Supermodularity in Unweighted Graph Optimization III: Highly-connected Digraphs

Kristóf Bérczi[*] and András Frank[†]

September 4, 2017

Abstract

By generalizing a recent result of Hong, Liu, and Lai [16] on characterizing the degree-sequences of simple strongly connected directed graphs, a characterization is provided for degree-sequences of simple k-node-connected digraphs. More generally, we solve the directed node-connectivity augmentation problem when the augmented digraph is degree-specified and simple. As for edge-connectivity augmentation, we solve the special case when the edge-connectivity is to be increased by one and the augmenting digraph must be simple.

1 Introduction

There is an extensive literature of problems concerning degree sequences of graphs or digraphs with some prescribed properties such as simplicity or k-connectivity. For example, Edmonds [8] characterized the degree-sequences of simple k-edge-connected undirected graphs, while Wang and Kleitman [23] solved the corresponding problem for simple k-node-connected graphs.

In what follows, we consider only directed graphs for which the default understanding will be throughout the paper that loops and parallel arcs are allowed. When neither loops nor parallel arcs from u to v are allowed we speak of **simple** digraphs. Oppositely oriented arcs uv and vu, however, are allowed in simple digraphs. A typical problem is as follows. Given an n-element ground-set V, decide for a specified integer-valued function $m_i : V \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ if there is a digraph $D = (V, A)$ with some prescribed properties realizing (or fitting) m_i, which means that $\varrho_D(v) = m_i(v)$ for every node $v \in V$ where $\varrho_D(v)$ denotes the number of arcs of D with head v. Often we call a function m_i an **in-degree specification** or **sequence** or **prescription**. An out-degree specification m_o is defined analogously, and a pair (m_o, m_i) of functions is simply called a **degree-specification**.

For any function $m : S \to \mathbb{R}$, the set-function $\widetilde{m}$ is defined by $\widetilde{m}(X) := \sum[m(v) : v \in X]$ for $X \subseteq S$, and we shall use this tilde-notation $\widetilde{m}$ throughout the paper. In order to realize (m_o, m_i) with a digraph, it is necessary to require that $\widetilde{m}_o(V) = \widetilde{m}_i(V)$ since both $\widetilde{m}_o(V)$ and $\widetilde{m}_i(V)$ enumerate the total number of arcs of a realizing digraph D. This common value will be denoted by γ, that is, our assumption throughout is that

$$\widetilde{m}_o(V) = \widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma. \tag{1}$$

The following result was proved by Ore [19] in a slightly different but equivalent form.

Theorem 1 (Ore). *A digraph $H = (V, F)$ has a subgraph fitting (m_o, m_i) if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - d_H(Z, X) \leq \gamma \text{ for every } X, Z \subseteq V, \tag{2}$$

where $d_H(Z, X)$ denotes the number of arcs $uv \in F$ with $u \in Z$ and $v \in X$.

This immediately implies the following characterization ([19], see also [10]).

---

[*]MTA-ELTE Egerváry Research Group, Department of Operations Research, Eötvös University, Pázmány P. s. 1/c, Budapest, Hungary, H-1117. e-mail: `berkri@cs.elte.hu` .

[†]MTA-ELTE Egerváry Research Group, Department of Operations Research, Eötvös University, Pázmány P. s. 1/c, Budapest, Hungary, H-1117. e-mail: `frank@cs.elte.hu` .

Theorem 2 (Ore). *Let (m_o, m_i) be a degree-specification meeting* (1).

(A) *There always exists a digraph realizing (m_o, m_i).*

(B) *There is a loopless digraph realizing (m_o, m_i) if and only if*

$$m_i(v) + m_o(v) \leq \gamma \text{ for every } v \in V. \tag{3}$$

(C) *There is a simple digraph realizing (m_o, m_i) if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| \leq \gamma \text{ for every } X, Z \subseteq V. \tag{4}$$

Moreover, it suffices to require the inequality in (4) *only for its special case when X consists of the h largest values of m_i and Z consists of the j largest values of m_o $(h = 1, \ldots, n, \ j = 1, \ldots, n)$.*

Note that (3) follows from (4) by taking $X = \{v\}$ and $Z = \{v\}$. We also remark that Part (A) can be proved directly by a simple greedy algorithm: build up a digraph by adding arcs uv one by one as long as there are (possibly not distinct) nodes u and v with $\varrho(v) < m_i(v)$ and $\delta(v) < m_o(v)$. Also, Part (B) immediately follows by the following **loop-reducing technique**. Let D be a digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) and suppose that there is a loop $e = vv$ sitting at v. Condition (3) implies that there must be an arc $f = xy$ with $x \neq v \neq y$ (but $x = y$ allowed). By replacing e and f with arcs xv and vy, we obtain a digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) that has fewer loops than D has. For later purposes, we remark that the loop-reducing procedure does not decrease the in-degree of any subset of nodes.

We call a digraph $D = (V, A)$ **strongly connected** or just **strong** if $\varrho_D(X) \geq 1$ whenever $\emptyset \subset X \subset V$. More generally, D is k-**edge-connected** if $\varrho_D(X) \geq k$ whenever $\emptyset \subset X \subset V$. D is k-**node-connected** or just k-**connected** if $k \leq |V| - 1$ and the removal of any set of less than k nodes leaves a strong digraph.

One may be interested in characterizing degree-sequences of k-edge-connected and k-node-connected digraphs. We will refer to this kind of problems as synthesis problems. The more general augmentation problem consists of making an initial digraph $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ k-edge- or k-node-connected by adding a degree-specified digraph. Clearly, when A_0 is empty we are back at the synthesis problem. The augmentation problem was solved for k-edge-connectivity in [12] and for k-node-connectivity in [13], but in both cases the augmenting digraphs D were allowed to have loops or parallel arcs. The same approach rather easily extends to the case when D is requested to be loopless but treating simplicity is significantly more difficult.

The goal of the present paper is to investigate these degree-specified augmentation and synthesis problems when simplicity is expected. In the augmentation problem, this means actually two possible versions depending on whether the augment**ing** digraph D or else the augment**ed** digraph $D_0 + D$ is requested to be simple. Clearly, when D_0 has no arcs (the synthesis problem) the two versions coincide. We will consider both variations.

An early result of this type is due to Beineke and Harary [1] who characterized degree-sequences of loopless strongly connected digraphs. In a recent work Hong, Liu, and Lai [16] characterized degree-sequences of simple strongly connected digraphs. In order to generalize conveniently their result, we formulate it in a slightly different but equivalent form.

Theorem 3 (Hong, Liu, and Lai). *Suppose that there is a simple digraph fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i) (that is, (4) holds). There is a strongly connected simple digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + 1 \leq \gamma \tag{5}$$

holds for every pair of disjoint subsets $X, Z \subset V$ with $X \cup Z \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, it suffices to require (5) *only in the special case when X consists of the h largest values of m_i and Z consists of the j largest values of m_o $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \ h = 0, 1, \ldots, n, \ 1 \leq j + h \leq n)$.*

We are going to extend this result in two directions. In the first one, degree-specifications are characterized for which there is a simple realizing digraph D whose addition to an initial $(k-1)$-edge-connected digraph D_0 results in a k-edge-connected digraph $D_0 + D$. The general problem of augmenting an arbitrary initial digraph D_0 with a degree-specified simple digraph to obtain a k-edge-connected digraph remains open even in the special case when D_0 has no arcs at all. That is, the synthesis problem of characterizing degree-sequences of simple k-edge-connected digraphs remains open for $k \geq 2$.

Our second generalization of Theorem 3 provides a characterization of degree-sequences of simple k-node-connected digraphs. We also solve the more general degree-specified node-connectivity augmentation problem when the augmented digraph is requested to be simple. It is a bit surprising that node-connectivity augmentation problems are typically more complex than their edge-connectivity counterparts and yet an analogous characterization for the general k-edge-connected case, as indicated above, remains open.

In the proof of both extensions, we rely on the following general result of Frank and Jordán [13].

Theorem 4 (Supermodular arc-covering, bi-set function version). *Let p be a positively crossing supermodular bi-set function which is zero on trivial bi-sets. The minimum number of arcs of a loopless digraph covering p is equal to $\max\{\sum[p(B) : B \in \mathcal{I}]\}$ where the maximum is taken over all independent families $\mathcal{I}$ of bi-sets. There is an algorithm for crossing supermodular p, which is polynomial in $|V|$ and in the maximum value of $p(B)$, to compute the optima.*

One way to obtain a non-negative positively crossing supermodular function is taking a crossing supermodular function and increase its negative values to zero, but not every non-negative positively crossing supermodular function arises in this way. In deriving applications, it is simpler to work with the more general notion but it should be emphasised that no polynomial algorithm is known when p is positively crossing supermodular, and the existing algorithms work only for crossing supermodular functions.

The algorithm described in [13] relies on the ellipsoid method and on a subroutine to minimize a submodular function given on a ring-family (see, Schrijver's algorithm in [21]). Végh and Benczúr [22] developed a purely combinatorial algorithm for optimal directed node-connectivity augmentation problem, an important special case of Theorem 4. Though not mentioned explicitly in the paper of Végh and Benczúr, their algorithm can be extended without much effort to the general case described in Theorem 4 when p is crossing supermodular. This extended algorithm relies on an oracle for minimizing submodular functions. We should emphasize that the algorithm of Végh and Benczúr is particularly intricate and it is a natural goal to develop simpler algorithms for the special cases considered in the present work.

This theorem was earlier used to solve several connectivity augmentation problems. It should be, however, emphasized that even this general framework did not allow to handle simplicity. Even worse, there is no hope to extend Theorem 4 so as to characterize minimal *simple* digraphs covering p since this problem, by relying on a result by Dürr et al. [7], was shown in [2] (Theorem 12) to include **NP**-complete special cases. In [2] and [3], we developed other applications of the supermodular arc-covering theorem when simplicity could be guaranteed.

A main feature of the present approach to manage the above-mentioned special cases (when simplicity of the augmenting digraph is an expectation) is that, though Theorem 4 remains a fundamental starting point, relatively tedious additional work is needed. (The complications may be explained by the fact that some special cases are **NP**-complete while others are in **NP**∩co-**NP**.)

There are actually two issues here to be considered. The first one is to develop techniques for embedding special simplicity-requesting connectivity augmentation problems into the framework of Theorem 4. When this is successful, one has to resolve a second difficulty stemming from the somewhat complicated nature of an independent family of bi-sets in Theorem 4.

To demonstrate this second obstacle, consider the following digraph $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ with a particularly simple structure. Let $e = uv$ be an arc of D_0 if $u \in Z$ or $v \in X$, where Z and X are two specified disjoint subsets of V with $|X| = |Z| < k$. An earlier direct consequence of Theorem 4 (formulated in Section 3 as Theorem 20) does provide a formula for the minimum number of new arcs whose addition to any initial digraph results in a k-connected digraph. But to prove that this minimum for our special digraph D_0 is actually equal to the total out-deficiency $\sum[(k - \delta_0(v))^+ : v \in V]$ of the nodes of D_0 is rather tricky or tedious.

