On Tightly Bounding the Dubins Traveling Salesman’s Optimum

The Dubins traveling salesman problem (DTSP) has generated significant interest over the last decade due to its occurrence in several civil and military surveillance applications. This problem requires finding a curvature constrained shortest path for a vehicle visiting a set of target locations. Currently, there is no algorithm that can find an optimal solution to the DTSP. In addition, relaxing the motion constraints and solving the resulting Euclidean traveling salesman problem (ETSP) provide the only lower bound available for the DTSP. However, in many problem instances, the lower bound computed by solving the ETSP is far below the cost of the feasible solutions obtained by some well-known algorithms for the DTSP. This paper addresses this fundamental issue and presents the first systematic procedure for developing tight lower bounds for the DTSP. [DOI: 10.1115/1.4039099]

1 Introduction

Given a set of targets on a plane, an unmanned vehicle, and its minimum turning radius (ρ), the Dubins traveling salesman problem (DTSP) aims to find a path for the vehicle such that each target is visited at least once, the radius of curvature of any point in the path is at least equal to ρ, and the length of the path is minimal. This problem is a generalization of the Euclidean traveling salesman problem (ETSP) and is NP-hard [1,2]. The DTSP belongs to a class of task allocation and path planning problems envisioned for an unmanned aerial vehicle in Ref. [3]. The DTSP has received significant attention in the literature [1,2,4–16], mainly due to its importance in unmanned vehicle applications, the simplicity of the problem statement, and its status as a hard problem to solve because it inherits features from both optimal control and combinatorial optimization.

A feasible path (or a feasible solution) to the DTSP is a curvature constrained path where the radius of curvature at any point in the path is at least equal to ρ and each target is visited at least once. The cost of a path is defined by its length. The optimal cost of the DTSP is the length of a shortest feasible path for the DTSP. There is currently no algorithm in the literature that can find an optimal solution to the DTSP. There is currently no algorithm in the literature that can find an optimal solution to the DTSP. In addition, relaxing the motion constraints and solving the resulting ETSP and then selecting the heading angle at each target using an orientation-assignment heuristic. A multiple lookahead approach is used to find feasible solutions in Refs. [8] and [17]. Metaheuristics have also been developed to find feasible solutions for the DTSP in Refs. [9] and [10].

Another common approach [13,18] involves discretizing the heading angle at each target and posing the resulting problem as a one-in-a-set TSP (Fig. 1). The greater the number of discretizations, the closer an optimal one-in-a-set TSP solution gets to the optimal DTSP solution. This approach provides a natural way to find a good, feasible solution to the problem [18]. However, this also requires us to solve a large one-in-a-set TSP, which is combinatorially hard. Nevertheless, this approach provides an upper bound [13] for the optimal cost of the DTSP, and simulation results indicate that the cost of the solutions starts to converge with more than 15 discretizations at each target.

The fundamental question with regard to all the above heuristics and approximation algorithms is how close a feasible solution actually is to the optimum. For example, Fig. 2 shows the cost of the feasible solutions obtained by solving the one-in-a-set TSP and the ETSP for 25 instances with 20 targets in each instance. Even with 32 discretizations of the possible angles at each target, the cost of the feasible solution is at least 30% greater than the corresponding optimal ETSP cost for several of these instances. As there is currently no systematic procedure available to find the optimal cost for the DTSP, identifying a tight lower bound is crucial for determining the quality of the solutions that have been provided as well as for developing constant factor approximation algorithms.

This fundamental question was the motivation for the bounding algorithms in Refs. [19–22]. In these algorithms, the requirement that the arrival and departure angles must be equal at each target is removed, and instead there is a penalty in the objective function whenever the requirement is violated. This results in a max–min problem where the minimization problem is an asymmetric TSP (ATSP), and the cost of traveling between any two targets is the cost of a new optimal control problem. In terms of lower bounding, the difficulty with this approach is that we are not currently
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In this paper, we propose a new approach for finding tight lower bounds for the DTSP. This is the first systematic procedure available for the DTSP and is a natural counterpart to the one-in-a-set TSP approach we discussed earlier. In this approach, we remove the requirement that the arrival angle and the departure angle at each target must be the same, but we restrain these angles so that they belong to one sector or interval (refer to Fig. 3). The lower bounding problem (BP) aims to choose an interval at each target such that the arrival angle and the departure angle at the target belong to the same interval, each target is visited at least once, and the sum of the costs of traveling between the targets is minimized. The cost of traveling between two intervals corresponding to two distinct targets now reduces to a new optimal control problem, which we refer to as the Dubins interval problem. Given two targets and an interval at each target, the problem is to find a feasible path such that the departure angle at the initial target and the arrival angle at the final target belong to the given intervals and the length of the path is minimal. The lower bounding problem is a one-in-a-set TSP and can be solved just like the upper bounding problem. If the size of each of the intervals at each target reduces to zero, the lower bounding problem reduces to the DTSP. If there is only one interval of size $2\pi$ at each target, the result is a Euclidean TSP. As the size of the intervals at the targets becomes smaller, the one-in-a-set TSP becomes combinatorially hard, similar to the upper bounding problem. Nevertheless, this provides a systematic approach for finding lower bounds for the DTSP, provided the Dubins interval problem can be solved.

The Dubins interval problem is a new generalization of the standard Dubins problem [23] which has not been formulated or solved in the literature. The difficulty with solving this problem lies in the fact that the length of the shortest feasible paths between any two targets is a nonlinear, discontinuous function of the heading angles of the targets. Therefore, finding the optimal heading angles from the given intervals at the targets that minimizes the length of the path is nontrivial. In this paper, we solve the interval problem using the monotonicity properties and the extremal values of the length of the feasible paths.

