactly using a classic branch-and-cut algorithm. To simplify the description we describe the algorithm only for F3; the implementation is similar for F1 and F2. We solve a linear program containing the constraints (15), (16), (17), (20), (21) (or (22)), and constraints  $0 \leq y_a \leq 1$ . We then search for violated constraints of type (18) and (24), and the constraints detected are added to the current LP, which is then reoptimized. This process is repeated until all the constraints are satisfied. If there are fractional variables, we branch to generate two new subproblems. If all the variables are integer, we explore another subproblem.

Because the exact separation for (18) is quite time-consuming, after numerous tests, we decided to apply it only at the root node. More precisely,

at every node, we first find the strongly connected components of the graph created by the current variables. For each component, we check which customers are covered. If these customers can not be covered by the arcs outside the component, a constraint of type (24) is found. Otherwise, a constraint of type (18) is detected and added to the current program. At the root node, if this procedure fails to find violated constraints, we carry out the exact separation method. In other words, the exact separation of constraint (18) is used at the root node only if the heuristic fails. At the other nodes, only heuristic separation is applied. For F1, since we can not find any way to closely estimate  $M$  in constraints (5), the exact separation is useless for these constraints. Therefore, only the heuristic method is used even at the root node.

Our branch-and-cut algorithm is built around CPLEX 11.2 with the Callable Library. All CPLEX cuts except the zero-half cut are turned off. The parameter CPX-PARAM-ZEROHALFCUTS is set to 2 to generate zero-half cuts aggressively. All the other CPLEX parameters are set to their default values.

We tested several branching techniques, such as branching on the variables  $y$  before  $x$  as in [7] and branching on the variables  $x$  before  $y$ , but these do not outperform the CPLEX branching. Hence, we let CPLEX make the branching decisions.

In [6], a branch-and-cut algorithm based on F2 is developed to solve the GDRPP. The differences with our algorithm are that all the cuts of CPLEX 9.1 are turned on by default, the constraints (24) are not used, and the exact method to separate the connectivity constraints (11) is used at all nodes in the search tree. We also note that zero-half cuts were not implemented in CPLEX 9.1.

### *2.6. A MIP-based constructive algorithm*

In this subsection, we propose an algorithm called UB2 that gives good solutions for the CEARP. In practice, arcs are usually traversed just a few times, and the number of traversals is much lower than the lowest provable value of  $M$ . This suggests that we can bound the large number  $M$  in the branch-and-cut algorithm by a small value to improve performance. To ensure that a solution exists, a Chinese postman problem (CPP) is first solved, and  $M$  is determined by the maximum number of times an arc is traversed in the CPP solution. We use only F2 and F3 to construct this algorithm. For

F3, the dominance constraint (21) is used and added directly to the initial model.

### 3. Computational experiments

In this section, we describe the CEARP instances and the computational evaluation of the proposed algorithms. Our algorithm is coded in C/C++ and is run on a 2.4 GHz CPU with 6 GB of RAM. The running time of the branch-and-cut algorithms is limited to 2 hours for each instance.

#### 3.1. Data instances

We first use the CEARP instances of [5], which are random instances based on directed graphs. We now recall how to build these instances. Graphs that imitate real street networks are first generated randomly; this procedure is as follows:

- The coordinates of  $n$  vertices are randomly generated in a unit square. Then a heuristic is used to find the shortest tour passing through all the nodes exactly once. This tour is a Hamiltonian circuit, and it is used as a framework to construct the full graph. The resulting graph is therefore strongly connected.
- To imitate real networks, random arcs are added to the current tour to give a total of  $m = nd$  arcs, where  $n$  is the number of vertices and  $d$  the ratio between the number of arcs and the number of nodes, in such a way that: (i) the arcs are not too long, and (ii) there is no intersection between any two arcs.

In the tests in [5], graphs with  $n \in \{300, 400, 500\}$  vertices and a ratio  $d \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5, 3\}$  are used. For each combination of  $n$  and  $d$ , five different graphs are generated. The cost of an arc  $(v_i, v_j)$  is the Euclidean distance between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  multiplied by five to obtain an average arc length close to that seen in practice (from about 0.2 to 0.4 km).

Once the graphs have been built, the CEARP instances are generated by randomly positioning  $q = mt$  customer nodes in the square containing the graph, where  $m$  is the number of arcs and  $t$  the ratio between the number of customers and the number of arcs,  $t \in \{0.5, 1, 5, 10\}$ . Thus, for each graph, four CEARP instances are created. The effective radius  $r$  is set to 150 m. The distance between the arcs and the customer vertices are computed by

the distance from the closest point of the arc to the customer. To ensure that a solution exists, we delete all the customers that can not be covered by any arc. We also examine the impact of increasing the radius parameter from 150 m to 200 m. To do this, we use the graph created with  $r = 150$  m but change the read range to 200 m.

From the instances of [5], we choose the largest ones with 500 nodes and 1500 arcs ( $r=150$  m), and 500 nodes and 1000 arcs ( $r=200$  m) to test our algorithms. The instances are labeled *ce-n-k-r-t-i*, where  $n$  is the number of nodes,  $k$  is the number of arcs,  $r$  is the read range,  $t$  is the ratio between the number of customers and the number of arcs, and  $i$  ( $=1, \dots, 5$ ) is the instance number. For example, *ce-500-1500-150-10-5* indicates the 5th instance with 500 nodes, 1500 arcs, 150 m of read range, and  $t = 10$ .

