Part V

Matchings

Matching

- Input: undirected graph $G = (V, E)$.
- $M \subseteq E$ is a matching if each node appears in at most one edge in M.
- Maximum Matching: find a matching of maximum cardinality



16 Bipartite Matching via Flows

Which flow algorithm to use?

- Generic augmenting path: $\mathcal{O}(m \operatorname{val}(f^*)) = \mathcal{O}(mn)$.
- Capacity scaling: $\mathcal{O}(m^2 \log C) = \mathcal{O}(m^2)$.
- Shortest augmenting path: $\mathcal{O}(mn^2)$.

For unit capacity simple graphs shortest augmenting path can be implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(m\sqrt{n})$.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Definitions.

- Given a matching M in a graph G, a vertex that is not incident to any edge of M is called a free vertex w. r. .t. M.
- For a matching M a path P in G is called an alternating path if edges in M alternate with edges not in M.
- An alternating path is called an augmenting path for matching M if it ends at distinct free vertices.

Theorem 1

A matching M is a maximum matching if and only if there is no augmenting path w. r. t. M.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Definitions.

- Given a matching M in a graph G, a vertex that is not incident to any edge of M is called a free vertex w. r. .t. M.
- For a matching M a path P in G is called an alternating path if edges in M alternate with edges not in M.
- An alternating path is called an augmenting path for matching M if it ends at distinct free vertices.

Theorem 1

A matching M is a maximum matching if and only if there is no augmenting path w. r. t. M.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Definitions.

- Given a matching M in a graph G, a vertex that is not incident to any edge of M is called a free vertex w. r. .t. M.
- For a matching M a path P in G is called an alternating path if edges in M alternate with edges not in M.
- An alternating path is called an augmenting path for matching M if it ends at distinct free vertices.

Theorem 1

A matching M is a maximum matching if and only if there is no augmenting path w. r. t. M.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Definitions.

- Given a matching M in a graph G, a vertex that is not incident to any edge of M is called a free vertex w. r. .t. M.
- For a matching M a path P in G is called an alternating path if edges in M alternate with edges not in M.
- An alternating path is called an augmenting path for matching M if it ends at distinct free vertices.

Theorem 1

A matching M is a maximum matching if and only if there is no augmenting path w. r. t. M.

Augmenting Paths in Action



Augmenting Paths in Action



Augmenting Paths in Action



Augmenting Paths in Action



Augmenting Paths in Action



Augmenting Paths in Action



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof.

$\Rightarrow$ If M is maximum there is no augmenting path P, because we could switch matching and non-matching edges along P. This gives matching $M' = M \oplus P$ with larger cardinality.

$\Leftarrow$ Suppose there is a matching M' with larger cardinality. Consider the graph H with edge-set $M' \oplus M$ (i.e., only edges that are in either M or M' but not in both).

Each vertex can be incident to at most two edges (one from M and one from M'). Hence, the connected components are alternating cycles or alternating path.

As $|M'| > |M|$ there is one connected component that is a path P for which both endpoints are incident to edges from M'. P is an alternating path.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof.

- ⇒ If M is maximum there is no augmenting path P, because we could switch matching and non-matching edges along P. This gives matching $M' = M \oplus P$ with larger cardinality.
- ⇐ Suppose there is a matching M' with larger cardinality. Consider the graph H with edge-set $M' \oplus M$ (i.e., only edges that are in either M or M' but not in both).

Each vertex can be incident to at most two edges (one from M and one from M'). Hence, the connected components are alternating cycles or alternating path.

As $|M'| > |M|$ there is one connected component that is a path P for which both endpoints are incident to edges from M'. P is an alternating path.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof.

- ⇒ If M is maximum there is no augmenting path P, because we could switch matching and non-matching edges along P. This gives matching $M' = M \oplus P$ with larger cardinality.
- ⇐ Suppose there is a matching M' with larger cardinality. Consider the graph H with edge-set $M' \oplus M$ (i.e., only edges that are in either M or M' but not in both).

  Each vertex can be incident to at most two edges (one from M and one from M'). Hence, the connected components are alternating cycles or alternating path.

  As $|M'| > |M|$ there is one connected component that is a path P for which both endpoints are incident to edges from M'. P is an alternating path.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof.

- $\Rightarrow$ If M is maximum there is no augmenting path P, because we could switch matching and non-matching edges along P. This gives matching $M' = M \oplus P$ with larger cardinality.
- $\Leftarrow$ Suppose there is a matching M' with larger cardinality. Consider the graph H with edge-set $M' \oplus M$ (i.e., only edges that are in either M or M' but not in both).

  Each vertex can be incident to at most two edges (one from M and one from M'). Hence, the connected components are alternating cycles or alternating path.

  As $|M'| > |M|$ there is one connected component that is a path P for which both endpoints are incident to edges from M'. P is an alternating path.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Algorithmic idea:
As long as you find an augmenting path augment your matching using this path. When you arrive at a matching for which no augmenting path exists you have a maximum matching.

Theorem 2
Let G be a graph, M a matching in G, and let u be a free vertex w.r.t. M. Further let P denote an augmenting path w.r.t. M and let $M' = M \oplus P$ denote the matching resulting from augmenting M with P. If there was no augmenting path starting at u in M then there is no augmenting path starting at u in M'.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Algorithmic idea:
As long as you find an augmenting path augment your matching using this path. When you arrive at a matching for which no augmenting path exists you have a maximum matching.