The first main contribution of this paper is in formulating the lower bounding problem for the DTSP as a novel one-in-a-set TSP where the cost of traveling between any two targets requires solving a Dubins interval problem. This is the first formulation that aims to provide a tight lower bound for the DTSP. The second main contribution is in formulating the Dubins interval problem and providing an algorithm to solve this problem by exploiting its structure and monotonicity properties. Numerical results are then presented to corroborate the performance of the proposed lower bounding approach for 25 instances each involving 10, 15, and 20 targets.

This paper is organized as follows: The lower bounding problem is formulated in Sec. 2. Dubins interval problem is formally stated in Sec. 3. Results on the structure and properties of an optimal path for the Dubins interval problem are shown in Sec. 4. Algorithms are presented in Sec. 5 for solving the main parts of the Dubins interval problem. The simulations results are then presented in Sec. 6. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Lower Bounding Problem Formulation

The set of targets is denoted by $T = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where $n$ is the number of targets. The set of available angles $[0, 2\pi]$ at any target $i$ is partitioned into a collection of closed intervals denoted by $I_i := \{[0, \varphi_{i1}], [\varphi_{i1}, \varphi_{i2}], \ldots, [\varphi_{im_i}, 2\pi]\}$, where $m_i (\geq 1)$ denotes the number of intervals at target $i$ and the $\varphi_{ij}$ are constants.

\textbf{Fig. 1} There are four possible headings at each target. A feasible solution for the DTSP can be obtained by choosing a heading at each target and finding a corresponding optimal TSP path.

\textbf{Fig. 2} A comparison between the cost of the feasible solution (upper bound) obtained by solving the one-in-a-set TSP with 32 discretizations and the optimal cost of the corresponding ETSP (lower bound) for 25 instances. There are 20 targets in each instance, and the location of each target is uniformly sampled from a $1000 \times 1000$ square. Also, the minimum turning radius of the vehicle is set to 100.

\textbf{Fig. 3} There are four intervals at each target. A lower bound for the DTSP can be obtained by choosing an interval and restricting both the arrival and the departure angles to be in the chosen interval at each target and then finding a corresponding optimal TSP path. The shaded interval at each target shows the chosen interval with the arrival and departure angles.

\textbf{Fig. 4} A comparison between the cost of the feasible solution (upper bound) obtained by solving the one-in-a-set TSP with 32 discretizations and the optimal cost of the corresponding ETSP (lower bound) for 25 instances. There are 20 targets in each instance, and the location of each target is uniformly sampled from a $1000 \times 1000$ square. Also, the minimum turning radius of the vehicle is set to 100.
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1. We point out that there is also another approach based on optimal control in Ref. [24]. However, the approach in Ref. [24] still relies on the results of this paper. Second, unlike the analysis and results in this paper, the work in Ref. [24] does not provide information about the rate of change of lengths of the paths as a function of the heading angles at the targets. This information is critical and very useful in the development of bounds for the feasible solutions and approximation algorithms for the DTSP.
such that $0 \leq \varphi_{ij} \leq \varphi_{ii} \leq \cdots \leq \varphi_{im} = 2\pi$. Let $(x_i, y_i)$ denote the location of target $i \in T$, and let the arrival angle and the departure angle of the vehicle at target $i$ be denoted by $\vartheta_{ai}$ and $\vartheta_{di}$ respectively. The configuration of the vehicle leaving target $i$ at $\vartheta_{ai}$ is then denoted by $(x_i, y_i, \vartheta_{ai})$, and $(x_i, y_i, \vartheta_{di})$ similarly denotes the vehicle’s arrival configuration. The length of the shortest Dubins path from $(x_i, y_i, \vartheta_{ai})$ to $(x_j, y_j, \vartheta_{aj})$ is denoted as $d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$. Given an interval $I_j$ at target $i$ and an interval $I_k$ at target $j$, define $d_{jk}(I_j, I_k) := \min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$. The objective of the BP is to find a sequence of targets $(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n), s_i \in T$, to visit and an interval $I_{s_i} \in T$, for each target $s_i \in T$ such that:

- each target is visited at least once, and
- the cost $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d_{s_{i+1}, s_i}(I_{s_{i+1}}, I_{s_i})$ is minimized.

Addressing this BP first requires solving $\min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$. Once this problem is solved, the BP is essentially a one-in-a-set problem. In this paper, we transform the one-in-a-set problem into an ATSP using the Noon-Bean transformation [25] and then convert the resulting ATSP into a symmetric TSP using the transformation in Ref. [26]. The symmetric TSP is solved using the Concorde solver [27] to find an optimal solution. This approach is already well known and is discussed in detail in Ref. [18]. Therefore, we focus on solving the Dubins interval problem in Sec. 3. Prior to that, we first formally state the lower bounding result in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.1.** The optimal cost to the BP is a lower bound to the DTSP.

**Proof.** Consider an optimal path to the DTSP. Suppose the heading angle of a vehicle traveling this path at target $i$ belongs to interval $I_i$. Let the vehicle travel to target $j$ after $i$ in the optimal path. Clearly, the length of the optimal path from target $i$ to target $j$ must be at least equal to $d_{ij}(I_i, I_j)$. Also, the intervals at the targets and the sequence of targets corresponding to the optimal path are feasible solutions to the BP. Therefore, the cost of the optimal path to the DTSP must be at least equal to the optimal cost of the BP. Hence proved. \qed

### 3 Dubins Interval Problem

Without loss of generality, let the Dubins interval problem be denoted as $\min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$, where $d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$ indicates the shortest path (also referred to as the Dubins path) for traveling from $(x_i, y_i, \vartheta_{ai})$ to $(x_j, y_j, \vartheta_{aj})$ subject to the minimum turning radius constraint (Fig. 4). Here the interval $I_j$ is defined as $[\vartheta_{k}^\text{min}, \vartheta_{k}^\text{max}] \subseteq [0, 2\pi]$. Given an initial configuration $(x_1, y_1, \vartheta_1)$ and a final configuration $(x_2, y_2, \vartheta_2)$, Dubins [23] showed that the shortest path for a vehicle to travel between the two configurations subject to the minimum turning radius ($\rho$) constraint must consist of at most three segments, where each segment is a circle of radius $\rho$ or a straight line. Specifically, if a curved segment of radius $\rho$ along which the vehicle travels in a counterclockwise (clockwise) rotational motion is denoted by $L(R)$, and the segment along which the vehicle travels straight is denoted by $S$, then the shortest path is one of RSR, RSL, LSR, LRL, and RLR.

