



Laboratoire **ARTEMIS**

BP 53x - 38041 - Grenoble cedex



Photo Focale Studio Grenoble

## RAPPORT DE RECHERCHE

### MINIMUM WEIGHT $T, d$ -JOINS AND MULTI-JOINS

Michel BURLET Alexander V. KARZANOV

RR 929 -M-

Décembre 1993

# MINIMUM WEIGHT $T, d$ -JOINS AND MULTI-JOINS

Michel BURLET

*Université Fourier Grenoble 1  
BP 53x, 38041 Grenoble Cedex, France*

and

Alexander V. KARZANOV

*Institute for System Analysis of Russian Acad. Sci.  
9, Prospect 60 Let Oktyabrya, 117912 Moscow, Russia \**

**Abstract.** A  $T, d$ -join arises as a natural generalization of the notion of a  $T$ -join. Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a subset  $T$  of its vertices, and integers  $d_s \geq 0$  for  $s \in T$ , a  $T, d$ -join is a set  $B \subseteq E$  such that: (i)  $B$  is the union of (the edge sets of) some pairwise edge-disjoint paths  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  in  $G$  connecting pairs of distinct elements of  $T$ , and (ii) for each  $s \in T$  exactly  $d_s$  of these paths have the beginning or end at  $s$ .

We introduce some polyhedron  $D'$ , described by linear inequalities, and show that  $D = D' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$  is the dominant polyhedron for the set of  $T, d$ -joins. To this purpose we consider the problem of minimizing over  $D'$  a nonnegative linear objective function and prove that it is, in fact, equivalent to the minimum weight  $T, d$ -join problem.

We also give a description, via linear inequalities, of a polyhedron  $Q'$  such that  $Q' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$  is the dominant polyhedron for the set of maximum multi-joins for  $G, T$ . Here by a *multi-join* we mean a set  $B \subseteq E$  satisfying (i) as above, and a multi-join  $B$  is called *maximum* if the number  $k$  of paths is as large as possible.

Both results are derived from a minimax relation obtained in [9] for the parametric minimum cost edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths problem.

*Key words.* Dominant Polyhedron,  $T$ -join, Edge-disjoint Paths.

---

\* This research was done while the second author was visiting IMAG Artemis, Université Fourier Grenoble 1 and was supported by "Chaire municipale" from Mairie de Grenoble, France

## 1. Introduction

Throughout we deal with an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a subset  $T$  of its vertices, called *terminals* in  $G$ , and a nonnegative integer-valued function  $d$  (of *demands*) on  $T$ . A  $T$ -*path* is a path in  $G$  connecting two distinct terminals. A set  $B \subseteq E$  is called a  $T, d$ -*join* if it is representable in the form  $B = \cup(P \in \mathcal{P})$  for some set  $\mathcal{P}$  of mutually edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths such that for each  $s \in T$  exactly  $d_s$  paths in  $\mathcal{P}$  begin or end at  $s$  (considering a path as an edge set). Unless otherwise explicitly stated, we also assume that such a  $B$  is minimal with respect to inclusion under the above property; in particular each path in  $\mathcal{P}$  is simple. Let  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_d$  denote the set of  $T, d$ -joins for  $G, T, d$ . We assume that

$$\sum (d_s : s \in T) \text{ is even}$$

(otherwise  $\mathcal{B}$  is obviously empty) and that some  $d_s$  is non-zero. If  $d_s = 1$  for all  $s \in T$ , then  $|T|$  is even and we get the notion of a  $T$ -*join* [13]; such an object originally appeared in connection with the so-called Chinese postman problem [8,3].

It is well-known that the set  $\mathcal{B}_1$  of  $T$ -joins admits the “dual description” as being the set of all minimal  $B \subseteq E$  that meet every odd-terminus cut  $\delta X$ ; in other words,  $\mathcal{B}_1$  and the set  $\mathcal{C}$  of (minimal)  $T$ -cuts form a blocking pair [6]. [For  $X \subset V$ ,  $\delta X = \delta^G X$  denotes the set of edges of  $G$  with exactly one end in  $X$  (a *cut* in  $G$ ), and for  $|T|$  even,  $\delta X$  is called a  $T$ -*cut* if  $|X \cap T|$  is odd.] Moreover, Edmonds and Johnson [5] proved the theorem that for any weighting  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , the minimum weight  $w(B)$  of a  $T$ -join is equal to the maximum value of a  $w$ -packing of  $T$ -cuts; in other words,  $\mathcal{B}_1$  has the MFMC-property (see [12] for the definition). [For  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $S' \subseteq S$ ,  $f(S')$  denotes  $\sum (f(e) : e \in S')$ .] In polyhedral terms, this means that the *dominant polyhedron*

$$D(\mathcal{B}_1) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_1) + \mathbb{R}_+^E$$

for  $\mathcal{B}_1$  is formed by the vectors  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^E$  satisfying the system of inequalities

$$(1) \quad x(\delta X) \geq 1 \quad \text{for } \delta X \in \mathcal{C}.$$

[Here for a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^E$  of subsets of  $E$ ,  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{F})$  is the convex hull of the incidence vectors  $\xi_F \in \mathbb{R}^E$  of sets  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , and for sets  $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E$ ,  $X+Y$  denotes their Minkowsky sum, i.e., the set of  $z \in \mathbb{R}^E$  such that  $z = x + y$  for some  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ .] For a survey of the above-mentioned results see [11,7].

In the present paper we give a description of the dominant polyhedron  $D = D(\mathcal{B}_d)$  for arbitrary demands  $d$  (Theorem 1). Such a description turns out to be somewhat more complicated than that for  $\mathcal{B}_1$ . It comes from consideration of the *minimum weight  $T, d$ -join problem*: given a weighting  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ , find a  $T, d$ -join  $B$  of weight  $w(B)$

minimum, and applying to the latter a minimax relation for the parameteric minimum cost edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths problem obtained in [9].