Theorem 2

Let G be a graph, M a matching in G, and let u be a free vertex w.r.t. M. Further let P denote an augmenting path w.r.t. M and let $M' = M \oplus P$ denote the matching resulting from augmenting M with P. If there was no augmenting path starting at u in M then there is no augmenting path starting at u in M'.

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.
- u' splits P into two parts one of which does not contain e. Call this part P_1. Denote the sub-path of P' from u to u' with P_1'.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.
- u' splits P into two parts one of which does not contain e. Call this part P_1. Denote the sub-path of P' from u to u' with P'_1.



17 Augmenting Paths for Matchings

Proof

- Assume there is an augmenting path P' w.r.t. M' starting at u.
- If P' and P are node-disjoint, P' is also augmenting path w.r.t. M (↯).
- Let u' be the first node on P' that is in P, and let e be the matching edge from M' incident to u'.
- u' splits P into two parts one of which does not contain e. Call this part P_1. Denote the sub-path of P' from u to u' with P'_1.
- $P_1 \circ P'_1$ is augmenting path in M (↯).



How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 1:

y is free vertex not contained in T

you found alternating path

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 2:

y is matched vertex not in T; then $\text{mate}[y] \notin T$

grow the tree

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 3:

y is already contained in T as an odd vertex

ignore successor y

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 4:

y is already contained in T as an even vertex

can't ignore y

does not happen in bipartite graphs

Algorithm 24 BiMatch($G, match$)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

graph $G = (S \cup S', E)$

$S = \{1, \ldots, n\}$

$S' = \{1', \ldots, n'\}$

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

start with an
empty matching

Algorithm 24 BiMatch($G, match$)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

free: number of unmatched nodes in S

r: root of current tree

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

as long as there are unmatched nodes and we did not yet try to grow from all nodes we continue

Algorithm 24 BiMatch($G, match$)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

r is the new node that we grow from.

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

If r is free start tree construction

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

Initialize an empty tree.
Note that only nodes i' have parent pointers.

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

Q is a queue (BFS!!!).

aug is a Boolean that stores whether we already found an augmenting path.

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

as long as we did not augment and there are still unexamined leaves continue...

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

take next unexamined leaf

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

if x has unmatched neighbour we found an augmenting path (note that $y \neq r$ because we are in a bipartite graph)

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

do an augmentation...

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

setting $aug = \text{true}$ ensures that the tree construction will not continue

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

reduce number of free nodes

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

if y is not in the tree yet

Algorithm 24 BiMatch$(G, match)$

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n  do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0  then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅  do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0  then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0  then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

...put it into the tree

Algorithm 24 BiMatch(G, *match*)

```
 1: for x ∈ V do mate[x] ← 0;
 2: r ← 0; free ← n;
 3: while free ≥ 1 and r < n do
 4:     r ← r + 1
 5:     if mate[r] = 0 then
 6:         for i = 1 to n do parent[i'] ← 0
 7:         Q ← ∅; Q.append(r); aug ← false;
 8:         while aug = false and Q ≠ ∅ do
 9:             x ← Q.dequeue();
10:             for y ∈ A_x do
11:                 if mate[y] = 0 then
12:                     augm(mate, parent, y);
13:                     aug ← true;
14:                     free ← free − 1;
15:                 else
16:                     if parent[y] = 0 then
17:                         parent[y] ← x;
18:                         Q.enqueue(mate[y]);
```

add its buddy to the set of unexamined leaves

18 Weighted Bipartite Matching

Weighted Bipartite Matching/Assignment

- Input: undirected, bipartite graph $G = L \cup R, E$.
- an edge $e = (\ell, r)$ has weight $w_e \geq 0$
- find a matching of maximum weight, where the weight of a matching is the sum of the weights of its edges

Simplifying Assumptions (wlog [why?]):

- assume that $|L| = |R| = n$
- assume that there is an edge between every pair of nodes $(\ell, r) \in V \times V$
- can assume goal is to construct maximum weight perfect matching

Weighted Bipartite Matching

Theorem 3 (Halls Theorem)

A bipartite graph $G = (L \cup R, E)$ has a perfect matching if and only if for all sets $S \subseteq L$, $|\Gamma(S)| \geq |S|$, where $\Gamma(S)$ denotes the set of nodes in R that have a neighbour in S.

18 Weighted Bipartite Matching



Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Halls Theorem

Proof:

- $\Leftarrow$ Of course, the condition is necessary as otherwise not all nodes in S could be matched to different neigbhours.
- $\Rightarrow$ For the other direction we need to argue that the minimum cut in the graph G' is at least $|L|$.
  - Let S denote a minimum cut and let $L_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L \cap S$ and $R_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cap S$ denote the portion of S inside L and R, respectively.
  - Clearly, all neighbours of nodes in L_S have to be in S, as otherwise we would cut an edge of infinite capacity.
  - This gives $R_S \geq |\Gamma(L_S)|$.
  - The size of the cut is $|L| - |L_S| + |R_S|$.
  - Using the fact that $|\Gamma(L_S)| \geq L_S$ gives that this is at least $|L|$.

