

## **NOTICE CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS**

The copyright law of the United States [Title 17, United States Code] governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use" that use may be liable for copyright infringement.

The institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. No further reproduction and distribution of this copy is permitted by transmission or any other means.

CSA TN: 248733

18 October 2011

Maxcost :

Borrower: RAPID:EYM  
Lending String:

ODY /

L:-4844107

Patron:

RAPID:EYM ILLiad 1505428

Shipping Address:  
NEW: Main Library

Location: LL  
Call #: Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards

Journal Title: Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards

Vol.: 68 No: Mon/Yr: 1964  
Pages: 27-29

Article Title: Optimal matchings and degree-constrained subgraphs  
Ariel:  
Odyssey: 141.211.175.136

COPY  
Sacramento State University - Library  
2000 State Univ. Dr., East Sac CA 95819-6039  
916-278-6395 ill@csus.edu IP: 130.86.12.241

	Search Info	Date:	Initials:
Interlibrary Services OFFICE USE ONLY	Not on Shelf	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Yet Received <input type="checkbox"/>
	Missing/Lost	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lacking <input type="checkbox"/>
	At Bindery	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor Condition <input type="checkbox"/>
	Notes:		

**PROBLEM REPORT**

If you have a problem with the delivery of the requested item, please contact us with the following information.  
Please return via Ariel (130.86.12.241)  
or fax (916) 278-7089.

Pages missing or other pp. \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Edges were cut off pp. \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Illegible copy - please resend entire item

Incorrect article sent

Other (please explain):

**NOTICE:**

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)

**WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTION**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research". If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use", that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Interlibrary Services **41600101**  
Sacramento State University Library  
2000 State Univ. Dr., East  
SACRAMENTO CA **95819-6039**

LIBRARY MAIL  
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

**NEW: Main Library**

# Optimal Matchings and Degree-Constrained Subgraphs<sup>1</sup>

A. J. Goldman

(October 25, 1963)

The characterization of maximum-cardinality matchings in linear graphs, by the nonexistence of augmenting paths, has been extended by several authors to a similar characterization of maximum degree-constrained subgraphs. This paper contains a proof of the extended version by direct reduction to the case of matchings. Possible algorithmic implications of the reduction are suggested.

In this paper the term *graph* means a finite unoriented linear graph. The same symbol will be used for a graph and its edge-set. The *degree*  $d(v, G)$  of a vertex  $v$  in a graph  $G$  is simply the number of edges of  $G$  which are incident on  $v$ , with *loops* (edges from  $v$  to  $v$ ) counted twice. The term *strict graph* will be used for a graph which is loopless and contains at most one edge joining any pair of distinct vertices. A *path* in a graph is permitted to have repeated vertices, but not repeated edges.

Let  $G^*$  be a graph with vertex-set  $\{v_i\}_1^n$ . A *matching* in  $G^*$  is a subgraph  $M$  such that  $d(v_i, M) \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . An *optimal* matching is one for which the number  $|M|$  of edges is maximum. An *augmenting path* for a matching  $M$  is a path  $P$  in  $G^*$  with edges alternately in  $M$  and in  $G^* - M$ , no end edge<sup>2</sup> in  $M$ , and end vertices  $v$  such that  $d(v, M) = 0$ .

A matching  $M$  which admits an augmenting path  $P$  cannot be optimal, since the symmetric difference  $M \Delta P$  is a matching with one more edge than  $M$ . The non-trivial converse is also true, a result due to Berge [1]<sup>3</sup> and (in a different but equivalent form) to Norman and Rabin [6]. We state it in the following sharp form:

**THEOREM (M).** *Let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be matchings in a graph  $G^*$ , with  $|M_1| < |M_2|$ . Then  $M_1 \Delta M_2$  contains<sup>3a</sup> an augmenting path for  $M_1$ .*

An important consequence of the theorem is that the problem of efficiently finding an optimal matching in a graph is reduced to that of efficiently searching for an augmenting path  $P$  of a given matching  $M$ ; if the search fails, so that no "improvement" of the form  $M \rightarrow M \Delta P$  is possible, then no other improvement is possible and  $M$  is optimal. (For a proof by contradiction, take  $M_1 = M$  and  $M_2$  as any optimal matching in the theorem.) Theoretical and computational aspects of this topic are discussed by Edmonds [4, 5] and by Witzgall and Zahn [7].

