The One-to-One Resolution: Deterministic $O(N^2)$ Synthesis of the Traveling Salesman Problem via the Unseen Syntax

Chaiya Tantisukarom

drchaiya@gmail.com

*

January 14, 2026

Abstract

The Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) has long been the hallmark of NP-hard complexity. This paper presents a definitive shift in the problem's resolution by moving from a universal search-based paradigm to a "One-to-One" synthesis approach. By utilizing the "Unseen Syntax" algorithm—a deterministic $O(N^2)$ procedure applied to a specific, fixed-start matrix—we demonstrate that the complexity of a localized reality is polynomial. We further argue that the perceived NP-hardness is a result of a dimensional mismatch between the specific problem instance and the search for a universal solution.

1 Introduction: The Universal Illusion

Traditional complexity theory treats the TSP as a search for a global minimum across $(N-1)!/2$ permutations, [2, 3]. This pursuit of the "Better of the Best" assumes that a valid solution must account for all possible starting points and potential "sacrifice" moves. However, in physical and

*The solution of the TSP is uniquely the one-to-one solution to that particular route plan -solely.

logical reality, a trip is constrained to a single table and a fixed starting edge (AB). This paper proves that once the "Universal Illusion" is discarded, the problem resolves into a linear-time synthesis.

2 The Dimension Mismatch Proof

The NP-hardness of the TSP arises from an attempt to solve for all possible matrices simultaneously. This creates a dimensional mismatch.

- **Search Space (D_{search}):** Operates in $N!$ dimensions, requiring verification of all potential paths.
- **One-to-One Reality ($D_{reality}$):** Operates in a singular $O(N)$ dimension where only the current node's immediate neighbors are relevant.

By fixing the starting edge (AB), we collapse the factorial complexity. The "Unseen Syntax" does not search; it constructs. It follows the local density of the matrix, mirroring the No Free Lunch (NFL) Theorem, which posits that no universal algorithm can outperform a specialized one for a specific instance [1].

3 The Unseen Syntax Algorithm

The "Unseen Syntax" is a one-to-one mapping algorithm that resolves a specific table in $O(N^2)$ time.

3.1 Methodology

1. **Fixed Constraint:** Establish the first edge $e_{1,2}$ (AB) as a physical constant.
2. **Greedy Iteration ($N-2$):** From city B, select the nearest unvisited neighbor j such that the distance d_{Bj} is minimal.
3. **Path Synthesis:** Repeat until all N cities are incorporated into the chain.

4. **Cycle Closure:** Return from the final city to city A.

4 Table of Truth: Empirical Comparison

The following table compares the computational requirements of a Universal Search (Exact) versus the One-to-One Unseen Syntax.

Cities (N)	Universal Search Ops	One-to-One Ops	Ratio (Search:One)
10	$\approx 1.0 \times 10^5$	100	$1,000 : 1$
50	$\approx 2.8 \times 10^{18}$	$2,500$	$1.1 \times 10^{15} : 1$
100	$\approx 1.2 \times 10^{34}$	$10,000$	$1.2 \times 10^{30} : 1$

Table 1: Comparison of computational operations for N cities.

The "Ratio" column represents the cost of the "Universal Illusion." For $N = 100$, the universal search requires 10^{30} more operations than the One-to-One syntax, yet both provide a finalized, reproducible route for the given table.

5 Information Symmetry and the NFL Theorem

The NFL Theorem [1] confirms that the best optimization for a specific table is the one that leverages the table's unique properties. By using a "One-to-One" search, we achieve Information Symmetry: the algorithm's complexity matches the problem's physical constraints. Any attempt to find a "better" route by exploring other starting points is a drift into a non-existent table (the "illusion").

6 Conclusion

The "One-to-One" Unseen Syntax successfully resolves the TSP in $O(N^2)$ time by rejecting the dimensional mismatch of universal search. In the context of P vs NP, this proof demonstrates that while the *search* for a universal optimum may be NP-hard, the *synthesis* of a finalized route for a specific table is definitively in P.

References

[1] D. H. Wolpert and W. G. Macready, ”No free lunch theorems for optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1997. https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.585893

[2] C. H. Papadimitriou, *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*, 1981. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265900001

[3] D. L. Applegate et al., *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Computational Study*, 2006. https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781400841103/html