From the result in [9] we also derive a description of the dominant polyhedron  $Q$  for the set  $\mathcal{B}^{\max}$  of maximum multi-joins for  $G, T$  (Theorem 2). Let  $\nu = \nu(G, T)$  denote the maximum cardinality of a set of pairwise edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths in  $G$ . By a *maximum multi-join* we mean a minimal set  $B \subseteq E$  such that the subgraph  $(V, B)$  contains  $\nu$  pairwise edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths.

Note also that the above-mentioned parameteric problem can be solved in strongly polynomial time. This provides strongly polynomial algorithms to find optimal solutions to the minimum weight  $T, d$ -join problem and the minimum weight maximum multi-join problem (under nonnegative weights).

## 2. Theorems

We need some terminology and notation.

**Definition.** A pair  $\phi = (X_\phi, U_\phi)$  is called a *fragment* if  $X_\phi \subseteq V$ ,  $U_\phi \subseteq \delta X_\phi$ , and the numbers  $|U_\phi|$  and  $d(X_\phi \cap T)$  have different parity, that is,

$$(2) \quad |U_\phi| - \sum (d_s : s \in X_\phi \cap T) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

In particular,  $U_\phi$  has odd cardinality if  $X_\phi \cap T = \emptyset$ ; such a fragment is called *inner*. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the set of all fragments for  $G, T, d$ . Define the *characteristic function* of  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_\phi(e) &:= 1 && \text{if } e \in U_\phi, \\ &:= -1 && \text{if } e \in \delta X_\phi - U_\phi, \\ &:= 0 && \text{for the other edges in } G. \end{aligned}$$

We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.**  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_d) \subseteq D' \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}_d) + \mathbb{R}_+^E$ , where  $D' = D'(G, T, d)$  is the set of vectors  $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$  satisfying

- (3) (i)  $x_e \geq 0$  for  $e \in E$ ;
- (ii)  $x_e \leq 1$  for  $e \in E$ ;
- (iii)  $x(\delta X) \geq d_s - d(X \cap T - \{s\})$  for  $s \in T$  and  $X \subset V$  such that  $s \in X$ ;
- (iv)  $x\chi_\phi \leq |U_\phi| - 1$  for  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$ .

In particular,  $D = D' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$ .

[For  $a, b : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $ab$  denotes the inner product  $\sum(a_e b_e : e \in S)$ .] Note that in case  $d = \mathbb{1}$  system (3)(iv) implies (1). Indeed, for  $\delta X \in \mathcal{C}$  the pair  $\phi = (X, \emptyset)$  forms a fragment (since  $d(X \cap T) = |X \cap T|$  is odd). Then  $x\chi_\phi \leq |U_\phi| - 1 = -1$  shows that  $x(\delta X) \geq 1$ .

Let  $e_P$  denote the pair of end vertices of a path  $P$ .

To see the inclusion  $\text{conv}(B_d) \subseteq D'$ , we observe that the incidence vector  $\xi_B$  of any  $T, d$ -join  $B$  belongs to  $D'$ . Indeed, (3)(i),(ii) are obvious, and (3)(iii) can be easily seen by considering a representation  $B = \cup(P \in \mathcal{P})$ . Fix a fragment  $\phi$ . For  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $|P \cap \delta X_\phi|$  is odd if  $|e_P \cap X_\phi| = 1$ , and even otherwise. Hence,

$$(4) \quad |B \cap \delta X_\phi| - d(X_\phi \cap T) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

(taking into account that  $|\{P \in \mathcal{P} : s \in e_P\}| = d_s$  for any  $s \in T$ ). Obviously,  $|B \cap \delta X_\phi|$  and  $\xi_B \chi_\phi$  have the same parity. Thus,  $\xi_B \chi_\phi - |U_\phi| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , by (2) and (4). Now the evident fact that  $\xi \chi_\phi \leq |U_\phi|$  for any 0,1-vector  $\xi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^E$  implies

$$(5) \quad \xi_B \chi_\phi \leq |U_\phi| - 1,$$

that is, (3)(iv) holds for  $x = \xi_B$ .

We also show the following. For  $W \subseteq E$  and  $v \in V$  let  $W_v = W_v^G$  denote the set of edges in  $W$  incident to  $v$ .

**Statement 2.1.** *Let  $x$  be an integer vector in  $D'$ , and let  $B = \{e \in E : x_e = 1\}$ . Then  $B$  contains a  $T, d$ -join  $\tilde{B}$ , and  $B - \tilde{B}$  is the union of pairwise edge-disjoint circuits (considered as edge-sets).*

*Proof.* By (3)(i),(ii),  $x$  is a 0,1-vector. We observe that  $|B_v|$  is even for each  $v \in V - T$ . For if  $|B_v|$  is odd for some  $v \in V - T$  then for the inner fragment  $\phi$  with  $X_\phi = \{v\}$  and  $U_\phi = B_v$  one has  $x\chi_\phi = |U_\phi|$ , contradicting (3)(iv). Also considering for  $s \in T$  the fragment  $\phi = \{\{s\}, B_s\}$  we conclude from (3)(iv) that  $|B_s|$  and  $d_s$  have the same parity.

