

P3

Prompt:

Given the described graph G , design an algorithm that runs in time polynomial in n and $\max_e c(e)$ and outputs "yes" if we can satisfy all demands and "no" otherwise.

Algorithm:

Let $\text{Abs}(x)$ be the standard absolute value function that is given a real number x and returns x if $x \geq 0$ and $-x$ if $x < 0$.

Let $\text{FFA}(G)$ be the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm which is given a network $G = (V, E)$ with flow capacity c , a source node s , and a sink node t and returns the flow f from s to t of maximum value.

Input: The described graph G

Output: "yes" if all demands can be satisfied and "no" otherwise

DemandSatisfied(G):

 Let H be a copy of G

 Add vertex s to H

 Add vertex t to H

 Set $r(s) = 0$

 Set $r(t) = 0$

 Let demand = 0

 For each vertex v in H do

 If $r(v) > 0$ then

 Add edge e from s to v with $c(e) = r(v)$

 Else if $r(v) < 0$ then

 Add edge e from v to t with $c(e) = \text{Abs}(r(v))$

 demand += $\text{Abs}(r(v))$

 EndIf

 EndFor

 Let maxFlow = $\text{FFA}(H)$

 If maxFlow \geq demand then

 return "yes"

 Else then

 return "no"

 EndIf

Claim:

The algorithm terminates in time polynomial in n and $\max_e c(e)$.

Proof:

Since we assume that the capacities in G are integers, we know that Ford-Fulkerson is bounded by $O(n * m * \max_e c(e))$ and hence has the same bound on H . The algorithm loop visits each vertex exactly once and so is bounded by the number of vertices in H . Therefore, the Ford-Fulkerson runtime dominates the loop runtime. Thus, the algorithm terminates in $O(n * m * \max_e c(e))$.

Claim:

The algorithm outputs "yes" if and only if we can supply all the demands and "no" otherwise.

Proof:

First, consider the construction of the graph H within the algorithm. Let H be a graph that is a copy of the given arbitrary graph G with the following additions. Let H have two additional vertices s and t where $r(s) = 0$ and $r(t) = 0$. For each vertex v in H such that $r(v) > 0$, let s have a directed edge e to v and let the capacity $c(e) = r(v)$. For each vertex u in H such that $r(u) < 0$, let u have a directed edge f to t and let the capacity $c(f) = \text{Abs}(r(u))$.

Note the following facts about the construction of H :

1. The $\text{Sum}\{c(e) \text{ for all edges } e \text{ directed from } s\} = \text{Sum}\{r(v) \text{ for all vertices } v \text{ with } r(v) > 0 \text{ in } H\} = \text{the sum of all sources in } G = \text{the supply in } G$.
2. The $\text{Sum}\{c(f) \text{ for all edges } f \text{ directed to } t\} = \text{Sum}\{\text{Abs}(r(u)) \text{ for all vertices } u \text{ with } r(u) < 0 \text{ in } H\} = \text{the positive sum of all sinks in } G = \text{the demand in } G$.

Now, we prove the claim by considering the biconditional from both directions.

If the algorithm is given a graph G with feasible supply/demand then the algorithm outputs "yes". For a contradiction, assume that G has feasible supply/demand and the algorithm outputs "no". By the construction of H , we know that since G has a feasible supply/demand that:

1. The sum of the capacity of edges leaving s is \geq the sum of the capacity of the edges entering t and
2. there is sufficient capacity between s and t to carry the current from s to t .

Therefore, the maximum flow found by the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm on H will be \geq the demand of G and the algorithm outputs "yes". Which is a contradiction.

And from the other direction.

If the algorithm outputs "yes" then it was given a graph G with feasible supply/demand. For a contrapositive, assume that G does not have feasible supply/demand that the algorithm outputs "no". By construction of H , we know that since G does not have feasible supply/demand that:

1. The sum of the capacity of edges leaving s is less than the sum of the capacity of the edges entering t or
2. there is insufficient capacity between s and t to carry current from s to t .

Therefore, the maximum flow found by the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm on H will be $<$ the demand of G and the algorithm outputs "no".

Since we've shown both directions of the bidirectional, the claim holds. \square