From an algorithmic point of view, it should be noted that the original proof of Hong et al. [16] gives rise to a polynomial algorithm which is purely combinatorial. The present approach makes use of the supermodular arc-covering theorem. Since [13] and [22] describe polynomial algorithm to compute the optima in question, there are polynomial algorithms for finding the simple degree-specified digraphs with the prescribed connectivity properties. However, the algorithm in [13] relies on the ellipsoid method while the general algorithm of Végh and Benczúr is particularly complex. Therefore developing a simple combinatorial algorithm for our cases requires further investigations.

Also, when, instead of exact degree-specifications, upper and lower bounds are prescribed for the in-degrees and out-degrees, the problem of characterizing the existence of simple k-node-connected and

degree-constrained digraphs, even in the special case $k = 1$, remains a challenging research task for the future.

1.1 Notions and notation

For a number x, let $x^+ = \max\{0, x\}$. For a function $m : V \to \mathbb{R}$ and for $X \subseteq V$, let $\widetilde{m}(X) := \sum[m(v) : v \in X]$. For a set-function p and a family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets, let $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{F}) := \sum[p(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{F}]$. For a family $\mathcal{T}$ of sets, let $\cup \mathcal{T}$ denote the union of the members of $\mathcal{T}$.

Two subsets of a ground-set V are said to be **co-disjoint** if their complements are disjoint. By a **partition** of a ground-set V, we mean a family of disjoint subsets of V whose union is V. A **subpartition** of V is a partition of a subset of V. A **co-partition** (resp., **co-subpartition**) of V is a family of subsets arising from a partition (subpartition) of V by complementing each of its member. For a subpartition $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \ldots, T_q\}$, we always assume that its members T_i are non-empty but $\mathcal{T}$ is allowed to be empty (that is, $q = 0$).

Two subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$ are **crossing** if none of $X - Y, Y - X, X \cap Y, V - (X \cup Y)$ is empty. A family of subsets is **cross-free** if it contains no two crossing members. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets is **crossing** if both $X \cap Y$ and $X \cup Y$ belong to $\mathcal{F}$ whenever X and Y are crossing members of $\mathcal{F}$.

When X is a subset of V, we write $X \subseteq V$, while $X \subset V$ means that X is a proper subset. The standard notation $A \setminus B$ for set difference will be replaced by $A - B$. When it does not cause any confusion, we do not distinguish a one-element set $\{v\}$ (often called a **singleton**) from its only element v, and we use the notation v for the singleton as well. For example, we write $V - v$ rather than $V - \{v\}$, and $V + v$ stands for $V \cup \{v\}$. In some situations, however, the formally precise $\{v\}$ notation must be used. For example, an arc $e = uv$ in a digraph is said to enter a node v even if e is a loop (that is, $u = v$) while e enters the singleton $\{v\}$ only if $u \in V - v$. That is a loop sitting at v enters v but does not enter $\{v\}$. Therefore the in-degree $\varrho(v)$ (the number of arcs entering v) is equal to the in-degree $\varrho(\{v\})$ plus the number of loops sitting at v.

In a digraph $D = (V, A)$, an arc uv **enters** a subset $X \subseteq V$ or **leaves** $V - X$ if $u \in X$, $v \in V - X$. The in-degree $\varrho_D(X) = \varrho_A(X)$ of a subset $X \subseteq V$ is the number of arcs entering X while the out-degree $\delta_D(X) = \delta_A(X)$ is the number of arcs leaving X. Two arcs of a digraph are **parallel** if their heads coincide and their tails coincide. The oppositely directed arcs uv and vu are not parallel. We call a digraph **simple** if it has neither loops nor parallel arcs.

By the **complete digraph** $D^* = (V, A^*)$, we mean the simple digraph on V in which there is one arc from u to v for each ordered pair (u, v) of distinct nodes, that is, D^* has $n(n - 1)$ arcs. For two subsets $Z, X \subseteq V$, let $D^*[Z, X]$ denotes the subgraph of D^* consisting of those arcs uv for which $u \in Z$ or $v \in X$. Then $D^*[Z, X]$ has $|Z|(n - 1) + (n - |Z|)|X| - |X - Z|$ arcs.

For two digraphs $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ and $D = (V, A)$ on the same node-set, $D_0 + D = (V, A_0 + A)$ denotes the digraph consisting of the arcs of D_0 and D. That is, $D_0 + D$ has $|A_0| + |A|$ arcs.

A digraph D **covers** a family $\mathcal{K}$ of subsets if $\varrho_D(K) \geq 1$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$. A digraph D **covers** a set-function p on V if $\varrho_D(K) \geq p(K)$ for every $K \subseteq V$.

By a **bi-set** we mean a pair $B = (B_O, B_I)$ of subsets for which $B_I \subseteq B_O$. Here B_O and B_I are the outer set and the inner set of B, respectively. A bi-set is **trivial** if $B_I = \emptyset$ or $B_O = V$. The set $W(B) := B_O - B_I$ is the **wall** of B, while $w(B) = |W(B)|$ is its **wall-size**. Two bi-sets B and C are **comparable** if $B_I \subseteq C_I$ and $B_O \subseteq C_O$ or else $B_I \supseteq C_I$ and $B_O \supseteq C_O$. The **meet** of two bi-sets B and C is defined by $B \sqcap C = (B_O \cap C_O, B_I \cap C_I)$ while their **join** is $B \sqcup C = (B_O \cup C_O, B_I \cup C_I)$. Note that $w(B)$ is a modular function in the sense that $w(B) + w(C) = w(B \sqcap C) + w(B \sqcup C)$. Two bi-sets B and C are **crossing** if $B_O \cup C_O \neq V, B_I \cap C_I \neq \emptyset$, and they are not comparable. A family $\mathcal{B}$ of bi-sets is **crossing** if both $B \sqcap C$ and $B \sqcup C$ belong to $\mathcal{B}$ whenever B and C are crossing members of $\mathcal{B}$. A bi-set function p is **positively crossing supermodular** if

$$p(B) + p(C) \leq p(B \sqcap C) + p(B \sqcup C)$$

whenever $p(B) > 0, p(C) > 0$, B and C are crossing bi-sets.

An arc e **enters** (or **covers**) a bi-set B if e enters both B_O and B_I. The **in-degree** $\varrho(B)$ of a bi-set B is the number of arcs entering B. Two bi-sets are **independent** if no arc can cover both, which is equivalent to requiring that their inner sets are disjoint or their outer sets are co-disjoint. A family of

bi-sets is **independent** if their members are pairwise independent. Given a digraph $D = (V, A)$, a bi-set $B = (B_O, B_I)$ is D-**one-way** or just **one-way** if no arc of D covers B.

2 Edge-connectivity

The degree-specified augmentation problem for k-edge-connectivity was shown by the second author [12] to be equivalent to Mader's directed splitting off theorem [18].

Theorem 5 ([12])**.** *An initial digraph $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ can be made k-edge-connected by adding a digraph $D = (V, A)$ fitting (m_o, m_i) if and only if $\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \varrho_{D_0}(X) \geq k$ and $\widetilde{m}_o(X) + \delta_{D_0}(X) \geq k$ hold for every subset $\emptyset \subset X \subset V$. If, in addition, (3) holds, then D can be chosen loopless.*

The second part immediately follows from the first one by applying the loop-reducing technique mentioned in Section 1 since loop-reduction never decreases the in-degree of a subset. Though the problem when simplicity of D is requested remains open even in the special case when D_0 has no arcs, we are able to prove the following straight extension of Theorem 3.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that there is a simple digraph fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i) (that is, (4) holds). A digraph D_0 can be made strongly connected by adding a simple digraph fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i) if and only if inequality (5) holds for every pair of disjoint subsets $X, Z \subset V$ for which there is a non-empty, proper subset K of V so that $\varrho_{D_0}(K) = 0$ and $Z \subseteq K \subseteq V - X$.*

This theorem is just a special case of the following.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that there is a simple digraph fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i). A $(k-1)$-edge-connected digraph D_0 can be made k-edge-connected by adding a simple digraph fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i) if and only if inequality (5) holds for every pair of disjoint subsets $X, Z \subset V$ for which there is a non-empty, proper subset K of V so that $\varrho_{D_0}(K) = k - 1$ and $Z \subseteq K \subseteq V - X$.*

Since the family of subsets of in-degree $k-1$ in a $(k-1)$-edge-connected digraph D_0 is a crossing family, the following result immediately implies Theorem 7.

Theorem 8. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a crossing family of non-empty proper subsets of V. Suppose that there is a simple digraph fitting a degree specification (m_o, m_i), that is, (4) holds. There is a simple digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) which covers $\mathcal{K}$ if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + 1 \leq \gamma \tag{6}$$

holds for every pair of disjoint subsets $X, Z \subset V$ for which there is a member $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $Z \subseteq K \subseteq V - X$.

Proof. Proof. Suppose that there is a requested digraph D. By the simplicity of D, there are at most $|X||Z|$ arcs from Z to X. Therefore the total number of arcs with tail in Z or with head in X is at least $\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z|$. Moreover at least one arc enters K and such an arc neither leaves an element of Z nor enters an element of X, from which we obtain that $\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + 1 \leq \gamma$, that is, (6) is necessary.

To prove sufficiency, observe first that the theorem is trivial if $n := |V| \leq 2$ so we assume that $n \geq 3$. We need some further observations.

Claim 9.

$$\widetilde{m}_i(K) \geq 1 \text{ and } \widetilde{m}_o(V - K) \geq 1 \text{ holds for every } K \in \mathcal{K}. \tag{7}$$

In particular, if $\{v\} \in \mathcal{K}$ for some $v \in V$, then $m_i(v) \geq 1$, and if $V - u \in \mathcal{K}$ for some $u \in U$, then $m_o(u) \geq 1$.

Proof. Proof. $\widetilde{m}_i(K) \geq 1$ follows by applying (6) to $Z = \emptyset$ and $X = V - K$, while $\widetilde{m}_o(V - K) \geq 1$ follows with the choice $X = \emptyset$ and $Z = K$. • $\qquad\qquad\square$

This claim immediately implies the following.

Claim 10. *$\mathcal{K}$ has at most γ pairwise disjoint and at most γ pairwise co-disjoint members.*

Claim 11. $m_o(v) \le n - 1$ and $m_i(v) \le n - 1$ for every $v \in V$.

Proof. Proof. By applying (4) to $X = \{v\}$ and $Z = V$, one gets $m_i(v) + \widetilde{m}_o(V) - 1 \cdot |V| + |\{v\}| \le \gamma$, that is, $m_i(v) \le n - 1$, and $m_o(v) \le n - 1$ is obtained analogously by choosing $X = V$ and $Z = \{v\}$. • $\square$

Define a bi-set function p as follows. Let $p(Y_O, Y_I)$ be zero everywhere apart from the next three types of bi-sets.