Algorithm Outline

Idea:

We introduce a node weighting $\vec{x}$. Let for a node $v \in V$, $x_v \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the weight of node v.

- Suppose that the node weights dominate the edge weights in the following sense:
- Let $G_{\vec{x}}$ denote the subgraph of G that only contains edges that are tight w.r.t. the node weighting $\vec{x}$, i.e., edges for which $x_u + x_v = w(u,v)$.
- Try to compute a perfect matching in the subgraph $G_{\vec{x}}$. If you are successful you found an optimal matching.

Algorithm Outline

Idea:

We introduce a node weighting $\vec{x}$. Let for a node $v \in V$, $x_v \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the weight of node v.

- Suppose that the node weights dominate the edge-weights in the following sense:

$$x_u + x_v \geq w_e \text{ for every edge } e = (u, v).$$

- Let $H(\vec{x})$ denote the subgraph of G that only contains edges that are tight w.r.t. the node weighting $\vec{x}$, i.e. edges $e = (u, v)$ for which $w_e = x_u + x_v$.
- Try to compute a perfect matching in the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$. If you are successful you found an optimal matching.

Algorithm Outline

Idea:

We introduce a node weighting $\vec{x}$. Let for a node $v \in V$, $x_v \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the weight of node v.

- Suppose that the node weights dominate the edge-weights in the following sense:

$$x_u + x_v \geq w_e \text{ for every edge } e = (u, v).$$

- Let $H(\vec{x})$ denote the subgraph of G that only contains edges that are tight w.r.t. the node weighting $\vec{x}$, i.e. edges $e = (u, v)$ for which $w_e = x_u + x_v$.
- Try to compute a perfect matching in the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$. If you are successful you found an optimal matching.

Algorithm Outline

Idea:

We introduce a node weighting $\vec{x}$. Let for a node $v \in V$, $x_v \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the weight of node v.

- Suppose that the node weights dominate the edge-weights in the following sense:

$$x_u + x_v \geq w_e \text{ for every edge } e = (u, v).$$

- Let $H(\vec{x})$ denote the subgraph of G that only contains edges that are tight w.r.t. the node weighting $\vec{x}$, i.e. edges $e = (u, v)$ for which $w_e = x_u + x_v$.
- Try to compute a perfect matching in the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$. If you are successful you found an optimal matching.

Algorithm Outline

Reason:

- The weight of your matching M^* is

$$\sum_{(u,v)\in M^*} w_{(u,v)} = \sum_{(u,v)\in M^*} (x_u + x_v) = \sum_v x_v \ .$$

- Any other perfect matching M (in G, not necessarily in $H(\vec{x})$) has

$$\sum_{(u,v)\in M} w_{(u,v)} \leq \sum_{(u,v)\in M} (x_u + x_v) = \sum_v x_v \ .$$

Algorithm Outline

What if you don't find a perfect matching?

Then, Halls theorem guarantees you that there is a set $S \subseteq L$, with $|\Gamma(S)| < |S|$, where Γ denotes the neighbourhood w.r.t. the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$.

Idea: reweight such that:

- the total weight assigned to nodes decreases
- the weight function still dominates the edge-weights

If we can do this we have an algorithm that terminates with an optimal solution (we analyze the running time later).

Algorithm Outline

What if you don't find a perfect matching?

Then, Halls theorem guarantees you that there is a set $S \subseteq L$, with $|\Gamma(S)| < |S|$, where Γ denotes the neighbourhood w.r.t. the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$.

Idea: reweight such that:

- the total weight assigned to nodes decreases
- the weight function still dominates the edge-weights

If we can do this we have an algorithm that terminates with an optimal solution (we analyze the running time later).

Algorithm Outline

What if you don't find a perfect matching?

Then, Halls theorem guarantees you that there is a set $S \subseteq L$, with $|\Gamma(S)| < |S|$, where Γ denotes the neighbourhood w.r.t. the subgraph $H(\vec{x})$.

Idea: reweight such that:

- the total weight assigned to nodes decreases
- the weight function still dominates the edge-weights

If we can do this we have an algorithm that terminates with an optimal solution (we analyze the running time later).

Changing Node Weights

Increase node-weights in $\Gamma(S)$ by $+\delta$, and decrease the node-weights in S by $-\delta$.

- Total node-weight decreases.
- Only edges from S to $R - \Gamma(S)$ decrease in their weight.
- Since, none of these edges is tight (otw. the edge would be contained in $H(\vec{x})$, and hence would go between S and $\Gamma(S)$) we can do this decrement for small enough $\delta > 0$ until a new edge gets tight.



Changing Node Weights

Increase node-weights in $\Gamma(S)$ by $+\delta$, and decrease the node-weights in S by $-\delta$.

- Total node-weight decreases.
- Only edges from S to $R - \Gamma(S)$ decrease in their weight.
- Since, none of these edges is tight (otw. the edge would be contained in $H(\vec{x})$, and hence would go between S and $\Gamma(S)$) we can do this decrement for small enough $\delta > 0$ until a new edge gets tight.



Changing Node Weights

Increase node-weights in $\Gamma(S)$ by $+\delta$, and decrease the node-weights in S by $-\delta$.

