



UNIVERSITY
OF TRENTO

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

38050 Povo – Trento (Italy), Via Sommarive 14
<http://www.dit.unitn.it>

MINIMUM T-CUTS AND OPTIMAL T-PAIRINGS

Romeo Rizzi

2002

Technical Report # DIT-02-0087

Minimum T -cuts and optimal T -pairings

Romeo Rizzi

July 22, 2002

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Trento
via Sommarive 14, 38050 Povo, Italy
romeo@science.unitn.it

Abstract

We introduce the notion of T -pairing and give a min-max characterization for the minimum size of a T -cut. We show that the coefficients in the minimal TDI system for the T -cut polyhedron can be arbitrarily big.

Key words: T -cut, minimum T -cut, T -pairing, Gomory-Hu tree.

1 Introduction

Given a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ and $S \subseteq V$, the *cut* $\delta_G(S)$ (subscripts omitted when no confusion arises) is the set of those edges in E with precisely one endnode in S . When $T \subseteq V$ has even cardinality, the pair (G, T) is called a *graft*. A T -cut is a cut $\delta(S)$ such that $|S \cap T|$ is odd. In the following, \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{N} denote the set of non-negative reals and the set of non-negative integers, respectively. Given a *cost* function $c : E \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, the cost $c(F)$ of a set of edges F is defined as $\sum_{e \in F} c_e$. Denote by $\lambda_{G,T,c}$ the minimum cost of a T -cut in (G, T, c) . When, as a special case, $c = 1$, then we denote by $\lambda_{G,T}$ the minimum size of a T -cut in (G, T) .

A T -pairing is a partition of T into pairs. The value of a T -pairing \mathcal{P} is defined as:

$$val_{G,c}(\mathcal{P}) = \min_{\{u,v\} \in \mathcal{P}} \lambda_{G,\{u,v\},c}$$

Let \mathcal{P} be any T -pairing and $\delta(S)$ be any T -cut. Since $|S \cap T|$ is odd, \mathcal{P} contains a pair $\{u, v\}$ such that $\delta(S)$ is a $\{u, v\}$ -cut. Therefore, $c(\delta(S)) \geq \lambda_{G,\{u,v\},c} \geq val_{G,c}(\mathcal{P})$ and the value of \mathcal{P} is a lower bound on $\lambda_{G,T,c}$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *The maximum value of a T -pairing equals the minimum cost of a T -cut.*

Theorem 1.1 is proven in Section 2. In Section 3, we give some negative results for the minimal TDI system of the T -cut polyhedron. These exclude the possibility of characterizing $\lambda_{G,T,c}$ along the lines of the characterization of optimal T -joins in terms of T -borders given by Sebő [12]. We conclude this introduction with an application of Theorem 1.1 and a deep result of Nash-Williams. (Further applications and extensions of Theorem 1.1 can be found in [3].)

Theorem 1.2 (Nash-Williams [7]). *Every undirected graph G has an orientation \vec{G} such that for every ordered pair of nodes (x, y) there are $\lfloor \lambda_{G, \{x, y\}}/2 \rfloor$ arc-disjoint paths in \vec{G} from x to y .*

When $D = (V, A)$ is a digraph and $S \subset V$, then $d_D^+(S)$ denotes the number of arcs in A with tail in S and head in $V \setminus S$.

Corollary 1.3. *For any graft (G, T) , there exists an orientation D of G such that $d_D^+(S) \geq \lfloor \lambda_{G, T}/2 \rfloor$ for every subset S of V with $|S \cap T|$ odd.*

Proof: Given a graft (G, T) , let \mathcal{P} be a T -pairing of value $\lambda_{G, T}$. By Theorem 1.2, there exists an orientation $D(V, A)$ of $G(V, E)$ with the property that for every pair $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there are $\lfloor \lambda_{G, T}/2 \rfloor$ arc-disjoint paths from whichever node in P to the other. Consider now any subset S of V with $|S \cap T|$ odd: by parity reasons, there must exist some pair $\{s, t\} \in \mathcal{P}$ with $s \in S$ and $t \notin S$. Hence, D contains $\lfloor \lambda_{G, T}/2 \rfloor$ arc-disjoint paths from s to t and $d_D^+(S) \geq \lfloor \lambda_{G, T}/2 \rfloor$ follows. \square

2 Gomory-Hu trees and minimum T -cuts

Given a graft (G, T) , a T -join is an edge subset $J \subseteq E$ such that every node $v \in V$ is incident with an odd number of edges in J iff $v \in T$. Clearly, when J is a T -join and C is a T -cut, then $|J \cap C|$ is odd. As an example, when G is a tree, then (G, T) admits a unique T -join J , and J contains precisely those edges e of G such that $\{e\}$ is a T -cut.