We also use mixed graphs from the literature to generate instances for the CEARP. We choose the mixed graphs introduced in [14] for which the coordinates of the vertices are published. These are large graphs with a structure similar to that of real street networks. To transform the mixed graphs to directed graphs, we model each undirected edge by two arcs with the same cost. From these graphs, we select two, MB537 and MB547, which, after being transformed to directed graphs, have fewer than 1500 arcs. MB357 has 500 nodes, 364 edges, and 476 arcs and MB547 has 500 nodes, 351 edges, and 681 arcs.

For the mixed graphs, the procedure to generate the customers is the same, except that the read range  $r$  is determined by the average length of all the arcs in the graph. For each graph and each value of  $t$ , we generate five CEARP instances.

We also test our algorithms on 30 instances defined on undirected graphs. We use two sets of graphs taken from [15] with 15 general routing problem instances each, generated from the Albaida and Madrigueras graphs proposed in [16] by defining each edge as being required with probability  $P = \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ . The Albaida graph includes 116 nodes and 174 edges, and the Madrigueras graph has 196 nodes and 316 edges. From these graphs, we generate CEARP instances as follows:

- The number of clients is defined by the number of required edges in the graph; each client is covered by a required edge.
- Each client is covered by  $e$  additional required edges where  $e$  is a random number taking values from 1 to 5, so that each client is covered by at least 2 and at most 6 edges.

To solve the undirected instances as directed instances, we transform each edge into two arcs with the same cost. As in other arc routing problems defined on undirected graphs (see [17], for example), it is easy to prove that, for a given CEARP instance defined on an undirected graph, an optimal solution exists in which no edge is traversed more than twice. This allows us to fix the large number  $M$  to 2 in F2 and to 1 in F3. Therefore, we use the dominance constraints of type (21) for the undirected instances. Note that, in this case, all variables in F3 are now binary. For the directed and mixed instances where  $M$  cannot be estimated effectively, the constraints (22) are used.

### 3.2. Comparisons of lower bounds

The first set of results compares the lower bounds obtained at the root node of our branch-and-cut algorithms. These are based on the formulations F1–F3 and the formulation similar to that in [6] in which all the CPLEX cuts except the zero-half cuts are turned on. The formulations are tested on the directed-graph instances of [5]. The results are given in Table 2. This table presents, for each formulation F1, F2 and F3, the lower bound obtained at the root node ( $lb_i$ ). The value  $lb_4$  is the lower bound obtained by the branch-and-cut algorithm of [6]. The best results are in bold.

The results shown in Table 2 indicate that the  $lb_4$  bounds are always worse than the  $lb_2$  bounds. This proves the efficiency of the addition of zero-half cuts in CPLEX. The results also imply that the formulations F2 and F3 are more efficient than F1. It seems that F3 is slightly better than F2, since  $lb_3$  is larger than  $lb_2$  in 30 of the 40 instances.

### 3.3. Overall comparisons

Table 3 compares the five exact algorithms for the CEARP in terms of the number of instances successfully solved to optimality. Column F0 gives the results for the cutting-plane method introduced in [5], and columns F1, F2, and F3 give the results for our three branch-and-cut algorithms based on the corresponding formulations. Column F4 presents the number of successful instances for the algorithm proposed in [6] using CPLEX 11.2 instead of 9.1 which contains, among other improvements, the zero-half cuts. Again, the formulations are tested on the directed-graph instances of [5].

From Table 3, an interesting observation is that the branch-and-cut algorithms based on F1 and proposed in [6] are worse than the cutting-plane method introduced in [5]. The branch-and-cut algorithms based on F2 and