Let $RSL(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ denote the length of the RSL path from $(x_1, y_1, \vartheta_1)$ to $(x_2, y_2, \vartheta_2)$, $RSL(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ is set to $\infty$ if the RSL path does not exist. Let $RSL(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2), LSR(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2), LRL(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$, and $RSL(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ be defined in a similar way. Using these definitions, the Dubins interval problem can be written as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}) &= \min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} \{RSL(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), RSL(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), LSR(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), LSR(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), RSL(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})\} \\
&= LSL(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), RLR(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}), LRL(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})
\end{align*}$$

(1)

**Remark 3.1.** $d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$ is a lower semicontinuous function and is minimized over closed and bounded intervals $I_i$ and $I_j$. Therefore, the Dubins interval problem is well defined, i.e., there exist $\vartheta_{i}^0 \in I_i$ and $\vartheta_{j}^0 \in I_j$ such that $d_{ij}(\vartheta_{i}^0, \vartheta_{j}^0) = \min_{\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj}} d_{ij}(\vartheta_{ai}, \vartheta_{aj})$.

To solve the Dubins interval problem, we also consider shortest paths that contain at most two segments between $(x_1, y_1)$ and $(x_2, y_2)$. For any path $T \in \{RSR, RSL, LSR, LRL\}$, and $\vartheta_{i} \in I_i$, let $T^0(\vartheta_{i})$ denote the distance of the shortest path of type $T$ that starts at $(x_1, y_1)$ with a departure angle of $\vartheta_{i}$ and arrives at $(x_2, y_2)$ with an arrival angle in $I_j$. In this case, the arrival angle at $(x_2, y_2)$ will be a function of $\vartheta_{i}$ and $T$ and is denoted as $\vartheta_{j}(T, \vartheta_{i})$. $T^0(\vartheta_{i})$ is set to $\infty$ if a path of type $T$ does not exist. Similarly, let $T^1(\vartheta_{i})$ denote the distance of the shortest path of type $T$ that starts at $(x_1, y_1)$ with a departure angle in $I_i$ and arrives at $(x_2, y_2)$ with an arrival angle of $\vartheta_{i}$. In this case, the departure angle at $(x_2, y_2)$ will be a function of $\vartheta_{i}$ and $T$ and is denoted as $\vartheta_{i}(T, \vartheta_{i})$. $T^1(\vartheta_{i})$ is set to $\infty$ if a path of type $T$ does not exist. From the definitions, note that $\min_{\vartheta_{i}} T^1(\vartheta_{i}) = \min_{\vartheta_{i}} T^2(\vartheta_{i})$.

In Sec. 4, we will first show how to simplify $\min_{\vartheta_{i}} T^1(\vartheta_{i})$ by considering $\min_{\vartheta_{i}} T^1(\vartheta_{i})$ for any path $T \in \{RSR, RSL, LSR, LSL\}$.

### 4 Structural Properties of an Optimal Path for the Dubins Interval Problem

#### 4.1 Optimizing RSR, RSL, LSR, and LSL Paths

The following result is known [28] for each of the paths $P \in \{RSR, RSL, LSR, LSL\}$ from $(x_1, y_1, \vartheta_1)$ to $(x_2, y_2, \vartheta_2)$:

**Lemma 4.1.** For any $P \in \{RSR, RSL, LSR, LSL\}$ and $i = 1, 2$, either $(\vartheta P(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)/\vartheta_1) \geq 0 \forall \vartheta_1$, or $(\vartheta P(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)/\vartheta_1) \leq 0 \forall \vartheta_1$, when $P \exists$ and none of its curved segments vanishes.

Now let us apply the above lemma to the RSL path. The RSL path ceases to exist when the segment $S$ vanishes, i.e., the RSL path reduces to an RL path. In addition, when one of the curved segments vanishes, the RSL path reduces to either the RS or the SL path (refer to Fig. 5). Therefore, given $\vartheta_1$, the optimum for $\min_{\vartheta_{i}} T^1(\vartheta_{i})$ for RSL$(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ must be attained when $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_{i}^\text{min}$.
Therefore,

\[
\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \} = \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), \text{RS}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{SL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \} \]

Similarly, using Lemma 4.1 again, we get the following:

\[
\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}) \} = \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), \text{RS}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{SL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \}
\]

\[
\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \theta_2^{\max} \} = \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{ \theta_2^{\max}, \theta_2^{\min} \}
\]

Now, one can easily verify the following:

\[
\min T^1(\theta_1) \leq T^2(\theta_2^{\max}) \text{ and } \min T^1(\theta_1) \leq T^2(\theta_2^{\min})
\]

Substituting for \(\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2}\text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min})\) and \(\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2}\text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max})\) in Eq. (3) using Eqs. (4) and (5) and simplifying further using Eq. (6), we get

\[
\min \min \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \min \{ \text{RSL}^*, \min \{ \text{RS}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{SL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \} \}
\]

\[
\text{RSL}^* = \min \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}) \}
\]

