

TSP Algorithms - Comparative Analysis

Generated on: 2025-11-17 13:15:45

1. Performance Ratio Analysis (Distance / Optimal)

| Algorithm | Mean Ratio | Median Ratio | Min Ratio | Max Ratio | Std Dev |
|-------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Nearest Neighbor | 0.305 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 3.813 | 0.951 |
| Genetic Algorithm | 0.313 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 3.527 | 0.890 |
| Brute Force | 0.305 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 3.813 | 0.951 |
| Branch and Bound | 0.305 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 3.813 | 0.951 |

Interpretation: A ratio of 1.0 means the algorithm found the optimal solution. Ratios < 1.0 indicate better-than-optimal results (may indicate data discrepancy). Ratios > 1.0 indicate suboptimal solutions. Lower ratios are better.

2. Execution Time Analysis

| Algorithm | Mean Time (s) | Median Time (s) | Min Time (s) | Max Time (s) |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Nearest Neighbor | 0.0011 | 0.0011 | 0.0003 | 0.0015 |
| Genetic Algorithm | 1.7154 | 1.7461 | 0.8052 | 1.9717 |
| Brute Force | 0.0012 | 0.0012 | 0.0003 | 0.0018 |
| Branch and Bound | 0.0012 | 0.0011 | 0.0002 | 0.0016 |

3. Algorithm Comparison by Benchmark

| Benchmark | Cities | Optimal | NN Ratio | GA Ratio | BF Ratio | BB Ratio |
|-----------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| ali535 | 100 | 202339 | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.006 | 0.006 |
| att48 | 48 | 10628 | 3.813 | 3.527 | 3.813 | 3.813 |
| att532 | 100 | 27686 | 0.675 | 0.939 | 0.675 | 0.675 |
| d1291 | 100 | 50801 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| d1655 | 100 | 62128 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| d198 | 100 | 15780 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| d493 | 100 | 35002 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| d657 | 100 | 48912 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| fl1400 | 100 | 20127 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| fl3795 | 100 | 28772 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| fnl4461 | 100 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| gr431 | 100 | 171414 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| pa561 | 100 | 2763 | 0.080 | 0.098 | 0.080 | 0.080 |
| pcb3038 | 100 | 137694 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| pla7397 | 100 | 23260728 | 0.075 | 0.123 | 0.075 | 0.075 |
| rat575 | 100 | 6773 | 0.220 | 0.303 | 0.220 | 0.220 |
| rl11849 | 100 | 923288 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

4. Key Findings and Conclusions

Best Average Performance: Nearest Neighbor with average ratio of 0.305

Fastest Algorithm: Nearest Neighbor with average time of 0.0011 seconds

Algorithm Characteristics:

- **Nearest Neighbor:** Fast, greedy heuristic. Good for quick solutions but may not be optimal.
- **Genetic Algorithm:** Population-based metaheuristic. Can find good solutions but requires more time.
- **Brute Force:** Exact algorithm but only feasible for small instances (≤ 10 cities).
- **Branch and Bound:** Exact algorithm with pruning. Efficient for medium-sized instances (≤ 20 cities).

Limitations Observed:

- Some benchmark results show significant discrepancies with optimal values, suggesting possible data format differences.
- For large instances, exact algorithms (Brute Force, Branch and Bound) use heuristic fallbacks.
- Genetic Algorithm performance depends on parameter tuning and problem characteristics.