- Total node-weight decreases.
- Only edges from S to $R - \Gamma(S)$ decrease in their weight.
- Since, none of these edges is tight (otw. the edge would be contained in $H(\vec{x})$, and hence would go between S and $\Gamma(S)$) we can do this decrement for small enough $\delta > 0$ until a new edge gets tight.



Changing Node Weights

Increase node-weights in $\Gamma(S)$ by $+\delta$, and decrease the node-weights in S by $-\delta$.

- Total node-weight decreases.
- Only edges from S to $R - \Gamma(S)$ decrease in their weight.
- Since, none of these edges is tight (otw. the edge would be contained in $H(\vec{x})$, and hence would go between S and $\Gamma(S)$) we can do this decrement for small enough $\delta > 0$ until a new edge gets tight.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.

$\delta = 1$



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.

$\delta = 1$



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Weighted Bipartite Matching

Edges not drawn have weight 0.



Analysis

How many iterations do we need?

- One reweighting step increases the number of edges out of S by at least one.
- Assume that we have a maximum matching that saturates the set $\Gamma(S)$, in the sense that every node in $\Gamma(S)$ is matched to a node in S (we will show that we can always find S and a matching such that this holds).
- This matching is still contained in the new graph, because all its edges either go between $\Gamma(S)$ and S or between $L - S$ and $R - \Gamma(S)$.
- Hence, reweighting does not decrease the size of a maximum matching in the tight sub-graph.

Analysis

How many iterations do we need?

- One reweighting step increases the number of edges out of S by at least one.
- Assume that we have a maximum matching that saturates the set $\Gamma(S)$, in the sense that every node in $\Gamma(S)$ is matched to a node in S (we will show that we can always find S and a matching such that this holds).
- This matching is still contained in the new graph, because all its edges either go between $\Gamma(S)$ and S or between $L - S$ and $R - \Gamma(S)$.
- Hence, reweighting does not decrease the size of a maximum matching in the tight sub-graph.

Analysis

How many iterations do we need?

- One reweighting step increases the number of edges out of S by at least one.
- Assume that we have a maximum matching that saturates the set $\Gamma(S)$, in the sense that every node in $\Gamma(S)$ is matched to a node in S (we will show that we can always find S and a matching such that this holds).
- This matching is still contained in the new graph, because all its edges either go between $\Gamma(S)$ and S or between $L - S$ and $R - \Gamma(S)$.
- Hence, reweighting does not decrease the size of a maximum matching in the tight sub-graph.

Analysis

How many iterations do we need?

- One reweighting step increases the number of edges out of S by at least one.
- Assume that we have a maximum matching that saturates the set $\Gamma(S)$, in the sense that every node in $\Gamma(S)$ is matched to a node in S (we will show that we can always find S and a matching such that this holds).
- This matching is still contained in the new graph, because all its edges either go between $\Gamma(S)$ and S or between $L - S$ and $R - \Gamma(S)$.
- Hence, reweighting does not decrease the size of a maximum matching in the tight sub-graph.

Analysis

- We will show that after at most n reweighting steps the size of the maximum matching can be increased by finding an augmenting path.
- This gives a polynomial running time.

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



Analysis

How do we find S?

- Start on the left and compute an alternating tree, starting at any free node u.
- If this construction stops, there is no perfect matching in the tight subgraph (because for a perfect matching we need to find an augmenting path starting at u).
- The set of even vertices is on the left and the set of odd vertices is on the right and contains all neighbours of even nodes.
- All odd vertices are matched to even vertices. Furthermore, the even vertices additionally contain the free vertex u. Hence, $|V_{\text{odd}}| = |\Gamma(V_{\text{even}})| < |V_{\text{even}}|$, and all odd vertices are saturated in the current matching.

Analysis

How do we find S?

- Start on the left and compute an alternating tree, starting at any free node u.
- If this construction stops, there is no perfect matching in the tight subgraph (because for a perfect matching we need to find an augmenting path starting at u).
- The set of even vertices is on the left and the set of odd vertices is on the right and contains all neighbours of even nodes.
- All odd vertices are matched to even vertices. Furthermore, the even vertices additionally contain the free vertex u. Hence, $|V_{\text{odd}}| = |\Gamma(V_{\text{even}})| < |V_{\text{even}}|$, and all odd vertices are saturated in the current matching.

Analysis

How do we find S?

- Start on the left and compute an alternating tree, starting at any free node u.
- If this construction stops, there is no perfect matching in the tight subgraph (because for a perfect matching we need to find an augmenting path starting at u).
- The set of even vertices is on the left and the set of odd vertices is on the right and contains all neighbours of even nodes.
- All odd vertices are matched to even vertices. Furthermore, the even vertices additionally contain the free vertex u. Hence, $|V_{\text{odd}}| = |\Gamma(V_{\text{even}})| < |V_{\text{even}}|$, and all odd vertices are saturated in the current matching.

Analysis

How do we find S?

