A JÓZSEF ATTILA TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM KÖZLEMÉNYEI

ACTA SCIENTIARUM MATHEMATICARUM

CSÁKÁNY BÉLA, LEINDLER LÁSZLÓ, POLLÁK GYÖRGY
CSÖRGŐ SÁNDOR, LOVÁSZ LÁSZLÓ, RÉDEI LÁSZLÓ
GÉCSEG FERENC, MEGYESI LÁSZLÓ, SZALAY ISTVÁN
HATVANI LÁSZLÓ, MÓRICZ FERENC, SZŰCS JÓZSEF
HUHN ANDRÁS, PINTÉR LAJOS, TANDORI KÁROLY

KÖZREMŰKÖDÉSÉVEL SZERKESZTI

SZŐKEFALVI-NAGY BÉLA

41. KÖTET

SZEGED, 1979

JÓZSEF ATTILA TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM BOLYAI INTÉZETE

Acta Sci. Math., 41 (1979), 77–81

Covering branchings

ANDRÁS FRANK

In a previous paper [4] we proved, among others, a min-max theorem concerning cuts of a directed graph. Now this theorem will be applied in order to get some new min-max theorems about branchings and arborescences. For example, a good characterization is given for the problem of the existence of k branchings covering all of the edges of a directed graph. This theorem can be considered as a directed counterpart of a theorem of Nash-Williams about covering forests.

Another corollary is a directed analogue of Tutte's theorem about edge disjoint spanning trees. A directed graph has k edge disjoint spanning arborescences (possibly rooted at different vertices) if and only if, for every family of t disjoint subsets of vertices, the sum of their indegrees is at least $k(t-1)$. This theorem differs from Edmonds' one concerning the existence of k edge disjoint spanning arborescences rooted at a fixed vertex. However we shall use Edmonds' result in the proof.

Let $G=(V, E)$ be a finite directed graph with vertex set V and edge set E. Multiple edges are allowed, loops are excluded. Let r be a distinguished vertex of G. We use the notation $U=V\setminus\{r\}$.

An *arborescence a* is a directed tree such that every edge is directed toward a different vertex. It is well known that an arborescence has a unique vertex (of indegree 0) from which every other vertex can be reached by a directed path. This vertex is called the *root* of *a*. A spanning arborescence of G rooted at r is called an *r-arborescence*.

A *branching b* is a directed forest, the components of which are arborescences.

We say that a directed edge e *enters* a set X of vertices if the head of e is in X but its tail is not. We say that a subset E' of edges *enters* X if at least one element of E' enters X.

The *indegree* $\varrho_G(X)$ of a subset X of V is the number of edges entering X. The following inequality is straightforward: $\varrho_G(X)+\varrho_G(Y)\geqq\varrho_G(X\cup Y)+\varrho_G(X\cap Y)$.

Received December 30, 1977.

For an arbitrary set X, $X' \sqsubset X$ means that X' is a family of not necessarily distinct elements of X.

A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of U is called *laminar* if at least one of $X \setminus Y$, $Y \setminus X$, $X \cap Y$ is empty for any two members of $\mathcal{F}$.

Let $\mathbf{f}$ be a non-negative integer valued function defined on the subsets of U. $\mathbf{f}$ is called *weakly supermodular* if $X, Y \subseteq U$, $\mathbf{f}(X), \mathbf{f}(Y) > 0$ and $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ imply $\mathbf{f}(X) + \mathbf{f}(Y) \leqq \mathbf{f}(X \cup Y) + \mathbf{f}(X \cap Y)$. If $X, Y \subseteq U$ and $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ already imply it then $\mathbf{f}$ is called *supermodular*.

A family E' of not necessarily distinct edges of G (i.e. $E' \sqsubset E$) is called $\mathbf{f}$-*entering* if in the graph $G' = (V, E')$ the indegree of every subset X is at least $\mathbf{f}(X)$.

Let $\mathbf{c}$ be a non-negative integer valued function on E. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of not necessarily distinct subsets of U is called $\mathbf{c}$-*edge-independent* if each edge e of G enters at most $\mathbf{c}(e)$ members of $\mathcal{F}$.

The following theorem was proved in a slightly other form in [4].

Theorem 1. *If* $\mathbf{f}$ *is weakly supermodular and* $\varrho(Y) = 0$ *implies* $\mathbf{f}(Y) = 0$ *then*

$$\max_{\mathcal{F}} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbf{f}(X) = \min_{E' \sqsubset E} \sum_{e \in E'} \mathbf{c}(e)$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ *is* $\mathbf{c}$-*edge-independent* ($\mathcal{F} \sqsubset 2^U$) *and* $E' \sqsubset E$ *is* $\mathbf{f}$-*entering. The maximum can be realized by a laminar* $\mathcal{F}$.

