CO 450/650 Combinatorial Optimization

Keven Qiu
Instructor: Bill Cook
Fall 2023

Contents

I Introduction **5**

1 Introduction **6**

2 Linear Programming **7**

2.1 Farkas' Lemma 7

2.2 Duality 8

2.3 Complementary Slackness 9

3 Graph Theory **10**

3.1 Undirected Graphs 10

3.2 Directed Graphs 12

4 Complexity Classes **13**

II Polyhedral Combinatorics **14**

5 Integrality of Polyhedra **15**

5.1 Convex Hull 15

5.2 Polytopes 16

5.3 Integral Polytopes 18

5.4 Total Unimodularity 19

5.5 Separation and Optimization 21

5.6 Total Dual Integrality 22

III Optimal Trees and Paths **23**

6 Minimum Spanning Trees **24**

6.1 Problem . . . 24

6.2 Kruskal's Algorithm . . . 24

6.3 Linear Programming . . . 25

6.3.1 Complementary Slackness Conditions . . . 26

6.4 Spanning Tree Polytope . . . 27

7 Shortest Paths **28**

7.1 Ford's Algorithm . . . 29

7.2 Linear Programming . . . 29

IV Network Flows **31**

8 Maximum Flow **32**

8.1 Problem . . . 32

8.2 Augmenting Path Algorithm . . . 32

8.2.1 Shortest Augmenting Paths . . . 33

8.3 Linear Programming . . . 34

V Matchings **38**

9 Matchings **39**

9.1 Bipartite Matching . . . 40

9.2 Alternating Paths . . . 40

9.3 Matching LP . . . 41

9.4 Tutte-Berge Formula . . . 42

9.5 Maximum Matching . . . 45

9.6 Perfect Matching . . . 45

9.6.1 Alternating Trees . . . 45

9.6.2 Bipartite Perfect Matching Algorithm 46
9.6.3 Blossom Algorithm for Perfect Matching 47
9.7 Blossom Algorithm for Maximum Matching 50

10 Weighted Matchings **51**
10.1 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching 51
10.2 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching in Bipartite Graphs 52
10.3 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching in General Graphs 52

11 T-Joins and Postman Problems **57**
11.1 Postman Problem 57
11.2 T-Joins 58
11.3 Optimal T-Join Algorithm 59
11.4 T-Join LP 59

12 General Matching **61**
12.1 General Matching LP 62

VI Matroids 63

13 Matroid Theory **64**

VII Traveling Salesman Problem 65

14 The Traveling Salesman Problem **66**

List of Algorithms

1 Kruskal's Algorithm for MST 25
2 Ford's Algorithm 29
3 Ford-Fulkerson Algorithm 33
4 Bipartite Perfect Matching Algorithm 47
5 Blossom Algorithm for Perfect Matching 49
6 Blossom Algorithm for Maximum Matching 50
7 Bipartite Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching Algorithm 52
8 Blossom Algorithm for Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching 56
9 Optimal T-Join Algorithm 59
10 Greedy Algorithm 64

Part I

Introduction

Chapter 1

Introduction

Definition: Combinatorial Optimization

A subfield of mathematical optimization which involves searching for an optimal object in a finite collection of objects.

Typically, the collection has a concise representation, while the number of objects is large. Objects include graphs, networks, and matroids.

The main tool in combinatorial optimization is linear programming duality.

Chapter 2

Linear Programming

Definition: Linear Programming

The problem of finding a vector x that maximizes a given linear function $c^T x$, where x ranges over all vectors satisfying a given system $Ax \leq b$ of linear inequalities.

2.1 Farkas' Lemma

Lemma (Farkas' Lemma for Inequalities)

The system $Ax \leq b$ has a solution x if and only if there is no vector y satisfying $y \geq 0$, $y^T A = 0$, and $y^T b < 0$.

Proof. Suppose $Ax \leq b$ has a solution $\overline{x}$ and suppose there exists a vector $\overline{y} \geq 0$ satisfying $\overline{y}^T A = 0$ and $\overline{y}^T b < 0$. Then we obtain the contradiction

$$0 > \overline{y}^T b \geq \overline{y}^T (A\overline{x}) = (\overline{y}^T A)\overline{x} = 0$$

Now suppose that $Ax \leq b$ has no solution. If A has only one column, then the result is easy. Otherwise, apply Fourier-Motzkin elimination to obtain a system $A'x' \leq b'$ with one less variable. Since $A'x' \leq b'$ also has no solution, we can assume by induction that there exists a vector $y' \geq 0$ satisfying $y'^T A' = 0$ and $y'^T b' < 0$. Now since each inequality in $A'x' \leq b'$ is the sum of positive multiples of inequalities in $Ax \leq b$, we can use y' to construct a vector y satisfying the conditions in the theorem. □

Lemma (Farkas' Lemma)

The system $Ax = b$ has a nonnegative solution if and only if there is no vector y satisfying $y^T A \geq 0$ and $y^T b < 0$.

Proof. Define

$$A' = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ -A \\ -I \end{bmatrix}, b' = \begin{bmatrix} b \\ -b \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then $Ax = b$ has a nonnegative solution x if and only if $A'x' \leq b'$ has a solution x'. Applying Farkas' Lemma for Inequalities to $A'x' \leq b'$ gives the result. □

Corollary

Suppose the system $Ax \leq b$ has at least one solution. Then every solution x of $Ax \leq b$ satisfies $c^T x \leq \delta$ if and only if there exists a vector $y \geq 0$ such that $y^T A = c$ and $y^T b \leq \delta$.

2.2 Duality

Consider the LP:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & c^T x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax \leq b \end{aligned}$$

and dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & y^T b \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y^T A = c^T \\ & y \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem (Weak Duality)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that $\overline{x}$ is a feasible solution to $Ax \leq b$ and $\overline{y}$ is a feasible solution to $y \geq 0, y^T A = c^T$. Then

$$c^T \overline{x} \leq \overline{y}^T b$$

Proof.

$$c^T \overline{x} = (\overline{y}^T A)\overline{x} = \overline{y}^T (A\overline{x}) \leq \overline{y}^T b$$

□

Theorem (Duality Theorem)

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\max\{c^T x : Ax \leq b\} = \min\{y^T b : y^T A = c^T, y \geq 0\}$$

provided that both sets are nonempty.

Corollary

Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\max\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\} = \min\{y^T b : y^T A \geq c^T\}$$

provided that both sets are nonempty.

2.3 Complementary Slackness

Consider the LP and dual LP

$$\max\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\} = \min\{y^T b : y^T A \geq c^T, y \geq 0\}$$

Definition: Complementary Slackness Conditions

Suppose $\overline{x}, \overline{y}$ are feasible solutions to the primal and dual.

- If a component of $\overline{x} > 0$, then the corresponding inequality in $y^T A \geq c^T$ is satisfied by $\overline{y}$ with equality, i.e.

$$(\overline{y}^T A - c^T)\overline{x} = 0$$

- If a component of $\overline{y} > 0$, then the corresponding inequality in $Ax \leq b$ is satisfied by $\overline{x}$ with equality, i.e.

$$\overline{y}^T(b - A\overline{x}) = 0$$

Theorem (Complementary Slackness Theorem)

Let x^* be a feasible solution of $\max\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\}$ and let y^* be a feasible solution of $\min\{y^T b : y^T A \geq c^T, y \geq 0\}$. Then the following are equivalent:

(a) $\overline{x}, \overline{y}$ are optimal solutions.

(b) $c^T\overline{x} = \overline{y}^T b$

(c) The complementary slackness conditions hold.

Proof. ((a) $\iff$ (b)) By Duality Theorem.

((b) $\iff$ (c)) By Weak Duality, we have $c^T\overline{x} \leq \overline{y}^T A\overline{x} \leq \overline{y}^T b$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} c^T\overline{x} = \overline{y}^T b &\iff \overline{y}^T A\overline{x} = c^T\overline{x} \text{ and } \overline{y}^T b = \overline{y}^T A\overline{x} \\ &\iff (\overline{y}^T A - c^T)\overline{x}) = 0 \text{ and } \overline{y}^T(b - A\overline{x}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Chapter 3

Graph Theory

3.1 Undirected Graphs

Definition: Graph

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a set of vertices/nodes V and a set of edges E.
We define $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$.

Definition: Degree

The degree of a vertex v of a graph G is the number of edges incident with v, denoted $\deg_G(v)$.

Definition: Subgraph

H is a subgraph of G if $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$ and $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$.

Definition: Spanning Subgraph

H is spanning if $V(H) = V(G)$.

Definition: Path

A sequence $P = v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ where $v_0, \ldots, v_k \in V(G)$, $e_1, \ldots, e_k \in E(G)$, and $e_i = v_{i-1}v_i$.

We call P a v_0v_1-path. The length of P is the number of edges in P.

Definition: Simple Path

A path $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ where all v_i are distinct.

Definition: Edge-Simple Path

A path $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ where all e_i are distinct.

Definition: Closed Path

A path $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ where $v_0 = v_k$.

Definition: Circuit/Cycle

An edge-simple, closed path where $v_0, \ldots, v_{k-1}$ are distinct.

Definition: Connected

A graph is connected if every pair of vertices is joined by a path.

Theorem

A graph G is connected if and only if there is no set $A \subseteq V$ where $\emptyset \neq A \neq V$ with $\delta(A) = \emptyset$.

Definition: Connected Component

A maximal connected subgraph.

Definition: Cut Vertex

A vertex v of a connected graph G where $G - v$ is not connected.

Definition: Forest

A graph with no circuits.

Definition: Tree

A connected forest.

Definition: Cut

Let $R \subseteq V$, then

$$\delta(R) = \{vw : vw \in E, v \in R, w \notin R\}$$

Definition: rs-Cut

A cut for which $r \in R, s \notin R$.

3.2 Directed Graphs

Definition: Digraph

A digraph $G = (V, E)$ is a set of vertices/nodes V and a set of edges E, sometimes called arcs, where each $e \in E$ has two ends, one called the head $h(e)$ and the other called the tail $t(e)$.