Instance	$lb_1$	$lb_2$	$lb_3$	$lb_4$
ce500-1500-150-0.5-1	97408.9	100806.7	<b>102217.6</b>	97120.2
ce500-1500-150-0.5-2	91174.4	<b>94106.2</b>	93793.5	90109.9
ce500-1500-150-0.5-3	105610.5	109639.3	<b>109641.2</b>	102412.4
ce500-1500-150-0.5-4	89407.1	<b>92052.3</b>	92023.0	86579.5
ce500-1500-150-0.5-5	97380.9	99276.9	<b>100212.6</b>	93786.0
ce500-1500-150-1-1	124365.7	126587.0	<b>127317.0</b>	122182.1
ce500-1500-150-1-2	119585.3	121820.3	<b>122007.2</b>	116832.0
ce500-1500-150-1-3	129284.2	<b>131544.9</b>	131222.7	126613.8
ce500-1500-150-1-4	109707.3	112258.5	<b>113558.1</b>	108049.6
ce500-1500-150-1-5	112212.1	<b>114481.8</b>	113600.8	106513.5
ce500-1500-150-5-1	158893.7	160143.6	<b>160772.9</b>	157372.1
ce500-1500-150-5-2	158452.9	159078.5	<b>159897.7</b>	157100.3
ce500-1500-150-5-3	174584.4	<b>176492.5</b>	176166.2	171283.5
ce500-1500-150-5-4	149310.1	150954.0	<b>150965.4</b>	147512.2
ce500-1500-150-5-5	159917.1	161005.9	<b>161236.8</b>	156457.5
ce500-1500-150-10-1	172904.7	173757.7	<b>174219.1</b>	170685.1
ce500-1500-150-10-2	171701.5	172117.5	<b>172691.4</b>	169647.9
ce500-1500-150-10-3	183425.9	184383.5	<b>184608.3</b>	180971.4
ce500-1500-150-10-4	160815.3	161200.2	<b>161279.4</b>	157174.1
ce500-1500-150-10-5	166463.3	166789.9	<b>167919.9</b>	163820.5
ce500-1000-200-0.5-1	68866.5	70697.9	<b>73487.9</b>	65020.4
ce500-1000-200-0.5-2	75673.2	79838.8	<b>82208.3</b>	74942.7
ce500-1000-200-0.5-3	75831.4	79291.9	<b>86063.8</b>	70341.0
ce500-1000-200-0.5-4	64885.7	72082.7	<b>73116.8</b>	68179.2
ce500-1000-200-0.5-5	78765.6	<b>83502.2</b>	83082.8	79526.7
ce500-1000-200-1-1	75801.9	79880.2	<b>80334.8</b>	71999.5
ce500-1000-200-1-2	83930.2	85511.7	<b>88301.9</b>	75334.9
ce500-1000-200-1-3	90527.1	94697.9	<b>95175.6</b>	90869.7
ce500-1000-200-1-4	73571.1	77859.5	<b>79749.0</b>	75844.6
ce500-1000-200-1-5	87119.4	<b>91569.9</b>	90790.5	88867.4
ce500-1000-200-5-1	94893.6	98107.2	<b>98547.0</b>	93816.3
ce500-1000-200-5-2	105008.9	108094.2	<b>108484.0</b>	104636.4
ce500-1000-200-5-3	110631.7	<b>113553.4</b>	112952.4	112829.9
ce500-1000-200-5-4	98142.1	99483.7	<b>103466.7</b>	97615.6
ce500-1000-200-5-5	108961.5	111696.9	<b>111932.5</b>	110569.1
ce500-1000-200-10-1	108402.9	<b>110222.7</b>	109062.8	107673.1
ce500-1000-200-10-2	108827.2	<b>112565.9</b>	112129.0	110069.1
ce500-1000-200-10-3	123741.6	125644.3	<b>125647.7</b>	124849.3
ce500-1000-200-10-4	111134.0	112184.6	<b>115022.7</b>	111502.0
ce500-1000-200-10-5	124283.3	126852.4	<b>127171.7</b>	124776.1

Table 2: Comparison of lower bounds of the four algorithms

Data	F0	F1	F2	F3	F4
ce500-1500-0.5	0	0	0	0	0
ce500-1500-1	1	0	2	2	0
ce500-1500-5	4	3	5	5	2
ce500-1500-10	5	5	5	5	4
ce500-1000-0.5	2	0	1	3	1
ce500-1000-1	3	2	4	4	2
ce500-1000-5	5	3	5	5	4
ce500-1000-10	5	5	5	5	5

Table 3: Number of successful instances

F3 outperform the others. For  $r = 150$  m, it seems that F2 and F3 are equivalent. For  $r = 200$  m, F3 is better because it can solve 2 instances with  $t = 0.5$  that F2 can not. Therefore, in the next subsection, we compare only F2 and F3 on other criteria and other instances.

#### 3.4. Detailed comparisons of directed-graph instances

This subsection provides the results for the branch-and-cut algorithms using F2 and F3. For each formulation, Table 4 shows the time required (time), the gap (gap), and the solution value (result), and Table 5 presents the number of dominance constraints of type (22) (*domi*), the number of zero-half cuts (*zero*), the number of connectivity cuts (*user*), and the number of vertices (*bb*) in the branch-and-bound tree. The gap for F3 is better than that for F2. F3 also finds better solutions than F2. We believe this is because F2 contains Big-M constraints that lead to numerical difficulties because of the many generated connectivity constraints (the *user* column in Table 5). These increase the size of the model, and so CPLEX needs more time to process each node. Therefore, there are less chances to find good solutions. In contrast, the branch-and-bound tree of F3 is much larger. This is because we use the constraints (22) instead of the constraints (21) to reduce the size of the search tree and it seems that the constraints (21) are more efficient than the constraints (22).

#### 3.5. Comparisons of undirected- and mixed-graph instances

Table 6 gives the results for the two formulations on undirected-graph instances. F3 can solve the instance MADR-7-3 that F2 can not. It is also faster on 22 of 30 instances. Therefore, on undirected instances F3 outperforms F2. Note that in this case, all the variables of F3 are binary and this is probably why F3 is better than F2.