Let k be a natural number and $F \subseteq E$.

Problem 1. What is the maximum number M of edges of F which can be covered by k r-arborescences of G?

The case $F = E$ was discussed in [4]. We formulate this problem in another form.

Problem 1a. What is the minimum number m of not necessarily distinct edges of G which, together with F, contain k edge disjoint r-arborescences?

The two problems are equivalent because $M \geqq k(|V|-1) - m$ and $m \leqq k(|V|-1) - M$, hence

$$m + M = k(|V|-1). \tag{1}$$

By a theorem of J. Edmonds [3, 5] a digraph has k edge disjoint r-arborescences if and only if the indegree of every subset of $V \setminus \{r\}$ is at least k. Therefore $m = \min_{E' \sqsubset E} |E'|$ where E' is $\mathbf{f}$-entering and the function $\mathbf{f}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{f}(X) = \max(0, k - \varrho_H(X)) \quad \text{for} \quad X \subseteq U$$

where $\varrho_H(X)$ is the indegree of X in the subgraph $H = (V, F)$. Obviously $\mathbf{f}$ is weakly supermodular. (Observe that F is used only to define $\mathbf{f}$). Applying Theorem 1 to G and to this function $\mathbf{f}$, with the choice $\mathbf{c}(e) = 1$ ($e \in E$), we get $m = \max_{\mathcal{F}} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbf{f}(X)$ where $\mathcal{F}$ is 1-edge-independent. This, together with (1), proves

Theorem 2. *If* $H = (V, F)$ *is a subgraph of* $G = (V, E)$ *then the maximum number of edges of* H *which can be covered by* k r-*arborescences of* G *is equal to*

$$\min \left[k(|V| - 1 - t) + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varrho_H(V_i) \right]$$

where the minimum is taken over all 1-*edge-independent laminar families* $\mathcal{F} = \{V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_t\}$ ($V_i \subseteq U$).

Problem 2. Let $H = (U, F)$ be a directed graph (there is no distinguished vertex). What is the maximum number M of edges which can be covered by k branchings?

Complete H by a new vertex r and by $|U|$ new edges which are joined from r to all other vertices of U, i.e. $V = U \cup \{r\}$ and $E = F \cup \{(\overrightarrow{r, x}) : x \in U\}$. It is easy to check that the maximum number of edges of H which can be covered by k r-arborescences of $G = (V, E)$ is M. Apply Theorem 2 and observe that in this case a laminar family of subsets of U consists of pairwise disjoint subsets. Thus we have

Theorem 3. *The maximum number of edges of* $H = (U, F)$ *which can be covered by* k *branchings is equal to*

$$\min \left[k(|U| - t) + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varrho_H(V_i) \right]$$

where the minimum is taken over all families of disjoint subsets V_i ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$) *of* U.

A simple application of this theorem provides an analogue of Tutte's disjoint spanning trees theorem [8].

Theorem 4. $H = (U, F)$ *has* k *edge disjoint spanning arborescences (possibly rooted at different vertices) if and only if*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} \varrho_H(V_i) \geqq k(t-1) \tag{2}$$

for every family of disjoint subsets V_i ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$) *of* U.

Proof. H has k edge disjoint spanning arborescences if and only if at least $k(|U|-1)$ edges of H can be covered by k branchings, i.e., by Theorem 3, $k(|U| - t) + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varrho_H(V_i) \geqq k(|U|-1)$, which is equivalent to (2). □

Another consequence of Theorem 3 is

Theorem 5. *The edges of H can be covered by k branchings if and only if*

$$k(|U|-t) \geqq e_t \tag{3}$$

for every family of disjoint subsets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_t$ of U, where e_t denotes the number of edges not entering any V_i.