Definition: Forward Arc

In a path $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$, $e_i \in P$ is called forward if $t(e_i) = v_{i-1}$ and $h(e_i) = v_i$.

Definition: Backward Arc

In a path $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$, $e_i \in P$ is called backward if $t(e_i) = v_i$ and $h(e_i) = v_{i-1}$.

Definition: Dipath

If all arcs in a path P are forward, then P is a dipath.

Definition: Dicircuit

A dipath that is a circuit.

Definition: Directed Spanning Tree

A directed spanning tree rooted at r is a spanning tree that contains a dipath from r to each $v \in V$.

Chapter 4

Complexity Classes

Definition: Decision Problem

A problem with a yes-no answer.

Definition: $\mathcal{P}$

Decision problems that can be solved in polynomial time.

Definition: $\mathcal{NP}$

Decision problems in which we can certify the answer is yes in polynomial time.

Definition: co-$\mathcal{NP}$

Decision problems in which we can certify the answer is no in polynomial time.

A good characterization means the problem is in $\mathcal{NP} \cap co - \mathcal{NP}$.

Definition: $\mathcal{NP}$-Hard

A problem X is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard if every other problem Y in $\mathcal{NP}$ can be reduced to X.

S. Cook (1971) proved that the satisfiability problem (SAT) is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard. R. Karp (1972) used Cook's result to show 21 well-known combinatorial optimization problems are also $\mathcal{NP}$-hard.

To show that the traveling salesman problem (TSP) is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard, we show that any example of SAT can be formulated as a TSP, of size polynomial in the size of SAT. Then, since Cook shows SAT is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard, TSP is also $\mathcal{NP}$-hard.

Part II

Polyhedral Combinatorics

Chapter 5

Integrality of Polyhedra

5.1 Convex Hull

Definition: Convex Combination

$x = \lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k v_k$ for some vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ and nonnegative scalars $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ such that $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k = 1$.

Definition: Convex Hull

The convex hull of a finite set S, denoted $conv.hull(S)$, is the set of all vectors that can be written as a convex combination of S.
It is also defined as the smallest convex set containing S.

Proposition

Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a finite set and let $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\max / \min\{w^T x : x \in S\} = \max / \min\{w^T x : x \in conv.hull(S)\}$$

Theorem (Minkowski)

If S is finite, then $conv.hull(S)$ is a polyhedron.

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{w^T x : x \in S\} &= \max\{w^T x : x \in conv.hull(S)\} \\ &= \max\{w^T x : Ax \leq b\} \\ &= \min\{y^T b : y^T A = w^T, y \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

So we can use LP duality to attack combinatorial problems. If we understand $Ax \leq b$, then the problem is in co-$\mathcal{NP}$. Thus, if we have an algorithm to produce the inequalities in $Ax \leq b$ (separation), then the problem is in $\mathcal{P}$ (Ellipsoid method).

5.2 Polytopes

Definition: Polyhedron

A set of the form $\{x : Ax \leq b\}$.

In combinatorial optimization, we typically have $x \geq 0$ as a constraint, so we have polyhedra of the form $\{x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\}$.

Definition: Polytope

A polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a polytope if there exists $\ell, u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\ell \leq x \leq u$ for all $x \in P$.

Definition: Convex Set

Let P be a polyhedron, $x_1, x_2 \in P$, and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. If $\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 \in P$, then P is a convex set.

Definition: Valid Inequality

An inequality $w^T x \leq t$ is valid for a polyhedron P if $P \subseteq \{x : w^T x \leq t\}$.

Definition: Hyperplane

The solution set of $w^T x = t$ where $w \neq 0$.

Definition: Supporting Hyperplane

With respect to a polyhedron P, a hyperplane is supporting if $w^T x \leq t$ is valid for P and $P \cap \{x : w^T x = t\} \neq \emptyset$.

Definition: Face

The intersection of a polyhedron with one of its supporting hyperplanes.

The null set and the polyhedron itself is a face.

Definition: Proper Face

Faces which are not the null set or the polyhedron itself.

Proposition

A nonempty set $F \subseteq P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ is a face of P if and only if for some subsystem $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ of $Ax \leq b$, we have $F = \{x \in P : A^\circ x = b^\circ\}$.

Proof. ($\implies$) Suppose F is a face of P. Then there exists a valid inequality $w^T x \leq t$ such that $F = \{x \in P : w^T x = t\}$.

Consider the LP problem $\max\{w^T x : Ax \leq b\}$. The set of optimal solutions is precisely F. Now let y^* be an optimal solution to the dual problem $\min\{y^T b : y^T A = w, y \geq 0\}$ and let $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ be those inequalities $a_i^T x \leq b_i$ whose corresponding dual variable y_i^* is positive. By complementary slackness, we have $F = \{x : Ax \leq b, A^\circ x = b^\circ\}$ as required.

($\Longleftarrow$) Conversely, if $F = \{x \in P : A^\circ x = b^\circ\}$ for some subsystem $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ of $Ax \leq b$, then add the inequalities $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ to obtain an inequality $w^T x \leq t$. Every $x \in F$ satisfies $w^T x = t$ and every $x \in P \setminus F$ satisfies $w^T x < t$ as required. □

Proposition

Let F be a minimal nonempty face of $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$. Then $F = \{x : A^\circ x = b^\circ\}$ for some subsystem $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ of $Ax \leq b$.
Moreover, the rank of the matrix A° is equal to the rank of A.

Definition: Vertex/Extreme Point

A vector $x \in P$ is called a vertex/extreme point if $\{x\}$ is a face of P.
Equivalently, $x \in P$ is a vertex/extreme point if x cannot be written as $\frac{1}{2}x_1 + \frac{1}{2}x_2$ for points $x_1, x_2 \in P, x_1 \neq x_2$.

Note: Not all polyhedra have vertices, but if $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n_+$, then P has vertices.

LP Fact

If a polyhedron P has vertices, then the set of optimal LP solutions contains at least one vertex of P.
Moreover, if all vertices of P are integral, then the LP always has an integral optimal solution.

Definition: Pointed Polyhedron

A polyhedron P is pointed if it has at least one vertex.

$\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \geq 0\}$ is a polyhedron with no vertex.

Proposition

If a polyhedron P is pointed, then every minimal nonempty face of P is a vertex.

Proposition

Let $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ and $v \in P$. Then v is a vertex of P if and only if v cannot be written as a convex combination of vectors in $P \setminus \{v\}$.

Theorem

A polytope is equal to the convex hull of its vertices.

Proof. Let P be a nonempty polytope. Since P is bounded, P must be pointed. Let

$v_1, \ldots, v_k$ be the vertices of P. Clearly, $conv.hull(\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}) \subseteq P$. So suppose there exists

$$u \in P \setminus conv.hull(\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\})$$

Then by proposition, there exists an inequality $w^T x \leq t$ that separates u from

$$conv.hull(\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\})$$

Let $t^* = \max\{w^T x : x \in P\}$ and consider the face $F = \{x \in P : w^T x = t^*\}$. Since $u \in P$, we have $t^* > t$. So F contains no vertex of P, a contradiction. □

Theorem

A set P is a polytope if and only if there exists a finite set V such that P is the convex hull of V.

5.3 Integral Polytopes

Definition: Rational Polyhedron

A polyhedron that can be defined by rational linear systems.

Definition: Integral Polyhedron

A rational polyhedron where every nonempty face contains an integral vector.

Definition: Pointed Integral Polyhedron

A pointed rational polyhedron is integral if and only if all its vertices are integral.

Theorem

A rational polytope P is integral if and only if for all integral vectors w, the optimal value of $\max\{w^T x : x \in P\}$ is an integer.

Proof. To prove sufficiency, suppose that for all integral vectors w, the optimal value of $\max\{w^T x : x \in P\}$ is an integer. Let $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)^T$ be a vertex of P and let w be an integral vector such that v is the unique optimal solution to $\max\{w^T x : x \in P\}$. By multiplying w by a large positive integer if necessary, we may assume $w^T v > w^T u + u_1 - v_1$ for all vertices u of P other than v. This implies that if we let $\overline{w} = (w_1 + 1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)^T$, then v is an optimal solution to $\max\{\overline{w}^T x : x \in P\}$. So $\overline{w}^T v = w^T v + v_1$. But, by assumption, $w^T v$ and $\overline{w}^T v$ are integers. Thus, v_1 is an integer. We can repeat this for each component of v, so v must be integral. □

5.4 Total Unimodularity

Proposition

Let A be an integral, nonsingular, $m \times n$ matrix. Then $A^{-1}b$ is integral for every integral vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if and only if $\det(A) = 1$ or -1.

Proof. ($\Longleftarrow$) Suppose $\det(A) = \pm 1$. By Cramer's Rule, we know that A^{-1} is integral, which implies $A^{-1}b$ is integral for every integral b.

($\Longrightarrow$) Conversely, suppose $A^{-1}b$ is integral for all integral vectors b. Then, in particular, $A^{-1}e_i$ is integral for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. This means that A^{-1} is integral. So $\det(A)$ and $\det(A^{-1})$ are both integers. But, $\det(A) \cdot \det(A^{-1}) = 1$, this implies $\det(A) = \pm 1$. □

Definition: Unimodular

A matrix A of full row rank is unimodular if A is integral and each basis of A has determinant ± 1.

Theorem (Veinott & Dantzig 1968)

Let A be an integral $m \times n$ matrix of full row rank. Then the polyhedron defined by $Ax = b, x \geq 0$ is integral for every integral vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if and only if A is unimodular.

Proof. ($\Longleftarrow$) Suppose A is unimodular. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be an integral vector and let $\overline{x}$ be a vertex of $\{x : Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$. The nonnegativity constraints implies the polyhedron has vertices. Then there are n linearly independent constraints satisfied by $\overline{x}$ with inequality. It follows that the columns of A corresponding to the nonzero components of $\overline{x}$ are linearly independent. Extending these columns to a basis B of A, we have the nonzero components of $\overline{x}$ are contained in the integral vector $B^{-1}b$. So $\overline{x}$ is integral.