- Start on the left and compute an alternating tree, starting at any free node u.
- If this construction stops, there is no perfect matching in the tight subgraph (because for a perfect matching we need to find an augmenting path starting at u).
- The set of even vertices is on the left and the set of odd vertices is on the right and contains all neighbours of even nodes.
- All odd vertices are matched to even vertices. Furthermore, the even vertices additionally contain the free vertex u. Hence, $|V_{\text{odd}}| = |\Gamma(V_{\text{even}})| < |V_{\text{even}}|$, and all odd vertices are saturated in the current matching.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

Analysis

- The current matching does not have any edges from V_{odd} to $L \setminus V_{\text{even}}$ (edges that may possibly be deleted by changing weights).
- After changing weights, there is at least one more edge connecting V_{even} to a node outside of V_{odd}. After at most n reweights we can do an augmentation.
- A reweighting can be trivially performed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ (keeping track of the tight edges).
- An augmentation takes at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.
- In total we obtain a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.
- A more careful implementation of the algorithm obtains a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 4:

y is already contained in T as an even vertex

can't ignore y

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 4:

y is already contained in T as an even vertex

can't ignore y

How to find an augmenting path?

Construct an alternating tree.



even nodes

odd nodes

Case 4:

y is already contained in T as an even vertex

can't ignore y

The cycle $w \leftrightarrow y - x \leftrightarrow w$ is called a blossom.
w is called the base of the blossom (even node!!!).
The path u-w is called the stem of the blossom.

Flowers and Blossoms

Definition 4

A flower in a graph $G = (V, E)$ w.r.t. a matching M and a (free) root node r, is a subgraph with two components:

- A stem is an even length alternating path that starts at the root node r and terminates at some node w. We permit the possibility that $r = w$ (empty stem).
- A blossom is an odd length alternating cycle that starts and terminates at the terminal node w of a stem and has no other node in common with the stem. w is called the base of the blossom.

Flowers and Blossoms

Definition 4

A flower in a graph $G = (V, E)$ w.r.t. a matching M and a (free) root node r, is a subgraph with two components:

- A stem is an even length alternating path that starts at the root node r and terminates at some node w. We permit the possibility that $r = w$ (empty stem).
- A blossom is an odd length alternating cycle that starts and terminates at the terminal node w of a stem and has no other node in common with the stem. w is called the base of the blossom.

Flowers and Blossoms

Definition 4

A flower in a graph $G = (V, E)$ w.r.t. a matching M and a (free) root node r, is a subgraph with two components:

- A stem is an even length alternating path that starts at the root node r and terminates at some node w. We permit the possibility that $r = w$ (empty stem).
- A blossom is an odd length alternating cycle that starts and terminates at the terminal node w of a stem and has no other node in common with the stem. w is called the base of the blossom.

Flowers and Blossoms



Flowers and Blossoms

Properties:

1. A stem spans $2\ell + 1$ nodes and contains ℓ matched edges for some integer $\ell \geq 0$.
2. A blossom spans $2k + 1$ nodes and contains k matched edges for some integer $k \geq 1$. The matched edges match all nodes of the blossom except the base.
3. The base of a blossom is an even node (if the stem is part of an alternating tree starting at r).

Flowers and Blossoms

Properties:

1. A stem spans $2\ell + 1$ nodes and contains ℓ matched edges for some integer $\ell \geq 0$.
2. A blossom spans $2k + 1$ nodes and contains k matched edges for some integer $k \geq 1$. The matched edges match all nodes of the blossom except the base.
3. The base of a blossom is an even node (if the stem is part of an alternating tree starting at r).

Flowers and Blossoms

Properties:

1. A stem spans $2\ell + 1$ nodes and contains ℓ matched edges for some integer $\ell \geq 0$.
2. A blossom spans $2k + 1$ nodes and contains k matched edges for some integer $k \geq 1$. The matched edges match all nodes of the blossom except the base.
3. The base of a blossom is an even node (if the stem is part of an alternating tree starting at r).

Flowers and Blossoms

Properties:

4. Every node x in the blossom (except its base) is reachable from the root (or from the base of the blossom) through two distinct alternating paths; one with even and one with odd length.
5. The even alternating path to x terminates with a matched edge and the odd path with an unmatched edge.

Flowers and Blossoms

Properties:

4. Every node x in the blossom (except its base) is reachable from the root (or from the base of the blossom) through two distinct alternating paths; one with even and one with odd length.
5. The even alternating path to x terminates with a matched edge and the odd path with an unmatched edge.

Flowers and Blossoms



Shrinking Blossoms

When during the alternating tree construction we discover a blossom B we replace the graph G by $G' = G/B$, which is obtained from G by contracting the blossom B.

- Delete all vertices in B (and its incident edges) from G.
- Add a new (pseudo-)vertex b. The new vertex b is connected to all vertices in $V \setminus B$ that had at least one edge to a vertex from B.

Shrinking Blossoms

When during the alternating tree construction we discover a blossom B we replace the graph G by $G' = G/B$, which is obtained from G by contracting the blossom B.

- Delete all vertices in B (and its incident edges) from G.
- Add a new (pseudo-)vertex b. The new vertex b is connected to all vertices in $V \setminus B$ that had at least one edge to a vertex from B.

Shrinking Blossoms

When during the alternating tree construction we discover a blossom B we replace the graph G by $G' = G/B$, which is obtained from G by contracting the blossom B.

- Delete all vertices in B (and its incident edges) from G.
- Add a new (pseudo-)vertex b. The new vertex b is connected to all vertices in $V \setminus B$ that had at least one edge to a vertex from B.

