

LINEAR PROGRAMMING, ZERO-FORCING, AND MAXIMALLY DIVERSE OPTIMA

(PROGRESS DOCUMENTATION)

1 Integer Program for Zero Forcing Diameter

Denote the zero forcing diameter model as $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$, where $G \in \mathbb{G}$ and s^* is an optimal solution to $\text{ZIP}(G)$. That is, s^* is the zero forcing number of G . The integer program $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$ presented in (1a)-(1k) computes the minimum intersection of two distinct zero forcing sets of G . We reference these sets by B and B' . Note that every edge in $E(G)$ is represented by two directed edges with opposite direction. The binary variables s_v and s'_v indicate whether v is in B or B' respectively. The variables $x_v, x'_v \in \mathbb{Z}$ ranging in $\{0, 1, \dots, T\}$ specify at which time steps vertex v is forced given its corresponding initial zero forcing set. Note that T is the maximum difference in the forcing times of two vertices. The binary variables y_e, y'_e , for each directed edge $e = (u, v)$, indicate whether u forces v given B or B' initially. Lastly, the notation $\delta^-(v)$ references the set of edges pointing toward vertex v and $N(u)$ denotes the set of all vertices $v \in V(G)$ that are adjacent to u . Note that the vertex and edge sets of G are denoted by V and E respectively.

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{v \in V} z_v \tag{1a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad s_v + \sum_{e \in \delta^-(v)} y_e = 1, \quad \forall v \in V, \tag{1b}$$

$$s'_v + \sum_{e \in \delta^-(v)} y'_e = 1, \quad \forall v \in V, \tag{1c}$$

$$x_u - x_v + (T+1)y_e \leq T, \quad \forall e = (u, v) \in E, \tag{1d}$$

$$x'_u - x'_v + (T+1)y'_e \leq T, \quad \forall e = (u, v) \in E, \tag{1e}$$

$$x_w - x_v + (T+1)y_e \leq T, \quad \forall e = (u, v) \in E, \forall w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\}, \tag{1f}$$

$$x'_w - x'_v + (T+1)y'_e \leq T, \quad \forall e = (u, v) \in E, \forall w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\}, \tag{1g}$$

$$\sum_{v \in V} s_v = s^*, \tag{1h}$$

$$\sum_{v \in V} s'_v = s^*, \tag{1i}$$

$$s_v + s'_v - z_v \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in V, \tag{1j}$$

$$s, s', z \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad x, x' \in \{0, \dots, T\}^n, \quad y, y' \in \{0, 1\}^m \tag{1k}$$

The triples (s, x, y) and (s', x', y') , where $s, s' \in \{0, 1\}^n$; $x, x' \in \{0, \dots, T\}^n$, and $y, y' \in \{0, 1\}^m$, make a *feasible solution* of $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$ provided that (s, x, y) and (s', x', y') satisfy (1b)-(1k). Additionally, if s and s' are minimal with respect to the objective function (1a), then we say that (s, x, y) and (s', x', y') is an *optimal solution* of $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$. The corresponding minimal value of the objective function (1a) is the *optimal value* of $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$.

Proposition 1.1. *Given an optimal solution to $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$, $z_v = 1$ for some $v \in V$ if and only if $s_v = s'_v = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $z_v = 1$ for some $v \in V$. By way of contradiction, also suppose either $s_v = 0$ or $s'_v = 0$. Then constraint (1j) will be true if $z_v = 0$. This contradicts the fact that we have an optimal solution to $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$, i.e., the objective function (1a) would not be minimized. Thus, our assumption that $s_v = 0$ or $s'_v = 0$ must be false. Hence, $s_v = s'_v = 1$.

Conversely, let $s_v = s'_v = 1$ for some $v \in V$. Then constraint (1j) holds only when $z_v = 1$. Therefore, given an optimal solution to $\text{ZFD}(G, s^*)$, $z_v = 1$ for some $v \in V$ if and only if $s_v = s'_v = 1$. \square

2 Zero Forcing Diameter/Graphical Interpretation of ZFD (G, s^*)

Given a *feasible solution* of ZFD (G, s^*) , the value of the objective function (1a) can be defined as $|B \cap B'|$, where B and B' are zero forcing sets of G . Furthermore, the *optimal value* of ZFD (G, s^*) is equal to $\min |B \cap B'|$, where $B, B' \in S$ and S is the set of all minimal zero forcing sets of G . We define the *zero forcing diameter* of a graph $G \in \mathbb{G}$ as

$$d(G) = zf(G) - \min |B \cap B'| \quad (2)$$

where $B, B' \in S$ and $zf(G)$ is the zero forcing number of G . Note that $zf(G) = s^*$ in terms of the inter program ZFD (G, s^*) given in equations (1a) -(1k).

Proposition 2.1. *Given a graph $G \in \mathbb{G}$, $d(G) = 0$ if and only if G is an empty graph.*

Proof. Suppose $G \in \mathbb{G}$ and $d(G) = 0$, i.e., $zf(G) = \min |B \cap B'|$. This implies there is only one unique zero-forcing set of G , which is only possible for a graph with no edges. Thus, G is an empty graph.

Conversely, suppose G is an empty graph. Since G has no edges by definition, then the only way to force all of its vertices blue is to include them in our zero-forcing set. Hence, $\min |B \cap B'| = zf(G)$ where B, B' are minimal zero-forcing sets of G . Thus, $d(G) = 0$. Therefore, $d(G) = 0$ if and only if G is an empty graph. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Given a path graph P_n , $d(P_n) = 1 \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proposition 2.3. *Given a complete graph K_n , $d(K_n) = 1 \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proposition 2.4. *Given a star graph S_n , $d(S_n) = 1 \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proposition 2.5. *Given a cycle graph C_n , $d(C_n) = 2 \forall n \geq 4 \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Theorem 2.6. *For all graphs $G \in \mathbb{G}$, we have that $0 \leq d(G) \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ where n is the order of G .*

Proof. Suppose $G \in \mathbb{G}$. By definition, $0 \leq d(G) \leq zf(G)$. Hence, $d(G) \geq 0$. By way of contradiction, suppose $d(G) > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, i.e., $d(G) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c$ where $0 < c < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then $zf(G) - \min |B \cap B'| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c$. This implies $zf(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + c$, and it follows that $\min |B \cap B'| \geq c$ for all zero-forcing sets B and B' . Hence, $d(G) \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, which contradicts our assumption that $d(G) > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Therefore, $0 \leq d(G) \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ for all $G \in \mathbb{G}$. \square