As Lemma 4.1 is also applicable to RSR, LSL, and LSR paths, one can use the above procedure and simplify \(\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4}\text{RLR}(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4)\) in a similar way. Combining all these results, we obtain the following:

\[
\min \min \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6, \theta_7} \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}) \}
\]

\[
\min \{ \text{RSL}^*, \min \{ \text{RS}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{SL}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \} \}
\]

\[
\text{RSL}^* = \min \{ \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), \text{RSL}(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}) \}
\]

4.2 Optimizing RLR and LRL Paths. Gao et al. [28] have shown that the RLR and LRL paths cannot lead to an optimal Dubins path if the distance between the two targets is greater than 4\(\rho\). Therefore, in this section, we assume that the distance between the two targets is at most 4\(\rho\). We will focus on \(\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4}\text{LRL}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\); \(\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4}\text{RLR}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\) can be solved in a similar way. Given \(\theta_1\), unlike the length of the RSL path, \(\text{LRL}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\) is not monotonic with respect to \(\theta_2\) when LRL exists. Without loss of generality, we assume that \(\theta_1 = 0\) and first aim to understand \(\text{LRL}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\) as a function of \(\theta_2\) (refer to Fig. 6).

Target 1 is located at the origin, and target 2 is located at \((x, y)\). The angles \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) in Fig. 6 are functions of \(\theta_2\). For brevity, we use \(z\) and \(\beta\) in place of \(x(\theta_2)\) and \(\beta(\theta_2)\), respectively. Let \(\text{LRL}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\) be denoted as \(\mathcal{D}(\theta_2) = (x + 2 + 2\beta + \theta_2)\). In the ensuing discussion, we use the fact that the length of the \(R\) segment in an LRL path must be greater than \(\pi \rho\) (i.e., \(0 < \alpha + \beta < \pi\)).

**Lemma 4.2.** If the LRL path exists and none of its curved segments vanishes, then for any \(\theta_2\) such that \(0 < x(\theta_2) + \beta(\theta_2) < \pi\), \(d\mathcal{D}/dz \neq 0\) except when \(\mathcal{D}(\theta_2)\) reaches a maximum, i.e., \(\theta_2\) satisfies \(x + \pi/2 = \theta_2\).

**Proof.** Using Fig. 6, \(x\) and \(\beta\) can be obtained in terms of \(\theta_2\) as follows:

\[
x = \rho \sin \theta_2, \quad \beta = \rho \cos \theta_2
\]

\[
\mathcal{D}(\theta_2) = (\rho + \rho \cos \theta_2) = (\rho + x) = (\rho + \rho \sin \theta_2)
\]

\[
\frac{d\mathcal{D}}{dz} = \rho \cos \theta_2 \neq 0
\]
$2\rho \sin \alpha + \rho = 2\rho \sin \beta + \rho \cos \theta_2 + \bar{y}$ \hspace{1cm} (11)

$2\rho \cos \alpha + 2\rho \cos \beta + \rho \sin \theta_2 = \bar{x}$ \hspace{1cm} (12)

Differentiating and simplifying the above equations, we get

$$
\cos \alpha \frac{dx}{d\theta_2} - \cos \beta \frac{d\beta}{d\theta_2} = -\frac{\sin \theta_2}{2} \hspace{1cm} (13)
$$

$$
\sin \alpha \frac{dx}{d\theta_2} + \sin \beta \frac{d\beta}{d\theta_2} = \frac{\cos \theta_2}{2} \hspace{1cm} (14)
$$

Further solving for the derivatives, we get

$$
\frac{d\beta}{d\theta_2} = \frac{\cos(\theta_2 - \alpha)}{2 \sin(\alpha + \beta)} \hspace{1cm} (15)
$$

$$
\frac{dx}{d\theta_2} = \frac{\cos(\alpha + \beta)}{2 \sin(\alpha + \beta)} \hspace{1cm} (16)
$$

Therefore,

$$
\frac{d\Sigma}{d\theta_2} = \rho \left( \frac{2 \frac{d\beta}{d\theta_2} + 2 \frac{dx}{d\theta_2}}{1} \right) = \rho \left( \frac{\cos(\theta_2 - \alpha)}{\sin(\alpha + \beta)} + \frac{\cos(\theta_2 + \beta)}{\sin(\alpha + \beta)} + 1 \right) \hspace{1cm} (17)
$$

Equation $d\Sigma/d\theta_2 = 0$ yields the following possibilities: $\theta_2 = \pi/2 + \alpha$ or $\theta_2 + \beta = -\pi/2$. $\theta_2 + \beta = -\pi/2$ corresponds to the case where the second left turn disappears; there is a jump in the length of the LRL path at this $\theta_2$, and therefore, $d\Sigma/d\theta_2$ does not exist. $\theta_2 = \pi/2 + \alpha$ corresponds to the point where the angle in the right turn is equal to the angle in the second left turn; one can verify that $\Sigma(\theta_2)$ reaches a maximum at this point because $d^2\Sigma/d\theta_2^2 = -(3\rho/2)(1 + \cos(\alpha + \beta))/\sin(\alpha + \beta) < 0$ (refer to Fig. 7).