Next, form the graph  $H = (V', B')$  by adding to the graph  $(V, B)$  a new vertex  $s'$  and  $d_s$  parallel edges connecting  $s$  and  $s'$ , for each  $s \in T$ . Let  $T' = \{s' : s \in T\}$  be the set of terminals in  $H$ . By the above argument, every vertex  $v \in V' - T' = V$  has an even degree in  $H$ . Furthermore, (3)(iii) and the construction of  $H$  show that  $|\delta^H X| \geq d_s$  for any  $s \in T$  and  $X \subset V'$  such that  $X \cap T' = \{s'\}$ , and that this inequality holds with equality for  $X = \{s'\}$ . Hence,

$$\min\{|\delta^H X| : X \subset V', X \cap T' = \{s'\}\} = d_s \text{ for any } s' \in T'.$$

Now the statement is implied by the following theorem due to Lovász [10] and, independently, Cherkassky [1]: if a graph  $G'' = (V'', E'')$  and a set  $T'' \subseteq V''$  are such that the degree of every vertex in  $V'' - T''$  is even, then there exists a set  $\mathcal{P}''$  of edge-disjoint  $T''$ -paths in  $G''$  such that for each  $t \in T''$  the number of paths  $P \in \mathcal{P}''$  with  $t \in e_P$  is exactly  $\min\{|\delta^{G''} X| : X \subset V'', X \cap T'' = \{t\}\}$  paths in  $\mathcal{P}''$ . •

In view of Statement 2.1, in order to prove the second inclusion in Theorem 1 it suffices to show that (i) if  $\mathcal{B}_d = \emptyset$  then  $D' = \emptyset$ , and (ii) if  $\mathcal{B}_d \neq \emptyset$  then the problem:

(6) given weights  $w_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  of edges  $e \in E$ , minimize  $wx$  over all  $x \in D'$ ,

has an integer-valued optimal solution  $x$ . Indeed, in case (i) we have  $D = \emptyset = \emptyset + \mathbb{R}_+^E = D' + E_+^E$ . In case (ii), varying  $w$ , we conclude that all vertices of  $D' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$  are integral. Then, by Statement 2.1, these vertices must be the incident vectors of  $T, d$ -joins, whence the result follows. In particular, (6) turns out to be equivalent, in essence, to the above-mentioned minimum weight  $T, d$ -join problem. We prove (i) and (ii) in the next section.

Now we state the theorem describing the dominant polyhedron  $Q$  for the set  $\mathcal{B}^{\max}$  of maximum multi-joins for  $G, T$ . A set  $K$  of pairwise disjoint subsets  $Y_s \subset V, s \in T$ , is called a  $T$ -kernel family if  $Y_s \cap T = \{s\}$  for all  $s \in T$ . Let  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(G, T)$  denote the set of  $T$ -kernel families for  $G, T$ . For  $e \in E$  define  $\zeta_K(e)$  to be the number of occurrences of  $e$  in the cuts  $\delta Y_s, s \in T$ , that is,

$$\zeta_K = \sum (\xi_{\delta Y_s} : Y_s \in K)$$

(thus  $\zeta_K$ , the *characteristic function* of  $K$ , takes values only 0, 1 or 2).

**Theorem 2.**  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}) \subseteq Q' \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}) + \mathbb{R}_+^E$ , where  $Q'$  is the set of vectors  $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$  satisfying

- (7)            (i)     $x_e \geq 0, \quad e \in E;$   
                   (ii)    $x_e \leq 1, \quad e \in E;$   
                   (iii)    $x\zeta_K \geq 2\nu$  for any  $K \in \mathcal{K};$   
                   (iv)    $x\chi_\phi \leq |U_\phi| - 1$  for each inner fragment  $\phi$ .

In particular,  $Q = Q' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$ .

Again, it is easy to show that the characteristic vector  $x = \xi_B$  of every maximum multi-join  $B$  belongs to  $Q'$ , thus proving the first inclusion in the theorem (the inequality in (7)(iii) follows from the fact that each  $T$ -path  $P$  meets at least two cuts  $\delta Y_s$  for  $Y_s \in K$ ). Next, arguing as in the proof of Statement 2.1 and using Lovász-Cherkassky'

theorem, one can see that for every 0,1-vector  $x \in Q'$  there is a maximum multi-join  $B$  with  $\xi_B \leq x$ .

To prove the remaining parts in Theorems 1 and 2, we utilize one general result on minimum cost edge-disjoint paths, as follows. Consider a graph  $G' = (V', E')$  and a set  $T' \subseteq V'$ . For brevity, in the sequel we refer to a set of edge-disjoint  $T'$ -paths in  $G'$  as a *packing*. Let  $w : E' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be a weighting. For a packing  $\mathcal{P}$  let  $w(\mathcal{P})$  denote the total weight (or *cost*)  $\sum(w(P) : P \in \mathcal{P})$  of paths in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The *parameteric minimum cost problem* is:

- (8) given  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , find a packing  $\mathcal{P}$  that maximizes the objective function  $\psi(\mathcal{P}, p) = p|\mathcal{P}| - w(\mathcal{P})$ .

Clearly, if  $p$  is large enough (e.g.,  $p = w(E') + 1$ ) then (8) becomes equivalent to the problem: among all packings  $\mathcal{P}$  of maximum possible cardinality  $|\mathcal{P}|$ , find a packing  $\mathcal{P}$  whose total cost  $w(\mathcal{P})$  is as small as possible. [Therefore, (8) is a generalization of the minimum weight maximum multi-join problem and, in fact, of the minimum weight  $T, d$ -join problem, due to a simple reduction as explained in Section 3.]