Type 1:   For $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $1 < |K| < n - 1$, let $p(K, K) = 1$.

Type 2:   For $u \in V$, let $p(V - u, V - u) = m_o(u)$.

Type 3:   For $v \in Y \subset V$, let $p(Y, \{v\}) = m_i(v) - (|Y| - 1)$.

Note that the role of m_o and m_i is not symmetric in the definition of p. Since $n \ge 3$, each bi-set B with positive $p(B)$ belongs to exactly one of the three types.

Claim 12. *The bi-set function p defined above is positively crossing supermodular.*

Proof. Proof.Let $B = (B_O, B_I)$ and $C = (C_O, C_I)$ be two crossing bi-sets with $p(B) > 0$ and $p(C) > 0$. Then neither of B and C is of Type 2. Suppose first that both B and C are of Type 1. Observe that if $K = \{v\} \in \mathcal{K}$ for some $v \in V$, then (K, K) is of Type 3 and hence $p(K, K) = m_i(v) \ge 1$ by Claim 9. Similarly, if $K = V - u \in \mathcal{K}$ for some $u \in V$, then (K, K) is of Type 2 and hence $p(K, K) = m_o(u) \ge 1$. Therefore the supermodular inequality in this case follows from the assumption that the set-system $\mathcal{K}$ is crossing.

If both B and C are of Type 3, then $B_I = \{v\} = C_I$ for some $v \in V$, and in this case the supermodular inequality holds actually with equality.

Finally, let B be of Type 1 and let C be of Type 3. Then $B_I = K = B_O$ for some $K \in \mathcal{K}$ with $1 < |K| < n - 1$ and $C_I = \{v\}$ for some $v \in K$. Observe that $B \sqcup C$ does not belong to any of the three types and hence $p(B \sqcup C) = 0$. Furthermore, since $B \sqcap C$ is of Type 3, we have $p(B \sqcap C) = m_i(v) - (|B_O \cap C_O| - 1)$.

Since (K, K) and $(C_O, \{v\})$ are not comparable, $|C_O \cap K| \le |C_O| - 1$ and therefore $p(B) + p(C) = 1 + [m_i(v) - (|C_O| - 1)] \le [m_i(v) - (|B_O \cap C_O| - 1)] + 0 = p(B \sqcap C) + p(B \sqcup C)$. • $\square$

It follows from the definition of p that every digraph covering p must have at least γ arcs.

Case 1.   There is a loopless digraph $D = (V, A)$ with γ arcs covering p.

Now $\gamma = |A| = \sum[\varrho_A(v) : v \in V] \ge \sum[m_i(v) : v \in V] = \gamma$ from which $\varrho_A(v) = m_i(v)$ follows for every $v \in V$. Analogously, we get $\delta_A(v) = \varrho_A(V - v) = m_o(v)$ for every $v \in V$. By the definition of p, it also follows that D covers $\mathcal{K}$.

Claim 13. D *is simple.*

Proof. Proof.Suppose, indirectly, that D has two parallel arcs e and f from u to v. Consider the bi-set $(Y, \{v\})$ for $Y = \{u, v\}$. We have $p(Y, \{v\}) \le \varrho(v) - 2 = m_i(v) - 2 = p(Y, \{v\}) - 1$, a contradiction. • $\square$

We can conclude that in Case 1 the digraph requested by the theorem is indeed available.

Case 2.   The minimum number of arcs of a loopless digraph covering p is larger than γ.

Theorem 4 implies that in Case 2 there is an independent family $\mathcal{I}$ of bi-sets for which $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) > \gamma$. Then $\mathcal{I}$ partitions into three parts according to the three possible types its members belong to. Therefore we have a subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, a subset $Z \subseteq V$, and a family $\mathcal{B} = \{(Y, \{v\}) : v \in Y \subset V\}$ of bi-sets so that

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(K, K) : K \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{(V - z, V - z) : z \in Z\} \cup \mathcal{B}, \text{ and}$$

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \sum[m_i(v) - (|Y| - 1) : (Y, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{B}] = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) > \gamma. \tag{8}$$

We may assume that $|\mathcal{B}|$ is as small as possible.

Claim 14. *There are no two members $(Y, \{v\})$ and $(Y', \{v\})$ of $\mathcal{B}$ with the same inner set $\{v\}$.*

6

Proof. Proof.If indirectly there are two such members, then $Y \cup Y' = V$ by the independence of $\mathcal{I}$. If we replace the two members $(Y, \{v\})$ and $(Y', \{v\})$ of $\mathcal{I}$ by the single bi-set $(Y \cap Y', \{v\})$, then the resulting family $\mathcal{I}'$ is also independent since any arc covering $(Y \cap Y', \{v\})$ covers at least one of $(Y, \{v\})$ and $(Y', \{v\})$. Furthermore,

$$p(Y, \{v\}) + p(Y', \{v\}) = m_i(v) - (|Y| - 1) + m_i(v) - (|Y'| - 1) \tag{9}$$

and

$$p(Y \cap Y', \{v\}) = m_i(v) - (|Y \cap Y'| - 1). \tag{10}$$

We claim that $p(Y, \{v\}) + p(Y', \{v\}) \leq p(Y \cap Y', \{v\})$. Indeed, this is equivalent to $m_i(v) \leq (|Y| - 1) + (|Y'| - 1) - (|Y \cap Y'| - 1)$, that is, $m_i(v) \leq |V| - 1$, but this holds by Claim 11. Consequently, $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}') \geq \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) > \gamma$, contradicting the minimality of $|\mathcal{B}|$. ● $\quad\square$

Let $X := \{v : \text{there is a bi-set } (Y, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{B}\}$. For any element $v \in X$, Claim 14 implies that the (outer) set Y for which $(Y, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{B}$ is uniquely determined, and it will be denoted by Y_v. Now (8) transforms to

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \sum [m_i(v) - (|Y_v| - 1) : v \in X] = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) > \gamma. \tag{11}$$

We may assume that $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$ is as large as possible, and modulo this, $|\mathcal{F}|$ is minimal.

Claim 15. *For $v \in X - Z$, one has $Y_v = Z + v$, and for $v \in X \cap Z$, one has $Y_v = Z$.*

Proof. Proof.The independence of $\mathcal{I}$ implies $Z \subseteq Y_v$. Suppose, indirectly, that there is an element $u \in (Y_v - v) - Z$. Replace the member $(Y_v, \{v\})$ of $\mathcal{I}$ by $(Y_v - u, \{v\})$. Since $p(Y_v - u, \{v\}) = p(Y_v) + 1$, the resulting system $\mathcal{I}'$ is not independent, therefore there exists a member (Y_O, Y_I) of $\mathcal{I}$ that is covered by arc uv. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is independent, this member is unique. As $u \notin Z$, Claim 14 implies that (Y_O, Y_I) must be in $\mathcal{F}$, that is, $(Y_O, Y_I) = (K, K)$ for some $K \in \mathcal{K}$. By leaving out (K, K) from $\mathcal{I}'$, we obtain an independent $\mathcal{I}''$ for which $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}'') = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$, contradicting the minimal choice of $\mathcal{F}$. ● $\quad\square$

Due to these claims, Condition (8) reduces to $|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - [|X \cap Z|(|Z| - 1) + |X - Z||Z|] > \gamma$, which is equivalent to

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| > \gamma. \tag{12}$$

Claim 16. $X \cup Z \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Proof.If $X \cup Z = \emptyset$, then (12) reduces to $|\mathcal{F}| > \gamma$. It is an easy observation that the members of the independent $\mathcal{F}$ are either pairwise disjoint or pairwise co-disjoint, contradicting Claim 10. ●

Claim 17. $Z \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Proof.If indirectly $Z = \emptyset$, then $X \neq \emptyset$ in which case (12) reduces to

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_i(X) > \gamma. \tag{13}$$

By Claim 15, we have $Y_v = \{v\}$ for every element $v \in X$. The independence of $\mathcal{I}$ implies that all the members of $\mathcal{F}$ are disjoint from X. Hence $\mathcal{F} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_q\}$ is a subpartition of $V - X$. Now (13) is equivalent to $q > \widetilde{m}_i(V - X)$, and by Claim 9 and $m_i \geq 0$, we have

$$q > \widetilde{m}_i(V - X) \geq \widetilde{m}_i(\cup \mathcal{F}) = \sum_{j=1}^{q} \widetilde{m}_i(P_j) \geq q,$$

a contradiction. ● $\quad\square$

Claim 18. $X \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Proof. Suppose, indirectly, that $X = \emptyset$. Then (12) reduces to

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) > \gamma. \tag{14}$$

The independence of $\mathcal{I}$ implies that all the members of $\mathcal{F}$ include Z and these members are pairwise co-disjoint. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_q\}$ consist of the complements of the members of $\mathcal{F}$ (that is, $\mathcal{F} = \{V - P_1, \ldots, V - P_q\}$). Then $\mathcal{P}$ is a subpartition of $V - Z$.

By (14), by $m_o \geq 0$, and by Claim 9, we have

$$q = |\mathcal{F}| > \gamma - \widetilde{m}_o(Z) = \widetilde{m}_o(V) - \widetilde{m}_o(Z) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{q} \widetilde{m}_o(P_j) \geq q,$$

a contradiction. ● ☐

We have concluded that $X \neq \emptyset$ and $Z \neq \emptyset$.

Case A $X \cap Z = \emptyset$.

On one hand, (4) reduces in this case to $\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| \leq \gamma$. On the other hand, (12) reduces to

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| > \gamma. \tag{15}$$

Therefore we must have $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 1$. For $K \in \mathcal{F}$, the independence of $\mathcal{I}$ implies that $Z \subseteq K$ and $X \subseteq V - K$. As $X \neq \emptyset$ and $Z \neq \emptyset$, the independence of $\mathcal{I}$ also implies that $\mathcal{F}$ cannot have more than one member, that is, $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$, and hence K, X, Z violate (6).

Case B $X \cap Z \neq \emptyset$.

If $K \in \mathcal{F}$, then $Z \subseteq K$. Moreover, for an element $v \in X \cap Z$, we have $(Y_v, v) = (Z, v)$ by Claim 15. The independence of (K, K) and $(Z, \{v\})$ implies that $Z \cup K = V$, that is, $K = V$, which is not possible. Hence $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ and (12) reduces to $\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| > \gamma$ contradicting (4). This contradiction shows that Case 2 cannot occur, completing the proof of the theorem. ● ● ☐

3 Node-connectivity

Let $H = (V, F)$ be a simple digraph on $n \geq k + 1$ nodes. Recall that a bi-set $B = (B_O, B_I)$ was called H-**one-way** or just **one-way** if $\varrho_H(B) = 0$, that is, if no arc of H enters both B_I and B_O. Recall the notation $w(B) := |B_O - B_I|$. The following lemma occured in [13]. For completeness, we include its proof.