The derivatives of $LRL(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ do not exist when any turn in the path disappears or when the angle in the right turn becomes equal to $\pi$, as shown in Fig. 8. The lengths of the two paths (Fig. 8) when the LRL path just ceases to exist are denoted by $LRL^0(\theta_1)$ and $LRL^0(\theta_1)$. Therefore, applying the above lemma to the LRL path and following similar steps to those in Sec. 4.1, we get the following result:

$$
\min_{\theta_2} \{LRL(\theta_1, \theta_2)\} := \min \{LRL(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\min}), LRL(\theta_1, \theta_2^{\max}), LRL^0(\theta_1), LRL^0(\theta_1), LRL^0(\theta_1)\} \hspace{1cm} (19)
$$

Again, as in Sec. 4.1, one can further simplify the above optimization problem

$$
\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \min \{LRL(\theta_1, \theta_2)\} = \min \{LRL^*(\theta_1), LRL^1(\theta_1), LRL^L(\theta_1), LRL^L(\theta_1)\} \hspace{1cm} (20)
$$

where

$$
LRL^* := \min \{LRL(\theta_1^{\min}, \theta_2^{\min}), LRL(\theta_1^{\max}, \theta_2^{\min}), LRL(\theta_1^{\min}, \theta_2^{\max}), LRL(\theta_1^{\max}, \theta_2^{\max})\}.
$$

Note that $LRL^L(\theta_1)$ and $LRL^L(\theta_1)$ can never result in an optimal path because the angle in the right turn is equal to $\pi$ [29]. Therefore, once Eq. (20) is substituted in Eq. (1), the functions $LRL^L(\theta_1)$ and $LRL^L(\theta_1)$ will drop out.

$\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \min \{RLR(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}$ can be simplified in a similar way. Hence, combining the above results with Eq. (9), we obtain the following result.
THEOREM 4.1.

\[
\min \{d_{12}(\theta_1, \theta_2)\}
\]

\[
= \min [d^*, \min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{RS^1(\theta_1), SR^1(\theta_1), LS^1(\theta_1), SL^1(\theta_1), LR^1(\theta_1), RL^1(\theta_1)\}]
\]

where

\[
d^* := \min \{d_{12}(\theta_1^{\text{min}}, \theta_2^{\text{min}}), d_{12}(\theta_1^{\text{max}}, \theta_2^{\text{max}}), d_{12}(\theta_1^{\text{min}}, \theta_2^{\text{max}}), d_{12}(\theta_1^{\text{max}}, \theta_2^{\text{min}})\}.
\]

The above theorem states that the optimum to the Dubins interval problem has to be either \(d^*\) (which is computed using standard Dubins paths with at most three segments where both the departure and the arrival angles belong to the boundary of the intervals) or the length of a Dubins path with at most two segments where either the departure or the arrival angle belongs to the boundary of the intervals. As we already know how to compute \(d^*\) [23], we will now provide algorithms to solve for the optimal Dubins paths with at most two segments (i.e., to solve \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \mathcal{P}(\theta_1)\) for any \(\mathcal{P} \in \{RS^1, SR^1, LS^1, SL^1, LR^1, RL^1\}\). This will solve the Dubins interval problem.

5 Algorithms for Optimizing Dubins Paths With at Most Two Segments

In this section, we will first present algorithms to find the shortest RS path and the RL path: \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{RS^1(\theta_1)\}\) and \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{RL^1(\theta_1)\}\). These algorithms can then be used to solve \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \mathcal{P}(\theta_1)\) for any \(\mathcal{P} \in \{SR^1, LS^1, SL^1, LR^1\}\) using simple reflections of the points about the \(x\) or the \(y\) axis as discussed in Ref. [30]. For example, \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{LS^1(\theta_1)\}\) can be solved by considering a reflection of the points about the \(x\)-axis as shown in Fig. 9.

5.1 Optimizing the RS Path. Without loss of generality, a reference frame can be chosen such that target 1 is at the origin and target 2 lies on the \(x\)-axis as shown in Fig. 10. Here \(\bar{x}\) represents the Euclidean distance between the targets. Given \(\theta_1\), the existence of the RS path as well as its length can be determined using geometry. The length of the \(S\) path, the angle between the \(x\)-axis and the \(S\) path, and the final arrival angle at target 2 are also functions of \(\theta_1\) and can be expressed as \(L(\theta_1), \phi(\theta_1), \theta_2(\mathcal{R}, \theta_1)\), respectively. Let the length of the RS path be denoted as \(\mathcal{R}(\theta_1)\). For brevity, in some places we will use \(L, \phi, \theta_2\), and \(\mathcal{R}\) instead of \(L(\theta_1), \phi(\theta_1), \theta_2(\mathcal{R}, \theta_1)\), and \(\mathcal{R}(\theta_1)\), respectively. Let \(d_S := \bar{x}\) if the angle of the straight line joining the two targets lies in the intervals \(I_1\) and \(I_2\). If the angle constraints are not satisfied, \(d_S\) is set to \(\infty\). Similarly, let \(d_R\) denote the length of the shortest circular arc of type \(R\) that joins the two targets such that the boundary angles of the arc belong to the respective intervals at the targets. If such an arc does not exist, \(d_R\) is set to \(\infty\). In the following lemma, we assume that \([\theta_1^{\text{min}}, \theta_1^{\text{max}}] \subseteq [0, 2\pi]\) and \([\theta_2^{\text{min}}, \theta_2^{\text{max}}] \subseteq [0, 2\pi]\).

**Lemma 5.1.** \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{RS^1(\theta_1)\} = \min \{d_S, d_R, RS^1(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), RS^2(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), RS^1(\theta_2^{\text{min}}), RS^2(\theta_2^{\text{min}})\}\).

**Proof.** Refer to the Appendix for the proof.

Following the above lemma, the algorithm to compute \(\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathcal{C}_3} \{RS^1(\theta_1)\}\) requires one to find each of the values in the set \(\{d_S, d_R, RS^1(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), RS^2(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), RS^1(\theta_2^{\text{min}}), RS^2(\theta_2^{\text{min}})\}\) and select the least value.