Data	F2			F3		
	time	gap	result	time	gap	result
ce500-1500-150-0.5-1	7202.29	4.21	106474.2	7202.77	1.76	105231.4
ce500-1500-150-0.5-2	7202.72	3.34	97900.6	7203.01	2.13	97435.3
ce500-1500-150-0.5-3	7202.46	0.82	112363.3	7202.91	0.39	112129.6
ce500-1500-150-0.5-4	7202.45	2.23	95657.7	7202.98	2.53	95778.1
ce500-1500-150-0.5-5	7202.51	2.35	102603.2	7202.91	0.98	102323.9
ce500-1500-150-1-1	7206.93	1.25	129790.7	7207.52	0.40	129659.7
ce500-1500-150-1-2	505.35	0	123123.0	278.86	0	123123.0
ce500-1500-150-1-3	121.73	0	133418.3	598.91	0	133418.3
ce500-1500-150-1-4	7206.53	2.11	116531.6	7207.07	1.04	116058.8
ce500-1500-150-1-5	7206.48	2.21	117967.2	7206.98	1.55	117003.4
ce500-1500-150-5-1	452.86	0	162097.8	278.01	0	162097.8
ce500-1500-150-5-2	128.71	0	160792.7	101.33	0	160792.7
ce500-1500-150-5-3	166.73	0	177242.4	122.72	0	177242.4
ce500-1500-150-5-4	64.19	0	151852.9	78.69	0	151852.9
ce500-1500-150-5-5	147.09	0	161833.4	191.63	0	161833.4
ce500-1500-150-10-1	152.53	0	174504.1	174.82	0	174504.1
ce500-1500-150-10-2	212.81	0	173404.5	190.57	0	173404.5
ce500-1500-150-10-3	197.64	0	185330.8	201.41	0	185330.8
ce500-1500-150-10-4	201.64	0	162071.7	222.80	0	162071.7
ce500-1500-150-10-5	945.25	0	168734.3	240.02	0	168734.3
ce500-1000-200-0.5-1	7200.69	1.59	76033.0	4275.83	0	76033.0
ce500-1000-200-0.5-2	7200.78	1.22	84311.6	385.83	0	84237.2
ce500-1000-200-0.5-3	7200.74	12.82	95790.2	7200.95	0.80	89653.5
ce500-1000-200-0.5-4	7200.71	2.51	76226.2	7201.04	1.52	76084.4
ce500-1000-200-0.5-5	137.05	0	85097.0	1714.54	0	85097.0
ce500-1000-200-1-1	461.58	0	82687.1	4440.20	0	82687.1
ce500-1000-200-1-2	140.30	0	89896.5	257.57	0	89896.5
ce500-1000-200-1-3	6209.50	0	98051.8	279.85	0	98051.8
ce500-1000-200-1-4	7202.02	1.95	82682.3	7202.20	0.41	82344.2
ce500-1000-200-1-5	38.03	0	91915.6	59.10	0	91915.6
ce500-1000-200-5-1	130.37	0	100395.3	1233.24	0	100395.3
ce500-1000-200-5-2	36.33	0	109318.5	92.57	0	109318.5
ce500-1000-200-5-3	121.71	0	114362.3	121.69	0	114362.3
ce500-1000-200-5-4	57.89	0	103790.9	75.01	0	103970.9
ce500-1000-200-5-5	19.58	0	112625.0	52.97	0	112625.0
ce500-1000-200-10-1	67.97	0	110527.9	119.54	0	110527.9
ce500-1000-200-10-2	57.21	0	113694.1	83.24	0	113694.1
ce500-1000-200-10-3	82.84	0	126659.9	95.27	0	123733.9
ce500-1000-200-10-4	69.35	0	115281.4	54.81	0	115281.4
ce500-1000-200-10-5	44.56	0	128163.2	58.86	0	128163.2

Table 4: Comparison of performance of F2 and F3

Data	F2			F3			
	<i>zero</i>	<i>user</i>	<i>bb</i>	<i>domi</i>	<i>zero</i>	<i>user</i>	<i>bb</i>
ce500-1500-150-0.5-1	259	19913	5817	3293	1910	9334	61903
ce500-1500-150-0.5-2	263	20036	6236	3575	2374	3701	113037
ce500-1500-150-0.5-3	390	9797	16080	2998	2785	1818	169909
ce500-1500-150-0.5-4	592	7189	30983	3469	2658	4539	71536
ce500-1500-150-0.5-5	349	17751	12756	3333	2426	4453	66482
ce500-1500-150-1-1	269	16305	11690	2797	2567	1540	264117
ce500-1500-150-1-2	686	2015	16271	2644	1569	361	20852
ce500-1500-150-1-3	427	1229	3969	2900	2053	1300	40877
ce500-1500-150-1-4	418	7696	22392	2791	2101	2778	125514
ce500-1500-150-1-5	262	15410	12192	3044	2029	6288	48432
ce500-1500-150-5-1	355	3663	3119	2243	1140	264	33910
ce500-1500-150-5-2	340	535	1270	2293	664	177	1561
ce500-1500-150-5-3	246	2040	343	2444	467	328	716
ce500-1500-150-5-4	231	158	136	2159	529	124	1047
ce500-1500-150-5-5	366	224	582	2226	984	149	4817
ce500-1500-150-10-1	242	164	174	2152	400	46	144
ce500-1500-150-10-2	289	1013	1286	2425	667	135	1158
ce500-1500-150-10-3	244	512	141	2259	376	448	487
ce500-1500-150-10-4	301	211	292	2396	806	92	2667
ce500-1500-150-10-5	639	6493	5309	2152	948	129	2741
ce500-1000-200-0.5-1	200	17037	11274	2110	3179	2845	180230
ce500-1000-200-0.5-2	160	27332	8960	1972	1618	1064	26006
ce500-1000-200-0.5-3	116	37116	1143	1942	4397	2381	194081
ce500-1000-200-0.5-4	196	18965	21752	1989	1572	8734	64879
ce500-1000-200-0.5-5	218	3417	1146	1994	3372	2458	51554
ce500-1000-200-1-1	272	6291	4822	1666	2106	6997	104788
ce500-1000-200-1-2	338	2709	3206	1590	1668	1232	10894
ce500-1000-200-1-3	148	29035	2314	1520	1613	738	18844
ce500-1000-200-1-4	230	19286	17746	1444	681	8147	79627
ce500-1000-200-1-5	160	945	70	1456	636	495	3987
ce500-1000-200-5-1	214	2670	785	1146	2354	2546	64371
ce500-1000-200-5-2	182	221	125	1245	527	162	1329
ce500-1000-200-5-3	164	2870	285	1024	652	1656	3312
ce500-1000-200-5-4	161	1376	176	1070	385	137	266
ce500-1000-200-5-5	142	156	27	1208	339	264	194
ce500-1000-200-10-1	162	298	46	1020	568	257	2052
ce500-1000-200-10-2	273	810	194	1306	812	116	5612
ce500-1000-200-10-3	146	979	305	1067	421	733	1549
ce500-1000-200-10-4	133	961	79	1104	224	21	18
ce500-1000-200-10-5	134	192	27	1191	449	107	468