Shrinking Blossoms

- Edges of T that connect a node u not in B to a node in B become tree edges in T' connecting u to b.
- Matching edges (there is at most one) that connect a node u not in B to a node in B become matching edges in M'.
- Nodes that are connected in G to at least one node in B become connected to b in G'.



Shrinking Blossoms

- Edges of T that connect a node u not in B to a node in B become tree edges in T' connecting u to b.
- Matching edges (there is at most one) that connect a node u not in B to a node in B become matching edges in M'.
- Nodes that are connected in G to at least one node in B become connected to b in G'.



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Correctness

Assume that in G we have a flower w.r.t. matching M. Let r be the root, B the blossom, and w the base. Let graph $G' = G/B$ with pseudonode b. Let M' be the matching in the contracted graph.

Lemma 5

If G' contains an augmenting path P' starting at r (or the pseudo-node containing r) w.r.t. the matching M' then G contains an augmenting path starting at r w.r.t. matching M.

Correctness

Assume that in G we have a flower w.r.t. matching M. Let r be the root, B the blossom, and w the base. Let graph $G' = G/B$ with pseudonode b. Let M' be the matching in the contracted graph.

Lemma 5

If G' contains an augmenting path P' starting at r (or the pseudo-node containing r) w.r.t. the matching M' then G contains an augmenting path starting at r w.r.t. matching M.

Correctness

Proof.

If P' does not contain b it is also an augmenting path in G.

Correctness

Proof.

If P' does not contain b it is also an augmenting path in G.

Case 1: non-empty stem

- Next suppose that the stem is non-empty.

Correctness

Proof.

If P' does not contain b it is also an augmenting path in G.

Case 1: non-empty stem

- Next suppose that the stem is non-empty.



Correctness

Proof.

If P' does not contain b it is also an augmenting path in G.

Case 1: non-empty stem

- Next suppose that the stem is non-empty.



Correctness

- After the expansion ℓ must be incident to some node in the blossom. Let this node be k.
- If $k \neq w$ there is an alternating path P_2 from w to k that ends in a matching edge.
- $P_1 \circ (i,w) \circ P_2 \circ (k,\ell) \circ P_3$ is an alternating path.
- If $k = w$ then $P_1 \circ (i,w) \circ (w,\ell) \circ P_3$ is an alternating path.

Correctness

Proof.

Case 2: empty stem

- If the stem is empty then after expanding the blossom, $w = r$.

Correctness

Proof.

Case 2: empty stem

- If the stem is empty then after expanding the blossom, $w = r$.



Correctness

Proof.

Case 2: empty stem

- If the stem is empty then after expanding the blossom, $w = r$.



Correctness

Proof.

Case 2: empty stem

- If the stem is empty then after expanding the blossom, $w = r$.



- The path $r \circ P_2 \circ (k, \ell) \circ P_3$ is an alternating path.

Correctness

Lemma 6

If G contains an augmenting path P from r to q w.r.t. matching M then G' contains an augmenting path from r (or the pseudo-node containing r) to q w.r.t. M'.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Proof.

- If P does not contain a node from B there is nothing to prove.
- We can assume that r and q are the only free nodes in G.

Case 1: empty stem

Let i be the last node on the path P that is part of the blossom.

P is of the form $P_1 \circ (i,j) \circ P_2$, for some node j and (i,j) is unmatched.

$(b,j) \circ P_2$ is an augmenting path in the contracted network.

Correctness

Illustration for Case 1:



Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Correctness

Case 2: non-empty stem

Let P_3 be alternating path from r to w; this exists because r and w are root and base of a blossom. Define $M_+ = M \oplus P_3$.

In M_+, r is matched and w is unmatched.

G must contain an augmenting path w.r.t. matching M_+, since M and M_+ have same cardinality.

This path must go between w and q as these are the only unmatched vertices w.r.t. M_+.

For M'_+ the blossom has an empty stem. Case 1 applies.

G' has an augmenting path w.r.t. M'_+. It must also have an augmenting path w.r.t. M', as both matchings have the same cardinality.

This path must go between r and q.

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

Search for an augmenting path
starting at r.

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: *found* $\leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize *list* $\leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** *list* $\neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from *list*
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** *found* = true **then return**

$A(i)$ contains neighbours of node i.

We create a copy $\bar{A}(i)$ so that we later can shrink blossoms.

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

found is just a Boolean that allows
to abort the search process...

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

In the beginning no node is in the tree.

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from *list*
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** *found* = true **then return**

Put the root in the tree.

list could also be a set or a stack.

Algorithm 25 search($r, found$)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine($i, found$)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

As long as there are nodes with unexamined neighbours...

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

...examine the next one

Algorithm 25 search(r, *found*)

1: set $\bar{A}(i) \leftarrow A(i)$ for all nodes i
2: $found \leftarrow$ false
3: unlabel all nodes;
4: give an even label to r and initialize $list \leftarrow \{r\}$
5: **while** $list \neq \emptyset$ **do**
6: delete a node i from $list$
7: examine(i, *found*)
8: **if** $found =$ true **then return**

If you found augmenting path
abort and start from next root.