Now let  $G$  be a graph with vertex-set  $\{v_i\}_1^n$ , and  $\delta = \{\delta_i\}_1^n$  an  $n$ -vector of positive integers. We define a *degree-constrained subgraph* of  $(G, \delta)$  to be a subgraph  $D$  of  $G$  such that  $d(v_i, D) \leq \delta_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and

consider the problem of finding such a subgraph which is *optimal* in the sense that  $|D|$  is maximum. (When all  $\delta_i = 1$  we are back to optimal matchings.) For this problem, it is no loss of generality to assume that the sets  $E_{ij}$  of edges joining particular vertex-pairs  $(v_i, v_j)$  obey the conditions

- (1)  $|E_{ij}| \leq \min(\delta_i, \delta_j)$  for  $i \neq j$ ,
- (2)  $|E_{ii}| \leq \delta_i/2$ .

An *augmenting path* for a degree-constrained subgraph  $D$  is a path  $P$  in  $G$  with edges alternately in  $D$  and  $G - D$ , no end edge in  $D$ , and either distinct end vertices  $v_e$  such that  $d(v_e, D) \leq \delta_e - 1$ , or else coincident end vertices (i.e.,  $P$  a closed path) such that  $d(v_e, D) \leq \delta_e - 2$ . As for matchings, it is obvious that if  $D$  admits an augmenting path then it is not optimal, and there is a nontrivial converse which we state in the following sharp form:

**THEOREM (DCSG):** *Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be degree-constrained subgraphs of  $(G, \delta)$  with  $|D_1| < |D_2|$ . Then  $D_1 \Delta D_2$  contains an augmenting path for  $D_1$ .*

Berge [2] adapted the Norman-Rabin proof of the theorem (M) to a proof of the theorem (DCSG). Zahn (unpublished manuscript) has given a direct constructive proof based on ideas in the work of Edmonds. Relevant literature includes papers [3, 5] of Edmonds.

Our purpose here is to provide a proof of the theorem (DCSG) by (i) reduction to the historically earliest case of matchings and (ii) application of the theorem (M). This is done by constructing, in a way loosely motivated by the theory of covering spaces and possibly useful in other contexts, a *strict graph*  $G^*$  such that the analysis of  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  can be transferred to a discussion of matchings in  $G^*$ . Thus only the restriction of theorem (M) to strict graphs will be used.

The edges of  $G^*$  will be in one-to-one correspondence with those of  $G$ , and the vertices of  $G^*$  will consist of  $\delta_i$  "replicas" of the vertex  $v_i$  of  $G$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Formally, the vertex-set of  $G^*$  is

$$\{(v_i, k) : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq \delta_i\}.$$

<sup>1</sup>Supported in part by the Army Research Office (Durham), CRD-AA-L-P-3532.

<sup>2</sup>The possibility that  $P$  consists of a single edge accounts for this awkward wording.

<sup>3</sup>Figures in brackets indicate the literature references at the end of this paper.

<sup>3a</sup>The word "contains" can be further sharpened to "has as a connected component": see Edmonds [4].

Let  $E_i$  be the set of edges of  $G$  incident on  $v_i$ , with loops (if any) appearing twice. Thus  $E_i$  is the disjoint union of (i) the sets  $E_{ij}$  for  $i \neq j$ , and (ii) a "doubled"  $E_{ii}$ . For  $i \neq j$  let  $\phi_{ij}$  be an indexing of  $E_{ij}$  by a subset of the integers  $\{1, 2, \dots, \delta_{ij}\}$ ; this is possible by condition (1). (In general  $\phi_{ij} \neq \phi_{ji}$ .) Also let  $\phi_{ii}$  be an indexing of the edge-appearances in the doubled  $E_{ii}$  by a subset of the integers  $\{1, 2, \dots, \delta_i\}$ , which is possible by condition (2).

The edges of  $G^*$  are constructed in one-to-one correspondence with those of  $G$  as follows. Suppose an edge  $e$  joins  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  in  $G$ . If  $i \neq j$ , associate to  $e$  an edge  $e^*$  in  $G^*$  which joins the vertices  $(v_i, \phi_{ij}(e))$  and  $(v_j, \phi_{ji}(e))$ . If  $i = j$  and the symbols  $e^+$  and  $e^-$  are used for the two appearances of  $e$  in  $E_{ii}$ , then associate to  $e$  an edge  $e^*$  in  $G^*$  which joins  $(v_i, \phi_{ii}(e^+))$  and  $(v_i, \phi_{ii}(e^-))$ .  $G^*$  has only the edges  $e^*$  thus defined.

