# Homework 4

Algorithms on Directed Graphs, Winter 2018/9

Due: 23.11.2018 by 16:00

### 1 Disjoint Paths and k-linkage

In this note we consider two related problems on directed graphs: disjoint paths, and k-linkage. In the following sections, we describe three reductions with implications for the computational complexity of disjoint paths and k-linkage.

Let G = (V(G), E(G)) be a directed graph, and let  $A, B \subseteq V(G)$  be disjoint subsets with |A| = |B| = k. For concreteness we write

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$$
 and  $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k\}$ 

We say that (G, A, B) satisfies the **disjoint paths property** if there exist k pair-wise vertex disjoint directed paths  $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_k$  such that the first vertex of each  $P_i$  is in A and the last vertex of each  $P_i$  is in B. We say that the paths  $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_k$  form a k-linkage if additionally for each  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ ,  $P_i$  is a path from  $a_i$  to  $b_i$ . If such a family of paths exist, we say that (G, A, B) satisfies the k-linkage property.

### 2 Reducing Disjoint Paths to Max Flow/Min Cut

We describe a reduction from disjoint paths to the max flow/min cut problem. Let (G, A, B) be an instance of the disjoint paths problem. We construct the graph G' as follows. The vertex set V(G') contains vertices as follows:

- For each  $a_i \in A$  and  $b_i \in B$ ,  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $a_i, b_i \in V(G')$ .
- For each  $v \in V(G) \setminus (A \cup B)$ , there are two vertices  $v', v'' \in V(G')$ .
- There are two additional vertices  $s, t \in V(G')$ .

The edge set of G' and edge capacities are constructed as follows:

• For each  $a_i \in A$ ,  $b_i \in B$ , we have  $(s, a_i), (b_i, t) \in E(G')$  with  $c((s, a_i)) = c((b_i, t)) = 1$ .

- For each  $v \in V(G) \setminus (A \cup B), (v', v'') \in E(G')$  with c((v', v'')) = 1
- For each  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  we have

$$-(u'',v') \in E(G') \text{ if } u, v \notin A \cup B$$

- $(u, v') \in E(G')$  if  $u \in A, v \notin A \cup B$
- $-(u'',v) \in E(G')$  if  $u \notin A \cup B, v \in B$
- $-(u,v) \in E(G')$  if  $u \in A, v \in B$ .

The capacities of all edges above are  $\infty$ .

There are no other edges in E(G'). In particular, G' does not contain any edges of the form (u, a) for  $a \in A$ ,  $u \neq s$ , nor does it contain edges of the form (b, w) for  $w \neq t$ .

**Exercise 1.** Prove that the graph G' constructed above has max flow/min cut value of k if and only if (G, A, B) satisfies the disjoint paths property.

**Exercise 2.** Use the construction above and the max flow/min cut theorem to prove Menger's theorem: the size of the minimum vertex  $\operatorname{cut}^1$  separating A and B is equal to the number of vertex-disjoint paths between A and B.

### **3** Reducing 3-SAT to *k*-linkage

Let  $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$  be Boolean variables, and let  $\Phi$  be a 3-CNF formula over  $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ . That is,

$$\Phi = \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_m,$$

where each  $\phi_i$  is of the form

$$\phi_j = y_j^1 \vee y_j^2 \vee y_j^3$$

and each  $y_j^{\ell}$  is a literal (equal to some  $x_i$  or its negation  $\neg x_i$ ). The 3-SAT problem is to determine if there exists an assignment of the  $x_i$  to true or false such that  $\Phi$  evaluates to true—in this case we say that  $\Phi$  is *satisfiable*. 3-SAT is one of the classical NP-complete problems.

Given a 3-CNF formula  $\Phi$  as above, we construct a directed acyclic graph  $G = G(\Phi)$  such that G satisfies the k-linkage property if and only if  $\Phi$  is satisfiable. We build the graph G as follows.

• For each literal  $x_i$ , V(G) contains two vertices  $s_i, t_i$  along with two vertex-disjoint paths from  $s_i$  to  $t_i$ . We label the two paths by  $T_i$  and  $F_i$  respectively. Initially  $T_i$  and  $F_i$  each consists of a single edge from  $s_i$  to  $t_i$ , but the edges will be sub-divided as the construction proceeds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>A *vertex cut* separating A and B is a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  such that removing the vertices in X from G disconnects  $A \setminus X$  and  $B \setminus X$ . In particular, the cuts X = A and X = Bseparate A and B, so that a min cut has size at most k.

- For each clause  $\phi_j$  in  $\Phi$ , V(G) contains two vertices  $u_j$  and  $w_j$  along with three vertex-disjoint paths from  $u_j$  to  $w_j$ . The paths correspond to the three literals in  $\phi_j$ . For each literal y in  $\phi_j$ :
  - if  $y = x_i$  appears as a positive literal in  $\phi_j$ , subdivide the path  $F_i$  by adding a new vertex v to this path (between  $s_i$  and  $t_i$ ),
  - if  $y = \neg x_i$  appears as a negative literal in  $\phi_j$ , subdivide the path  $T_i$  by adding a new vertex v to this path.

Then add the edges  $(u_j, v)$  and  $(v, w_j)$  to E(G) so that they form a path from  $u_j$  to  $w_j$ .