Given a pair (G, c) , let H be a tree with $V(H) = V$ and w_h be a non-negative weight assigned to every edge h of H . The pair (H, w) is a *Gomory-Hu tree* of (G, c) if for every two nodes $u, v \in V$ the following property holds: if h is any edge of minimum weight in the unique path between u and v in H , and where S_h denotes any of the two connected components in the graph obtained from H by deleting h , then $\delta_G(S_h)$ is a minimum $\{u, v\}$ -cut for (G, c) and $c(\delta_G(S_h)) = w_h$. In [5], Gomory and Hu proved that a Gomory-Hu tree always exists and showed how to construct one efficiently. In [8], Padberg and Rao gave an algorithm to find minimum T -cuts. Their algorithm was based on the following observation.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (H, w) be a Gomory-Hu tree for (G, c) . Let J be the T -join of H . Let h be an edge of J such that $w_h = \min_{e \in J} w_e$. Then $\delta_G(S_h)$ is a minimum T -cut.*

Proof: Let $\delta_G(S)$ be a minimum T -cut. Let $\bar{h} = uv$ be an edge in the T -cut $\delta_G(S)$ of J . We claim that $\delta_G(S_{\bar{h}})$ is a minimum T -cut. Indeed, $|S_{\bar{h}} \cap T|$ is odd since $\bar{h} \in J$. Moreover, $\delta_G(S_{\bar{h}})$ is a minimum $\{u, v\}$ -cut since \bar{h} is an edge of H . Hence, $c(\delta_G(S_{\bar{h}})) \leq c(\delta_G(S))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let (H, w) be a Gomory-Hu tree for (G, c) . Let J be the T -join of H . By Lemma 2.1, $\lambda_{G, T, c} = \min_{h \in J} w_h$. Clearly, every component of (V, J) has an even number of nodes in T . Construct a T -pairing \mathcal{P} by arbitrarily pairing up the nodes of T inside the components of (V, J) . Clearly, $val_{G, c}(\mathcal{P}) = \lambda_{G, T, c}$ and Theorem 1.1 follows. \square

The clutter of minimal T -joins and the clutter of minimal T -cuts are easily checked to be the blocker of each other. In [2], Edmonds and Johnson showed this pair [6, 4] of clutters to be ideal.

3 On the minimal TDI system for the T -cut polyhedron

Given a graft (G, T) , let $P_{G,T}$ denote the T -cut polyhedron (the dominant of the T -cut polytope). Note that $P_{G,T}$ is of blocking type and hence has full dimension. It follows [11] that $P_{G,T}$ admits a unique (up to scaling) minimal TDI system $\mathcal{S}_{G,T}$. In this section, we show that the coefficients in $\mathcal{S}_{G,T}$ can be arbitrarily big. This contrasts with the nice results on the minimal TDI system for the T -join polyhedron given in [12]. More precisely, a T -border of a graft (G, T) is a subset B of E such that all components of $G \setminus B$ have an odd number of nodes in T . Denote by $o(B)$ the number of components in $G \setminus B$. It is easy to see that, when \mathcal{B} is a *packing of T -borders* (i.e. a collection of disjoint T -borders), then $\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{o(B)}{2}$ gives a lower bound on the size of a minimum T -join. It is shown in [12] that for every graft (G, T) and for every cost function $c : E \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ there always exists a T -join J and a collection \mathcal{B} of T -borders (repetition is allowed), with no edge e in more than c_e T -borders of \mathcal{B} , and such that $c(J) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{o(B)}{2}$. Clearly, this nice min-max characterization is only possible because the left side coefficients of the minimal TDI system for the T -join polyhedron are all 0-1.

Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E$ be a non-empty polyhedron of blocking type. A non-negative integral function $w : E \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ is called a *weighting on E* and the *rank* of w is defined as $r(w) = \min\{wx : x \in P\}$. Clearly, the following infinite system defines P .

$$\begin{cases} wx \geq r(w) & \forall w : E \mapsto \mathbb{N} \\ x \geq \mathbf{0} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Moreover, System 1 is integral and TDI. The minimal TDI system \mathcal{S}_P of P is therefore a subsystem of System 1. A weighting w is *closed* if $r(w') < r(w)$ for every weighting $w' : E \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ with $w' \leq w$ and $w' \neq w$. A separation of w is a pair $w_1, w_2 : E \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ such that $w_1 + w_2 = w$ and $r(w_1) + r(w_2) = r(w)$. If w does not admit any separation with $w_1, w_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$ then w is said *non-separable*. As shown in [9], the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [1] can be easily adapted to obtain the following characterization of those constraints which are in \mathcal{S}_P .