The edge-correspondence will be denoted  $\phi: G \rightarrow G^*$ . It is easily shown that  $G^*$  is indeed a strict graph, that any matching  $M$  in  $G^*$  yields a degree-constrained subgraph  $D = \phi^{-1}(M)$  of  $(G, \delta)$ , and that an augmenting path  $P$  for  $M$  yields an augmenting path  $\phi^{-1}(P)$  for  $D$ .

A degree-constrained subgraph  $D$  of  $(G, \delta)$ , however, yields a subgraph  $\phi(D)$  of  $G^*$  which is not necessarily a matching. To overcome this difficulty we need only specialize the indexings  $\phi_{ij}$  (which so far have been arbitrary), in a manner depending on the particular  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  for which the conclusion of the theorem (DCSG) is to be proved, so that at least  $\phi(D_1)$  and  $\phi(D_2)$  are matchings. (A way of doing this is given below.) Then since

$$|\phi(D_1)| = |D_1| < |D_2| = |\phi(D_2)|,$$

theorem (M) yields an augmenting path  $P$  for  $\phi(D_1)$  contained in  $\phi(D_1) \Delta \phi(D_2)$ , and  $\phi^{-1}(P)$  provides the desired augmenting path for  $D_1$  contained in  $D_1 \Delta D_2$ .

The following choice of  $\phi_{ij}$ 's will insure that  $\phi(D_1)$  and  $\phi(D_2)$  are matchings. First index the appearances in  $E_i$  of edges of  $D_1 \cap D_2$  by the integers 1 through  $d(v_i, D_1 \cap D_2)$  in any way. Then index the appearances in  $E_i$  of edges of  $D_1 - D_2$  by the integers  $d(v_i, D_1 \cap D_2) + 1$  through  $d(v_i, D_1)$  in any way, and index the appearances of edges of  $D_2 - D_1$  by the integers  $d(v_i, D_1 \cap D_2) + 1$  through  $d(v_i, D_2)$  in any way. Each appearance  $x$  of an edge of  $D_1 \cup D_2$  in any  $E_{ij}$  (where  $j = i$  is admitted) has now received an index, which is taken as the value of  $\phi_{ij}(x)$ . Note that any two edges of  $E_i \cap D_1$  have received different indices, whether they were both in  $D_1 \cap D_2$ , both in  $D_1 - D_2$ , or one in  $D_1 \cap D_2$  and the other in  $D_1 - D_2$ . This is what makes  $\phi(D_1)$  a matching, and similarly for  $\phi(D_2)$ . The definition of the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's can be completed by extending them in any way to the remainder of their respective domains. This completes the proof.

The same line of reasoning suggests how algorithms for finding optimal degree-constrained subgraphs might, at least in principle, be generated from algorithms for finding optimal matchings. At each stage one is trying to improve the "current" degree-constrained subgraph  $D$  of  $(G, \delta)$ . Form  $G^*$  as above,

choosing the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's so that  $\phi(D)$  is a matching. Then use matching-algorithm techniques to improve  $\phi(D)$ , carry the gain back to  $G$  via  $\phi^{-1}$ , and proceed to the next stage. The new degree-constrained subgraph  $D' = D \Delta \phi^{-1}(P)$  is automatically such that  $\phi(D')$  is a matching, so that the same  $G^*$  (i.e., the same  $\phi_{ij}$ 's) can be used step after step so long as augmenting paths for  $\phi(D)$  are found in  $G^*$ .

Unfortunately the absence of augmenting paths for  $\phi(D)$  in  $G^*$  does not imply the absence of an augmenting path for  $D$  in  $(G, \delta)$ . That is,  $D$  may not be an optimal degree-constrained subgraph of  $(G, \delta)$  even though  $\phi(D)$  is an optimal matching in  $G^*$ . This situation is readily seen to arise precisely when  $D$  has one or more augmenting paths  $P$ , but every one of them is "pulled apart" by  $\phi$  so that  $\phi(P)$  is not a path in  $G^*$ . From the theorem (DCSG) we know that this cannot happen if the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's are so chosen that  $\phi(D^0)$  is a matching for at least one optimal  $D^0$ , or even for at least one  $D^0$  more populous than the current  $D$ . By taking  $D_1$  and  $D^0$  as the  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  of the particular indexings used in the last proof, we see that such  $\phi_{ij}$ 's do indeed exist; however, they are not known in advance since  $D^0$  is not.