Lemma 19. *The following are equivalent.*
(A1) $H = (V, F)$ *is k-connected.*
(A2) $\varrho_H(B) + w(B) \geq k$ *for every non-trivial bi-set B.*
(A3) $w(B) \geq k$ *for every non-trivial one-way bi-set B.*
(B) *There are k openly disjoint st-paths in H for every ordered pair of nodes s, t.*

Proof. Proof.(A1) implies (B) by the directed node-version of Menger's theorem.

(B)⇒(A2). Let $B = (B_O, B_I)$ be a non-trivial bi-set, let $s \in V - B_O$ and $t \in B_I$. By (B), there are k openly disjoint st-paths. Each of them uses an arc entering B or an element of the wall $W(B)$ of B, from which $\varrho_H(B) + w(B) \geq k$, that is, (A2) holds.

(A2)⇒(A3). Indeed, (A3) is just a special case of (A2).

(A3)⇒(A1). If (A1) fails to hold, then there is a subset Z of less than k nodes so that $H - Z$ is not strongly connected. Let B_I be a non-empty proper subset of $V - Z$ with no entering arc of $H - Z$ and let $B_O := Z \cup B_I$. Then $B = (B_O, B_I)$ is a non-trivial bi-set with $W(B) = Z$ for which $\varrho_H(B) = 0$ and $w(B) = |Z| < k$, that is, (A3) also fails to hold. ● ☐

3.1 Connectivity augmentation: known results

Let $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ be a starting digraph on $n \geq k+1$ nodes. The in-degree and out-degree functions of D_0 will be abbreviated by ϱ_0 and δ_0, respectively. In the connectivity augmentation problem we want to make D_0 k-connected by adding new arcs. Since parallel arcs and loops do not play any role in node-connectivity, we may and shall assume that D_0 is simple.

In one version of the connectivity augmentation problem, one strives for minimizing the number of arcs to be added. In this case, the optimal augmenting digraph is automatically simple. The following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.

Theorem 20 (Frank and Jordán, [13]). *A digraph D_0 can be made k-connected by adding a simple digraph with at most γ arcs if and only if*

$$\sum[k - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{I}] \leq \gamma \tag{16}$$

holds for every independent family $\mathcal{I}$ of non-trivial D_0-one-way bi-sets.

In what follows, $\mathcal{B}_0$ denotes the family of non-trivial D_0-one-way bi-sets. For any bi-set B, let $p_1(B) := k - w(B)$. With these terms, (16) requires that $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{I}) \leq \gamma$ for every independent $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$.

In a related version of the connectivity augmentation problem, the goal is to find an augmenting digraph D fitting a degree-specification (m_o, m_i) (meeting (1)) so that the augmented digraph $D_0^+ := D_0 + D$ is k-connected. The paper [13] described a characterization for the existence of such a D, but in this case the augmenting digraph is not necessarily simple. This characterization can also be derived from Theorem 4.

Theorem 21. *There exists a digraph D fitting (m_o, m_i) such that $D_0 + D$ is k-connected if and only if*

$$\varrho_0(v) + m_i(v) \geq k \text{ and } \delta_0(v) + m_o(v) \geq k \text{ for each } v \in V, \tag{17}$$

$$\widetilde{m}_i(Z) \geq \sum[k - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{I}] \tag{18}$$

holds for every $Z \subseteq V$ and for every independent family $\mathcal{I}$ of non-trivial D_0-one-way bi-sets B with $B_I \subseteq Z$, and

$$\widetilde{m}_o(Z) \geq \sum[k - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{I}] \tag{19}$$

holds for every $Z \subseteq V$ and for every independent family $\mathcal{I}$ of non-trivial one-way bi-sets B with $B_O \cup Z = V$.

Note that in this theorem both parallel arcs and loops are allowed in the augmenting digraph D. By using Theorem 4 and some standard steps, one can derive the following variation when loops are excluded.

Theorem 22. *There exists a loopless digraph D fitting (m_o, m_i) such that $D_0 + D$ is k-connected if and only if each of (3), (17), (18), and (19) hold.*

Corollary 23. *If there is a loopless digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) and if there is a digraph D fitting (m_o, m_i) for which $D_0 + D$ is k-connected, then D can be chosen loopless.*

Note that an analogous statement for k-edge-connectivity in Theorem 5 follows immediately by applying the loop-reducing technique, but this approach does not seem to work here since a loop-reducing step may destroy k-node-connectivity. To see this, let D_0 be the digraph on node-set $V = \{x, y, z, v\}$ with no arc. Let $k = 2$ and let $m_o(x) = 2 = m_i(x)$, $m_o(y) = 2 = m_i(y)$, $m_o(z) = 2 = m_i(z)$, and $m_o(v) = 3 = m_i(v)$. Consider the digraph D with arc set $\{xy, yx, yz, zy, zv, vz, vx, xv, vv\}$. This digraph is 2-node-connected and fits the degree-specification, but the loop-reducing technique replaces, say, the two arcs xy and vv by xv and vy, and the digraph D' arising in this way is not 2-connected since $D' - v$ is not strongly connected. Analogously, the same happens when the two arcs yx and vv are replaced by yv and vx. Note that the digraph on V with arc set $\{xv, vx, yv, vy, zv, vz, xy, yz, zx\}$ is 2-connected, loopless, and fits the degree-specification.

3.2 Degree-specified connectivity augmentation preserving simplicity

Our present goal is to solve the degree-specified node-connectivity augmentation problem when simplicity of the augmented digraph $D_0 + D$ is requested. With the help of a similar approach another natural variant, when only the simplicity of the augmenting digraph D is requested, can also be managed. Theorem 7 provided a complete answer to this latter problem in the special case $k = 1$.

Let $\overline{D}_0 = (V, \overline{A}_0)$ denote the complementary digraph of D_0 arising from the complete digraph $D^* = (V, A^*)$ by removing A_0, that is, $\overline{A}_0 := A^* - A_0$. In these terms, our goal is to find a degree-specified subgraph D of $\overline{D}_0$ for which $D_0 + D$ is k-connected. Note that in the case when an arbitrary digraph H for possible new arcs is specified instead of $\overline{D}_0$, the problem becomes NP-complete even in the special case $k = 1$ and $A_0 = \emptyset$ since, for the degree specification $m_o \equiv 1 \equiv m_i$, it is equivalent to finding a Hamiltonian circuit of H.

We will show that the problem can be embedded into the framework of Theorem 4 in such a way that the augmented digraph $D_0 + D$ provided by this theorem will automatically be simple. In this way, we shall obtain a good characterization for the general case when the initial digraph D_0 is arbitrary. This characterization, however, will include independent families of bi-sets, and in this sense it is more complicated than the one given in Theorem 3 for the special case $k = 1$.

In the special case when D_0 has no arcs at all, that is, when the goal is to find a simple degree-specified k-connected digraph, the general characterization will be significantly simplified in such a way that the use of independent bi-set families is completely avoided, and we shall arrive at a characterization which is a straight extension of the one in Theorem 3 concerning the special case $k = 1$. Recall that the simple digraph $D^*[Z, X]$ with node-set V was defined in Section 1.1 so that uv was an arc for distinct $u, v \in V$ precisely if $u \in Z$ or $v \in X$. Also, $\mathcal{B}_0$ was introduced above to denote the set of non-trivial D_0-one-way bi-sets.

Theorem 24. *Let $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ be a simple digraph with in- and out-degree functions ϱ_0 and δ_0, respectively. There is a digraph $D = (V, A)$ fitting (m_o, m_i) for which $D_0^+ := D_0 + D$ is simple and k-connected if and only if*

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) \leq \gamma \tag{20}$$

holds for every pair of subsets $X, Z \subseteq V$ and for every independent family $\mathcal{F}$ of non-trivial bi-sets which are one-way with respect to $D_0 + D^*[Z, X]$, where $p_1(B_O, B_I) = k - w(B)$ for $B \in \mathcal{F}$ and $d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$ denotes the number of arcs $a = zx \in \overline{A}_0$ for which $z \in Z$ and $x \in X$.

Proof. Proof.Note that the requirement for the members $B = (B_O, B_I)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ to be one-way with respect to $D_0 + D^*[Z, X]$ is equivalent to requiring that $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and both $Z \subseteq B_O$ and $X \cap B_I = \emptyset$ hold.

For proving necessity, assume that D is a digraph meeting the requirements of the theorem. To see (20), observe that there are $\widetilde{m}_o(Z)$ arcs of D with tail in Z and there are $\widetilde{m}_i(X)$ arcs with head in X. Since D can have at most $d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$ arcs with tail in Z and head in X, the number of arcs of D with tail in Z or head in X is at least $\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$. Moreover, since $D_0 + D$ is k-connected, D contains at least $k - w(B)$ arcs covering any D_0-one-way bi-set. Therefore D contains at least $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F})$ arcs covering $\mathcal{F}$. Since the members of $\mathcal{F}$ are one-way with respect to $D^*[Z, X]$, the tail of such an arc is not in Z and its head is not in X. Therefore the total number γ of arcs of D is at least $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$, and (20) follows.

Sufficiency. Assume that (20) holds. Define

$$N_0^+(u) := \{u\} \cup \{v : uv \in A_0\}, \quad N_0^-(u) := \{u\} \cup \{v : vu \in A_0\}.$$

Claim 25.
$$k \leq m_o(v) + \delta_0(v) \leq n - 1, \quad k \leq m_i(v) + \varrho_0(v) \leq n - 1 \tag{21}$$

for every node $v \in V$.

Proof. Proof.We prove only the first half of (21) since the second half follows analogously. By choosing $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$, $Z = \{v\}$, and $X = V$, (20) gives rise to $m_o(v) + \widetilde{m}_i(V) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(v, V) \leq \gamma$. Since $\widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma$ and $d_{\overline{A}_0}(v, V) = n - 1 - \delta_0(v)$, we obtain that $m_o(v) + \delta_0(v) \leq n - 1$.

Let $B = (V - v, V - N_0^+(v))$, $\mathcal{F} = \{B\}$, $Z = V - v$, and $X = \emptyset$. Then $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) = k - \delta_0(v)$ and $d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) = 0$ from which (20) implies that $k - \delta_0(v) + \widetilde{m}_o(V - v) \leq \gamma$ from which $k \leq m_o(v) + \delta_0(v)$, as required. ● □

$$p_1(B) = k - w(B) = k + |B_I| - |B_O| \qquad p_2(B) = m_o(u) \qquad p_3(B) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O|$$

(a) Definition of p_1 (b) Definition of p_2 (c) Definition of p_3

Figure 1: Construction of the bi-set functions appearing in the definition of p

Observe that $\mathcal{B}_0$ is a crossing family of bi-sets (for details, see [13]). Recall that the function p_1 on $\mathcal{B}_0$ was defined in the theorem by

$$p_1(B) := k - w(B) \ (= k + |B_I| - |B_O|). \tag{22}$$

In addition to p_1, we introduce three further functions defined on $\mathcal{B}_0$, as follows (see Figure 1). For $B = (B_O, B_I) \in \mathcal{B}_0$, let

$$p_2(B) := \begin{cases} m_o(u) & \text{if } B_O = V - u, \ B_I = V - N_0^+(u) \text{ for some } u \in V \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

$$p_3(B) := \begin{cases} m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O| & \text{if } B_I = \{v\} \text{ for some } v \in V \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

$$p(B) := \max\{p_1(B), \ p_2(B), \ p_3(B), \ 0\}. \tag{25}$$

Here p_2 and p_3 are to encode the out-degree and the in-degree specifications, respectively. Note, however, that the definitions of p_2 and p_3 are not symmetric since a node u determines a single bi-set B with outer set $V - u$ for which $p_2(B)$ is positive, while a node v may determine several bi-sets with inner set $\{v\}$ for which $p_3(B)$ is positive. The reason of this apparently undue asymmetry is that both the supermodularity of p and the simplicity of the augmented digraph can be ensured only in this way.