($\Longrightarrow$) Conversely, suppose $\{x : Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$ is integral for all integral vectors b. Let B be a basis of A and let v be an integral vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. By previous proposition, it suffices to show that $B^{-1}v$ is integral. Let y be an integral vector such that $y + B^{-1}v \geq 0$ and let $b = B(y + B^{-1}v)$. Note b is integral. Furthermore, by adding zero components to the vector $y + B^{-1}v$, we can obtain a vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $Az = b$. Then, z is a vertex of $\{x : Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$, since z is a polyhedron and satisfies n linearly independent constraints with equality: the m equations $Ax = b$ and the $n - m$ equations $x_i = 0$ for the columns i outside B. So z is integral, and thus, $B^{-1}v$ is integral. □

Definition: Totally Unimodular (TU)

A matrix is totally unimodular if all of its square submatrices have determinant 0, 1, or -1.

It is easy to see that A is totally unimodular if and only if $\begin{bmatrix} A & I \end{bmatrix}$ is unimodular where $I \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.

Theorem (Hoffman-Kruskal)

Let A be an $m \times n$ integral matrix. Then the polyhedron defined by $Ax \leq b, x \geq 0$ is integral for every integral vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if and only if A is totally unimodular.

Proof. Applying the linear programming trick of adding slack variables, we have that for any integral b, the polyhedron $\{x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0\}$ is integral if and only if the polyhedron $\{z : \begin{bmatrix} A & I \end{bmatrix} z = b, z \geq 0\}$ is integral. So the result follows from previous theorem. □

Theorem

Let A be an $m \times n$ totally unimodular matrix and let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be an integral vector. Then the polyhedron defined by $Ax \leq b$ is integral.

Proof. Let F be a minimal face of $\{x : Ax \leq b\}$. Then, by proposition, $F = \{x : A^\circ x = b^\circ\}$ for some subsystem $A^\circ x \leq b^\circ$ of $Ax \leq b$, with A° having full row rank. By reordering the columns, if necessary, we may write A° as $\begin{bmatrix} B & N \end{bmatrix}$ where B is a basis of A°. It follows

$$\overline{x} = \begin{bmatrix} B^{-1}b^\circ \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

is an integral vector in F. □

Theorem

Let A be a $0, \pm 1$ valued matrix where each column has at most one $+1$ and at most -1. Then A is totally unimodular.

Proof. Let N be a $k \times k$ submatrix of A. If $k = 1$, then $\det(N)$ is either 0 or ± 1. So we may suppose that $k \geq 2$ and proceed by induction on k. If N has a column having at most one nonzero, then expanding the determinant along this column, we have that $\det(N)$ is either 0 or ± 1, by induction. On the other hand, if every column of N has both a $+1$ and a -1, then the sum of the rows of N is 0 and hence $\det(N) = 0$. □

Let $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph and let A be its incidence matrix. Then A is totally unimodular.

Definition: Network Matrix

Let $T = (V, E')$ be a spanning tree of D and define the matrix M having rows indexed by E' and columns indexed by E, where $e = (u, v) \in E$ and $e' \in E'$.

$$M_{e',e} = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } uv\text{-path in } T \text{ uses } e' \text{ in forward direction} \\ -1 & \text{if } uv\text{-path in } T \text{ uses } e' \text{ in backward direction} \\ 0 & \text{if } uv\text{-path in } T \text{ does not use } e' \end{cases}$$

Theorem (Tutte 1965)

Network matrices are totally unimodular.

Proposition

A is totally unimodular if and only if A^T is totally unimodular.

5.5 Separation and Optimization

Recall that the plan for polyhedral combinatorics is to formulate the problem as optimizing over a finite set of vectors S, find a linear description of $conv.hull(S)$, and apply the Duality Theorem of Linear Programming. This gives us a min-max relation for the combinatorial problem.

Separation Problem

Given a bounded rational polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a rational vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, either conclude that $v \in P$ or, if not, find a rational vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $w^T x < w^T v$ for all $x \in P$.

Optimization Problem

Given a bounded rational polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a rational objective vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, either find $x^* \in P$ that maximizes $w^T x$ over all $x \in P$ or conclude that P is empty.

Definition: Classes of Polyhedra

$\mathcal{P} = \{P_t : t \in \mathcal{O}\}$ where $\mathcal{O}$ is some collection of objects and for each $t \in \mathcal{O}$, P_t is a bounded rational polyhedron.

E.g. $\mathcal{O}$ is the collection of all graphs and P_t is the perfect matching polytope for the graph t.

Definition: Proper Class

For each object $t \in \mathcal{P}$, we can compute in polynomial time (with respect to size of t) positive integers n_t and s_t such that $P_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_t}$. and such that P_t can be described by a linear system where each inequality has size at most s_t.

Definition: Polynomially Solvable

A separation/optimization problem is polynomially solvable over the class $\mathcal{P}$ if there exists a polynomial time algorithm to solve the problem.

Theorem (Separation $\equiv$ Optimization)

For any proper class of polyhedra, the optimization problem is polynomially solvable if and only if the separation problem is polynomially solvable.

5.6 Total Dual Integrality

Definition: Totally Dual Integral

A rational linear system $Ax \leq b$ is totally dual integral if the minimum of

$$\max\{w^T x : Ax \leq b\} = \min\{y^T b : y^T A = w^T, y \geq 0\}$$

can be achieved by an integral vector y for each integral w for which the optima exist.

Theorem (Hoffman 1974)

Let $Ax \leq b$ be a totally dual integral system such that $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ is a rational polytope and b is integral. Then P is an integral polytope.

Proof. Since b is integral, the duality equation implies $\max\{w^T x : x \in P\}$ is an integer for all integral vectors w. Thus, by theorem for integral polytopes, P is integral. □

Theorem

Let P be a rational polyhedron. Then there exists a totally dual integral system $Ax \leq b$, with A integral, such that $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$. Furthermore, if P is a integral polyhedron, then b can be chosen to be integral.

Part III

Optimal Trees and Paths

Chapter 6

Minimum Spanning Trees

6.1 Problem

Definition: Spanning Tree

A subgraph $T \subseteq G$ where $V(T) = V(G)$, T is connected, and T is acyclic.

Lemma

An edge $e = uv$ of G is an edge of a circuit of G if and only if there is a path in $G \setminus e$ from u to v.

Minimum Spanning Tree Problem (MST)

Given a connected graph G and a real cost c_e for each $e \in E$, find a minimum cost spanning tree of G.

Lemma

A spanning connected subgraph of G is a spanning tree if and only if it has exactly $n - 1$ edges.

6.2 Kruskal's Algorithm

Theorem

Kruskal's algorithm finds a MST.

This is a polynomial time algorithm and is very fast in practice for sparse graphs. We can maintain F with a union-find data structure.

Algorithm 1 Kruskal's Algorithm for MST

Sort E to $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ so that $c_{e_1} \leq \cdots \leq c_{e_m}$
$F = \emptyset, H = (V, F)$
for $i = 1$ to m **do**
    if ends of e_i are in different components of H **then**
        $F \leftarrow F \cup \{e_i\}$
return H

6.3 Linear Programming

Definition: $\kappa : E \to \mathbb{N}$

For $A \subseteq E$, $\kappa(A)$ is the number of components in the subgraph (V, A) of G.

The maximum number of tree edges in A is $|V| - \kappa(A)$.

We can formulate the MST problem as an ILP.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & c^T x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(x_e : e \in A) \leq |V| - \kappa(A), \ \forall A \subsetneq E \\ & \sum(x_e : e \in E) = |V| - 1 \\ & x_e \in \{0, 1\}, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

We can relax the integer program to get the following linear program.

Definition: MST LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & c^T x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(A) \leq |V| - \kappa(A), \ \forall A \subsetneq E \\ & x(E) = |V| - 1 \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

We replace the minimization with a maximization in the primal to write the dual.

Definition: MST Dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum((|V| - \kappa(A))y_A : A \subseteq E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(y_A : e \in A) \geq -c_e, \ \forall e \in E \\ & y_A \geq 0, \ \forall A \subsetneq E \end{aligned}$$

6.3.1 Complementary Slackness Conditions

Let T be a tree found by Kruskal's algorithm. Define the characteristic vector of T

$$x_e^0 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in E(T) \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin E(T) \end{cases}$$

Definition: MST Complementary Slackness Conditions

(i) For all $e \in E$, if $x_e^0 > 0$, then $\sum(y_A^0 : e \in A) = -c_e$.

(ii) For all $A \subsetneq E$, if $y_A^0 > 0$, then $\sum(x_e^0 : e \in A) = |V| - \kappa(A)$.

Theorem (Edmonds 1971)

Let x^0 be the characteristic vector of an MST with respect to costs c_e. Then x^0 is an optimal solution to the MST LP.

Proof. We show that x^0 is optimal for the LP and x^0 is the characteristic vector generated by Kruskal's algorithm.

Let $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ be the order in which Kruskal's algorithm considers the edges. Let $R_i = \{e_1, \ldots, e_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let y^0 be the be the dual solution.

- $y_A^0 = 0$ if A is not one of the R_i's.
- $y_{R_i}^0 = c_{e_{i+1}} - c_{e_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$.
- $y_{R_m}^0 = -c_{e_m}$

It follows from the ordering of the edges, $y_A^0 \geq 0$ for $A \neq E$. Now consider the first constraint, then where $e = e_i$, we have

$$\sum(y_A^0 : e \in A) = \sum_{j=i}^{m} y_{R_j}^0 = \sum_{j=i}^{m-1} (c_{e_{j+1}} - c_{e_j}) - c_{e_m} = -c_{e_i} = -c_{e_i} = -c_e$$

All of the inequalities hold with equality. So y^0 is a feasible dual solution and complementary slackness condition (i) holds.