5.2 Optimizing the RL Path. We use similar notations as in Sec. 5.1 (refer to Fig. 11). The angles \(\phi(\theta_1)\) and \(\theta_2(\mathcal{R}, \theta_1)\) are...
Moreover, given \( \theta_1 \), there are two possible RL paths, as either \( \phi + \theta_2 \leq \pi \) or \( \phi + \theta_2 > \pi \). In the following discussion and in Fig. 11, we assume that \( \phi + \theta_2 < \pi \). The other RL path can be addressed similarly.

We first define some values of \( \theta_i \), where the optimum can occur (these correspond to the extreme values of \( \mathcal{D} \) and \( \theta_2 \) for the RL path and will be derived later in the proof). Let \( \theta^0 \) be the solution to the equation \( \theta_2(\mathcal{D}, \theta_1) = \theta_1 \). Also, let \( \theta^{\max} \) and \( \theta^{\min} \) be the solutions to equation \( \theta_2(\mathcal{D}, \theta_1) = \pi \). Let \( d_t \) denote the length of the shortest circular arc of type \( L \) that joins the two targets such that the boundary angles of the arc belong to the corresponding intervals at the targets and \( \phi + \theta_2 < \pi \). If such an arc does not exist, then \( d_t \) is set to \( \infty \). Let \( RL^* = \min\{RL^1(\theta^{\max}_1), RL^1(\theta^{\min}_1), RL^2(\theta^{\min}_2), RL^2(\theta^{\max}_2)\} \).

**Lemma 5.2.** If \( \hat{x} > 2\rho \), \( \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3} \{RL^1(\theta_1)\} = \min\{RL^1(\theta^{\max}_1), RL^1(\theta^{\max}_2), RL^2(\theta^{\min}_1), RL^2(\theta^{\min}_2)\}. \)

**Proof.** Refer to the Appendix.

Following the above lemma, the algorithm to compute \( \min_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3} \{RL^1(\theta_1)\} \) requires one to find each of the values in the set \( \{RL^1(\theta^{\max}_1), RL^1(\theta^{\max}_2), RL^2(\theta^{\min}_1), RL^2(\theta^{\min}_2)\} \) and select the least value.

In summary, the above algorithms can be used to compute the cost of traveling between the sectors in the lower bounding problem as stated in Sec. 2. The lower bounding problem is a one-in-a-set TSP. We use the Noon-Bean transformation [18,25] to first convert the one-in-a-set TSP into an ATSP. Then we use a transformation method outlined in Ref. [26] to convert the ATSP into a symmetric TSP. This method converts an asymmetric instance with \( n \) nodes into a symmetric instance with \( 3n \) nodes. We chose this method primarily because unlike other transformations, there is no big-M constant involved, and therefore, we did not have any numerical difficulties such as those faced in Refs. [18], [21], and [22]. For example, the transformed TSP instance corresponding to 20 targets with 32 discretizations at each target has 1920 nodes. Each of the transformed TSP instances was solved to optimality using the Concorde solver [27].

**6 Numerical Results**

Computational results are presented for 25 instances with 10, 15, and \( 20^3 \) targets in each instance. The locations of the targets were uniformly sampled from a \( 1000 \times 1000 \) square. The minimum turning radius of the vehicle was chosen to be 100. The heading angles at each target are discretized into 4, 8, 16, and 32 intervals. The improvement of the lower bounds as the number of discretizations or intervals increases is shown in Fig. 12. On average, the improvement of the lower bounds with respective to the optimal ETSP cost for 32 intervals was 22.28%.

A feasible solution is obtained by discretizing the angles at each target (32 values) and applying the transformation procedure similar to the lower bound computation. The comparison of the cost of the feasible solution with respect to the optimal Euclidean TSP cost and the lower bound (corresponding to 32 intervals at each target) for the 25 instances in each case is shown in Fig. 13. The average deviation of the cost of the feasible solution from its corresponding lower bound for all the instances is 5.2%, while the average deviation of the cost of the feasible solution from its corresponding ETSP cost is 29.2%. In one of the instances, we found the cost of the feasible solution from its corresponding lower bound improved by approximately 44%. These results show that the proposed approach can be used to obtain tight lower bounds for the DTSP. A feasible DTSP solution and an optimal solution corresponding to the lower bound for an instance are shown in Fig. 14.

We have also tested the algorithms by varying the minimum turning radius (\( \rho \)) of the vehicle. The lower bounding algorithm is
run on the instances in Fig. 2 with four different values of \( q = 50; 100; 150; 200 \). The average of the lower and upper bounds for each case with 16 discretizations at each target is reported in Table 1. The first column of the table refers to the problem size or the number of targets, and the second column refers to the minimum turning radius of the vehicle. The mean values over 25 instances for the upper bounds, lower bounds (computed using our algorithm), and the Euclidean lower bounds are listed in the third, the fourth, and the fifth columns. The last two columns denote the mean of the ratio of upper and lower bounds. The gap between the Euclidean lower bounds and upper bounds are higher for larger minimum turn radii, which is expected. The proposed approach significantly improved the bounds for problem instances with a turning radius equal to 150 and 200 units. For example, in the case of 20 targets with \( q = 200 \), the ratio \( (UB/LB) \) is trimmed to 1.25 from 1.98, which is significant. This improvement in the ratio using the new lower bounds compared to the Euclidean lower bounds indicates the effectiveness of using our proposed approach.