Let  $\mathcal{F}^0$  denote the set of inner fragments  $\phi$  for  $G', T'$  (i.e.,  $X_\phi \cap T' = \emptyset$ ). For functions  $\beta' : \mathcal{F}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma' : E' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , define the *amortized cost function*  $w^{\beta', \gamma'}$  on  $E$  to be

$$(9) \quad w^{\beta', \gamma'} = w + \gamma' + \sum(\beta'_\phi \chi_\phi : \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0)$$

(here  $\chi_\phi$  concerns  $E'$ ). We say that  $(\beta', \gamma')$  is *p-admissible* if:

- (10)  $w^{\beta', \gamma'}$  is nonnegative;
- (11)  $\text{dist}_{w^{\beta', \gamma'}}(s', t') \geq p$  for all distinct  $s', t' \in T'$ ,

where  $\text{dist}_\ell(u, v)$  is the distance between vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G'$  with length  $\ell$  of edges, that is, the minimum length  $\ell(P)$  of a path connecting  $u$  and  $v$  (the distances in (11) are well-defined because of (10)).

**Theorem 3** [9]. *For any  $p \geq 0$ ,*

$$(12) \quad \max\{\psi(\mathcal{P}, p)\} = \min\{\gamma'(E') + \sum(\beta'_\phi(|U_\phi| - 1) : \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0)\},$$

where the maximum ranges over all packings  $\mathcal{P}$  and the minimum ranges over all *p-admissible*  $(\beta', \gamma')$ .

We shall also use the *optimality criterion* for problem (8): a packing  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $p$ -admissible  $(\beta', \gamma')$  achieve the equality in (12) if and only if the following “complementary slackness” conditions hold:

$$(13) \quad w^{\beta', \gamma'}(P) = p \text{ for each } P \in \mathcal{P};$$

$$(14) \quad \text{for } e \in E', \quad \gamma'_e > 0 \text{ implies that } e \text{ is covered by } \mathcal{P}, \text{ that is, } e \text{ belongs to some } P \in \mathcal{P};$$

$$(15) \quad \text{for } \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0, \quad \beta'_\phi > 0 \text{ implies } \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \chi_\phi(P) = |U_\phi| - 1.$$

This criterion can be seen by considering, for arbitrary a packing  $\mathcal{P}$  and a  $p$ -admissible  $(\beta', \gamma')$ , the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathcal{P}, p) &= \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (p - w(P)) \\ &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} (\gamma'(P) + \xi_P \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0} \beta'_\phi \chi_\phi) \quad (\text{by (9)}) \\ &\leq \gamma'(E') + \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0} \beta'_\phi \chi_\phi \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \xi_P \quad (\text{as the paths in } \mathcal{P} \text{ are edge-disjoint}) \\ &\leq \gamma'(E') + \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0} \beta'_\phi (|U_\phi| - 1) \quad (\text{by (5)}) . \end{aligned}$$

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1

For  $s \in T$  let  $\mathcal{X}_s$  denote the collection of pairs  $(s, X)$  such that  $X \subseteq V$  and  $s \in X \cap T$ , and let  $\mathcal{X} = \cup(\mathcal{X}_s : s \in T)$ . Assign a dual variable  $\gamma_e$  to  $e \in E$  in (3)(ii),  $\alpha_{s, X}$  to  $(s, X)$  in (3)(iii), and  $\beta_\phi$  to  $\phi$  in (3)(iv). Given  $\alpha : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , for  $e \in E$  define

$$(16) \quad \hat{\alpha}_e = \sum(\alpha_{s, X} : (s, X) \in \mathcal{X}, e \in \delta X), \quad \hat{\beta}_e = \sum(\beta_\phi \chi_\phi(e) : \phi \in \mathcal{F}),$$

and  $l_e = w_e + \gamma_e + \hat{\beta}_e$ .

Then the linear program dual to (6) is:

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} \\ \Omega(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= -\gamma(E) + \sum_{(s, X) \in \mathcal{X}} (d_s - d(X \cap T - \{s\})) \alpha_{s, X} - \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}} (|U_\phi| - 1) \beta_\phi \end{aligned}$$



subject to

- (i)  $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0;$
- (ii)  $-\gamma_e + \hat{\alpha}_e - \hat{\beta}_e \leq w_e, \quad e \in E.$

Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{B}_d$  of  $T, d$ -joins is nonempty. Our goal is to find  $B \in \mathcal{B}_d$  and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  satisfying (17)(i),(ii) so that the following relations hold:

- (18) (i)  $\alpha_{s,X} > 0$  implies  $|B \cap \delta X| = d_s - d(X \cap T - \{s\});$
- (ii)  $\beta_\phi > 0$  implies  $\chi_\phi(B) = |U_\phi| - 1;$
- (iii)  $\gamma_e > 0$  implies  $e \in B;$
- (iv)  $\hat{\alpha}_e < \ell_e$  implies  $e \notin B.$

One can see that (18) gives the complementary slackness conditions for  $x = \xi_B$  and  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ , whence  $x$  is an integer optimal solution to (6), and we are done.

To find the desired objects, we form the graph  $G' = (V', E')$  by adding to  $G$  a new vertex  $s'$  and  $d_s$  parallel edges connecting  $s$  and  $s'$ , for each  $s \in T$ . Let  $T' = \{s' : s \in T\}$ , and extend  $w$  by zero to the edges in  $E' - E$ . Clearly, each  $T', d$ -join in  $G'$  contains  $E' - E$ , and for  $B \subseteq E$ , the mapping  $B \rightarrow B \cup (E' - E)$  yields a one-to-one correspondence between the set of  $T, d$ -joins in  $G$  and the set of  $T', d$ -joins in  $G'$ . By the above supposition, the set of  $T', d$ -joins in  $G'$  is nonempty.

Let  $\mathcal{P}, \gamma', \beta'$  achieve the equality in (12) with a rather large  $p$ . Then  $|\mathcal{P}|$  is as large as possible. Since  $|\mathcal{P}|$  does not exceed  $|E' - E|/2 = d(T)/2$ ,  $B' = \cup(P \in \mathcal{P})$  is a  $T', d$ -join in  $G'$  and  $B = B'|_E$  is a  $T, d$ -join in  $G$ . This  $B$  is just the desired  $T, d$ -join.