Table 5: Details of branch-and-cut algorithms for F2 and F3

Data	F2					F3				
	lbl	gap	bb	time	result	lbl	gap	bb	time	result
ALBA-3-1	2391.8	0	236	5.34	2511	2319.2	0	209	2.08	2511
ALBA-3-2	2124.7	0	119	4.14	2324	2011.2	0	74	2.15	2324
ALBA-3-3	2012.8	0	74	1.88	2155	2070.7	0	30	1.32	2155
ALBA-3-4	2363.7	0	959	53.42	3074	2621.0	0	334	13.39	3074
ALBA-3-5	2244.0	0	71	3.63	2440	2355.1	0	21	2.04	2440
ALBA-5-1	2845.0	0	703	28.15	3125	2712.3	0	1105	24.26	3125
ALBA-5-2	2468.3	0	637	24.70	2926	2480.5	0	1655	35.78	2926
ALBA-5-3	3013.8	0	279	9.93	3170	2961.5	0	446	13.12	3170
ALBA-5-4	2447.8	0	298	8.78	2584	2405.8	0	433	7.77	2584
ALBA-5-5	2472.4	0	477	24.66	2642	2535.6	0	112	3.22	2642
ALBA-7-1	2989.7	0	495	21.33	3397	2879.4	0	528	13.64	3397
ALBA-7-2	3200.1	0	793	29.71	3558	3192.1	0	740	21.77	3558
ALBA-7-3	3234.6	0	1939	68.88	3647	3125.3	0	1913	64.31	3647
ALBA-7-4	3255.8	0	365	15.20	3461	3264.4	0	789	24.63	3461
ALBA-7-5	2540.8	0	401	23.27	2821	2642.5	0	249	8.81	2821
MADR-3-1	2511.2	0	11215	2027.39	2925	2658.0	0	4757	137.62	2925
MADR-3-2	3103.3	0	10653	1972.94	3665	3197.5	0	28755	2731.95	3665
MADR-3-3	2580.7	0	2556	366.50	3045	2714.9	0	2516	112.25	3045
MADR-3-4	2829.3	0	8838	2463.51	3295	2936.4	0	11386	794.31	3295
MADR-3-5	2704.7	0	3603	552.06	3165	2760.4	0	7960	1303.2	3165
MADR-5-1	3479.6	0	7116	1398.53	3945	3568.7	0	4261	593.94	3945
MADR-5-2	4234.9	0	3124	280.35	4570	4239.4	0	6871	213.86	4570
MADR-5-3	3850.6	0	17362	4067.07	4505	3810.2	0	4395	480.13	4505
MADR-5-4	3780.9	0	1526	184.09	4020	3840.0	0	2605	180.52	4120
MADR-5-5	3583.5	0	7894	1156.25	4010	3695.5	0	6199	738.96	4010
MADR-7-1	4287.3	0	5041	850.95	4645	4329.4	0	14985	2512.30	4645
MADR-7-2	4363.8	0	7424	1499.57	4650	4350.3	0	4825	477.29	4650
MADR-7-3	4120.9	1.05	33074	7200.08	4620	4234.8	0	16184	2128.87	4620
MADR-7-4	4190.7	2.27	27065	7200.07	4655	4186.7	2.48	39664	7200.06	4645
MADR-7-5	4370.1	0	12706	2958.65	4735	4338.2	0	23533	4535.04	4735

Table 6: Comparison of performance of F2 and F3 on undirected instances

Data	F2					F3				
	succ	gap	bb	time	result	succ	gap	bb	time	result
MB0537-0.5	4	1.75	10330.2	3379.42	17592.0	0	1.07	38679.6	7200.72	17460.4
MB0537-1	3	0.59	10425.2	4707.06	18646.8	0	1.33	63897.2	7201.54	18671.4
MB0537-5	5	0	3242.0	185.89	21712.2	3	0.19	138095.6	3937.83	21712.2
MB0537-10	5	0	1040.2	74.01	22666.2	5	0	163733.6	2418.27	22666.2
MB0547-0.5	0	9.28	5450.2	7200.63	15559.8	0	6.95	19457.4	7201.09	15489.2
MB0547-1	0	3.38	14069	7201.74	17155.0	0	3.48	42625.4	7202.20	17216.2
MB0547-5	5	0	4428.6	470.27	21343.2	4	0.13	27233.8	1639.97	21343.2
MB0547-10	5	0	1461.6	79.97	22404.0	5	0	31992.4	756.16	22404.0

Table 7: Comparison of performance of F2 and F3 on mixed-graph instances

Table 7 gives the results for mixed-graph instances. All the results are averages over five instances. F2 can solve more instances than F3 but once again its gap is, in some cases, poor.