Lemma 3.1. *An inequality of the form $wx \geq r(w)$ is in \mathcal{S}_P if and only if $w \neq \mathbf{0}$ is closed and non-separable.*

Proof: If $wx \geq r(w)$ is in the minimal TDI system for P then w is clearly closed and non-separable. To see the converse, let $\bar{w} : E \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ be a closed non-separable weighting. Consider the linear programs:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{PRIMAL:} & \text{DUAL:} \\ \min \bar{w}x & \max \sum_{w:E \mapsto \mathbb{N}} r(w)y_w \\ \begin{cases} wx \geq r(w) & \forall w : E \mapsto \mathbb{N} \\ x \geq \mathbf{0} \end{cases} & \begin{cases} \sum_{w:E \mapsto \mathbb{N}} wy_w \leq \bar{w} \\ y \geq \mathbf{0} \end{cases} \end{array}$$

The dual has the following integral solution:

$$y_{\bar{w}} = 1, \quad y_w = 0 \quad \forall w \neq \bar{w}$$

to which corresponds the optimum value $r(\bar{w})$. It suffices to show that no integral optimal dual solution has $y_{\bar{w}} = 0$. Suppose such a solution does exist. To it correspond w_1, w_2, \dots, w_j not necessarily distinct such that $\bar{w} \geq w_1 + w_2 + \dots + w_j$ and $r(w_1) + r(w_2) + \dots + r(w_j) = r(\bar{w})$.

Since \bar{w} is closed and $y_{\bar{w}} = 0$ then $j \geq 2$. But then \bar{w} is separable. \square

A graph G is called an r -graph if there exist rk 1-factors of G (repetition allowed) such that every edge of G is contained in precisely k of them. An r -graph is called *indecomposable* when its edge set can not be partitioned as $E_1 \cup E_2$ so that $G_i(V, E_i)$ is an r_i -graph for $i = 1, 2$ and for some $r_1, r_2 > 0$. In [9, 10], indecomposable r -graphs were shown to exist for every r .

Claim 3.2. *For every integer r , there exists a graft (G, T) such that $\mathcal{S}_{G,T}$ contains an inequality $ax \leq b$ with $b \geq r$.*

Proof: Let G be an indecomposable r -graph. We show that the graft (G, V) satisfies the claim. Let $\mathbf{1}$ be the all 1's weighting on E . Then $r(\mathbf{1}) = r$ since G is a r -graph. Moreover, $\mathbf{1}$ is closed since every edge of G is contained in a (trivial) minimum V -cut of $(G, V, \mathbf{1})$. Finally, $\mathbf{1}$ is non-separable since G is indecomposable. Apply Lemma 3.1. \square

Claim 3.3. *For every integer r , there exists a graft (G, T) such that $\mathcal{S}_{G,T}$ contains an inequality $ax \leq b$ with a left side coefficient equal to r .*

Proof: Let G be an indecomposable r -graph. Let H be the graph obtained from G by adding two new nodes u and v and an edge uv . We show that the graft $(H, V(H))$ satisfies the claim. Let \bar{w} be the weighting on $E(H)$ defined by $\bar{w}(uv) = r$ and $\bar{w}(e) = 1$ for every $e \in E(G)$. Then, \bar{w} is closed and non-separable and $r = r(\bar{w})$. Apply Lemma 3.1. \square

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to the anonymous referees. Their suggestions and advice significantly helped improving the presentation. I also thank Zoltán Szigeti and András Sebő who were among the first to encourage me on these results.

References

- [1] W. Cook, A note on matchings and separability. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 10 (1985), no. 2, 203–209.
- [2] J. Edmonds and E. Johnson, Matchings, Euler tours and the Chinese postman problem *Math. Programming* 5 88–124 (1973)
- [3] Z. Szigeti, manuscript, 1999.
- [4] D.R. Fulkerson, Blocking polyhedra. *Graph Theory and its Applications (Proc. Advanced Sem., Math. Research Center, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., 1969)* pp. 93–112 Academic Press, New York 1970.
- [5] R. Gomory and T.C. Hu, Multi-terminal network flows. *SIAM.* 9 (1961) 551–570.

- [6] A. Lehman, Addendum: "On the width-length inequality". *Math. Programming* 17 (1979), no. 3, 403–417.
- [7] C.St.J.A. Nash-Williams, On orientation, connectivity and odd vertex pairings in finite graphs. *Canad. J. Math.* 12 (1960) 555–567.
- [8] M.W. Padberg and M.R. Rao, Odd minimum cut-sets and b -matchings. *Mathematics of Operation Research* 7 (1982) 67–80.
- [9] R. Rizzi, On packing T -joins and T -cuts, Ph.D. thesis. Padova University (1997).
- [10] R. Rizzi, Indecomposable r -graphs and some other counterexamples. *Journal of Graph Theory* 32 (1) (1999) 1–15.
- [11] A. Schrijver, *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1986)
- [12] A. Sebő, The Schrijver system of odd join polyhedra. *Combinatorica* 8 (1988) 103–116.