Next we explain how to obtain  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  from  $\beta'$  and  $\gamma'$ . Consider a fragment  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0$  with  $\beta'_\phi > 0$ . Note that (15) is equivalent to the fact that there is a unique element  $u \in \delta^{G'} X_\phi$  such that

- (19) either  $u \in U_\phi$  and  $\delta^{G'} X_\phi \cap B' = U_\phi - \{u\}$ , or  $u \notin U_\phi$  and  $\delta^{G'} X_\phi \cap B' = U_\phi \cup \{u\}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be the set of  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0$  such that for each  $s \in T \cap X_\phi$  (if any) all edges  $e$  connecting  $s$  and  $s'$  belong to  $U_\phi$  (note that such an  $e$  is, obviously, in  $\delta^{G'} X_\phi \cap B'$ ). From (19) one can see that for  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_1$ , the pair  $(X_\phi, U_\phi \cap E)$  forms a fragment,  $\phi'$  say, for  $G, T, d$ ; moreover,  $\chi_{\phi'}(B) = |U_\phi| - 1$ . We denote  $\phi'$  by  $\sigma(\phi)$ . The desired  $\beta$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\phi'} &= \beta'_\phi & \text{for } \phi' = \sigma(\phi), \phi \in \mathcal{F}_1, \\ &= 0 & \text{for the other fragments in } \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\beta$  and  $B$  satisfy (18)(ii). On the other hand, (19) shows that for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0 - \mathcal{F}_1$ , the set  $U_\phi \cap E$  coincides with  $B \cap \delta X_\phi$ . Based on this property, we can

“destroy” such fragments, accordingly increasing the function  $\gamma$  on  $E$ . More precisely, we define  $\gamma$  on  $E$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_e &= \gamma'_e + \sum(\beta'_\phi : \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0 - \mathcal{F}_1, e \in \delta X_\phi) \quad \text{for each } e \in B, \\ &= \gamma'_e \quad \text{otherwise.}\end{aligned}$$

By the above property, for  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0 - \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $e \in E$ ,  $\chi_\phi(e) \geq 0$  if  $e \in B$  and  $\chi_\phi(e) \leq 0$  if  $e \in E - B$ . This and (14) imply that  $\gamma_e > 0$  only if  $e \in B$ , and therefore (18)(iii) is true. Furthermore, we have

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned}\gamma'_e + \sum(\beta'_\phi \chi_\phi(e) : \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0) &= \widehat{\beta}_e + \gamma_e \quad \text{for } e \in B, \\ &\leq \widehat{\beta}_e + \gamma_e \quad \text{for } e \in E - B,\end{aligned}$$

defining  $\widehat{\beta}$  as in (16) for our  $\beta$ . Let  $\ell'$  stand for  $w^{\beta', \gamma'}$  (see (9)). By (20),

$$(21) \quad \ell_e = \ell'_e \quad \text{for } e \in B \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_e \geq \ell'_e \quad \text{for } e \in E - B.$$

It remains to define  $\alpha$ . Consider  $s' \in T'$ . Introduce the set  $Z_{s'}$  to be  $\{v \in V' : \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v) \leq p/2\}$  (recall that  $\ell'$  is nonnegative, by (10)). From (11) it follows that if  $v$  is a common element for  $Z_{s'}$  and  $Z_{t'}$  with  $s' \neq t'$  then  $\text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v) = \text{dist}_{\ell'}(t', v) = p/2$ . Let  $0 = \pi_0 < \pi_1 < \dots < \pi_k = p/2$  be the sequence of all different values among  $\text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v)$  ( $v \in Z_{s'}$ ) and  $p/2$ . Define

$$(22) \quad X^i = \{v \in Z_{s'} - \{s'\} : \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v) < \pi_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Now the desired  $\alpha$  on  $\mathcal{X}_s$  is defined by

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned}\alpha_{s, X} &= \pi_i - \pi_{i-1} \quad \text{for } X = X^i \neq \emptyset, i = 1, \dots, k, \\ &= 0 \quad \text{for the other } (s, X)\text{'s in } \mathcal{X}_s.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the construction of  $G'$  shows that  $\text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v) = \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', s) + \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s, v)$  for any  $v \in Z_{s'} - \{s'\}$ , where  $s$  is the vertex in  $T$  corresponding to  $s'$ . This implies that if  $X^i \neq \emptyset$  then  $s \in X^i$ , so  $\alpha$  is well-defined.

**Claim.** Let  $P = (s' = v_0, e_1, v_1, \dots, e_r, v_r = t')$  be a path in  $G'$  connecting distinct terminals  $s', t' \in T'$  such that  $\ell'(P) = p$ . Then:

- (i)  $v_1 = s$  and  $v_{r-1} = t$ ;
- (ii) for every  $(s, X) \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\alpha_{s, X} > 0$ ,  $P$  intersects  $\delta^G X$  at most once;
- (iii) for  $i = 2, \dots, r - 1$ ,  $\widehat{\alpha}_{e_i} = \ell'_{e_i}$ .

*Proof.* (i) is obvious. To show (ii) and (iii), we observe that  $P$  is a shortest path for  $\ell'$  (by (11)). Hence,

(24) for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ,

$$\ell'_{e_i} = \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v_i) - \text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v_{i-1}) = \text{dist}_{\ell'}(t', v_{i-1}) - \text{dist}_{\ell'}(t', v_i).$$

From (24) and the definition of  $\alpha_{q,X}$  for  $q = s, t$  (see (23)) one can conclude that: (a) for  $(q, X) \in \mathcal{X}_s \cup \mathcal{X}_t$  with  $\alpha_{q,X} > 0$ ,  $\delta X$  contains exactly one edge among  $e_2, \dots, e_{r-1}$ , and (b) for  $i = 2, \dots, r-1$ ,  $\ell'_{e_i} = \sum(\alpha_{q,X} : (q, X) \in \mathcal{X}_s \cup \mathcal{X}_t, e_i \in \delta X)$ .