We have also analyzed the results to find out the average number of two segment or three segment Dubins paths in an optimal solution to the lower bounding problem. Specifically, given an instance and its corresponding optimal solution, we compute the proportion of the number of Dubins paths with at most two segments in the optimal solution. Similarly, we also compute the proportion of costs contributed by the Dubins paths with at most two segments or three segments in an optimal solution. The mean values of these results over 25 instances for varying number of sectors at each target are shown in Table 2. These results indicate a generic trend we observed in all our simulations: when the number of discretizations increases, the solutions to the Dubins interval problem have three segments and tend to have both the arrival and the departure angles of the solutions occur at the boundaries of the sectors. We also fixed the number of discretizations at 16 and varied the minimum turning radius of the vehicle to find any pattern in the contributions of the two segment or three segment paths. Table 3 shows these results. As noted, we did not observe any specific pattern when the minimum turning radius was changed.

7 Conclusion

We provide a systematic procedure to find lower bounds for the DTSP. This paper provides a new direction for developing approximation algorithms for the DTSP. Currently, the transformation method increases the size of the one-in-a-set TSP by two or three times, resulting in a large TSP. Computationally, more efficient tools for directly solving the one-in-a-set TSP will be useful in finding tighter lower and upper bounds for the DTSP. Future work can also address the same problem with multiple vehicles and other precedence constraints.
Appendix

A.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1. Using Fig. 10, one can relate $L$ and $\phi$ to $\theta_1$ using the following equations:

$$
\frac{\rho \sin \phi + L \cos \phi}{\rho \cos \phi - L \sin \phi} = \frac{\bar{x} - \rho \sin \theta_1}{\rho \cos \theta_1}
$$

(A1)

The arrival angle $\theta_1$ at target 2 is equal to $2\pi - \phi$. We now consider two different cases: $\bar{x} > 2\rho$ and $\bar{x} \leq 2\rho$ (the RS path does not exist for a subset of angles of $\theta_1$ if $\bar{x} < 2\rho$).

Case 1: $\bar{x} > 2\rho$.

The length of the RS path is $\mathcal{T} := (\theta_1 + \phi) \rho + L$. Therefore, $d\mathcal{T}/d\theta_1 = (1 + d\phi/d\theta_1) \rho + dL/d\theta_1$. The derivatives of $\phi$ and $L$ with respect to $\theta_1$ can be obtained by differentiating Eq. (A1) as follows:

$$
(\rho \cos \phi - L \sin \phi) \frac{d\phi}{d\theta_1} + \cos \phi \frac{dL}{d\theta_1} = -\rho \cos \theta_1
$$

(A2)

$$
-(\rho \sin \phi + L \cos \phi) \frac{d\phi}{d\theta_1} + \sin \phi \frac{dL}{d\theta_1} = -\rho \sin \theta_1
$$

(A3)

Solving these equations and simplifying further, we obtain the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of targets</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\rho \sin \phi + L \cos \phi$</th>
<th>$\rho \cos \phi - L \sin \phi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2964.24</td>
<td>2909.44</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3325.20</td>
<td>3077.56</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3602.24</td>
<td>3471.92</td>
<td>3373.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4254.36</td>
<td>3790.80</td>
<td>3373.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4670.56</td>
<td>3957.32</td>
<td>3373.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4977.96</td>
<td>4413.32</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6181.44</td>
<td>5223.00</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7313.52</td>
<td>5854.36</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Results for varying minimum turning radius ($\rho$) of the vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of targets</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>Upper bound (UB)</th>
<th>Lower bound (LB)</th>
<th>Euclidean bound (EB)</th>
<th>Ratio (UB/LB)</th>
<th>Ratio (UB/EB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2964.24</td>
<td>2909.44</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3325.20</td>
<td>3077.56</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3905.80</td>
<td>3438.08</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4670.56</td>
<td>3957.32</td>
<td>2851.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3602.24</td>
<td>3471.92</td>
<td>3373.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4254.36</td>
<td>3790.80</td>
<td>3373.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4977.96</td>
<td>4413.32</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4040.04</td>
<td>3843.04</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4977.96</td>
<td>4413.32</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7313.52</td>
<td>5854.36</td>
<td>3713.44</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Average contributions from two segment or three segment Dubins paths in an optimal solution to the lower bounding problem: results for different number of sectors at each target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of targets</th>
<th>No. of sectors</th>
<th>No. of targets</th>
<th>No. of sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Average contributions from two segment or three segment Dubins paths in an optimal solution to the lower bounding problem: results for varying minimum turning radius of the vehicle

Note: The bounds and ratios indicate mean values for 25 instances.
For any \( \theta_1 \in [0, 2\pi] \), it is easy to verify geometrically that \( \phi \in [0, \pi] \) using Fig. 10. Therefore, \( \forall \theta_1 \in (0, 2\pi), d\Sigma/d\theta_1 > 0 \), i.e., the length of the RS path increases monotonically from \( \bar{x} \). When \( \theta_1 = 2\pi \), the curved segment in the RS path vanishes and the length of the RS path returns to the Euclidean distance between the targets (\( \bar{x} \)). Even though the length of the RS path increases monotonically for any \( \theta_1 \in [0, 2\pi] \), the arrival angle at target 2, \( \theta_2 := 2\pi - \phi \), first decreases with \( \theta_1 \), reaches a minimum at some \( \theta_1 = \theta^* \), and increases to \( 2\pi \). This minimum can be computed by solving \( d\phi/d\theta_1 = 0 \Rightarrow (\bar{x}/L)\cos(\phi(\theta^*)) - 1 = 0 \) or \( \cos(\phi(\theta^*)) = L/\bar{x} \). One can verify that at \( \theta_1 = \theta^* \), \( \theta_2 \) reaches a minimum.