Now suppose $y_A^0 > 0$ for some $A \subsetneq E$. Thus, $A = R_i$ for some i. Consider the constraint

$$\sum(x_e^0 : e \in R_i) \leq |V| - \kappa(R_i)$$

If this does not hold with equality, then there is some edge of R_i having ends in two different components. of $(V, R_i \cap T)$ and this would have been added to T by Kruskal's algorithm. So (x^0, y^0) satisfy the complementary slackness conditions, which means they are optimal solutions to their LPs. Therefore, T is a MST. $\square$

6.4 Spanning Tree Polytope

Definition: Spanning Tree Polytope

$conv.hull\{x^H : H \text{ is a spanning tree}\}$ where

$$x_e^H = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in E(H) \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin E(H) \end{cases}$$

Theorem

The spanning tree polytope is the solution set to the following linear system:

$$\sum(x_e : e \in A) \leq |V| - \kappa(A), \ \forall A \subsetneq E$$
$$\sum(x_e : e \in E) = |V| - 1$$
$$x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E$$

Proof. Let P be the solution set of the linear system. We showed that for any edge costs $(c_e : e \in E)$, the LP

$$\max\{\sum(-c_e x_e : e \in E) : x \in P\}$$

has an integral optimal solution. So every vertex of P is integral. □

Chapter 7

Shortest Paths

Shortest Path Problem

Given a digraph G, a vertex $r \in V$, and a real cost vector $(c_e : e \in E)$, find for each $v \in V$, a minimum-cost dipath from r to v.

Note: You can provide a solution to the shortest path problem for r by giving a directed spanning tree rooted at r.

Proof. For each $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$, all shortest paths have at most one arc having head v_j, since the only such arc we need is the last arc of one min-cost rv-dipath.

So the union of the arc sets of all the shortest paths has exactly $|V| - 1$ arcs and thus is a tree. □

Important Case

If $c_e \geq 0$ for all $e \in E$, then this problem is handled by Dijkstra's algorithm, which starts at r and grows the tree vertex by vertex.

However, the Hamiltonian dipath problem (does G have a simple dipath P with $V(P) = V(G)$) is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard.

When G has negative-cost dicircuits, this is a problem, since there is no shortest path as we can loop around the dicircuit an infinite amount of times. There do exist polynomial time algorithms that either finds a shortest path or detect a negative-cost dicircuit.

Definition: Feasible Potential

$y = (y_v : v \in V)$ is a feasible potential if it satisfies $y_v + c_{vw} \geq y_w$ for all $vw \in E$.

Proposition

Let y be a feasible potential and let P be an rs-dipath. Then $c(P) \geq y_s - y_r$.

Proof. Suppose that P is $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k$ where $v_0 = r$ and $v_k = s$. Then

$$c(P) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_{e_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} (y_{v_i} - y_{v_{i-1}}) = y_{v_k} - y_{v_0} = y_s - y_r$$

□

So a potential y provides a stopping rule. A dipath P and a potential y with $c(P) = y_s - y_r$ implies P is optimal.

7.1 Ford's Algorithm

Definition: Incorrect

Given vertex values $(y_v : v \in V)$, the edge vw is incorrect if $y_v + c_{vw} < y_w$.

To correct vw, we set $y_w = y_v + c_{vw}$ and predecessor$(w) = v$.

Algorithm 2 Ford's Algorithm

1: $y_r = 0, y_v = \infty$ for all $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$
2: predecessor$(r) = \emptyset$, predecessor$(v) = -1$ for all $v \in V \setminus \{r\}$
3: **while** y is not a feasible potential **do**
4: Find an incorrect arc vw and correct vw

Theorem

If there are no negative-cost dicircuits, then Ford's algorithm terminates in a finite number of steps.
At termination, for each $v \in V$, the predecessors define a shortest rv-dipath of cost y_v.

Specialized versions like Ford-Bellman run in polynomial time.

7.2 Linear Programming

Definition: Shortest Path LP

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & y_s - y_r \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_w - y_v \leq c_{vw}, \ \forall vw \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Shortest Path Dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(x_{wv} : wv \in E) - \sum(x_{vw} : vw \in E) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in V \setminus \{r, s\} \\ -1 & \text{if } v = r \\ 1 & \text{if } v = s \end{cases} \\ & x_{vw} \geq 0, \ \forall vw \in E \end{aligned}$$

Any rs-dipath is a solution to the dual LP, so if the dual LP has an optimal solution, then it has an optimal solution that is an rs-dipath.

The constraint matrix for the LP is totally unimodular.

Theorem

Let G be a digraph, $r, s \in V$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$. If there exists a minimum-cost dipath from r to v for every $v \in V$, then

$$\min\{c(P) : P \text{ an } rs\text{-dipath}\} = \max\{y_s : y \text{ a feasible potential}\}$$

The vertices of the polyhedron defined by the dual LP constraints are the vectors x^P of simple dipaths.

$$x_e^P = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in E(P) \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin E(P) \end{cases}$$

Note: This is *not* the convex hull of simple dipaths.

Since the matrix is totally unimodular, we could add $x_{vw} \leq 1$ for all $vw \in E$, but this will not give simple dipaths.

Part IV

Network Flows

Chapter 8

Maximum Flow

8.1 Problem

Definition: Net Flow/Excess

$$f_x(v) = x(\delta(\overline{v})) - x(\delta(v)) = \sum(x_{wv} : w \in V, wv \in E) - \sum(x_{vw} : w \in V, vw \in E)$$

Definition: rs-Flow

A vector x that satisfies $f_x(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V$.

Definition: Value of rs-Flow

$$f_x(s)$$

Maximum Flow Problem

Given a digraph $G = (V, E)$, with source r and sink s, find an rs-flow of maximum value.

8.2 Augmenting Path Algorithm

Definition: Augmenting Path

An rs-path P is x-augmenting if for all forward arcs e we have $x_e < u_e$, and for all reverse arcs e we have $x_e > 0$.

Algorithm 3 Ford-Fulkerson Algorithm

```
x = 0
while there is an x-augmenting path P do
    ε1 = min(u_e − x_e : e forward in P)
    ε2 = min(x_e : e reverse in P)
    ε = min(ε1, ε2)   // x-width of P
    if ε = ∞ then
        No maximum flow
return x is maximum flow, set R of vertices reachable by an x-augmenting path from r is minimum cut
```

Definition: Auxiliary Digraph

$G(x)$, depending on G, u, x, where $V(G(x)) = V$ and $vw \in E(G(x))$ if and only if $vw \in E$ and $x_{vw} < u_{vw}$ or $wv \in E$ and $x_{wv} > 0$.

rs-dipaths in $G(x)$ corresponding to x-augmenting paths in G. Each iteration of Ford-Fulkerson can be performed in $O(m)$ time, using breadth-first search.

Theorem

If u is integral and the maximum flow value is $K < \infty$, then the maximum flow algorithm terminates after at most K augmentations.

8.2.1 Shortest Augmenting Paths

Theorem (Dinits 1970, Edmonds & Karp 1972)

If each augmentation of the augmenting path algorithm on a shortest augmenting path, then there are at most nm augmentations.

Corollary

The augmenting path algorithm with breadth-first search solves the maximum flow problem in time $O(nm^2)$.

Let $d_x(v, w)$ be the least length of a vw-dipath in $G(x)$. $d_x(v, w) = \infty$ if no vw-dipath exists.

Consider a typical augmentation from flow x to flow x' determined by the augmenting path P having vertex-sequence $v_0, \ldots, v_k$.

Lemma

For each $v \in V$, $d_{x'}(r, v) \geq d_x(r, v)$ and $d_{x'}(v, s) \geq d_x(v, s)$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists a vertex v such that $d_{x'}(r, v) < d_x(r, v)$ and choose such v so that $d_{x'}(r, v)$ is as small as possible. Clearly, $d_{x'}(r, v) > 0$. Let P' be a rv-dipath in $G(x')$

of length $d_{x'}(r,v)$ and let w be the second-last vertex of P'. Then

$$d_x(r,v) > d_{x'}(r,v) = d_{x'}(r,w) + 1 \geq d_x(r,w) + 1$$

It follows that wv is an arc of $G(x')$, but not of $G(x)$, otherwise $d_x(r,v) \leq d_x(r,w) + 1$, so $w = v_i$ and $v = v_{i-1}$ for some i. But, this implies that $i - 1 > i + 1$, a contradiction. The second statement is similar. □

Definition: $\tilde{E}(x)$

$$\tilde{E}(x) = \{e \in E : e \text{ is an arc of a shortest } x\text{-augmenting path}\}$$

Lemma

If $d_{x'}(r,s) = d_x(r,s)$, then $\tilde{E}(x') \subsetneq \tilde{E}(x)$.

Proof. Let $k = d_x(r,s)$ and suppose that $e \in \tilde{E}(x')$. Then e induces an arc vw of $G(x')$ and $d_{x'}(r,v) = i-1$, $d_{x'}(ws) = k-i$ for some i. Therefore, $d_x(r,v) + d_x(w,s) \leq k-1$ by previous lemma. Now suppose that $e \notin \tilde{E}(x)$, then $x_e \neq x'_e$, so e is an arc of P, a contradiction. This proves $\tilde{E}(x') \subseteq \tilde{E}(x)$.

There is an arc e of P such that e is forward and $x'_e = u_e$ or e is reverse and $x'_e = 0$. Therefore, any x'-augmenting path using e must use it in the opposite direction from P, so its length, for some i, will be at least $i + k - i + 1 + 1 = k + 23$, so $e \notin \tilde{E}(x')$. □

Proof. (Dinits, Edmonds, Karp) It follows from previous lemma that there can be at most m augmentations per stage. Since there are at most $n - 1$ stages, there are at most nm augmentations in all. □

8.3 Linear Programming

Definition: Maximum Flow LP

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & f_x(s) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_x(v) = 0, \ \forall v \in V \setminus \{r,s\} \\ & 0 \leq x_e \leq u_e, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

We give a different LP approach to this problem.

Definition: Minimum Cut LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(u_e y_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(y_e : e \in E(P)) \geq 1, \ \forall \ rs\text{-simple dipaths } P \\ & y_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Every rs-cut $\delta(R)$ gives a feasible solution

$$y_e^R = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in \delta(R) \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin \delta(R) \end{cases}$$

Definition: Maximum Flow LP (Dual Minimum Cut LP)

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(w_P : P \text{ a simple } rs\text{-dipath}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(w_P : e \in E(P)) \leq u_e, \ \forall e \in E \\ & w_P \geq 0, \ \forall \text{ simple dipaths } P \end{aligned}$$

Let x be a max flow. We want to find a simple rs-dipath P such that $x_e > 0$ for each $e \in E(P)$. Set $w_P = \min\{x_e : e \in E(P)\}$ and let $x_e = x_e - w_P$ for all $e \in E(P)$. We repeat until $\sum(x_{rv} : rv \in E) = 0$.