**Exercise 3.** For the graph G constructed as above, prove that there exists a k-linkage from  $A = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\} \cup \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\}$  to  $B = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n\} \cup \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_m\}$  (k = n + m) if and only if  $\Phi$  is satisfiable.

## 4 Reducing k-linkage for DAGs to Connectivity

Let G be a directed acyclic graph (DAG), and let  $A, B \subseteq V(G)$  with  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  and |A| = |B| = k. Without loss of generality, we assume that there are no edges of the form (u, a) for  $a \in A$ , nor any edges of the form (b, w) for  $b \in B$ .<sup>2</sup> We construct a graph G' from G in the following manner. The vertex set V(G') is the the set of k-tuples of pair-wise distinct vertices in G:

$$V(G') = \{ (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) \mid v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \in V(G), i \neq j \implies v_i \neq v_j \}.$$

The edge set E(G') is defined as follows. Since G is a DAG, for every  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k) \in V(G')$ , there is some index r such that  $v_r$  is not reachable from any of the other  $v_i$   $(i \neq r)$ . That is, there is no directed path from any  $v_i$  to  $v_r$ . For this index r (choosing one arbitrarily if there is more than one), and each edge  $(v_r, w) \in E(G)$  with  $w \neq v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ , we add the edge  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_r(w)) \in E(G')$  where  $\mathbf{v}_r(w)$  is  $\mathbf{v}$  with  $v_r$  replaced by w:

$$\mathbf{v}_r(w) = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{r-1}, w, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_k).$$

We will first show that if G' contains a directed path P' from  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k)$  to  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k)$ , then G contains a k-linkage from A to B. To this end, suppose P' consists of vertices

$$\mathbf{v}_1(=\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_\ell, \mathbf{v}_{\ell+1}(=\mathbf{b}).$$

From the definition of G', for each edge  $(\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$  along P', there is a unique index  $r_j$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_j$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{j+1}$  differ only in the entry with index  $r_j$ . Let  $u_j$  and  $w_j$  denote the  $r_j$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{v}_j$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{j+1}$ , respectively. Further, by the definition of E(G'), we must have  $(u_j, w_j) \in E(G)$ . If  $r_j = i$ , we call  $(u_j, w_j)$  an *i*-edge.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>No edge of the form (u, a) or (b, w) can appear in any k-linkage, so removing such edges will not change whether or not G satisfies the k-linkage property.

**Claim.** The set of *i*-edges induced by P' forms a path  $P_i$  from  $a_i$  to  $b_i$  in G.

To see the claim, consider a fixed *i*, and let consider the *i*-edges in the order that they appear in P'. Consider the first *i*-edge  $(u_j, w_j)$ , and let  $(\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_{j+1})$  be the corresponding edge in P'. Since this the first *i*-edge, the *i*-th entry of  $\mathbf{v}_j$  is the same as the *i*-th entry of  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{a}$ . Therefore,  $u_j = a_i$ , so the first *i*-edge is an edge out of  $a_i$ :  $(a_i, w_j)$ . Similarly, the next *i*-edge is an edge from  $w_j$  to some other vertex. Continuing in this way, *i*-edges form a path from  $a_i$ . Since the final vertex in P' is  $\mathbf{v}_{\ell+1} = \mathbf{b}$ , the final *i*-edge in P' must change the *i*-th entry of the corresponding  $\mathbf{v}_j$  to  $b_i$ , so that  $P_i$  does indeed terminate at  $b_i$ .

By the claim, the path P' induces k paths  $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_k$  where each  $P_i$  is a path from  $a_i$  to  $b_i$ . We now show that the  $P_i$  are pair-wise vertex disjoint, thus forming a k-linkage from A to B. To this end, suppose towards a contradiction that there exist  $i \neq j$  and a vertex w appearing in both  $P_i$  and  $P_j$ . Let  $u_i$  denote the vertex before w in  $P_i$  and let  $u_j$  denote the vertex before w in  $P_i$  and let  $u_j$  denote the vertex before w in  $P_j$ . Thus  $(u_i, w)$  is and *i*-edge and  $(u_j, w)$  is a *j*-edge. Suppose the edges in P' corresponding to  $(u_i, w)$  and  $(u_j, w)$  are the  $t_i$ -th and  $t_j$ -th edges respectively. Assume without loss of generality that  $t_i < t_j$ . Let  $u'_j$  be the *j*-th entry of  $\mathbf{v}_{t_i}$ —i.e.,  $u'_j$  is the *j*-th entry of  $\mathbf{v}$  when the *i*-edge  $(u_i, w)$  appears in P'.

Observe that *j*-edges induced by the sub-path  $\mathbf{v}_{t_i}, \mathbf{v}_{t_i+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{t_j}$  of P' form a path from  $u'_j$  to  $u_j$  (and then to w). Thus, w is reachable from  $u'_j$  in G. Therefore (by the definition of G') the *i*-th entry of  $\mathbf{v}_{t_j}$  cannot have changed from w in this sub-path. But this implies that in  $\mathbf{v}_{t_j}$ , both the *i*-th and *j*-th entries are equal to w, contradicting the definition of G'! Therefore, the paths  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  do not intersect, as desired.

**Exercise 4.** Assume (without loss of generality) that G does not contain edges of the form (u, a) for  $a \in A$ , nor any edges (b, w) for  $b \in B$ . Prove that if G contains a k linkage from A to B, then there exists a path P' in G' from  $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k)$  to  $(b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k)$ .