### 3.6. Results for upper bounds

Tables 8 and 9 give the results for algorithms UB1 and UB2. In these tables,  $M_{CPP}$  is the value of  $M$  calculated by solving the CPP problems. The names of instances in bold indicate that these instances were proved optimal by the branch-and-cut algorithms. The BnC Time column gives the running time in seconds of the branch-and-cut algorithm based on F2. The Gap column displays the gap in percent of upper bounds to the best solutions found by the two branch-and-cut algorithms in the previous subsection. The negative results imply that the upper-bound algorithms found better solutions than the branch-and-cut algorithms. From the results of the exact algorithms, we observe that an arc is rarely crossed more than 5 times in the solution. Therefore, we also test the MIP-based constructive algorithms with  $M = 5$ . Note that this algorithm is not competitive on undirected-graph instances because in these cases we can bound the large number  $M$  efficiently. When  $M$  is bounded more strictly, F2 is much better than F3, so we do not present the results of the algorithm for F3.

The results for directed- and mixed-graph instances show the good performance of the algorithm UB2. It not only finds better solutions but is also faster in almost all the instances that the branch-and-cut algorithms can not solve exactly. The performance of algorithm with  $M = 5$  is slightly better than with  $M = M_{CPP}$  but bounding  $M$  too strictly can make the problem infeasible, two instances **ce500-1500-5-3-150** and **ce500-1500-10-3-150** for example. The quality of UB1 is poor, especially on the directed-graph instances

where  $r = 200$  m as well as on the mixed-graph instances. It only works better on the easy instances with  $r = 150$  m and  $t = 0.5, 1$ . However, it is much faster than UB2.

#### 4. Conclusion

We have proposed a new formulation for the CEARP. In contrast to two formulations in the literature, this formulation has an important advantage: it does not require Big-M constraints. Branch-and-cut algorithms have been developed for three formulations, and the three formulations have been compared. The results show that the branch-and-cut algorithms based on our new formulation and on the formulation of [6] outperform the other algorithms considered. In comparison with the formulation of [6], our new formulation is better on directed- and undirected-graph instances but worse on mixed-graph instances. Normally, our new formulation gives a better gap, but an enormous branch-and-bound tree is the price to pay. We also propose a MIP-based constructive heuristic for the CEARP on directed- and mixed-graph instances based on the formulation of [6] in which the large number  $M$  is bounded more strictly.

Data	UB1		UB2-F2, $M=5$		UB2-F2, $M=M_{CPP}$			Bnc
	Time	Gap	Time	Gap	$M_{CPP}$	Time	Gap	Time
ce500-1500-150-0.5-1	6.93	14.71	3819.53	-0.32	11	1128.79	-0.32	7202.29
ce500-1500-150-0.5-2	7.49	16.97	473.07	-0.69	12	1084.34	-0.69	7202.72
ce500-1500-150-0.5-3	7.80	15.81	141.14	-0.02	15	171.44	-0.02	7202.46
ce500-1500-150-0.5-4	8.28	13.30	1337.99	-0.80	12	7202.44	-0.79	7202.45
ce500-1500-150-0.5-5	7.30	13.97	1699.12	-0.33	10	7202.37	-0.33	7202.51
ce500-1500-150-1-1	10.97	10.02	143.32	-0.07	11	129.40	-0.07	7206.93
<b>ce500-1500-150-1-2</b>	11.25	6.24	83.17	0	12	90.92	0	505.35
<b>ce500-1500-150-1-3</b>	11.50	6.39	153.90	0	15	121.17	0	121.73
ce500-1500-150-1-4	11.60	12.62	480.28	-0.10	12	746.87	-0.10	7206.53
ce500-1500-150-1-5	11.19	11.38	7206.52	-0.12	10	7206.26	0.03	7206.48
<b>ce500-1500-150-5-1</b>	57.61	2.94	140.66	0	11	117.08	0	452.86
<b>ce500-1500-150-5-2</b>	54.70	2.41	133.76	0	12	132.17	0	128.71
<b>ce500-1500-150-5-3</b>	54.15	3.58			15	147.08	0	166.73
<b>ce500-1500-150-5-4</b>	51.24	3.62	93.06	0	12	79.82	0	64.19
<b>ce500-1500-150-5-5</b>	53.93	3.04	147.37	0	10	166.00	0	147.09
<b>ce500-1500-150-10-1</b>	119.36	1.75	143.05	0	11	152.90	0	152.53
<b>ce500-1500-150-10-2</b>	107.62	2.26	164.46	0	12	175.16	0	212.81
<b>ce500-1500-150-10-3</b>	118.05	2.57			15	178.73	0	197.64
<b>ce500-1500-150-10-4</b>	101.88	2.78	175.58	0	12	178.49	0	201.64
<b>ce500-1500-150-10-5</b>	115.54	2.91	250.78	0	10	218.16	0	945.25
<b>ce500-1000-200-0.5-1</b>	4.58	30.25	88.65	0	10	54.29	0	7200.69
<b>ce500-1000-200-0.5-2</b>	4.69	42.00	66.63	0	14	161.62	0	7200.78
ce500-1000-200-0.5-3	4.62	33.06	96.97	0	12	354.75	0	7200.74
ce500-1000-200-0.5-4	4.57	41.92	287.06	-0.17	12	252.59	-0.17	7200.71
<b>ce500-1000-200-0.5-5</b>	4.68	39.59	89.17	0	11	81.70	0	137.05
<b>ce500-1000-200-1-1</b>	5.78	24.22	78.95	0	10	106.86	0	461.58
<b>ce500-1000-200-1-2</b>	5.87	35.84	73.87	0	14	182.10	0	140.30
<b>ce500-1000-200-1-3</b>	6.07	23.36	180.66	0	12	81.72	0	6209.50
ce500-1000-200-1-4	5.94	30.50	112.85	0	12	358.85	0	7202.02
<b>ce500-1000-200-1-5</b>	5.99	28.21	23.47	0	11	15.51	0	38.03
<b>ce500-1000-200-5-1</b>	19.57	30.18	60.29	0	10	97.54	0	130.37
<b>ce500-1000-200-5-2</b>	17.98	10.98	74.72	0	14	81.14	0	36.33
<b>ce500-1000-200-5-3</b>	21.04	10.41	58.55	0	12	71.51	0	121.71
<b>ce500-1000-200-5-4</b>	21.14	18.55	34.15	0	12	42.40	0	57.89
<b>ce500-1000-200-5-5</b>	21.19	18.32	24.90	0	11	28.32	0	19.58
<b>ce500-1000-200-10-1</b>	39.85	9.79	67.88	0	10	95.28	0	67.97
<b>ce500-1000-200-10-2</b>	35.85	6.63	49.28	0	14	55.72	0	57.21
<b>ce500-1000-200-10-3</b>	42.70	4.45	80.61	0	12	86.33	0	82.84
<b>ce500-1000-200-10-4</b>	42.54	11.91	49.51	0	12	46.20	0	69.35
<b>ce500-1000-200-10-5</b>	43.33	12.98	62.41	0	11	57.18	0	444.56