Algorithm 26 examine$(i, found)$

```
 1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
 2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
 3:     if j is unmatched then
 4:         q ← j;
 5:         pred(q) ← i;
 6:         found ← true;
 7:         return
 8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
 9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:         pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:         add mate(j) to list
```

Examine the neighbours of a node i

Algorithm 26 examine(i, *found*)

```
1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
3:     if j is unmatched then
4:         q ← j;
5:         pred(q) ← i;
6:         found ← true;
7:         return
8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:        pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:        add mate(j) to list
```

For all neighbours j do...

Algorithm 26 examine$(i, found)$

```
 1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
 2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
 3:     if j is unmatched then
 4:         q ← j;
 5:         pred(q) ← i;
 6:         found ← true;
 7:         return
 8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
 9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:         pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:         add mate(j) to list
```

You have found a blossom...

Algorithm 26 examine$(i, found)$

```
1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
3:     if j is unmatched then
4:         q ← j;
5:         pred(q) ← i;
6:         found ← true;
7:         return
8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:        pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:        add mate(j) to list
```

You have found a free node which gives you an augmenting path.

Algorithm 26 examine(i, *found*)

```
 1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
 2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
 3:     if j is unmatched then
 4:         q ← j;
 5:         pred(q) ← i;
 6:         found ← true;
 7:         return
 8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
 9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:         pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:         add mate(j) to list
```

If you find a matched node that is not in the tree you grow...

Algorithm 26 examine(i, *found*)

```
 1: for all j ∈ Ā(i) do
 2:     if j is even then contract(i, j) and return
 3:     if j is unmatched then
 4:         q ← j;
 5:         pred(q) ← i;
 6:         found ← true;
 7:         return
 8:     if j is matched and unlabeled then
 9:         pred(j) ← i;
10:         pred(mate(j)) ← j;
11:         add mate(j) to list
```

mate(j) is a new node from which you can grow further.

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Contract blossom identified by
nodes i and j

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Get all nodes of the blossom.

Time: $\mathcal{O}(m)$

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Identify all neighbours of b.

Time: $\mathcal{O}(m)$ (how?)

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

b will be an even node, and it has unexamined neighbours.

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Every node that was adjacent to a node in B is now adjacent to b

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Only for making a blossom expansion easier.

Algorithm 27 contract(i, j)

1: trace pred-indices of i and j to identify a blossom B
2: create new node b and set $\bar{A}(b) \leftarrow \cup_{x \in B} \bar{A}(x)$
3: label b even and add to *list*
4: update $\bar{A}(j) \leftarrow \bar{A}(j) \cup \{b\}$ for each $j \in \bar{A}(b)$
5: form a circular double linked list of nodes in B
6: delete nodes in B from the graph

Only delete links from nodes not in B to B.

When expanding the blossom again we can recreate these links in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Analysis

- A contraction operation can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$. Note, that any graph created will have at most m edges.
- The time between two contraction-operation is basically a BFS/DFS on a graph. Hence takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.
- There are at most n contractions as each contraction reduces the number of vertices.
- The expansion can trivially be done in the same time as needed for all contractions.
- An augmentation requires time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. There are at most n of them.
- In total the running time is at most

$$n \cdot (\mathcal{O}(mn) + \mathcal{O}(n)) = \mathcal{O}(mn^2) \ .$$

Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



Example: Blossom Algorithm



A Fast Matching Algorithm

Algorithm 28 Bimatch-Hopcroft-Karp(G)

1: $M \leftarrow \emptyset$
2: **repeat**
3: let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$ be maximal set of
4: vertex-disjoint, shortest augmenting path w.r.t. M.
5: $M \leftarrow M \oplus (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k)$
6: **until** $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$
7: **return** M

We call one iteration of the repeat-loop a phase of the algorithm.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, E_M \cup E_{M^*})$ and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $|M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least $|M^*| - |M|$ components that have more red edges than blue edges.
- Starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, M \oplus M^*)$, and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least k components that form a path starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, M \oplus M^*)$, and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least k components that form a path starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, M \oplus M^*)$, and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least k components that form a path starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, M \oplus M^*)$, and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least k components that form a path starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 7

Given a matching M and a maximal matching M^* there exist $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path w.r.t. M.

Proof:

- Similar to the proof that a matching is optimal iff it does not contain an augmenting path.
- Consider the graph $G = (V, M \oplus M^*)$, and mark edges in this graph blue if they are in M and red if they are in M^*.
- The connected components of G are cycles and paths.
- The graph contains $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |M^*| - |M|$ more red edges than blue edges.
- Hence, there are at least k components that form a path starting and ending with a red edge. These are augmenting paths w.r.t. M.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

- Let $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ be a maximal collection of vertex-disjoint, shortest augmenting paths w.r.t. M (let $\ell = |P_i|$).
- $M' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) = M \oplus P_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus P_k$.
- Let P be an augmenting path in M'.

Lemma 8

The set $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (M' \oplus P) = (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) \oplus P$ contains at least $(k+1)\ell$ edges.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

- Let $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ be a maximal collection of vertex-disjoint, shortest augmenting paths w.r.t. M (let $\ell = |P_i|$).
- $M' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) = M \oplus P_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus P_k$.
- Let P be an augmenting path in M'.