Next, for  $q' \in T' - \{s', t'\}$  and  $i = 0, \dots, r$ , one has  $\text{dist}_{\ell'}(q', v_i) \geq p/2$ . For otherwise for some  $z \in \{s', t'\}$  we would have  $\text{dist}_{\ell'}(z, q') \leq \text{dist}_{\ell'}(z, v_i) + \text{dist}_{\ell'}(q', v_i) < p$  because  $\min\{\text{dist}_{\ell'}(s', v_i), \text{dist}_{\ell'}(t', v_i)\} \leq p/2$ . Hence, none of  $X \subseteq V$  with  $\alpha_{q,X} > 0$  meets  $P$ .

These arguments prove (ii) and (iii). •

In view of (13), part (ii) in Claim easily implies (18)(i), and part (iii) together with (21) shows that  $\hat{\alpha}_e = \ell_e$  holds for all  $e \in B$ . Next, if  $e \in E - B$  belongs to a  $T'$ -path of  $l'$ -length  $p$  in  $G'$  then  $\hat{\alpha}_e \leq \ell_e$ , by (21) and (iii) in Claim. Finally, arguing as above, one can deduce that  $\hat{\alpha}_e \leq \ell'_e$  for any  $e \in E$  that belongs to no  $T'$ -path of  $l'$ -length  $p$ , and therefore  $\hat{\alpha}_e \leq \ell_e$ . Thus, (18)(iv) is true.

This completes the proof for case  $\mathcal{B}_d \neq \emptyset$ .

Now suppose that  $\mathcal{B}_d = \emptyset$ . We first show that the polyhedron  $D'(G', T', d)$  is empty, where  $G' = (V', E')$  and  $T'$  are formed as above from  $G, T, d$ , and then, using this property, we show that  $D'(G, T, d)$  is empty as well. Let  $w$  be the all-unit function on  $E'$ . We shall show that the objective function  $\Omega(\alpha', \beta', \gamma')$  in (17) is unbounded (considering  $G', T'$  instead of  $G, T$ ). By the linear duality theorem, this fact will imply that  $D'(G', T', d) = \emptyset$ .

Let  $\nu$  be the maximum cardinality of a packing for  $G', T'$ . Choose a rather large  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$  to ensure that  $|\mathcal{P}| = \nu$  for an optimal solution to  $\mathcal{P}$  to (8). For  $s' \in T'$  let  $\mu_{s'}$  be the number of paths  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $s' \in e_P$ ; then  $\mu_{s'} \leq |E'_{s'}| = d_{s'}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{B}_d = \emptyset$ ,  $G'$  has no  $T', d$ -join, whence

$$(25) \quad 2\nu = \sum(\mu_{s'} : s' \in T') \leq d(T) - 2.$$

Let  $(\beta', \gamma')$  be  $p$ -admissible and achieve the minimum in (12). Then

$$(26) \quad p\nu \geq \psi(\mathcal{P}, p) = \gamma'(E') + \sum(\beta'_\phi(|U_\phi| - 1) : \phi \in \mathcal{F}^0).$$

The desired function  $\alpha'$  on  $\mathcal{X}'$  is defined similarly to  $\alpha$  in the proof for case  $\mathcal{B}_d \neq \emptyset$  (here  $\mathcal{X}' = \cup(\mathcal{X}'_{s'} : s' \in T')$ , and  $\mathcal{X}'_{s'}$  is the set of pairs  $(s', X)$  with  $X \subseteq V'$  and

$s' \in X \cap T'$ ). Namely, for  $s' \in T'$  define  $X^i$  to be  $\{v \in Z_{s'} : \text{dist}_{T'}(s', v) < \pi_i\}$  (cf. (22)) and then define  $\alpha'$  on  $\mathcal{X}'_{s'}$  as in (23) (with  $s'$  instead of  $s$ ). Repeating arguments as in the proof of the Claim, we observe that

$$(27) \quad \widehat{\alpha}'_e \leq \ell'_e \quad (= w_e + \gamma'_e + \widehat{\beta}'_e) \quad \text{for each } e \in E'.$$

Thus,  $(\alpha', \beta', \gamma')$  is a feasible solution to (17) for  $G', T', d$  (assuming that  $\beta'$  is extended by zero on the fragments not in  $\mathcal{F}^0$ ). Next, (23) (for  $\alpha'$ ) shows that for each  $s' \in T'$ ,

$$(28) \quad \sum (\alpha'_{s', X} : (s', X) \in \mathcal{X}'_{s'}) = p/2, \quad \text{and } \alpha'_{s', X} > 0 \text{ implies } X \cap T' = \{s'\}.$$

Now, putting (25),(26) and (28) together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\alpha', \beta', \gamma') &= \sum_{(s', X) \in \mathcal{X}'} (d_s - d(X \cap T' - \{s'\})) \alpha'_{s', X} - \left( \gamma'(E') + \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0} \beta'_\phi (|U_\phi| - 1) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{s \in T} d_s p/2 - p\nu = p(d(T)/2 - \nu) \geq p. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $p$  can be chosen arbitrarily large,  $\Omega$  is unbounded. Thus,  $D'(G', T', d)$  is empty.