$\sum(w_P : P \text{ a simple } rs\text{-dipath})$ is equal to the original value of the flow. Therefore, the max flow equals the min cut which implies the two LPs have integral optimal solutions if u_e is integral for all $e \in E$.

Proposition

There exists a family $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ of rs-dipaths such that $|\{i : e \in P_i\}| \leq u_e$ for all $e \in E$ if and only if there exists an integral feasible rs-flow of value k.

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) We have seen family of dipaths determines a corresponding flow.

($\Longleftarrow$) Let x be a flow. We assume that x is acyclic, that is, there is no dicircuit C, each of whose arcs e has $x_e > 0$. If a dicircuit does exist, we can decrease x_e by 1 on all arcs of C. The new x remains feasible of value k.

If $k \geq 1$, we can find an arc vs with $x_{vs} \geq 1$. Then, if $v \neq r$, it follows that there is an arc wv with $x_{wv} \geq 1$ by the constraint $f_x(v) = 0$. If $w \neq r$, then the argument can be repeated producing distinct vertices, since x is acyclic, so we get a simple rs-dipath P_k on each arc e with $x_e \geq 1$. We can decrease x_e by 1 for each $e \in P_k$. The new x is an integral feasible flow of value $k - 1$, and the process is repeated. □

Definition: Path Flow

A vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ such that for some rs-dipath P and some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_e = \alpha$ for each $e \in P$ and $x_e = 0$ for every other arc of G.

Definition: Circuit Flow

A vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ such that for some rs-dicircuit C and some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_e = \alpha$ for each $e \in C$ and $x_e = 0$ for every other arc of G.

Proposition

Every rs-flow of nonnegative value is the sum of at most m flows, each of which is a path flow or a circuit flow.

Proposition

For any rs-cut $\delta(R)$ and any rs-flow x, we have

$$f_x(s) = x(\delta(R)) - x(\delta(\overline{R}))$$

Proof. We add the equations $f_x(v) = 0$ for all $v \in \overline{R} \setminus \{s\}$ as well as the identity $f_x(s) = f_x(s)$. The right hand side sums to $f_x(s)$.

For any arc vw with $v, w \in R$, x_{vw} occurs in none of the equations, so it does not occur in the sum. If $v, w \in \overline{R}$, then x_{vw} occurs in the equation for v with a coefficient of -1, and in the equation for w with a coefficient of $+1$, so it has a coefficient of 0 in the sum. If $v \in R, w \notin R$, then x_{vw} occurs in the equation for w with a coefficient of 1, and so has coefficient 1 in the sum. If $v \notin R, w \in R$, then x_{vw} occurs in the sum with a coefficient of -1. So, the left hand side sums to $x(\delta(R)) - x(\delta(\overline{R}))$, as required. □

Corollary

For any feasible rs-flow x and any rs-cut $\delta(R)$,

$$f_x(s) \leq u(\delta(R))$$

Proof. Using previous proposition, since $x(\delta(R)) \leq u(\delta(R))$ and $x(\delta(\overline{R})) \geq 0$. □

Theorem (Max-Flow Min-Cut)

If there is a maximum rs-flow, then

$$\max\{f_x(s) : x \text{ is a feasible } rs\text{-flow}\} = \min\{u(\delta(R)) : \delta(R) \text{ is an } rs\text{-cut}\}$$

Proof. By previous corollary, we need only show that there exists a feasible flow x and a cut $\delta(R)$ such that $f_x(s) = u(\delta(R))$. Let x be a flow of maximum value. Let $R = \{v \in V : \text{there exists an } x\text{-augmenting } rv\text{-path}\}$. Clearly $r \in R$ and $s \notin R$, since there can be no x-augmenting path.

For every arc $vw \in \delta(R)$, we must have $x_{vw} = u_{vw}$, since otherwise adding vw to the x-augmenting rv-path would yield such a path to w, but $w \notin R$. Similar, for every arc $vw \in \delta(\overline{R})$, we have $x_{vw} = 0$. Then by proposition, $f_x(s) = x(\delta(R)) - x(\delta(\overline{R})) = u(\delta(R))$. □

Theorem

A feasible flow x is maximum if and only if there is not x-augmenting path.

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) If x is maximum, there is no x-augmenting path.

($\Longleftarrow$) If there is no x-augmenting path, then the construction of the proof of Max-Flow Min-Cut yields a cut $\delta(R)$ with $f_x(s) = u(\delta(R))$, so x is maximum, by corollary. □

Theorem

If u is integral and there exists a maximum flow, then there exists a maximum flow that is integral.

Proof. Choose an integral flow x of maximum value. If there is an x-augmenting path, then since x and u are integral, the new flow can be chosen integral, contradicting the choice of x. Hence there is no x-augmenting path, so x is a maximum flow, by previous theorem. □

Corollary

If x is a feasible rs-flow and $\delta(R)$ is an rs-cut, then x is maximum and $\delta(R)$ is minimum if and only if $x_e = u_e$ for all $e \in \delta(R)$ and $x_e = 0$ for all $e \in \delta(\overline{R})$.

Proof. Combine Max-Flow Min-Cut theorem with the proof of corollary. □

Part V

Matchings

Chapter 9

Matchings

Definition: Matching

A set $M \subseteq E$ such that no vertex of G is incident with more than one edge in M.

Definition: M-Covered

A vertex v is covered by M if some edge of M is incident with v.

Definition: M-Exposed

A vertex v is exposed if v is not M-covered.

The number of vertices covered by M is $2|M|$ and number of M-exposed vertices is $|V| - 2|M|$.

Definition: Maximum Matching

A matching of maximum cardinality, denoted $\nu(G)$.

Definition: Deficiency

The minimum number of exposed vertices for any matching of G, denoted by $\text{def}(G)$.

Note $\text{def}(G) = |V| - 2\nu(G)$.

Definition: Perfect Matching

A matching that covers all vertices.

9.1 Bipartite Matching

Definition: Bipartite

$G = (V, E)$ is bipartite if $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, where V_1, V_2 disjoint and every edge has one end in V_1 and the other end in V_2.

Definition: Vertex Cover

A set $C \subseteq V$ such that every edge has at least one in C.

Lemma

If M is a matching and C is a cover, then $|M| \leq |C|$.

Proof. Every $e \in M$ has at least one end in C. No vertex in C meets more than one edge in M. □

Definition: Minimum Cover

A cover of minimum cardinality, denoted $\tau(G)$.

Theorem (König)

If G is bipartite, $\nu(G) = \tau(G)$.

Proof. We note that $\nu(G) \leq \nu^*(G)$ and $\tau(G) \geq \tau^*(G)$. By using LP duality and the matching LP (*Matching LP*), we show that $\nu(G) = \nu^*(G)$. We also have the matching LP in the form of $Mx^+ = (1, \ldots, 1)^T$. Since M is totally unimodular, then M^T is also totally unimodular. So the dual LP has all integral vertices, implying $\tau(G) = \tau^*(G)$. So,

$$\nu(G) = \nu^*(G) = \tau^*(G) = \tau(G)$$

□

9.2 Alternating Paths

Definition: M-Alternating

A path P is M-alternating if its edges are alternately in and not in M.

Definition: M-Augmenting

An M-alternating path P is M-augmenting if the ends of P are distinct and are both M-exposed.

Definition: Symmetric Difference

For sets S and T, let $S\Delta T$ denote the symmetric difference, which is defined as

$$S\Delta T = (S \cup T) \setminus (S \cap T)$$

Let a path P be an M-augmenting path. Then we can obtain a larger matching $M' = M\Delta E(P)$ with $|M'| = |M| + 1$.

Theorem (Petersen 1891, Berge 1957)

A matching M in a graph G is maximum if and only if there is no M-augmenting path.

Proof. ($\implies$) Suppose there exists an M-augmenting path P joining v and w. Then $N = M\Delta E(P)$ is a matching that covers all vertices covered by M, plus v and w. So, M is not maximum.

($\impliedby$) Conversely, suppose that M is not maximum and some other matching N satisfies $|N| > |M|$. Let $J = N\Delta M$. Each vertex of G is incident with at most two edges of J, so J is the edge set of some vertex disjoint paths and circuits of G. For each such path or circuit, the edges alternately belong to M or N. Therefore, all circuits are even and contain the same number of edges of M and N. Since $|N| > |M|$, there must be at least one path with more edges of N than M. This path is an M-augmenting path. □

9.3 Matching LP

Definition: Matching LP

P is the set of solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} x(\delta(v)) &\leq 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ x_e &\geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Let $\overline{x}$ be a vertex of P. We show that $\overline{x}$ is integral, which implies that $M = \{e \in E : \overline{x}_e = 1\}$ is a matching and $\nu(G) = \nu^*(G)$.

Recall that for a polyhedron $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\overline{x} \in P$ is a vertex if and only if $\overline{x}$ is the unique solution to $A'x = b'$ for some subset of n inequalities $A'x \leq b'$ from $Ax \leq b$.

For our matching P, let $E^+ := \{e : \overline{x}_e > 0\}$ and $E^0 := \{x : \overline{x}_e = 0\}$. We write $\overline{x} = (\overline{x}^+, \overline{x}^0)$ split by (E^+, E^0).

Since $\overline{x}$ is a vertex, there exists $V^+ \subseteq V$ such that $\overline{x}$ is the unique solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum(x_e : e \in \delta(v) \cap E^+) &= 1, \ \forall v \in V^+ \\ x_e &= 0, \ \forall e \in E^0 \end{aligned}$$

Restricting to E^+, we can write the system of equations as

$$Mx^+ = (1, \ldots, 1)^T$$

By Cramer's Rule, the solution to the system is $(\overline{x}_1^+, \ldots, \overline{x}_k^+)$, where

$$\overline{x}_j^+ = \frac{\det(M^j)}{\det(M)}$$

with M^j obtained from M by replacing the jth column by $(1, \ldots, 1)^T$.

