

# Combinatorial optimization

## Exercise sheet 7

Solutions by: Anjana E Jeevanand and David Čadež

25. November 2023

**Exercise 7.1.** Hint already gives us the graph, we just have to prove it satisfies the requirements. So let  $(K_n, c)$  be a graph with weights  $c(\{i, j\}) = \lambda_{i,j}$  (we use  $\lambda_{i,j} = \lambda_{j,i} \ \forall i, j \in K_n$  for this to be well-defined) and  $T$  be a maximum weight spanning tree in  $(K_n, c)$ . Lets show local edge-connectivities in  $T$  are exactly  $\lambda_{i,j}$ .

Since  $T$  is a tree, local edge-connectivity for any pair of vertices is the minimum of weights of edges on the path between them.

Take  $i, j \in T$ .

Condition  $\lambda_{i,k} \geq \min\{\lambda_{i,j}, \lambda_{j,k}\}$  clearly implies  $\lambda_{i,k} \geq \min_{e \in P_{i,k}} \lambda_e$ , where  $P_{i,k}$  is the edge set of the path between  $i$  and  $k$ . This already proves that local edge-connectivity for a pair  $i, j$  is smaller or equal to  $\lambda_{i,j}$ .

Now suppose the inequality would be strict. Let  $\{k, l\} \in P_{i,j}$  be an edge on the path between  $i$  and  $j$  with  $\lambda_{k,l} < \lambda_{i,j}$ . Then we could simply replace  $\{k, l\} \in T$  with  $\{i, j\}$  and obtain a tree with strictly bigger weight, which contradicts our assumption that  $T$  is maximum weight.

Therefore local edge-connectivity is exactly  $\lambda_{i,j}$  for every  $i, j \in T$ .