It remains to prove that  $D'(G, T, d)$  is empty. Suppose that this is not so. Let  $x$  be a vector in  $D'(G, T, d)$ . Define  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} x'_e &= x_e \quad \text{for } e \in E, \\ &= 1 \quad \text{for } e \in E' - E. \end{aligned}$$

We show that  $x' \in D'(G', T', d)$ , thus coming to a contradiction with the fact that  $D'(G', T', d)$  is empty. The inequalities in (3)(i),(ii) (for  $E'$ ) are obvious. Consider  $(s', X) \in \mathcal{X}'$ . If  $s \notin X$  then  $\delta^{G'} X$  contains all  $d_s$  edges connecting  $s'$  and  $s$ , whence  $x'(\delta^{G'} X) \geq d_s \geq d_s - \sum (d_t : t \in X \cap T' - \{s'\})$ . And if  $s \in X$ , consider  $Y = X - T'$ . Let  $Z$  be the set of  $t \in T - \{s\}$  such that  $t \in X \not\equiv t'$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} x'(\delta^{G'} X) &\geq x(\delta^{G'} Y) + \sum (|E'_t| : t \in Z) = x(\delta^{G'} Y) + d(Z) \\ &\geq x(\delta^{G'} Y) + d(Y \cap T - \{s\}) - \sum (d_t : t' \in X \cap T' - \{s'\}). \end{aligned}$$

Now the inequality as in (3)(iii) for  $x'$  and  $(s', X)$  follows from (3)(iii) for  $x$  and  $(s, Y)$ .

Finally, consider a fragment  $\phi'$  for  $G', T', d$ . Let  $Z$  be the set of  $s \in T$  such that  $|X_{\phi'} \cap \{s, s'\}| = 1$ ; then  $E'_{s'} \subseteq \delta^{G'} X_{\phi'}$  for all  $s \in Z$ . Suppose that there is  $s \in Z$  such

that some  $e \in E'_{s'}$  is not in  $U_{\phi'}$ . Then  $x'\chi_{\phi'} \leq x'(U_{\phi'}) - x'_e \leq |U_{\phi'}| - 1$ . Thus, we may assume that  $E'_{s'} \subseteq U_{\phi'}$  for all  $s \in Z$ . Consider the pair  $\phi = (Y, W)$ , where  $Y = X_{\phi'} - T'$  and  $W = U_{\phi'} - \cup(E'_{s'} : s \in Z)$ . Then  $W$  is a subset of  $\delta^G Y$ . Moreover, obviously,  $|U_{\phi'}| - \sum(d_s : s' \in X_{\phi'} \cap T')$  has the same parity as that of  $|W| - d(Y \cap T)$ . Hence,  $\phi$  is a fragment for  $G, T, d$ . We have

$$x'\chi_{\phi'} = x\chi_{\phi} + x'(\cup(E'_{s'} : s \in Z)) \leq (|W| - 1) + |U_{\phi'} - W| = |U_{\phi'}| - 1.$$

Thus, (3)(iv) is true for  $x'$  and any fragment for  $G', T', d$ .

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

#### 4. Proof of Theorem 2

We show that the problem:

$$(29) \text{ given } w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \text{ minimize } wx \text{ subject to } x \in Q',$$

has an integer optimal solution  $x$ ; in other words, (29) is, in fact, equivalent to the minimum weight maximum multi-join problem:

$$(30) \text{ minimize } w(B) \text{ over all } B \in \mathcal{B}^{\max}.$$

Assign a dual variable  $\gamma_e$  to  $e \in E$  in (7)(ii),  $\tau_K$  to  $K \in \mathcal{K}$  in (7)(iii), and  $\beta_{\phi}$  to  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0$  (where  $\mathcal{F}^0$  is the set of inner fragments for  $G, T$ ). Then the program dual to (29) is

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && -\gamma(E) + 2\nu \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \tau_K - \sum_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}^0} (|U_{\phi}| - 1)\beta_{\phi} && \text{subject to} \\ & && \text{(i)} && \beta \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \tau \geq 0; \\ & && \text{(ii)} && -\gamma_e + \hat{\tau}_e - \hat{\beta}_e \leq w_e, \quad e \in E, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\beta}$  is defined in (16), and

$$\hat{\tau} = \sum(\tau_K \zeta_K : K \in \mathcal{K}).$$

We may assume that  $\nu > 0$ ; else  $Q' \subseteq \text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}) + \mathbb{R}_+^E$  is obviously true since  $\emptyset$  is a maximum multi-join (whence  $\text{conv}(\mathcal{B}^{\max}) = \{0\}$ ). We have to show that there exist  $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\max}$  and  $\beta, \gamma, \tau$  satisfying (31)(i),(ii) so that the following (complementary

slackness) conditions hold:

- (32) (i)  $\beta_\phi > 0$  implies  $\chi_\phi(B) = |U_\phi| - 1$ ;  
(ii)  $\gamma_e > 0$  implies  $e \in B$ ;  
(iii)  $\tau_K > 0$  implies  $2\nu = \zeta_K(B) (= \sum (|B \cap \delta Y_s| : Y_s \in K))$ ;  
(iv)  $\hat{\tau}_e < \ell_e$  implies  $e \notin B$ ;

where  $\ell_e = w_e + \gamma_e + \hat{\beta}_e$  (see (16)). Consider  $\mathcal{P}, \beta, \gamma$  that achieve the equality in (12) for a rather large  $p$  (using notation without primes). Then  $|\mathcal{P}| = \nu$ ,  $B = \cup(P \in \mathcal{P})$  is a maximum multi-join, and  $B, \beta, \gamma$  satisfy (32)(i),(ii) (by (14),(15)).