Claim: $\det(M) = 1$ or $\det(M) = -1$.

This gives that $\overline{x}_j^+$ is integer for all j, so $\overline{x}$ is integer. Thus, $\nu(G) = \nu^*(G)$.

Lemma

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bipartite graph. Let A be the $|V| \times |E|$ matrix $\left[A_{ve}\right]$ with

$$A_{ve} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in \delta(v) \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin \delta(v) \end{cases}$$

then A is totally unimodular.

Proof. By induction of the number of rows k of the submatrix B of A. If B is 1×1, then this is obvious.

Suppose it is true for $k = 1, \ldots, t-1$ and let B be a $t \times t$ submatrix of A.

1. If B has a column of all 0's, then $\det(B) = 0$.
2. If a column of B has exactly one 1, then we compute $\det(B)$ by expanding on that column and use induction.
3. Otherwise, every column of B has exactly two 1's.

We can partition the rows of B into W_1 and W_2, so that every column has exactly one 1 in W_1 and exactly one 1 in W_2 (W_1 are vertices in V_1, W_2 in V_2 from G being bipartite).

Now multiplying each row in W_1 by 1 and each row in W_2 by -1 and summing, we get the row vector of all 0's. So $\det(B) = 0$. □

9.4 Tutte-Berge Formula

Let A be a subset of the vertices which $G - A$ has k components $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ having an odd number of vertices. Let M be a matching of G. For each i, either H_i has an M-exposed vertex or M contains an edge having just one end in $V(H_i)$. All such edges have their other

ends in A and since M is a matching, all these ends must be distinct. Therefore, there can be at most $|A|$ edges and so the number of M-exposed vertices is at least $k - |A|$.

Definition: $\mathrm{oc}(H)$

The number of odd components of a graph H.

Thus, for any $A \subseteq V$,

$$\nu(G) \leq \frac{1}{2}(|V| - \mathrm{oc}(G - A) + |A|)$$

If A is a cover of G, then there are $|V| - |A|$ odd components of $G - A$ (each is a single vertex), so the right hand side reduces to $|A|$. This bound is at least as strong as that provided by covers.

Theorem (Tutte-Berge Formula)

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, we have

$$\max\{|M| : M \text{ a matching}\} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}(|V| - \mathrm{oc}(G - A) + |A|) : A \subseteq V\right\}$$

Theorem (Tutte's Matching Theorem 1947)

A graph $G = (V, E)$ has a perfect matching if and only if for all $A \subseteq V$, $\mathrm{oc}(G - A) \leq |A|$.

Definition: Shrink

Let C be an odd circuit in G. Define $G' = G \times C$ as the subgraph obtained from G by shrinking C; G' has vertex set $(V - V(C)) \cup \{C\}$ and edge set $E \setminus \gamma(V(C))$.

Proposition

Let C be an odd circuit of G, let $G' = G \times C$, and let M' be a matching of G'. Then here is a matching M of G such that $M \subseteq M' \cup E(C)$ and the number of M-exposed vertices of G is the same as the number of M'-exposed vertices of G'.

Proof. Choose a vertex $w \in V(C)$ as follows. If C is covered by $e \in M'$, then choose w to be the vertex in $V(C)$ that is an end of e, and otherwise, choose w arbitrarily. Deleting w from C results in a subgraph having a perfect matching M''. Take $M = M' \cup M''$. M has the required properties. □

The previous proposition gives the inequality

$$\nu(G) \geq \nu(G \times C) + \frac{|V(C)| - 1}{2}$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathrm{def}(G) \leq \mathrm{def}(G \times C)$$

Definition: Tight Odd Circuit

An odd circuit C is tight if $\nu(G) = \nu(G \times C) + \frac{|V(C)|-1}{2}$.

Definition: Inessential

A vertex v of G is inessential if there is a maximum matching of G that does not cover v.

Definition: Essential

A vertex not inessential.

Let A be a set that satisfies the Tutte-Berge formula. Let $v \in A$ and consider $G' = G - v$. Then, $G' - (A \setminus \{v\})$ has the same odd components as $G - A$, so $\nu(G') < \nu(G)$, i.e. every $v \in A$ is essential.

Lemma

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $vw \in E$. If v, w are both inessential, then there is a tight odd circuit C using vw. Moreover, C is an inessential vertex of $G \times C$.

Definition: Gallai-Edmonds Partition

Let B be the set of inessential vertices of $G = (V, E)$, C be the set of vertices not in B but adjacent to at least one element of B, and D be $V \setminus (B \cup C)$, then (B, C, D) is the Gallai-Edmonds Partition of G.

Proposition

Let (B, C, D) be the Gallai-Edmonds Paritition for G.
C is a minimizer in the Tutte-Berge formula.

Proposition

Let (B, C, D) be the Gallai-Edmonds Paritition for G.
For every maximum matching M and every vertex $v \in C$, there is an edge $vw \in M$ with $w \in B$.

Proposition

Let (B, C, D) be the Gallai-Edmonds Paritition for G.
Every maximum matching contains a perfect matching of $G[D]$.

9.5 Maximum Matching

Maximum Matching Problem

Given a graph G, find a maximum matching of G.

Definition: Maximum Matching ILP

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) \leq 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \\ & x_e \text{ integer}, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Maximum Matching LP Relaxation

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) \leq 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Minimum Cover Dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(y_v : v \in V) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_u + y_v \geq 1, \ \forall e = (u, v) \in E \\ & y_v \geq 0, \ \forall v \in V \end{aligned}$$

Let M be a matching and C be a cover, then

$$x_e^M = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in M \\ 0 & \text{if } e \notin M \end{cases}, y_v^C = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in C \\ 0 & \text{if } v \notin C \end{cases}$$

So, $\nu(G) \leq \nu^*(G)$ and $\tau(G) \geq \tau^*(G)$, and by LP duality, we have

$$\nu(G) \leq \nu^*(G) = \tau^*(G) \leq \tau(G)$$

9.6 Perfect Matching

9.6.1 Alternating Trees

Suppose we have a matching M of G and a fixed M-exposed vertex r of G. We can iteratively build up sets A, B of vertices such that each vertex in A is the other end of an odd-length M-alternating path beginning at r, and each vertex in B is the other end of an even-length M-alternating path beginning at r.

Begin with $A = \emptyset, B = \{r\}$, and use the rule: if $vw \in E, v \in B, w \notin A \cup B, wz \in M$, then add w to A, z to B. The set $A \cup B$ and edges in the construction form a tree T rooted at r.

Definition: Alternating Tree

A tree T such that

- every vertex of T other than r is covered by an edge of $M \cap E(T)$;
- for every vertex v of T, the path in T from v to r is M-alternating.

We let the vertex sets at odd and even distances from the root as $A(T)$ and $B(T)$ respectively. Note that $|B(T)| = |A(T)| + 1$ since all other vertices other than r come in matched pairs, one in $A(T)$ and one in $B(T)$.

Using vw to Extend T

Input: A matching M' of a graph G', an M'-alternating tree T, and an edge vw of G' such that $v \in B(T)$, $w \notin V(T)$, and w is M'-covered.
Algorithm: Let wz be the edge in M' covering w (but z is not a vertex of T). Replace T by the tree having edge set $E(T) \cup \{vw, wz\}$.

Use vw to Augment M'

Input: A matching M' of a graph G', an M'-alternating tree T of G' with root r, and an edge vw of G' such that $v \in B(T)$, $w \notin V(T)$, and w is M'-exposed.
Algorithm: Let P be the path obtained by attaching vw to the path from r to v in T. Replace M' by $M' \Delta E(P)$.

Definition: Frustrated

An M-alternating tree T in a graph G is frustrated if every edge of G has one end in $B(T)$ and the other end in $A(T)$.

Proposition

Suppose that G has a matching M and an M-alternating tree T that is frustrated. Then G has no perfect matching.

Proof. Clearly, every element of $B(T)$ is a single-vertex odd component of $G \setminus A(T)$. Since $|A(T)| < |B(T)|$, then G has no perfect matching. □

9.6.2 Bipartite Perfect Matching Algorithm

The following algorithm is to obtain a perfect matching in a bipartite graph based on alternating trees or outputs no perfect matching.

Algorithm 4 Bipartite Perfect Matching Algorithm

```
M = ∅
Choose an M-exposed vertex r
T = ({r}, ∅)
while there exists vw ∈ E with v ∈ B(T), w ∉ V(T) do
    if w is M-exposed then
        Use vw to augment M
        if there is no M-exposed vertex in G then
            return Perfect matching M
        else
            T = ({r}, ∅), where r is M-exposed
    else
        Use vw to extend T
return G has no perfect matching
```

Proposition

Suppose that G is bipartite, M is a matching of G, and T is an M-alternating tree such that no edge of G joins a vertex in $B(T)$ to a vertex not in $V(T)$. Then T is frustrated, and hence G has no perfect matching.

Proof. We show that every edge having an end in $B(T)$ has an end in $A(T)$. From the hypothesis, the only possible exception would be an edge joining two vertices in $B(T)$. But this edge, together with the paths joining them to the root of T, would form a closed path of odd length, which contradicts G being bipartite. Hence T is frustrated, and so by previous proposition, G has no perfect matching. □

9.6.3 Blossom Algorithm for Perfect Matching

Definition: Derived Graph

A graph G' obtained from G by a sequence of odd-circuit shrinkings.

Definition: Original Vertex

A vertex in the derived graph G' that is in G.

Definition: Pseudonode

A vertex in the derived graph G' not in G.

Definition: $S(v)$

Given a vertex v of G', there corresponds a set $S(v)$ of vertices of G, where

$$S(v) = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } v \in V(G) \\ \bigcup_{w \in V(C)} S(w) & \text{if } v = C \text{ is a pseudonode} \end{cases}$$

Proposition

Let G' be a derived graph of G, M' be a matching of G', and T be an M'-alternating tree of G' such that no element of $A(T)$ is a pseudonode. If T is frustrated, then G has no perfect matching.