Table 8: Upper bounds based on F2 for directed-graph instances

Data	UB1		UB2-F2, $M=5$		UB2-F2, $M=M_{CPP}$			BnC
	Time	Gap	Time	Gap	$M_{CPP}$	Time	Gap	Time
<b>MB0537-0.5-1</b>	4.77	34.40	345.39	0	7	278.38	0	992.57
<b>MB0537-0.5-2</b>	4.77	39.41	382.67	0	7	397.07	0	4491.65
MB0537-0.5-3	5.04	36.08	2726.26	-0.51	7	981.18	-0.51	7200.69
<b>MB0537-0.5-4</b>	4.73	37.74	146.45	0	7	212.68	0	690.54
<b>MB0537-0.5-5</b>	5.09	31.65	478.33	0	7	214.05	0	3521.67
<b>MB0537-1-1</b>	5.79	33.56	276.76	0	7	155.04	0	1382.62
<b>MB0537-1-2</b>	5.79	33.60	108.31	0	7	127.44	0	3629.55
MB0537-1-3	5.78	33.08	393.87	-0.45	7	287.98	-0.45	7201.13
MB0537-1-4	5.53	38.33	723.45	0	7	3143.52	0	7201.26
<b>MB0537-1-5</b>	5.88	34.87	2471.76	0	7	617.78	0	4120.76
<b>MB0537-5-1</b>	13.40	17.44	274.46	0	7	283.69	0	593.70
<b>MB0537-5-2</b>	13.08	15.59	41.81	0	7	50.01	0	60.67
<b>MB0537-5-3</b>	13.78	18.12	92.07	0	7	96.55	0	138.32
<b>MB0537-5-4</b>	14.10	17.96	63.01	0	7	107.87	0	93.19
<b>MB0537-5-5</b>	13.66	15.07	64.30	0	7	57.08	0	43.58
<b>MB0537-10-1</b>	23.27	13.45	69.48	0	7	72.61	0	73.15
<b>MB0537-10-2</b>	25.68	14.77	67.03	0	7	74.79	0	75.52
<b>MB0537-10-3</b>	25.64	18.29	185.10	0	7	144.82	0	114.87
<b>MB0537-10-4</b>	25.22	11.42	49.43	0	7	30.24	0	30.61
<b>MB0537-10-5</b>	24.12	14.85	40.86	0	7	46.35	0	75.92
MB0547-0.5-1	5.60	44.89	7200.58	-4.03	14	7200.88	-1.40	7200.65
MB0547-0.5-2	5.23	41.12	1460.73	-1.20	14	2645.67	-1.20	7200.60
MB0547-0.5-3	5.22	45.92	7200.57	-1.06	14	2215.78	-1.33	7200.59
MB0547-0.5-4	5.31	39.19	7200.69	-1.34	14	7201.31	-0.65	7200.62
MB0547-0.5-5	5.21	40.64	7200.58	-1.65	14	7200.61	-1.63	7200.68
MB0547-1-1	6.25	36.72	66.54	-0.17	14	233.73	-0.17	7201.69
MB0547-1-2	6.27	33.26	383.36	-0.31	14	1211.10	-0.31	7201.86
MB0547-1-3	6.54	26.39	7201.62	-1.06	14	7201.70	-1.09	7201.60
MB0547-1-4	6.20	32.59	954.23	-0.21	14	969.81	-0.21	7201.87
MB0547-1-5	6.21	33.52	7201.62	-0.69	14	7201.59	-0.66	7201.67
<b>MB0547-5-1</b>	17.35	29.24	17.54	0	14	24.49	0	46.89
<b>MB0547-5-2</b>	17.62	40.39	18.28	0	14	43.18	0	32.89
<b>MB0547-5-3</b>	18.28	139.02	18.05	0	14	67.34	0	2158.19
<b>MB0547-5-4</b>	17.27	14.59	33.64	0	14	50.53	0	40.31
<b>MB0547-5-5</b>	17.46	16.91	64.69	0	14	52.02	0	73.08
<b>MB0547-10-1</b>	22.94	44.51	17.99	0	14	48.91	0	98.00
<b>MB0547-10-2</b>	35.85	14.71	60.13	0	14	67.20	0	54.33
<b>MB0547-10-3</b>	32.65	12.50	83.55	0	14	105.39	0	138.32
<b>MB0547-10-4</b>	31.59	11.56	69.47	0	14	64.96	0	47.86
<b>MB0547-10-5</b>	31.88	14.39	55.85	0	14	67.30	0	61.35