Now the desired  $\tau$  is determined in a way close to that of determining  $\alpha$  in Section 3. More precisely, letting  $Z_s = \{v \in V : \text{dist}_\ell(s, v) \leq p/2\}$  for  $s \in T$ , form the sequence  $0 = \pi_0 < \pi_1 < \dots < \pi_k = p/2$  of all different values among  $\text{dist}_\ell(s, v)$  ( $s \in T, v \in Z_s$ ) and  $p/2$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$  define  $K^i = \{Y_s^i : s \in T\}$  by

$$Y_s^i = \{v \in V : \text{dist}_\ell(s, v) < \pi_i\}.$$

Obviously,  $s \in Y_s^i$ , and for any distinct  $s, t \in T$  the sets  $Y_s^i$  and  $Y_t^i$  are disjoint; so  $K^i$  is a  $T$ -kernel family. Now putting  $\tau_{K^i} = \pi_i - \pi_{i-1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , and  $\tau_K = 0$  for the other  $T$ -kernel families, we get  $\tau$  that satisfies (31)(ii) and (32)(iii),(iv). Indeed, arguing as in the proof of the Claim from the previous section, we observe that, for a fixed  $i$ , every path  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  from  $s$  to  $t$  traverses only cuts  $\delta Y_s^i$  and  $\delta Y_t^i$ , each being traversed at exactly one edge. Hence,  $|B \cap Y_s^i| = |\{P \in \mathcal{P} : s \in e_P\}|$  for each  $s \in T$ , whence (32)(iii) follows. Also we observe that  $\hat{\tau}_e = \ell_e$  if  $e$  belongs to a  $T$ -path  $P$  with  $\ell(P) = p$ , and  $\hat{\tau}_e \leq \ell_e$  otherwise; whence (31)(ii) and (32)(iv) follow.

## 5. Open problems

Theorem 1 shows the integrality of every vertex of the polyhedron  $D' = D'(G, T, d)$  that remains a vertex in  $D' + \mathbb{R}_+^E$ . These vertices are exactly the incidence vectors of  $T, d$ -joins. An open question: is it true that *all* vertices of  $D'$  are integral? Clearly the answer is affirmative if and only if problem (6) has an integer optimal solution for any objective function  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (then the set of vertices of  $D'$  is exactly the set of incidence vectors of  $B \subseteq E$  such that  $B$  contains a  $T, d$ -join  $B'$  and the graph  $(V, B - B')$  is eulerian, by Statement 2.1).

Note that Theorem 3 (as well as the algorithm in [9]) concerns only a nonnegative  $w$ , and nothing is at present known for the case of an arbitrary  $w$ , which is crucial for

studying the vertices of  $D'$ . The minimum (arbitrary) weight  $T, d$ -join problem with  $d \neq \mathbb{I}$  seems to be more sophisticated than the same problem for  $T$ -joins. It is well-known (see [11]) that if  $B$  is a  $T$ -join and  $B'$  is a  $T'$ -join then  $B\Delta B'$  contains a  $T\Delta T'$ -join, and that this property provides a simple reduction of the minimum (arbitrary) weight  $T$ -join problem to its nonnegative version ( $S\Delta S'$  denotes the symmetric difference  $(S - S') \cup (S' - S)$ ). A similar property does not remain, in general, true for an arbitrary  $d$ ; there is a simple example with  $T = \{s_1, s_2\}$ ,  $d_{s_1} = d_{s_2} = 2$  and  $T' = \{s_3, s_4\}$  that shows that for some  $T, d$ -join  $B$  and  $T'$ -join  $B'$ , the set  $B\Delta B'$  contains no  $T'', d''$ -join, where  $T'' = \{s_1, \dots, s_4\}$ ,  $d_{s_i} = 2$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $d_{s_i} = 1$  for  $i = 3, 4$ .

A similar question concerning the integrality of the vertices of the polyhedron  $Q'$  (related to the maximum multi-joins) is also open.

Another interesting open problem is to describe the dominant polyhedra  $D$  and  $Q$  via systems of linear inequalities rather than the Minkowsky sums as above. Can it be done explicitly? (To compare: the perfect matching polytop of a graph has a "good" description via inequalities [4], but arguments in [2] make it unlikely that such a description exists for the corresponding dominant polyhedron.)

## References

- [1] Cherkassky, B.V.: A solution of a problem of multicommodity flows in a network. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody* **13** (1)(1977) 143-151 (Russian).
- [2] Cunningham, W., Green-Krotki, J.: Dominants and submissives of matching polyhedra. *Mathematical Programming* **36** (1986) 228-237.
- [3] Edmonds, J.: The Chinese postman problem. *Oper. Research* **13** Suppl. (1) (1965), p. 373.
- [4] Edmonds, J.: Maximum matching and polyhedra with (0,1) vertices. *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B* **69B** (1965) 125-130.
- [5] Edmonds, J., Johnson, E.L.: Matchings, Euler tours and Chinese postman. *Math. Programming* **5** (1973) 88-124.
- [6] Fulkerson, D.R.: Blocking polyhedra. In: Harris, B. (ed.) *Graph theory and its applications*, Acad. Press, NY, 1970, pp. 93-112.
- [7] Grötschel, M., Lovász, L., and Schrijver, A.: *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization* (Springer Verlag, 1988).
- [8] Guan, M.: Graphic programming using odd or even points. *Chinese Mathematics* **1** (1962) 273-277.

- [9] Karzanov, A.V.: Edge-disjoint  $T$ -paths of minimum total cost. *Report No. STAN-CS-92-1465*, Stanford Univ., Stanford, 1993, 66p.
- [10] Lovász, L.: 2-matchings and 2-covers of hypergraphs. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **26** (1975) 433-444.
- [11] Lovász, L. and Plummer, M.D.: *Matching Theory* (Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1986).
- [12] Seymour, P.D.: On multi-colouring of cubic graphs, and conjectures of Fulkerson and Tutte. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, Ser.3 **38** (1979) 423-460.
- [13] Seymour, P.D.: On odd cuts and planar multicommodity flows. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, Ser.3 **42** (1981) 178-192.