It is therefore necessary, when a point is reached at which  $\phi(D)$  is an optimal matching in  $G^*$ , to take into account somehow the possibility of augmenting paths for  $D$  in  $G$  whose connectivity has been lost in the transformation by  $\phi$ . For simplicity of description we distinguish two general classes of tactics; the distinction is conceptual rather than computational and no attempt is made to consider directly the possible computational implementations, comparisons, or compromises.

First, one might attempt to restore possible missing connections by *reindexing*. What would be required is a systematic way of varying the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's (i.e.,  $G^*$ ) until an indexing is found for which the image of  $D$  admits an augmenting path. To indicate that the optimum has been achieved, a "stop rule" for this process is also needed.

Second, one might try to supply the connections by *enlarging* the graph  $G^*$ , either initially, or gradually as the algorithm progresses. The enlarged graph would no longer have  $G$  as a self-intersecting copy in the sense of Edmonds [3].

The second policy can be illustrated in a rather heavy-handed way as follows. Instead of  $G^*$ , we employ a (typically enormous) graph  $G^{**}$  whose vertex-set, like that of  $G^*$ , is

$$\{(v_i, k): 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq \delta_i\}.$$

For each edge  $e \in E_{ij}$  of  $G$  ( $i < j$ ), we construct a collection

$$\{e_{kl}: 1 \leq k \leq \delta_i, 1 \leq l \leq \delta_j\}$$

of  $\delta_i \delta_j$  edges of  $G^{**}$ ;  $e_{kl}$  joins  $(v_i, k)$  and  $(v_j, l)$ . For each loop  $e \in E_{ii}$  of  $G$ , we construct a collection

$$\{e_{kl}: 1 \leq k < l \leq \delta_i\}$$

if  $\delta_i(\delta_i - 1)/2$  edges of  $G^{**}$ ;  $e_{kl}$  joins  $(v_i, k)$  and  $(v_i, l)$ . These are the only edges of  $G^{**}$ . A many-to-one onto mapping  $\psi: G^{**} \rightarrow G$  is defined by the formula  $\psi(e_{kl}) = e$ . Note that for every choice of indexings  $\phi_{ij}$ ,  $G^* = \phi(G)$  is in an obvious sense a subgraph of  $G^{**}$  and  $\psi\phi$  is the identity map of  $G$ .

For each matching  $M$  in  $G^{**}$ ,  $\psi(M)$  is a degree-constrained subgraph of  $(G, \delta)$ . Conversely, for each degree-constrained subgraph  $D$  of  $(G, \delta)$ , we can choose the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's so that  $\phi(D)$  is a matching in  $G^* = \phi(G)$  and hence in  $G^{**}$ , with  $\psi\phi(D) = D$ . The matchings  $M$  of  $G^{**}$  obtained in this way are precisely those for which the restriction  $\psi|M$  is one-to-one. Such matchings in  $G^{**}$  will be called *special*.

An augmenting path  $P$  for a special matching  $M$  will in turn be called *special* if the matching  $M\Delta P$  is also special. This will be the case if and only if

$$\psi(P - M) \cap \psi(M - P)$$

is empty and in addition the matching  $P - M$  is special. A special augmenting path  $P$  for  $M$  will be called *strong* if  $\psi|P$  is one-to-one.

Now consider the following process, which begins with an arbitrary special matching  $M^{(1)}$  in  $G^{**}$  (e.g., the null matching). At the  $m$ th stage we have a special matching  $M^{(m)}$  in  $G^{**}$ , and seek a special augmenting path (or if preferred even a strong special augmenting path) for  $M^{(m)}$ . If such a path  $P$  is found, we form the special matching  $M^{(m+1)} = M^{(m)}\Delta P$  and go on to the next stage.