Proof. When deleting $A(T)$ from G, we get a component with vertex set $S(v)$ for each $v \in B(T)$. Therefore, $\text{oc}(G \setminus A(T)) > |A(T)|$, so G has no perfect matching by Tutte's theorem. □

Definition: Blossom

Let $v, w \in B(T)$ and $vw \in E(G)$. The odd circuit in $T + vw$ is a blossom.

When we shrink a blossom, we get a pseudonode and the new graph is a derived graph.

Use vw to Shrink and Update M' and T

Input: A matching M' of a graph G', an M'-alternating tree T, and an edge vw of G' such that $vw \in B(T)$.
Algorithm: Let C the circuit formed by vw with the vw-path in T. Replace G' with $G' \times C$, M' by $M' \setminus E(C)$, and T by the tree in G' having edge set $E(T) \setminus E(C)$.

Proposition

After application of the shrinking subroutine, M' is a matching of G', T is an M'-alternating tree of G', and $C \in B(T)$.

Algorithm 5 Blossom Algorithm for Perfect Matching

Input: Graph G and matching M of G
$M' = M$
$G' = G$
Choose an M'-exposed vertex r of G'
$T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$
while there exists $vw \in E'$ with $v \in B(T), w \notin A(T)$ **do**
    Case: w is M'-exposed
        Use vw to augment M'
        Extend M' to a matching M of G
        Replace M' by M, G' by G
        if there is no M'-exposed vertex in G' **then**
            return Perfect matching M'
        else
            $T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is M'-exposed
    Case: $w \notin V(T)$, w is M'-covered
        Use vw to extend T
    Case: $w \in B(T)$
        Use vw to shrink and update M' and T
return G', M', T, G has no perfect matching

Theorem

The Blossom Algorithm terminates after $O(n)$ augmentations, $O(n^2)$ shrinking steps, and $O(n^2)$ tree-extension steps.
Moreover, it determines correctly whether G has a perfect matching.

9.7 Blossom Algorithm for Maximum Matching

We can extend the Blossom algorithm for perfect matchings to maximum matchings.

Algorithm 6 Blossom Algorithm for Maximum Matching

1: **Input**: Graph G and matching M of G
2: $M' = M, G' = G, \mathcal{T} = \emptyset$
3: Choose an M'-exposed vertex r of G'
4: $T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$
5: **while** there exists $vw \in E'$ with $v \in B(T), w \notin A(T)$ **do**
6: **Case**: w is M'-exposed
7: Use vw to augment M'
8: Extend M' to a matching M of G
9: Replace M' by M, G' by G
10: **if** there is no M'-exposed vertex in G' **then**
11: **return** Perfect matching M'
12: **else**
13: $T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is M'-exposed
14: **Case**: $w \notin V(T)$, w is M'-covered
15: Use vw to extend T
16: **Case**: $w \in B(T)$
17: Use vw to shrink and update M' and T
18: $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T} \cup \{T\}, G' = G \setminus V(T), M' = M \setminus E(T)$
19: **if** there exists an M'-exposed vertex **then**
20: Go to line 5
21: Restore the matching M
22: **return** M

Theorem

The Blossom Algorithm can be implemented to run in time $O(nm \log n)$.

Chapter 10

Weighted Matchings

10.1 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching

Definition: Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching ILP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) = 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \\ & x_e \text{ integer}, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching LP Relaxation

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) = 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching Dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(y_v : v \in V) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_u + y_v \leq c_e, \ \forall e = uv \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Complementary Slackness Conditions for Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching

If $x_e > 0$, then $\bar{c}_e = c_e - y_u - y_v = 0$ for all $e \in E$.

10.2 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching in Bipartite Graphs

Theorem (Birkhoff)

Let G be a bipartite graph and let $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$. Then G has a perfect matching if and only if the Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching LP Relaxation has a feasible solution. Moreover, if G has a perfect matching, then the minimum weight of a perfect matching is equal to the optimal value of the LP relaxation.

Definition: $E_=$

$E_= = \{e \in E : \bar{c}_e = 0\}$.

Algorithm 7 Bipartite Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching Algorithm

Let y be a feasible solution to the dual LP
M is a matching of $G_= = (V, E_=)$
$T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is an M-exposed vertex of G
while true **do**
    while there exists $vw \in E_=$ with $v \in B(T), w \notin V(T)$ **do**
        if w is M-exposed **then**
            Use vw to augment M
            if there is no M-exposed vertex in G **then**
                return Perfect matching M
            else
                $T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is M-exposed
        else
            Use vw to extend T
    if every $vw \in E$ with $v \in B(T)$ has $w \in A(T)$ **then**
        return G has no perfect matching
    else
        $\varepsilon = \min\{\bar{c}_{vw} : v \in B(T), w \notin V(T)\}$
        $y_v = y_v + \varepsilon$ for $v \in B(T)$
        $y_v = y_v - \varepsilon$ for $v \in A(T)$

10.3 Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching in General Graphs

By Minkowski's theorem, we know that there is a system of inequalities for the convex hull of a set, but we typically do not know what the system is. However, Edmonds founded the matching polytope theory in the 1960s.

The integer program for the minimum-weight perfect matching problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(w_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) = 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \\ & x_e \text{ integer}, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

If G is bipartite, then we do not need the integrality constraint. If G is non-bipartite, then there exists a circuit C with $|E(C)|$ odd.

Definition: Perfect Matching Polytope

$$\mathcal{PM}(G) = conv.hull(\{x^M : M \text{ a perfect matching}\})$$

Let $U \subseteq V$ with $|U|$ odd and $|U| \geq 3$. For an undirected graph, every perfect matching must contain at least one edge in $\delta(U)$, so we arrive at the blossom inequality constraint.

Definition: Blossom Inequality

For $U \subseteq V$ with $|U|$ odd and $|U| \geq 3$,

$$x(\delta(U)) \geq 1$$

Theorem (Perfect Matching Polytope Theorem – Edmonds)

For any graph $G = (V, E)$, $\mathcal{PM}(G)$ is the solution set of the linear system

$$\begin{aligned} x(\delta(v)) &= 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ x(\delta(U)) &\geq 1, \ \forall U \subseteq V, |U| \text{ odd}, |U| \geq 3 \\ x_e &\geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (Schrijver) Let Q denote the solution set of the linear system. Clearly $\mathcal{PM}(G) \subseteq Q$. Suppose $Q \not\subseteq \mathcal{PM}(G)$ and let x be a vertex of Q with $x \notin \mathcal{PM}(G)$. Choose this counterexample G such that $|V| + |E|$ is as small as possible.

Claim 1: $0 < x_e < 1$ for all $e \in E$.
Proof. (**Claim 1**) Otherwise, if $x_e = 0$, then delete e. If $x_e = 1$, then delete e and the ends of e. □

So each vertex of G has degree at least 2, which implies $|E| \geq |V|$.

Claim 2: $|E| > |V|$.
Proof. (**Claim 2**) If $|E| = |V|$, then G is a circuit and the theorem is true. □

Since x is a vertex of Q, there are $|E|$ constraints of the linear system satisfied as an equation by x. Thus, there exists an odd $U \subseteq V$ with $3 \leq |U| \leq |V| - 3$ and $x(\delta(U)) = 1$.

Let G' be the graph obtained by shrinking U to a single vertex and G'' be obtained by shrinking $V \setminus U$ to a single vertex. Let x' and x'' be obtained by shrinking x to G' and G''

respectively. So x' and x'' satisfy the linear system for G' and G''. By induction, $x' \in \mathcal{PM}(G')$ and $x'' \in \mathcal{PM}(G'')$.

Since x is rational, x' and x'' are rational convex combinations of perfect matchings in G' and G'', i.e.

$$x' = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} x^{M'_i}, x'' = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} x^{M''_i}$$

for some k (the common denominator of the multipliers λ'_i and λ''_i in the convex combinations).

For each edge $e \in \delta(U)$, the number of indices i with $e \in M'_i$ is $kx'_e = kx_e = kx''_e$ which is equal to the number of indices i with $e \in M''_i$.

We may assume that for each i, the two matchings M'_i and M''_i have an edge in $\delta(U)$ in common. So $M_i = M'_i \cup M''_i$ is a perfect matching of G and

$$x = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} x^{M_i}$$

and thus $x \in \mathcal{PM}(G)$, a contradiction. □

Definition: Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching LP – Stronger

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) = 1, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x(\delta(U)) \geq 1, \ \forall U \subseteq V, |U| \text{ odd}, |U| \geq 3 \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching Dual LP – Stronger

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(y_v : v \in V) + \sum(Y_U : U \subseteq V, |U| \text{ odd}, |U| \geq 3) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_v + y_w + \sum(Y_U : e \in U \subseteq V, |U| \text{ odd}, |U| \geq 3) \leq c_e, \ \forall e = vw \in E \\ & Y_U \geq 0, \ \forall U \subseteq V, |U| \text{ odd}, |U| \geq 3 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem

Let G be a graph and let $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$. Then G has a perfect matching if and only if the Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching LP has a feasible solution.
Moreover, if G has a perfect matching, then the minimum weight of a perfect matching is equal to the optimal value of the LP.

Change y

Input: A derived pair (G', c'), a feasible solution y of stronger dual LP for this pair, a matching M' of G' consisting of equality edges, and an M'-alternating tree T consisting of equality edges in G'.
Algorithm:

1. $\varepsilon_1 = \min(\overline{c}_e : e \text{ joins in } G' \text{ a vertex in } B(T) \text{ to a vertex not in } V(T))$
2. $\varepsilon_2 = \min(\overline{c}_e/2 : e \text{ joins in } G' \text{ two vertices in } B(T))$
3. $\varepsilon_3 = \min(y_v : v \in A(T), v \text{ is a pseudonode of } G')$
4. $\varepsilon = \min(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3)$
5. Replace

$$y_v = \begin{cases} y_v + \varepsilon & \text{if } v \in B(T) \\ y_v - \varepsilon & \text{if } v \in A(T) \\ y_v & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Expand Odd Pseudonode v and Update M', T, c'

Input: A matching M' consisting of equality edges of a derived graph G', an M'-alternating tree T consisting of equality edges, and an odd pseudonode v of G' such that $y_v = 0$.
Algorithm: Let f, g be the edges of T incident with v, let C be the circuit that was shrunk to form v, let u, w be the ends of f, g in $V(C)$, and let P be the even-length path in C joining u to w.
Replace G' by the graph obtained by expanding C. Replace M' by the matching obtained by extending M' to a matching of G'. Replace T by the tree having edge set $E(T) \cup E(P)$. For each edge st with $s \in V(C)$ and $t \notin V(C)$, replace c'_{st} by $c'_{st} + y_s$.