Claim 26. *Let B and C be two crossing bi-sets. Then* (a) *$p_1(B) + p_1(C) = p_1(B \sqcap C) + p_1(B \sqcup C)$ and* (b) *$p_2(B) = 0 = p_2(C)$.* (c) *If $p_3(B) > 0$ and $p_3(C) > 0$, then $p_3(B) + p_3(C) = p_3(B \sqcap C) + p_3(B \sqcup C)$.*

Proof. Proof.Part (a) is immediate from the definition of p_1. A bi-set B in $\mathcal{B}_0$ with $p_2(B) > 0$ cannot cross any member of $\mathcal{B}_0$ from which (b) follows. In Part (c), $B_I = \{v\} = C_I$ for some $v \in V$. Therefore $B \sqcap C = (B_O \cap C_O, \{v\})$ and $B \sqcup C = (B_O \cup C_O, \{v\})$ from which $p_3(B) + p_3(C) = p_3(B \sqcap C) + p_3(B \sqcup C)$ follows. ● □

Lemma 27. *The bi-set function p on $\mathcal{B}_0$ is positively crossing supermodular.*

Proof. Proof.Let B and C be two crossing members of $\mathcal{B}_0$ with $p(B) > 0, p(C) > 0$. By Part (b) of Claim 26, $p(B) = \max\{p_1(B), p_3(B)\}$ and $p(C) = \max\{p_1(C), p_3(C)\}$. If $p(B) = p_1(B)$ and $p(C) = p_1(C)$, then, by Part (a) of Claim 26, $p(B) + p(C) = p_1(B) + p_1(C) = p_1(B \sqcap C) + p_1(B \sqcup C) \leq p(B \sqcap C) + p(B \sqcup C)$. The supermodular inequality follows analogously from Part (C) of Claim 26 when $p(B) = p_3(B)$ and $p(C) = p_3(C)$.

Finally, suppose that $p(B) = p_3(B) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O|$ where $B_I = \{v\}$ for some $v \in V$, and $p(C) = p_1(C) = k + |C_I| - |C_O|$. Now $C_I \cap B_I = \{v\}$ from which $p_3(B \sqcap C) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O \cap C_O|$. Furthermore, $C_I \cup B_I = C_I$ from which $p_1(B \sqcup C) = k + |C_I| - |B_O \cup C_O|$. Hence we have

$$p(B) + p(C) = [m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O|] + [k + |C_I| - |C_O|] =$$

$$[m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O \cap C_O|] + [k + |C_I| - |B_O \cup C_O|] \leq$$
$$p_3(B \sqcap C) + p_1(B \sqcup C) \leq p(B \sqcap C) + p(B \sqcup C). \qquad \bullet$$

$\square$

Lemma 28. *A loopless digraph $D = (V, A)$ covering p has at least γ arcs. If D has exactly γ arcs, then* (a) *D fits (m_o, m_i),* (b) *$D_0 + D$ is k-connected, and* (c) *$D_0 + D$ is simple.*

Proof. Proof.Since D covers p and $p \geq p_2$, we obtain that D has at least $m_o(u)$ arcs leaving u for every node u, and therefore

$$|A| = \sum[\delta_D(u) : u \in V] = \sum[\varrho_D(V - u) : u \in V] \geq \widetilde{m}_o(V) = \gamma. \tag{26}$$

Suppose now that D has exactly γ arcs. Then (26) implies $\delta_D(u) = m_o(u)$ for every node $u \in V$. Furthermore, $p_3(B) = m_i(v)$ for $B = (N_0^-(v), \{v\})$, and thus $\varrho_D \geq p \geq p_3$ implies that $\varrho_D(B) = \varrho_D(v) \geq m_i(v)$, from which $\varrho_D(v) = m_i(v)$ for every $v \in V$. That is, D fits (m_o, m_i).

By Lemma 19, in order to see that $H := D_0 + D$ is k-connected, it suffices to show that $w(B) \geq k$ for every non-trivial H-one-way bi-set B. But this follows from $0 = \varrho_D(B) \geq p(B) \geq p_1(B) = k - w(B)$.

Finally, we prove that $D_0 + D$ is simple. Let v be any node. For $B = (N_0^-(v), \{v\})$ we have $\varrho_D(v) \geq \varrho_D(B) \geq p(B) \geq p_3(B) = m_i(v) = \varrho_D(v)$ from which one has equality throughout. But $\varrho_D(v) = \varrho_D(B)$ implies that every arc $e = uv$ of D must enter $N_0^-(v)$ as well, implying that e cannot be parallel to any arc of D_0. Suppose now that there is an arc in D from u to v. We have just seen that e is not parallel to any arc of D_0, that is, $u \notin N_0^-(v)$. Let $B' = (N_0^-(v) + u, \{v\})$. Then $p_3(B') = m_i(v) - 1$ and hence

$$\varrho_D(v) \geq \varrho_D(B') + 1 \geq p(B') + 1 \geq p_3(B') + 1 = m_i(v) - 1 + 1 = \varrho_D(v)$$

from which one has equality throughout. In particular, $\varrho_D(v) = \varrho_D(B') + 1$, implying that there is at most one arc in D from u to v. $\bullet$ $\square$

Lemma 29. *There is a loopless digraph $D = (V, A)$ with γ arcs covering p.*

Proof. Proof.Suppose indirectly that no such a digraph exists. Theorem 4 implies that there is an independent family $\mathcal{I}$ of non-trivial D_0-one-way bi-sets for which $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) > \gamma$. We may assume that $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$ is as large as possible, modulo this, $|\mathcal{I}|$ is minimal, and within this,

$$\sum[|B_I| : (B_O, B_I) \in \mathcal{I}] \text{ is as small as possible.} \tag{27}$$

The minimality of $\mathcal{I}$ implies $p(B) > 0$ for every $B \in \mathcal{I}$.

Claim 30. *There are no two members $B = (B_O, \{v\})$ and $C = (C_O, \{v\})$ of $\mathcal{I}$ (with the same inner set $\{v\}$) for which $p(B) = p_3(B)$ and $p(C) = p_3(C)$.*

Proof. Proof.On the contrary, suppose that there are two such members. Then $B_O \cup C_O = V$ by the independence of $\mathcal{I}$. If we replace the two members B and C of $\mathcal{I}$ by the single bi-set $B \sqcap C = (B_O \cap C_O, \{v\})$, then the resulting family $\mathcal{I}'$ is also independent since any arc covering $B \sqcap C$ covers at least one of B and C.

Recall that $p_3(B \sqcap C) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O \cap C_O|$. By Claim 25, $m_i(v) + \varrho_0(v) \leq n - 1$ and hence

$$p(B) + p(C) = p_3(B) + p_3(C) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O| + m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |C_O| =$$

$$m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O \cap C_O| + m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O \cup C_O| =$$

$$p_3(B \sqcap C) + m_i(v) + \varrho_0(v) + 1 - |V| \leq p_3(B \sqcap C) + 0 \leq p(B \sqcap C).$$

By the maximality of $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$ we must have $p(B) + p(C) = p(B \sqcap C)$ and hence $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}')$ but this contradicts the minimality of $|\mathcal{I}|$. $\bullet$ $\square$

Let

$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \{B \in \mathcal{I} : p(B) = p_1(B) > \max\{p_2(B), p_3(B)\}\},$$

$$\mathcal{I}_2 := \{B \in \mathcal{I} : p(B) = p_2(B)\},$$

$$\mathcal{I}_3 := \{B \in \mathcal{I} : p(B) = p_3(B) > p_2(B)\}.$$

Note that if $p_2(B) = p_3(B) \geq p_1(B)$ for $B \in \mathcal{I}$, then $B \in \mathcal{I}_2$. It follows that $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2$, and $\mathcal{I}_3$ form a partition of $\mathcal{I}$.

Let Z consist of those nodes u for which the bi-set $(V - u, V - N_0^+(u))$ is in $\mathcal{I}_2$. Let X consist of those nodes v for which there is a set K_v such that $(K_v, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{I}_3$. By Claim 30, there is at most one such K_v for each $v \in X$.

Claim 31. *For $v \in X$, one has $K_v = Z \cup N_0^-(v)$.*

Proof. Proof.$N_0^-(v) \subseteq K_v$ holds since $(K_v, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{I}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$. If an element $u \in Z - N_0^-(v)$ would not be in K_v, then uv would cover both $(V - u, V - N_0^+(u)) \in \mathcal{I}_2$ and $(K_v, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{I}_3$, contradicting the independence of $\mathcal{I}$. Therefore $Z \cup N_0^-(v) \subseteq K_v$.

To see the reverse inclusion suppose indirectly that there is an element $u \in K_v - (Z \cup N_0^-(v))$. Replace the member $B = (K_v, v)$ of $\mathcal{I}$ by $B' = (K_v - u, v)$. Note that $B' \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Since $p(B') \geq p_3(B') = p_3(B) + 1 = p(B) + 1$, the maximality of $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$ implies that the resulting system $\mathcal{I}'$ is not independent. Therefore there is a member C of $\mathcal{I}$ that is covered by arc uv.

Since $u \notin Z$, the bi-set C cannot be in $\mathcal{I}_2$. Since C and B are distinct, Claim 30 implies that C cannot be in $\mathcal{I}_3$ either. Therefore $C \in \mathcal{I}_1$. We claim that $|C_I| \geq 2$. Indeed, if $|C_I| = 1$, then $C_I = \{v\}$. Since $p_1(C) > p_3(C)$, $p_1(C) = k - |C_O| + |C_I| = k - |C_O| + 1$, and $p_3(C) = m_i(v) - |C_O| + |N_0^+(v)|$, we obtain that $k + 1 > m_i(v) + |N_0^+(v)| = m_i(v) + \varrho_0(v) + 1$, contradicting the second half of (21).

By replacing the member C of $\mathcal{I}'$ with $C' := (C_O, C_I - v)$, we obtain an independent family $\mathcal{I}''$. Note that $C' \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Since $p(C') \geq p_1(C') = p_1(C) - 1 = p(C) - 1$, we must have $\widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}'') = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I})$, but this contradicts the minimality property given in (27). $\bullet$ $\qquad\square$

Claim 32. $\widetilde{p}_3(\mathcal{I}_3) = \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$.