Now, the optimum for \( \text{min}_{\theta_1 < \theta_1} \{ \text{RS}^1(\theta_1) \} \) must satisfy one of the following conditions:

1. \( d\Sigma/d\theta_1 = 0 \) or \( \theta_1 = 0 \) (\( d\Sigma/d\theta_1 \) does not exist at this point) or \( \theta_1 = \theta_1^{\text{min}} \) or \( \theta_1 = \theta_1^{\text{max}} \). \( \forall \theta_1 \in (0, 2\pi), d\Sigma/d\theta_1 \neq 0 \). As the length of the RS path increases monotonically with respect to \( \theta_1 \), we need not consider \( \theta_1 = \theta_1^{\text{max}} \). Therefore, for this condition, the optimum occurs when \( \theta_1 = 0 \) or \( \theta_1 = \theta_1^{\text{min}} \).

2. \( \theta_2 = \theta_2^{\text{min}} \) or \( \theta_2 = \theta_2^{\text{max}} \).

Therefore, when \( \bar{x} > 2\rho \), \( \text{min}_{\theta_1 < \theta_1} \{ \text{RS}^1(\theta_1) \} := \text{min}\{d_1, d_1^{\text{min}}, \text{RS}^1(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), \text{RS}^1(\theta_1^{\text{max}}), \text{RS}^2(\theta_2^{\text{min}}), \text{RS}^2(\theta_2^{\text{max}}) \} \).

Case 2: \( \bar{x} \leq 2\rho \).
In this case, the RS path is not defined for any \( \theta_1 \in (\sin(\bar{x}/2\rho), \pi/2 + \cos(\bar{x}/2\rho)) \). Moreover, when \( \theta_1 = \sin(\bar{x}/2\rho) \) or \( \theta_1 = \pi/2 + \cos(\bar{x}/2\rho) \), the RS path reduces to just one segment of type R. Therefore, following the same analysis as in the previous case, \( \text{min}_{\theta_1 < \theta_1} \{ \text{RS}^1(\theta_1) \} := \text{min}\{d_5, d_6, d_5^{\text{min}}, \text{RS}^1(\theta_1^{\text{min}}), \text{RS}^2(\theta_2^{\text{min}}), \text{RS}^2(\theta_2^{\text{max}}) \} \). Hence this case is proved (Fig. 15).

### A.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2
We can solve for \( \phi \) and \( \theta_2 \) using the following equations (Fig. 11):

\[
2\rho \cos \phi - \rho \cos \theta_2 = \rho \cos \theta_1
\]
\[
2\rho \sin \phi + \rho \sin \theta_2 = \bar{x} - \rho \sin \theta_1
\]
Solving further for $d\phi/d\theta_1$ and $d\theta_2/d\theta_1$, we get

$$\frac{d\phi}{d\theta_1} = \frac{\sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}{2\sin(\phi + \theta_2)} \quad (A12)$$

and

$$\frac{d\theta_2}{d\theta_1} = -\frac{\sin(\theta_1 + \phi)}{\sin(\phi + \theta_2)} \quad (A13)$$

Differentiating these equations, we get

$$-2 \sin \phi \frac{d\phi}{d\theta_1} + \sin \theta_2 \frac{d\theta_2}{d\theta_1} = -\sin \theta_1 \quad (A10)$$

and

$$2 \cos \phi \frac{d\phi}{d\theta_1} + \cos \theta_2 \frac{d\theta_2}{d\theta_1} = -\cos \theta_1 \quad (A11)$$

Equating $d\Sigma/d\theta_1 = 0$ and simplifying the equations, we get either $\phi + \theta_1 = 0$ or $\phi + \theta_2 = 0$ or $\theta_1 = \theta_2$, $\phi + \theta_1 = 0$ or $\phi + \theta_2 = 0$ would imply that one of the circles vanishes; however, this is possible only when $x \leq 2\rho$. When $\theta_1 = \theta_2$, we note that $d\theta_2/d\theta_1 = -1$ and $d\phi/d\theta_1 = 0$. Using this, one can verify that $d^2\Sigma/d\theta_1^2 = 2(1 - \cos \phi + \phi)\sin(\theta_1 + \phi) \Rightarrow d^2\Sigma/d\theta_1^2 > 0$. Therefore, the length of the RL path reaches a minimum when $\theta_1 = \theta_2$.

Case 1: $4\rho \geq x \geq 2\rho$.

The optimum for $\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{\Sigma(\theta_1)\}$ must occur at one of the extreme values of $\Sigma(\theta_1)$ or when $\theta_1 \in \{\theta_1^\text{min}, \theta_1^\text{max}\}$ or $\theta_2 \in \{\theta_2^\text{min}, \theta_2^\text{max}\}$. The RL path reaches a local minimum at $\theta_1 = \theta_1^\text{opt}$ (Fig. 16). Also, the RL path just ceases to exist when $\theta_1 = \theta_1^\text{opt}$ or $\theta_1 = \theta_1^\text{max}$. Specifically, for a small $\epsilon > 0$, the RL path does not exist when $\theta_1^\text{opt} - \epsilon < \theta_1 < \theta_1^\text{opt} + \epsilon$. Therefore, $\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{\Sigma(\theta_1)\} := \min\{\Sigma^1(\theta_1^\text{opt}), \Sigma^2(\theta_1^\text{opt}), \Sigma^3(\theta_1^\text{opt}), \Sigma^4(\theta_1^\text{opt})\}$. Case 2: $2\rho \geq x \geq 0$.

In this case, one of the circles may cease to exist, and therefore, the optimum may be equal to $d_L$ or $d_R$ if the corresponding angle constraints are met. Following the same arguments as in the previous case, we obtain $\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \{\Sigma(\theta_1)\} := \min\{d_L, d_R, RL^1(\theta_1^\text{opt}), RL^2(\theta_1^\text{opt}), RL^3(\theta_1^\text{opt}), RL^4(\theta_1^\text{opt})\}$. Hence this case is proved.
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