**THEOREM.** *This process terminates with a special matching  $M$  in  $G^{**}$  such that  $D = \psi(M)$  is an optimal degree-constrained subgraph of  $(G, \delta)$ .*

For the proof, first observe that the finiteness of  $G^{**}$  insures termination with some special matching  $M$ . Since  $M$  is special,  $\psi|M$  is a one-to-one mapping of  $M$  onto the degree-constrained subgraph  $D = \psi(M)$  of  $(G, \delta)$ . If  $D$  were *not* optimal, there would be a degree-constrained subgraph  $D^0$  of  $(G, \delta)$  such that  $|D| < |D^0|$ . Exploiting our freedom in selecting indexings, we choose  $\phi_{ij}$ 's such that  $\phi(D) = M$  and  $\phi(D^0)$  is a matching. (A way of doing this is given below.) Then since

$$|\phi(D)| = |D| < |D^0| = |\phi(D^0)|,$$

Theorem (M) yields<sup>4</sup> an augmenting path  $P$  for  $\phi(D)$ , contained in  $\phi(D)\Delta\phi(D^0)$  and thus in  $\phi(G)$ . This containment guarantees that  $P$  is a strong special augmenting path for  $\phi(D) = M$ , contradicting the assumption that the process terminated with  $M$ .

The following choice of  $\phi_{ij}$ 's will insure that  $\phi(D) = M$  and that  $\phi(D^0)$  is a matching. Consider any  $e \in D \cap E_{ij}$ , where  $i \leq j$ . There is a unique  $e_{kl} \in M$ , for which  $\psi(e_{kl}) = e$ . If  $i < j$ , set  $\phi_{ij}(e) = k$  and  $\phi_{ji}(e) = l$ . If  $i = j$ , which implies  $k < l$ , then set  $\phi_{ii}(e^-) = k$  and  $\phi_{ii}(e^+) = l$ . This yields  $\phi(D) = M$ . Now fix the value of  $i$ . For each  $j$  (with  $j \leq i$  admitted), the  $\phi_{ij}$ -values assigned

to appearances in  $E_i$  of edges in  $D \cap D^0$  are distinct (since  $M = \phi(D)$  is a matching) and form a subset  $S_{ij}$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, \delta_i\}$ . For the same reason, the union  $\bigcup_j S_{ij}$  is a disjoint union and has cardinality  $d(v_i, D \cap D^0)$ . Because

$$d(v_i, D^0 - D) = d(v_i, D^0) - d(v_i, D \cap D^0) \leq \delta_i - \left| \bigcup_j S_{ij} \right|,$$

the appearances  $x$  of edges of  $D^0 - D$  in  $E_i$  can be indexed by a subset of

$$\{1, 2, \dots, \delta_i\} - \bigcup_j S_{ij},$$

and we can take  $\phi_{ij}(x)$  to be the index of  $x$ . This makes  $\phi(D^0)$  a matching; the definitions of the  $\phi_{ij}$ 's can be completed by extending them in any way to the remainder of their respective domains. This completes the proof, and shows that finding optimal degree-constrained subgraphs in  $(G, \delta)$  can in principle be "reduced" to finding strong special augmenting paths for special matchings in the very large graph  $G^{**}$ .

This "reduction" is not quite of the form desired, since  $G^{**}$  will not be strict unless  $G$  is such that  $|E_{ij}| \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . For many situations of interest that assumption is satisfied, and in any case the work on matching optimization [4] does not require strictness of the underlying graph.

It is hoped that further exploration of the ideas presented above will lead to a computationally useful reduction of the degree-constrained subgraph optimization problem to the matching optimization problem or its associated techniques. To avoid possible misunderstanding, it should be emphasized that one efficient algorithm for the former problem is already known [5].

I am indebted to NBS colleagues J. Edmonds, C. Witzgall, and C. T. Zahn, Jr., for many discussions of their recent work in this area of combinatorial extremization. Zahn's direct proof of the theorem (DCSG) was the specific stimulus for this paper, and his scrutiny of an early draft uncovered the need for several modifications.

## References

- [1] C. Berge, Two theorems in graph theory, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 43, 842-844 (1957).
- [2] C. Berge, The Theory of Graphs and its Applications (London, Methuen 1962).
- [3] J. Edmonds, Covers and packings in a family of sets, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 68, 494-499 (1962).
- [4] J. Edmonds, Paths, trees and flowers, to appear in Can. J. Math.
- [5] J. Edmonds, Maximum matching and a polyhedron with  $(0, 1)$  vertices, to be submitted for publication.
- [6] R. Z. Norman and M. O. Rabin, An algorithm for a minimum cover of a graph, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 10, 315-319 (1959).
- [7] C. Witzgall and C. T. Zahn, Jr., A modification of Edmonds' algorithm for maximum matching, to be submitted for publication.

<sup>4</sup>Theorem (M) specialized to strict graphs can be used even though  $G^{**}$  is not necessarily strict, since we are working in the strict graph  $\phi(G)$ .