Proof. Proof.Let $B = (K_v, \{v\}) \in \mathcal{I}_3$. By Claim 31, $K_v = Z \cup N_0^-(v)$ and hence $p_3(B) = m_i(v) + |N_0^-(v)| - |B_O| = m_i(v) - |Z - N_0^-(v)| = m_i(v) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, \{v\})$, and therefore $\widetilde{p}_3(\mathcal{I}_3) = \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$. $\bullet$ $\qquad\square$

By the definition of sets Z and X and by Claim 31, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \{(V - u, V - N_0^+(u)) : u \in Z\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_3 = \{(Z \cup N_0^-(v), \{v\}) : v \in X\}.$$

Claim 33. *Each member $B_1 = (B_O, B_I)$ of $\mathcal{I}_1$ is a one-way bi-set with respect to $D_0 + D^*[Z, X]$.*

Proof. Proof.Clearly, B_1 is D_0-one-way since $\mathcal{I}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$. Suppose now, indirectly, that an arc $e = uv$ of $D^*[Z, X]$, which is not in D_0, covers B_1. If $u \in Z$, then the bi-set $B_2 := (V - u, V - N_0^+(u))$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}_2$ and e covers B_2, contradicting the independence of $\mathcal{I}$ (namely, the independence of B_1 and B_2). If $v \in X$, then the bi-set $B_3 := (Z \cup N_0^-(v), \{v\})$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}_3$ and e covers B_3, contradicting the independence of $\mathcal{I}$ (namely, the independence of B_1 and B_3). $\bullet$ $\qquad\square$

Since $\widetilde{p}_2(\mathcal{I}_2) = \widetilde{m}_o(Z)$, we can conclude that

$$\gamma < \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}) = \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}_1) + \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}_2) + \widetilde{p}(\mathcal{I}_3) =$$

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{I}_1) + \widetilde{p}_2(\mathcal{I}_2) + \widetilde{p}_3(\mathcal{I}_3) = \widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{I}_1) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X),$$

and this inequality contradicts the hypothesis (20) of the theorem since Claim 33 implies that $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{I}_1$ consists of bi-sets which are one-way with respect to $D_0 + D^*[Z, X]$. $\bullet$ $\bullet$ $\qquad\square$

Remark 34. With a similar technique, it is possible to solve the degree-specified node-connectivity augmentation problem when only the augmenting digraph is required to be simple (and not the whole augmented digraph). Even more, one may prescribe a subset $F_0 \subseteq A_0$ of arcs of the starting digraph D_0 and request for the degree-specified augmenting digraph D we are looking for to be simple and have no parallel arcs with the elements of F_0. If F_0 is empty, then this requires that the augmenting digraph be simple, while if F_0 is the whole A_0, then this requires that the augmented digraph be simple. This can be done by revising first the original definition of $N_0^+(u)$ and $N_0^-(u)$ as follows:

$$N_0^+(u) := \{u\} \cup \{v : uv \in F_0\} \ \text{ and } \ N_0^-(u) := \{u\} \cup \{v : vu \in F_0\}.$$

and applying then these revised functions in defining p_2 and p_3. The details are left to the reader.

Remark 35. In the derivation of Theorem 24 above, we applied the supermodular arc-covering theorem for the general case when the bi-set function in question is positively crossing supermodular. But it is possible to modify the definition of the bi-set function to be crossing supermodular. This is important in order to construct an algorithm. The details shall be worked out in [4].

3.3 Simplified characterization for $k = 1$

In Theorem 6 we considered the augmentation problem in which an initial digraph D_0 was to be made strongly connected by adding a degree-specified simple digraph D. In Theorem 24, the general degree-specified node-connectivity augmentation problem was solved when not only the augmenting but the augment**ed** digraph was required to be simple. The characterization in Theorem 24 had, however, an aesthetic drawback in the sense that it included independent families of bi-sets. The goal of the present section is to show that in the special case of $k = 1$ this drawback can be eliminated.

Theorem 36. Let (m_o, m_i) be a degree-specification with $\widetilde{m}_o(V) = \widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma$ and let $D_0 = (V, A_0)$ be a simple digraph with in- and out-degree functions ϱ_0 and δ_0, respectively. There is a digraph $D = (V, A)$ fitting (m_o, m_i) for which $D_0^+ := D_0 + D$ is simple and strongly connected if and only if

$$\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) \leq \gamma \text{ holds for every } X, Z \subseteq V, \tag{28}$$

$$\widetilde{m}_i(K) \geq 1 \ \text{ and } \ \widetilde{m}_o(V - K) \geq 1 \ \text{ whenever } \varrho_0(K) = 0, \ \emptyset \subset K \subset V, \tag{29}$$

and

$$\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) + 1 \leq \gamma \tag{30}$$

holds for every pair of disjoint non-empty subsets $X, Z \subset V$ for which there is no dipath in D_0 from X to Z, where $d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$ denotes the number of arcs $a = zx \in \overline{A}_0$ for which $z \in Z$ and $x \in X$.

Proof. Proof.Necessity. Let D be a requested digraph. Since $D_0 + D$ is simple, D must be a subgraph of $\overline{D}_0$, and Condition (28) is a special case of (2) when $H = \overline{D}_0$.

To see the necessity of (29), observe that, as $D + D_0$ is strong, D_0 must admit an arc entering K from which $\widetilde{m}_i(K) \geq 1$ and $\widetilde{m}_o(V - K) \geq 1$.

Finally, consider the necessity of (30). Since Z is not reachable from X in D_0, there is a subset K for which $Z \subseteq K \subseteq V - X$ and $\varrho_0(K) = 0$. The digraph D must have at least $\widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X)$ arcs having tail in Z or having head in X, and D has at least one more arc entering K.

Sufficiency. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K : \emptyset \subset K \subset V, \varrho_0(K) = 0\}$. Theorem 24, when applied in the special case $k = 1$, states that the requested digraph D exists if and only if

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) \leq \gamma \tag{31}$$

for subsets $X, Z \subseteq V$ and for independent families $\mathcal{F}$ of non-trivial bi-sets which are one-way with respect to $D_0 + D^*[Z, X]$, where $p_1(B_O, B_I) = 1 - w(B)$ for $B \in \mathcal{F}$.

Now $p_1(B_O, B_I)$ can be positive only if $B_O = B_I$. The requirement that a (B_O, B_I) is D_0-one-way is equivalent to require that no arc of D_0 enters B_I. Therefore the condition can be restated as follows.

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) \leq \gamma \tag{32}$$

14

where $\mathcal{F}$ is an independent family of sets $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that no arc of $D^*[Z, X]$ enters K. This last property requires that $Z \subseteq K$ and $X \subseteq V - K$. The independence of $\mathcal{F}$ means that $\mathcal{F}$ consists of pairwise disjoint or pairwise co-disjoint sets.

Our goal is to prove that (32) follows from (28), (29), and (30). When $\mathcal{F}$ is empty, (32) is just (28), and hence we can assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is non-empty. If neither Z nor X is empty, then $\mathcal{F}$ has exactly one member, and in this case (32) and (30) coincide. Hence we can assume that at least one of X and Z is empty. In analyzing these cases, we rely on Condition (29) requiring that $\widetilde{m}_i(K) \geq 1$ and $\widetilde{m}_o(V - K) \geq 1$ for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$.

Suppose first that $Z = \emptyset$ and $X \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a subpartition and

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) = |\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_i(X) \leq \sum [\widetilde{m}_i(K) : K \in \mathcal{F}] + \widetilde{m}_i(X) \leq \widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma,$$

that is, (32) holds.

Suppose now that $Z \neq \emptyset$ and $X = \emptyset$. Then the members of $\mathcal{F}$ include Z and are pairwise co-disjoint. Hence

$$|\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - d_{\overline{A}_0}(Z, X) = |\mathcal{F}| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) \leq \sum [\widetilde{m}_o(V - K) : K \in \mathcal{F}] + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) \leq \widetilde{m}_o(V) = \gamma,$$

that is, (32) holds.

Finally, suppose that $X = \emptyset = Z$. When $\mathcal{F}$ is a subpartition, we have $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum [\widetilde{m}_i(K) : K \in \mathcal{F}] \leq \widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma$. When the members of $\mathcal{F}$ are pairwise co-disjoint, we have $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum [\widetilde{m}_i(V - K) : K \in \mathcal{F}] \leq \widetilde{m}_i(V) = \gamma$. Therefore in this case (32) holds.

Theorem 24 ensures that the requested digraph D does exist. ● ●   □

Remark 37. Theorem 36 actually implies Theorem 6 as follows. Subdivide each arc of D_0 by a node and define $m_o(z) = 0$ and $m_i(z) = 0$ for each subdividing node, and apply Theorem 36 to the resulting digraph D_0'.

4 Degree-sequences of simple k-connected digraphs

In 1972, Wang and Kleitman [23] characterized the degree-sequences of simple k-connected undirected graphs. The goal of this section is to solve the analogous problem for directed graphs. Before formulating the main result, we start with some preparatory work. Assume throughout that $1 \leq k < n = |V|$. A node v_f of a digraph H is said to be **full** if both $v_f u$ and $u v_f$ are arcs of H for every node $u \neq v_f$.

4.1 Preparations

Let Z and X be two proper (but possibly empty) subsets of V. Let $D_1 = (V, A_1)$ denote the simple digraph in which uv $(u \neq v)$ is an arc if $u \in Z$ or $v \in X$, that is, D_1 is the same as $D^*[Z, X]$. Note that each node in $X \cap Z$ is full. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ denote the set of non-trivial D_1-one-way bi-sets. Clearly, $Z \subseteq B_O$ and $B_I \cap X = \emptyset$ hold for each $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1$ be an independent family meaning that each arc of the complete digraph $D^* = (V, A^*)$ covers at most one member of $\mathcal{F}$. Let $p_1(B) = k - w(B)$ where $w(B) = |B_O - B_I|$. In proving our characterization of degree-sequences realizable by simple k-connected digraphs, we shall need a simple upper bound for $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F})$. Note that if A is a set of arcs for which $D_1^+ = (V, A_1 + A)$ is k-connected, then $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq |A|$.

Lemma 38. *For an independent family* $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1$,

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq 0 \text{ when } |X \cap Z| \geq k, \tag{33}$$

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq k - |X \cap Z| \text{ when } |X \cap Z| < k \text{ and } |X|, |Z| \geq k. \tag{34}$$

Proof. Proof.If $|X \cap Z| \geq k$, then D_1 has k full nodes and hence D_1 is k-connected, implying that $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq 0$.

The second part follows once we show that D_1 can be made k-connected by adding $k' = k - |X \cap Z|$ new arcs. By symmetry, we may assume that $|Z| \geq |X|$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_{k'}$ be distinct nodes in $X - Z$ and let $z_1, \ldots, z_{k'}$ be distinct nodes in $Z - X$. Let $A = \{x_1 z_1, \ldots, x_{k'} z_{k'}\}$ be a set of k' disjoint arcs.