Proof. By Theorem 3 we have to assure that $k(|U|-t)+\sum_{i=1}^{t}\varrho_H(V_i)\geqq|F|$. But this is equivalent to (3), because $e_t+\sum_{i=1}^{t}\varrho_H(V_i)=|F|$. □

Theorem 5a. *The edges of H can be covered by k branchings if and only if*

(4a) *the indegree of every vertex is at most k, and*

(4b) *the edges of H (in the undirected sense) can be covered by k forests.*

Proof. The necessity of the conditions is obvious. For the sufficiency we verify that (4a) and (4b) imply (3). Let $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_t$ be disjoint subsets of U. Let $V_0=U\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{t} V_i$ (V_0 may be empty) and let $e(X)$ denote the number of edges with tails and heads both in X. Then

$$e_t = \sum_{x\in V_0}\varrho_H(x)+\sum_{i=1}^{t} e(V_i) \leqq k|V_0|+\sum_{i=1}^{t} k(|V_i|-1) = k(|U|-t). \quad \square$$

Remark. The last theorem can be considered as a new "linking" theorem. Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ denote the circuit matroid (on F) of H considering H as an undirected graph. Let $\mathcal{M}_2$ denote the matroid on F in which a subset is defined to be independent if it contains no two edges directed toward the same vertex. Now Theorem 5a states that if F can be covered by k independent sets of $\mathcal{M}_1$ and can be covered by k independent sets of $\mathcal{M}_2$ then F can be covered by k sets which are independent in both $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$.

Another special case of this statement, when $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are transversal matroids, was proved by Brualdi [2]. However, this statement is not true in general: Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be the circuit matroid of K_4 (the complete graph on 4 vertices) and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be defined such that a subset in independent if it contains no disjoint edges of K_4.

Now we prove a Vizing type theorem which is due to Mosesyan [6] for $\gamma=1$.

Theorem 6. *If in $H=(U, F)$ the indegree of every vertex is at most K and H does not contain $\gamma+1$ edges with the same heads and tails then F can be covered by $k=K+\gamma$ branchings.*

Proof. (4a) holds obviously. To prove (4b) we have to verify that $e(X)\leqq k(|X|-1)$ for $X\subseteq U$. This condition is equivalent to (4b) by a well-known

theorem of Nash-Williams [7]. If $|X|\gamma\leqq k$ then $e(X)\leqq|X|(|X|-1)\gamma\leqq k(|X|-1)$. If in turn $|X|\gamma\geqq k$ then $e(X)\leqq|X|\cdot K=|X|(k-\gamma)\leqq k(|X|-1)$. □

Finally, a theorem is stated which is also a consequence of Theorem 1. The proof is left to the reader.

Theorem 7. *The edges of $H=(U, F)$ can be covered by k spanning arborescences if and only if $k(|U|-1-t+d)\geqq e_t$ for every 1-edge-independent laminar family $\mathcal{F}=\{V_1, \ldots, V_t\}$, where e_t is the number of edges not entering any V_i and d denotes the maximum number of V_i's containing any vertex.*

References

[1] C. Berge, *Graphs and Hypergraphs*, North-Holland, (Amsterdam, 1973).

[2] R. A. Brualdi, Common Partial Transversals and Integral Matrices, *Amer. Math. Soc.*, **155** (1971), 475—492.

[3] J. Edmonds, Edge disjoint branchings, in *Combinatorial Algorithms*, Academic Press (New York, 1973), 91—96.

[4] A. Frank, Kernel systems of directed graphs, *Acta. Sci Math.*, **41** (1979), 63—76.

[5] L. Lovász, On two minimax theorems in graph theory, *J. Combinatorial Theory*, Ser. B., **2** (1976), 96—103.

[6] K. M. Mosesyan, oral communication.

[7] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, Decompositions of finite graphs into forests, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **39** (1964), 12.

[8] W. T. Tutte, On the problem of decomposing a graph into n connected factors, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **36** (1961), 221—230.

BOLYAI INSTITUTE
ARADI VÉRTANÚK TERE 1.
6720 SZEGED, HUNGARY

and

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR TELECOMMUNICATION
GÁBOR ÁRON U. 65.
1026 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

INDEX–TARTALOM

ACTA SCIENTIARUM MATHEMATICARUM

SZEGED (HUNGARIA), ARADI VÉRTANÚK TERE 1

On peut s'abonner à l'entreprise de commerce des livres et journaux „Kultúra" (1061 Budapest, I., Fő utca 32)

ISSN 0001-6969

INDEX: 26 024

79-356 — Szegedi Nyomda — F. v.: Dobó József igazgató

Felelős szerkesztő és kiadó: Szőkefalvi-Nagy Béla
A kézirat a nyomdába érkezett: 1979. Január 19.
Megjelenés: 1979. Június 30.

Példányszám: 1200. Terjedelem: 24,5 (A/5) ív
Készült monószedéssel, íves magasnyomással,
az MSZ 5601-24 és az MSZ 5602-55 szabvány szerint