Proposition

After the application of the expand subroutine, M' is a matching contained in $E_=$, and T is an M'-alternating tree whose edges are all contained in $E_=$.

Theorem

The Blossom Algorithm terminates after $O(n)$ augmentation steps and $O(n^2)$ tree-extension, shrinking, expanding, and dual change steps.
Moreover, it returns a minimum-weight perfect matching or determines correctly that G has no perfect matching.

Algorithm 8 Blossom Algorithm for Minimum-Weight Perfect Matching

Let y be a feasible solution to the dual LP, M' a matching of $G_=$, $G' = G$
$T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is an M'-exposed vertex of G'
while true **do**
    Case: There exists $e \in E_=$ whose ends in G' are $v \in B(T)$ and an M'-exposed vertex $w \notin V(T)$
        Use vw to augment M'
        if there is no M'-exposed vertex in G' **then**
            Extend M' to a perfect matching M of G and return M
        else
            $T = (\{r\}, \emptyset)$, where r is M'-exposed.
    Case: There exists $e \in E_=$ whose ends in G' are $v \in B(T)$ and an M'-covered vertex $w \notin V(T)$
        Use vw to extend T
    Case: There exists $e \in E_=$ whose ends in G' are $v, w \in B(T)$
        Use vw to shrink and update M', T, c'
    Case: There is a pseudonode $v \in A(T)$ with $y_v = 0$
        Expand v and update M', T, c'
    Case: None of the above
        if every $e \in E$ incident in G' with $v \in B(T)$ has its other end in $A(T)$ and $A(T)$ contains no pseudonode **then**
            Stop, G has no perfect matching
        else
            Change y

Chapter 11

T-Joins and Postman Problems

11.1 Postman Problem

Definition: Postman Tour

A closed path where each edge is traversed at least once.

Definition: Euler Tour

A closed edge-simple path P such that $E(P) = E(G)$.

Note that if a graph G has an Euler tour, then the optimal postman tour is the Euler tour.

Theorem

A connected graph G has an Euler tour if and only if every vertex of G has even degree.

Definition: Postman Set

A set $J \subseteq E$ is a postman set of G if for every $v \in V$, v is incident with an odd number of edges from J if and only if v has odd degree in G.

Postman Problem

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$ such that $c \geq 0$, find a postman set J such that $c(J)$ is minimum.

Definition: Postman Problem LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) \equiv |\delta(v)| \pmod 2, \ \forall v \in V \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \\ & x_e \text{ integer}, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

11.2 T-Joins

Definition: T-Join

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $T \subseteq V$ such that $|T|$ is even. A T-join is a set $J \subseteq E$ such that

$$|J \cap \delta(v)| \equiv |T \cap \{v\}| \pmod 2, \ \forall v \in V$$

In other words, J is a T-join if and only if the odd-degree vertices of the subgraph (V, J) are exactly the elements of T.

Optimal T-Join Problem

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $T \subseteq V$ such that $|T|$ is even, and a cost vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$, find a T-join J of G such that $c(J)$ is minimum.

Examples:

- Postman sets: Let $T = \{v \in V : |\delta(v)| \text{ is odd}\}$. Then the T-joins are precisely the postman sets. Finding an optimal T-join solves the postman problem.
- Even set: Let $T = \emptyset$. Then a T-join is exactly an even set, that is, a set $A \subseteq E$ such that every vertex of (V, A) has even degree. A set is even if and only if it can be decomposed into edge sets of edge-disjoint circuits.
- rs-paths: Let $r, s \in V$ and let $T = \{r, s\}$. Every T-join J contains the edge-set of an rs-path. (***Proof.*** If not, the component of the subgraph (V, J) that contains r has only one vertex of odd degree.)

Proposition

Let J' be a T'-join of G. Then J is a T-join of G if and only if $J \Delta J'$ is a $(T \Delta T')$-join of G.

Proof. It is enough to prove the "only if" part, since the other part can be deduced by applying this one with J replaced by $J \Delta J'$ and T replaced by $T \Delta T'$.

Suppose that J is a T-join and J' is a T'-join. Let $v \in V$. Then $|(J \Delta J') \cap \delta(v)|$ is even if and only if $|J \cap \delta(v)| \equiv |J' \cap \delta(v)| \pmod 2$, which is true if and only if v is an element of neither or both of T and T', that is, if and only if $v \notin T \Delta T'$. □

11.3 Optimal T-Join Algorithm

Proposition

Every minimal T-join is the union of the edge sets of $\frac{|T|}{2}$ edge-disjoint simple paths, which join the vertices in T in pairs.

Proposition

Suppose that $c \geq 0$. Then there is an optimal T-join that is the union of $\frac{|T|}{2}$ edge-disjoint shortest paths joining the vertices of T in pairs.

Algorithm 9 Optimal T-Join Algorithm

1: Identify the set N of edges having negative cost and let the set T' of vertices incident with an odd number of edges from N
2: $c = |c|, T = T \Delta T'$
3: Find a least-cost uv-path P_{uv} with respect to c for each pair u, v of vertices from T and let $d(u, v)$ be the cost of P_{uv}
4: Form a complete graph $\hat{G} = (T, \hat{E})$ with uv having weight $d(u, v)$ for each $uv \in \hat{E}$
5: Find a minimum-weight perfect matching M in $\hat{G}$
6: Let J be the symmetric difference of $E(P_{uv})$ for $uv \in M$
7: $J = J \Delta N$

11.4 T-Join LP

Definition: T-Odd

A set $S \subseteq V$ is T-odd if $|S \cap T|$ is odd.

Definition: T-Cut

The set $\delta(S)$ where $S \subseteq V$ is T-odd.

Definition: T-Join LP

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum (c_e x_e : e \in E) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(D) \geq 1, \ \forall T\text{-cuts } D \\ & x_e \geq 0, \ \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Definition: T-Join Dual LP

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum(Z_D : D \text{ a } T\text{-cut}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum(Z_D : e \in D, D \text{ a } T\text{-cut}) \leq c_e, \ \forall e \in E \\ & Z_D \geq 0, \ \forall \ T\text{-cuts } D \end{aligned}$$

Theorem

If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, $T \subseteq V$ with $|T|$ even, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^E$ with $c \geq 0$, then the minimum cost of a T-join of G is equal to the optimal value of the T-join LP.

Theorem

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $c \in \mathbb{Z}^E$. Suppose that every circuit of G has even c-cost. Then the T-join dual LP has an optimal solution that is integral.

Chapter 12

General Matching

Definition: b-Factor

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $b \in \mathbb{Z}^E$. A b-factor of G is a set $M \subseteq E$ such that $|M \cap \delta(v)| = b_v$ for each $v \in V$.

A 1-factor is a perfect matching. A 2-factor is a collection of circuits covering all the vertices exactly once. The minimum-weight 2-factor problem is a useful relaxation of the traveling salesman problem.

The problem of deciding whether a bipartite graph has a b-factor is solvable by network flow methods. The problem of finding a minimum-weight b-factor in a bipartite graph can be solved as a minimum-cost flow problem.

Suppose we are given a vector $u \in (\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\})^E$.

Definition: (b, u)-Matching (u-Capacitated Perfect b-Matching)

A vector $x \in \mathbb{Z}^E$ such that

$$x(\delta(v)) = b_v, \ \forall v \in V$$
$$0 \leq x_e \leq u_e, \ \forall e \in E$$

12.1 General Matching LP

Definition: Minimum-Weight b-Factor LP

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum(c_e x_e : e \in E) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta(v)) = b_v, \ \forall v \in V \\
& x(\delta(S) \setminus F) - x(F) \geq 1 - |F|, \ \forall S \subseteq V, F \subseteq \delta(S), |F| + b(S) \equiv 1 \pmod 2 \\
& 0 \leq x_e \leq 1, \ \forall e \in E
\end{aligned}
$$

Part VI

Matroids

Chapter 13

Matroid Theory

Recall Kruskal's algorithm to find a maximum-weight spanning tree. A slight variant of the algorithm is to find a maximum-weight forest. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{J \subseteq E : J \text{ is a forest}\}$.

Algorithm 10 Greedy Algorithm

```
1: J = ∅
2: while there exists e ∉ J with c_e > 0 and J ∪ {e} ∈ I do
3:     Choose e with c_e maximum
4:     J = J ∪ {e}
5: return J
```

The family $\mathcal{I}$ of forests of a graph has the property that the Greedy Algorithm finds a maximum-weight independent set. Families like forests for which the Greedy Algorithm always returns an optimal solution are called matroids.

Definition: Matroid

Let S be a finite set (*ground set*) and $\mathcal{I}$ be a family of subsets of S (*independent sets*). $M = (S, \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid if the following axioms are satisfied:

(M0) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.

(M1) If $J' \subseteq J \in \mathcal{I}$, then $J' \in \mathcal{I}$.

(M2) For every $A \subseteq S$, every maximal independent subset of A has the same cardinality.

Definition: Basis

A maximal independent subset of a set $A \subseteq S$ is a basis of A.

Definition: Rank

The size (which depends only on A by (M2)) of the basis of A, denoted $r(A)$.

Part VII

Traveling Salesman Problem

Chapter 14

The Traveling Salesman Problem

Definition: Tour

A circuit that passes exactly once through each vertex.

This is also known as a Hamiltonian circuit.

Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP)

Given a finite set of points V and a cost c_{uv} of travel between each pair $u, v \in V$, find a tour of minimal cost.

The TSP can be modeled as a graph problem by considering the complete graph. TSP belongs to class of $\mathcal{NP}$-hard problems.