We claim that $D^+ = (V, A_1 + A)$ is k-connected. Indeed, if $D^+ - K$ is not strong for some $K \subset V$, then K contains every full node and hence $X \cap Z \subseteq K$. Moreover, K must hit every arc in A since if $\{x_i, z_i\} \cap K = \emptyset$ for some i, then $D^+ - K$ would be strong as there is an arc $z_i u$ and an arc $u x_i$ for each node $u \in V - K - \{x_i, z_i\}$. Therefore $|K| \geq k$ and hence D^+ is k-connected. This means that D_1 has been made k-connected by adding k' new arcs, from which $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq k' = k - |X \cap Z|$. • $\qquad\square$

The total out-deficiency of the nodes is defined by $\sigma_o = \sum[(k - \delta_{D_1}(v))^+ : v \in V]$. Clearly, if $|X| < k$, then

$$\sigma_o = (n - |Z|)(k - |X|) + |X - Z|.$$

Lemma 39. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1$ be an independent family. If $|X| < k$ and $|Z| \geq |X|$, then*

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq \sigma_o. \tag{35}$$

Proof. Proof.The number of arcs of D_1 can be expressed as follows.

$$|A_1| = |Z|(n - 1) + (n - |Z|)|X| - |X - Z|. \tag{36}$$

The inequality (35) is equivalent to

$$\sum[k - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq (n - |Z|)(k - |X|) + |X - Z|. \tag{37}$$

Let $q := |\mathcal{F}|$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1 $q \geq n - |Z|$.

Claim 40.
$$\sum[(n - 1) - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq (n - |Z|)(n - 1 - |X|) + |X - Z|. \tag{38}$$

Proof. Proof.Since $\mathcal{F}$ is independent, the total number of those arcs of the complete digraph $D^* = (V, A^*)$ which cover a member B of $\mathcal{F}$ is $\sum[|B_I|(n - |B_O|) : B \in \mathcal{F}]$. Since A_1 covers no member of $\mathcal{F}$, we conclude that

$$\sum[|B_I|(n - |B_O|) : B \in \mathcal{F}] + |Z|(n - 1) + (n - |Z|)|X| - |X - Z| =$$

$$\sum[|B_I|(n - |B_O|) : B \in \mathcal{F}] + |A_1| \leq |A^*| = n(n - 1).$$

By observing that

$$|B_I|(n - |B_O|) \geq 1 \cdot [n - |B_O| + (|B_I| - 1)] = n - 1 - w(B),$$

we obtain

$$\sum[(n - 1) - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq \sum[|B_I|(n - |B_O|) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq$$

$$n(n - 1) - [|Z|(n - 1) + (n - |Z|)|X| - |X - Z|] = (n - |Z|)(n - 1 - |X|) + |X - Z|,$$

as required for (38). • $\qquad\square$

As we are in Case 1, $q(n - 1 - k) \geq (n - |Z|)(n - 1 - k)$. By subtracting this inequality from (38), we obtain (37), proving the lemma in Case 1.

Case 2 $q < n - |Z|$. Recall that we have assumed $|Z| \geq |X|$ and $|X| < k$.

Claim 41.
$$\sum[n - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq q(n - |X|) + |X - Z|. \tag{39}$$

Proof. Proof.Let $h := |X - Z|$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ be the elements of $X - Z$ and let $\{z_1, \ldots, z_h\}$ be a subset of $Z - X$. Consider the set $A = \{x_1 z_1, \ldots, x_h z_h\}$ of disjoint arcs. For $B \in \mathcal{F}$, let $\alpha(B)$ denote the number of arcs in A entering B_O but not B_I, and $\beta(B)$ the number of arcs in A entering both B_O and B_I (that is, covering B). Note that $X \cap Z \subseteq B_O - B_I$.

Clearly, $\alpha(B) + \beta(B) = |X - B_O|$. The definition of $\alpha(B)$ immediately shows that $\alpha(B) \leq w(B) - |X \cap B_O|$. It follows that

$$\beta(B) = |X - B_O| - \alpha(B) \geq |X - B_O| - [w(B) - |X \cap B_O|] = |X| - w(B).$$

Since $\mathcal{F}$ is independent, every arc in A covers at most one member of $\mathcal{F}$ and hence

$$\sum [\beta(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq |A| = |X - Z|.$$

By combining these observations, we obtain

$$|X - Z| \geq \sum [\beta(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \geq \sum [|X| - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] = \sum [n - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] - q(n - |X|),$$

that is, $\sum [n - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq q(n - |X|) + |X - Z|$, and the claim follows. ● $\qquad\square$

By subtracting first the equality $\sum [n - k : B \in \mathcal{F}] = q(n - k)$ from (39) and applying then the assumption $q < n - |Z|$, one obtains

$$\sum [k - w(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}] \leq q(k - |X|) + |X - Z| < (n - |Z|)(k - |X|) + |X - Z|,$$

that is, (37) holds, completing the proof of the lemma. ● ● $\qquad\square$

4.2 The characterization

Theorem 42. *Let V be a set of n nodes and let $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Suppose that (m_o, m_i) is a degree-specification meeting (4). There exists a simple k-connected digraph fitting (m_o, m_i) if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + k \leq \gamma \text{ whenever } X, Z \subset V, \; X \neq Z. \tag{40}$$

Moreover, it suffices to require the inequality in (40) only for its special case when $|X \cap Z| < k$, X consists of the h largest values of m_i and Z consists of the j largest values of m_o.

Proof. Proof.Necessity. Suppose that there is a digraph D with the requested properties, and let X and Z be two distinct, proper subsets of V. If $|X \cap Z| \geq k$, then (4) implies $\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + k \leq \widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| \leq \gamma$ and (40) holds. This argument also implies that, given (4), it suffices to require the inequality in (40) only for X and Z for which $|X \cap Z| < k$.

Assume now that $|X \cap Z| \leq k - 1$. By the simplicity of D, there are at most $|X||Z| - |X \cap Z|$ arcs with tail in Z and head in X. Therefore the total number of arcs with tail in Z or head in X is at least $\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z|$. Moreover, the k-connectivity of D implies for distinct subsets $X, Z \subset V$ that there are at least $k - |X \cap Z|$ arcs from $V - Z$ to $Z - X$ or there are at least $k - |X \cap Z|$ arcs from $X - Z$ to $V - X$. Since the tails of these arcs are not in Z and the heads of these arcs are not in X, we can conclude that $\widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + k = \widetilde{m}_i(X) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| + (k - |X \cap Z|) \leq \gamma$, that is, the inequality in (40) holds in this case, too.

Sufficiency. Suppose indirectly that the requested digraph does not exist. By applying Theorem 24 to the empty digraph $D_0 = (V, \emptyset)$ and observing that in this case $d_{\overline{D}_0}(Z, X) = |Z||X| - |Z \cap X|$, we obtain that there exists an independent family $\mathcal{F}$ of bi-sets and subsets Z and X for which $Z \subseteq B_O, X \cap B_I = \emptyset$, and

$$\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| > \gamma. \tag{41}$$

If we reorient a digraph by reversing each of its arcs, then the k-connectivity is preserved and the in-degrees and out-degrees transform into each other. Therefore the roles of m_o and m_i in Theorem 24 are symmetric and thus we may and shall assume that $|Z| \geq |X|$ in (41).

We can also assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is minimal and hence $p_1(B) > 0$ for each $B \in \mathcal{F}$. Since (m_o, m_i) is required to meet (4), $\mathcal{F}$ is non-empty. Lemma 38 implies $|X \cap Z| < k$.

Suppose first that $|X|, |Z| \geq k$. Since $|X \cap Z| < k$ we have $X \neq Z$, $X \neq V$, and $Z \neq V$. By Lemma 38, $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq k - |X \cap Z|$. From (41), we have

$$\gamma < \widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| \leq$$

$$k - |X \cap Z| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| = k + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z|,$$

contradicting (40).

In the remaining case $|Z| \geq |X|$ and $|X| < k$. Lemma 39 implies that $\widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) \leq \sigma_o = (n - |Z|)(k - |X|) + |X - Z|$. By applying the inequality in (40) to $X = \emptyset$ and $Z = V - v$, one gets $\widetilde{m}_o(v) \geq k$ from which $\widetilde{m}_o(V - Z) \geq k|V - Z|$. By using again (41), we obtain

$$\gamma < \widetilde{p}_1(\mathcal{F}) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| \leq$$

$$(k - |X|)(n - |Z|) + |X - Z| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X \cap Z| =$$

$$k(|V| - |Z|) - |X||V| + |X||Z| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||Z| + |X| \leq$$

$$\widetilde{m}_o(V - Z) - |X||V| + \widetilde{m}_o(Z) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) + |X| =$$

$$\widetilde{m}_o(V) + \widetilde{m}_i(X) - |X||V| + |X \cap V|,$$

and this contradicts the inequality (4) with V in place of Z. $\bullet$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

5   Degree-sequences of k-elementary bipartite graphs

As an application of Theorem 42, we extend a characterization of degree-sequences of elementary bipartite graphs (bigraphs, for short), due to R. Brualdi [5], to k-elementary bigraphs. A simple bipartite graph $G = (S, T; E)$ is called **elementary** if G is perfectly matchable and the union of its perfect matchings is a connected subgraph. It is known (see, [17], p. 122) that G is elementary if and only if it is either just one edge or $|S| = |T| \geq 2$ and the Hall-condition holds with strict inequality for every non-empty proper subset of T. Another equivalent formulation requires that either G is just one edge or $G - s - t$ has a perfect matching for each $s \in S$ and $t \in T$. Yet another characterization states that G is elementary if and only if it is connected and every edge belongs to a perfect matching. It should be noted that there is a one-to-one correspondence between elementary bipartite graphs and fully indecomposable $(0, 1)$-matrices [6].

Let $k \leq n - 1$ be a positive integer. We call a simple bigraph $G = (S, T; E)$ with $|S| = |T| = n$ k-**elementary** if the removal of any j-element subset of S and any j-element subset of T leaves a perfectly matchable graph for each $0 \leq j \leq k$. Equivalently, $|\Gamma(X)| \geq |X| + k$ for every subset $X \subseteq S$ with $|X| \leq n - k$, where $\Gamma(X)$ denotes the set of neighbours of X, that is, $\Gamma(X) := \{t : $ there is an edge $st \in E$ with $s \in X\}$. Obviously, this last property is equivalent to requiring $|\Gamma(X)| \geq |X| + k$ for every subset $X \subseteq T$ with at most $n - k$ elements. Note that for $k = n - 1$ the complete bigraph $K_{n,n}$ is the only k-elementary bigraph. For $n \geq 2$, a bigraph is 1-elementary if and only if it is elementary, while for $n = 1$ the bigraph $K_{1,1}$ consisting of a single edge is considered elementary but not 1-elementary. The notion of k-elementary bigraphs was introduced by Frank and Végh in [14] where they developed a purely combinatorial algorithm the make a $(k-1)$-elementary bigraph k-elementary by adding a minimum number of new edges.