Table 9: Upper bounds based on F2 for mixed-graph instances

## References

- [1] N. Christofides, V. Campos, A. Corberán, E. Mota, An algorithm for the rural postman problem on a directed graph, *Mathematical Programming Studies* 26 (1986) 155–166.
- [2] M. O. Ball, M. J. Magazine, Sequencing of insertions in printed circuit board assembly, *Operations Research* 36 (2) (1988) 192–201.
- [3] V. Campos, J. V. Savall, A computational study of several heuristics for the directed rural postman problem, *Computational Optimization and Applications* 4 (1) (1993) 67–77.
- [4] B. Golden, S. Raghavan, E. Wasil, Advances in meter reading: Heuristic solution of the close enough traveling salesman problem over a street network, in: *The Vehicle Routing Problem: Latest Advances and New Challenges*, Springer, 2008, pp. 487–501.
- [5] M.-H. Ha, N. Bostel, A. Langevin, L.-M. Rouseau, An exact algorithm for close enough traveling salesman problem, in: C.-J. Luz, F. Valente (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Operations Research and Enterprise Systems*, Vilamoura, Algarve, Portugal, 2012, pp. 233–238.
- [6] M. Drexler, On some generalized routing problems, Ph.d. dissertation, Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen (2003).
- [7] M. Gendreau, G. Laporte, F. Semet, The covering tour problem, *Operations Research* 45 (1997) 568–576.
- [8] R. Baldacci, M. A. Boschetti, V. Maniezzo, M. Zamboni, Scatter search methods for covering tour problem, in: R. Sharda, S. Voss, C. Rego, B. Alidaee (Eds.), *Metaheuristic optimization via memory and evolution*, Springer Verlag, 2005, pp. 55–91.
- [9] M. Hachicha, M. J. Hodgson, G. Laporte, F. Semet, Heuristics for the multi-vehicle covering tour problem, *Computers and Operations Research* 27 (1) (2000) 29–42.
- [10] D. Gulczynski, J. Heath, C. Price, The close enough traveling salesman problem: A discussion of several heuristics, in: F. Alt, M. Fu, B. Golden



(Eds.), *Perspectives in Operations Research: Papers in Honor of Saul Gass 80th Birthday*, Springer Verlag, 2006, pp. 271–283.

- [11] J. Dong, N. Yang, M. Chen, Heuristic approaches for a tsp variant: The automatic meter reading shortest tour problem, in: E. Baker, A. Joseph, A. Medrotra, M. Trick (Eds.), *Extending the Horizons: Advances in Computing, Optimisation, and Decision Technologies*, Springer Verlag, 2007, pp. 145–163.
- [12] E. Balas, S. M. Ng, On the set covering polytope: All the facets with coefficients in  $\{0, 1, 2\}$ , *Mathematical Programming* 43 (1–3) (1986) 57–69.
- [13] M. Sánchez-García, M. I. Sobrón, B. Vitoriano, On the set covering polytope: Facets with coefficients in  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , *Annals of Operations Research* 81 (1998) 343–356.
- [14] A. Corberán, E. Mota, J. M. Sanchis, A comparison of two different formulations for arc routing problems on mixed graphs, *Computers and Operations Research* 33 (12) (2006) 3384–3402.
- [15] A. Corberán, A. N. Letchford, J. M. Sanchis, A cutting plane algorithm for the general routing problem, *Mathematical Programming* 90 (2001) 291–316.
- [16] E. Benavent, A. Carrota, A. Corberán, J. M. Sanchis, D. Vigo, Lower bounds and heuristics for the windy rural postman problem, *European Journal of Operations Research* (2) (2007) 855–869.
- [17] G. Ghiani, G. Laporte, A branch-and-cut algorithm for the undirected rural postman problem, *Mathematical Programming* 87 (3) (2000) 467–481.