There is a natural correspondence between k-connected digraphs and k-elementary bigraphs with a specified perfect matching. Let $M = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be a perfect matching of a k-elementary bigraph $G = (S, T; E)$. Suppose that the elements of S and T are indexed in such a way that $e_i = s_i t_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$. Let $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a node-set where v_i is associated with e_i. We associate a digraph $D = (V, A)$ with the pair (G, M) as follows. For each edge $e = t_i s_j$ of G $(i \neq j)$ (that is, $e \in E - M$) let $v_i v_j$ be an arc of D (see Figure 2 for an example). It can easily be observed that the digraph D obtained in this way is k-connected if and only if G is k-elementary. By using network flow techniques, a digraph can be checked in polynomial time whether it is k-connected or not, and therefore a bipartite graph can also be checked for being k-elementary.

Figure 2: A perfect matching of a 2-elementary bigraph and the associated digraph

Conversely, one can associate a perfectly matchable bigraph with a digraph D on node-set $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$, as follows. Define $G = (S, T; E)$ so that $s_i t_i$ belongs to E for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and, for every arc $v_j v_h$ of D, let $t_j s_h$ be an edge of G. This G is a simple k-elementary graph precisely if D is k-connected.

Let $m = (m_S, m_T)$ be a degree-specification for which $\widetilde{m}_S(S) = \widetilde{m}_T(T) = \gamma$ and assume that the set $\mathcal{G}(m_S, m_T)$ of simple bipartite graphs fitting (m_S, m_T) is non-empty, that is, by a theorem of Gale and Ryser [15], [20]

$$\widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z| \leq \gamma \text{ whenever } X \subseteq S, \ Z \subseteq T. \tag{42}$$

Brualdi [5] characterized the degree-sequences of elementary bipartite graphs in terms of fully inde-composable $(0, 1)$-matrices. Here we extend his results (apart from its trivial special case when $n = 1$) to k-elementary bipartite graphs.

Theorem 43. *Suppose that $\mathcal{G}(m_S, m_T)$ is non-empty, that is, (42) holds. There is a k-elementary member G of $\mathcal{G}(m_S, m_T)$ if and only if*

$$\widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z| + (n - |X| - |Z| + k) \leq \gamma \text{ whenever } X \subset S, \ Z \subset T. \tag{43}$$

Furthermore, it suffices to require (43) only for $X \subset S$ consisting of the h largest m_S-valued elements and for $Z \subset T$ consisting of the j largest m_T-valued elements ($h, j < n$). Moreover, if $m_S(s_1) \leq \cdots \leq m_S(s_n)$ and $m_T(t_1) \geq \cdots \geq m_T(t_n)$, the graph G can be chosen in such a way that $s_1 t_1, \ldots, s_n t_n$ is a perfect matching of G.

Proof. Proof.Necessity. Suppose that there is a requested bigraph G. Since G is k-elementary, the degree of each node is at least $k + 1$. For $X \subset S$ and $Z \subset T$, let γ_1 denote the number of edges incident to a node in $X \cup Z$ while γ_2 is the number of the remaining edges. Then $\gamma_1 \geq \widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z|$.

If $|Z| \geq k$, then $T - Z$ has at least $|T - Z| + k$ neighbours and hence $T - Z$ has at least $|T - Z| + k - |X| = n - |X| - |Z| + k$ neighbours in $S - X$, from which $\gamma_2 \geq |T - Z| + k - |X|$. If $|Z| < k$, then each node in $S - X$ has at least $k + 1 - |Z|$ neighbours in $T - Z$ from which $\gamma_2 \geq |S - X|(k + 1 - |Z|) = (n - |X|)(k - |Z|) + n - |X| \geq k - |Z| + n - |X|$ in this case, too. Therefore we have

$$\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \geq \widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z| + n - |X| - |Z| + k,$$

and hence the inequality in (43) holds.

Sufficiency. We may suppose that the elements of S and T are ordered in such a way that $m_S(s_1) \leq \cdots \leq m_S(s_n)$ and $m_T(t_1) \geq \cdots \geq m_T(t_n)$. The inequality in (43), when applied to $X := S - s$ and to $Z = \emptyset$, implies that $m_S(s) \geq k + 1$ for $s \in S$ and $m_T(t) \geq k + 1$ follows analogously for $t \in T$. Let $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a set. Let $m_o(v_j) := m_T(t_j) - 1$ and $m_i(v_j) := m_S(s_j) - 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Let $\gamma' = \gamma - n$.

Let Z_j denote the first j ($0 \leq j \leq n$) elements of V and let X_h denote the last h ($0 \leq h \leq n$) elements of V. The (possibly empty) subset of T corresponding to Z_j is denoted by Z while the subset of S corresponding to X_j is denoted by X. Due to the assumption made on the ordering of the elements of V, Z_j consists of the j elements of V with largest m_o-values while X_h consists of the h elements of V with largest m_i-values.

Claim 44. *Suppose that $j < n$ and $h < n$, that is, $X \subset S$ and $Z \subset T$. Then the inequality in (40) with γ' in place of γ holds.*

19

Proof. Proof.$\widetilde{m}_o(Z_j) + \widetilde{m}_i(X_h) - jh + k = \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |Z| + \widetilde{m}_S(X) - |X| - |X||Z| + k \leq \gamma - n = \gamma'.$ • □

Claim 45. *Suppose that $j \leq n$ and $h \leq n$, that is, $X \subseteq S$ and $Z \subseteq T$. Then the inequality in (4) with γ' in place of γ holds.*

Proof. Proof.Suppose first that $h + j \geq n$, that is, $|X_h \cup Z_j| = n$. Then

$$\widetilde{m}_i(X_h) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z_j) - |X_h||Z_j| + |X_h \cap Z_j| =$$

$$\widetilde{m}_S(X) - |X| + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |Z| - |X||Z| + |X_h \cap Z_j| =$$

$$\widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z| - |X_h| - |Z_j| + |X_h \cap Z_j| =$$

$$\widetilde{m}_S(X) + \widetilde{m}_T(Z) - |X||Z| - |X_h \cup Z_j| \leq$$

$$\gamma - |X_h \cup Z_j| = \gamma - n = \gamma'.$$

Here the last inequality follows from (42).

Second, suppose that $h + j < n$, that is, $X_h \cup Z_j \subset V$ implying that $X_h \cap Z_j = \emptyset$. By Claim 44, $\widetilde{m}_o(Z_j) + \widetilde{m}_i(X_h) - |X_h||Z_j| + k \leq \gamma'$ and hence $\widetilde{m}_i(X_h) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z_j) - |X_h||Z_j| + |X_h \cap Z_j| = \widetilde{m}_i(X_h) + \widetilde{m}_o(Z_j) - |X_h||Z_j| < \gamma'$. • □

Since the conditions (4) and (40) were shown above to hold, Theorem 42 implies the existence of a k-connected simple digraph $D = (V, A)$ fitting (m_o, m_i). Consider the bigraph $G = (S, T; E)$ associated with D (in which $s_i t_i$ belongs to E for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and, for every arc $v_j v_h$ of D, let $t_j s_h$ be an edge of G). This G is a simple k-elementary bigraph fitting (m_S, m_T). • • □

References

[1] L.W. Beineke and F. Harary, *Local restrictions for various classes of directed graphs*, Journal of London Math. Soc., Vol. 40 (1965) 87–95.

[2] K. Bérczi and A. Frank, *Supermodularity in unweighted graph optimization I: Branchings and matchings*, (2016), EGRES Technical Report No. 2016-9 (http://www.cs.elte.hu/egres. ISSN 15874451). Mathematics of Operations Research, to appear.

[3] K. Bérczi and A. Frank, *Supermodularity in unweighted graph optimization II: Matroidal term rank augmentation*, (2016), EGRES Technical Report No. 2016-10 (http://www.cs.elte.hu/egres . ISSN 15874451). Submitted for publication to Mathematics of Operations Research.

[4] K. Bérczi and A. Frank, *Supermodularity in unweighted graph optimization IV: Algorithms*, (2017) in preparation.

[5] R.A. Brualdi, *Matrices of 0's and 1's with total support*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. A, Vol. 28, No. 3 (1980) 249–256.

[6] R.A. Brualdi and H.J. Ryser, Combinatorial Matrix Theory, Cambridge University Press, 1991. (Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications).

[7] C. Dürr, F. Guinez, and M. Matamala, *Reconstructing 3-colored grids from horizontal and vertical projections is NP-hard*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, Vol. 26, No. 1 (2012) 330–352.

[8] J. Edmonds, *Existence of k-edge-connected ordinary graphs with prescribed degrees*, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards, B68 (1964) 73–74.

[9] K.P. Eswaran and R.E. Tarjan, *Augmentation problems*, SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1976) 653–665.

[10] L.R. Ford and D.R. Fulkerson, Flows in Networks, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ., 1962.

[11] A. Frank, Connections in Combinatorial Optimization, Oxford University Press, 2011 (ISBN 978-0-19-920527-1), Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 38.

[12] A. Frank, *Augmenting graphs to meet edge-connectivity requirements*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1992, February) 22–53.

[13] A. Frank and T. Jordán, *Minimal edge-coverings of pairs of sets*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B, Vol. 65, No. 1 (1995, September) 73–110.

[14] A. Frank and L. Végh, *An algorithm to increase the node-connectivity of a digraph by one*, Discrete Optimization, Vol. 5 (2008) 677–684.

[15] D. Gale, *A theorem on flows in networks*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 10 (1957) 1073–1082.

[16] Yanmei Hong, Qinghai Liu, and Hon-Jian Lai, *Characterization of digraphic sequences with strongly connected realizations*, Journal of Graph Theory, Vol. 84, No. 2 (2017, February) 191–201.

[17] L. Lovász and M. Plummer: Matching Theory, North-Holland, 1986. Reprinted with corrections: American Mathematical Society, Chelsea Publishing, 2009.

[18] W. Mader, *Konstruktion aller n-fach kantenzusammenhängenden Digraphen*, European Journal of Combinatorics, Vol. 3 (1982) 63–67.

[19] O. Ore, *Studies on directed graphs, I*, Annals of Mathematics, Vol. 63 (1956) 383–406.

[20] H.J. Ryser, *Combinatorial properties of matrices of zeros and ones*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 9 (1957) 371–377.

[21] A. Schrijver, *A combinatorial algorithm minimizing submodular functions in strongly polynomial time*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B, Vol. 80 (2000) 346–355.

[22] L.A. Végh and A.A. Benczúr, *Primal-dual approach for directed vertex connectivity augmentation and generalizations*, ACM Transactions on Algorithms, Vol. 4, No. 2 (2008) 1–21.

[23] D.L. Wang and D.J. Kleitman, *On the existence of n-connected graphs with prescribed degrees (n ≥ 2)*, Networks, Vol. 3, (1972) 225–239.