Lemma 8

The set $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (M' \oplus P) = (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) \oplus P$ contains at least $(k+1)\ell$ edges.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

- Let $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ be a maximal collection of vertex-disjoint, shortest augmenting paths w.r.t. M (let $\ell = |P_i|$).
- $M' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) = M \oplus P_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus P_k$.
- Let P be an augmenting path in M'.

Lemma 8

The set $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (M' \oplus P) = (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) \oplus P$ contains at least $(k+1)\ell$ edges.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

- Let $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ be a maximal collection of vertex-disjoint, shortest augmenting paths w.r.t. M (let $\ell = |P_i|$).
- $M' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) = M \oplus P_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus P_k$.
- Let P be an augmenting path in M'.

Lemma 8

The set $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} M \oplus (M' \oplus P) = (P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_k) \oplus P$ contains at least $(k+1)\ell$ edges.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Proof.

- The set describes exactly the symmetric difference between matchings M and $M' \oplus P$.
- Hence, the set contains at least $k+1$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths w.r.t. M as $|M'| = |M| + k + 1$.
- Each of these paths is of length at least ℓ.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Proof.

- The set describes exactly the symmetric difference between matchings M and $M' \oplus P$.
- Hence, the set contains at least $k+1$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths w.r.t. M as $|M'| = |M| + k + 1$.
- Each of these paths is of length at least ℓ.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Proof.

- The set describes exactly the symmetric difference between matchings M and $M' \oplus P$.
- Hence, the set contains at least $k+1$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths w.r.t. M as $|M'| = |M| + k + 1$.
- Each of these paths is of length at least ℓ.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

- If P does not intersect any of the $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, this follows from the maximality of the set $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- Otherwise, at least one edge from P coincides with an edge from paths $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- This edge is not contained in A.
- Hence, $|A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$.
- The lower bound on $|A|$ gives $(k+1)\ell \leq |A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$, and hence $|P| \geq \ell + 1$.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

- If P does not intersect any of the $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, this follows from the maximality of the set $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- Otherwise, at least one edge from P coincides with an edge from paths $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- This edge is not contained in A.
- Hence, $|A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$.
- The lower bound on $|A|$ gives $(k+1)\ell \leq |A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$, and hence $|P| \geq \ell + 1$.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

- If P does not intersect any of the $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, this follows from the maximality of the set $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- Otherwise, at least one edge from P coincides with an edge from paths $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- This edge is not contained in A.
- Hence, $|A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$.
- The lower bound on $|A|$ gives $(k+1)\ell \leq |A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$, and hence $|P| \geq \ell + 1$.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

- If P does not intersect any of the $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, this follows from the maximality of the set $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- Otherwise, at least one edge from P coincides with an edge from paths $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- This edge is not contained in A.
- Hence, $|A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$.
- The lower bound on $|A|$ gives $(k+1)\ell \leq |A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$, and hence $|P| \geq \ell + 1$.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 9

P is of length at least $\ell + 1$. This shows that the length of a shortest augmenting path increases between two phases of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm.

Proof.

- If P does not intersect any of the $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, this follows from the maximality of the set $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- Otherwise, at least one edge from P coincides with an edge from paths $\{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$.
- This edge is not contained in A.
- Hence, $|A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$.
- The lower bound on $|A|$ gives $(k+1)\ell \leq |A| \leq k\ell + |P| - 1$, and hence $|P| \geq \ell + 1$.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

If the shortest augmenting path w.r.t. a matching M has ℓ edges then the cardinality of the maximum matching is of size at most $|M| + \frac{|V|}{\ell+1}$.

Proof.

The symmetric difference between M and M^* contains $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths. Each of these paths contains at least $\ell + 1$ vertices. Hence, there can be at most $\frac{|V|}{\ell+1}$ of them.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

If the shortest augmenting path w.r.t. a matching M has ℓ edges then the cardinality of the maximum matching is of size at most $|M| + \frac{|V|}{\ell+1}$.

Proof.
The symmetric difference between M and M^* contains $|M^*| - |M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths. Each of these paths contains at least $\ell + 1$ vertices. Hence, there can be at most $\frac{|V|}{\ell+1}$ of them.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 10

The Hopcroft-Karp algorithm requires at most $2\sqrt{|V|}$ phases.

Proof.

- After iteration $\lfloor \sqrt{|V|} \rfloor$ the length of a shortest augmenting path must be at least $\lfloor \sqrt{|V|} \rfloor + 1 \geq \sqrt{|V|}$.
- Hence, there can be at most $|V|/(\sqrt{|V|}+1) \leq \sqrt{|V|}$ additional augmentations.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 10

The Hopcroft-Karp algorithm requires at most $2\sqrt{|V|}$ phases.

Proof.

- After iteration $\lfloor \sqrt{|V|} \rfloor$ the length of a shortest augmenting path must be at least $\lfloor \sqrt{|V|} \rfloor + 1 \geq \sqrt{|V|}$.
- Hence, there can be at most $|V|/(\sqrt{|V|}+1) \leq \sqrt{|V|}$ additional augmentations.

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

Lemma 11

One phase of the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm can be implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$.

construct a "level graph" G':

- construct Level 0 that includes all free vertices on left side L
- construct Level 1 containing all neighbors of Level 0
- construct Level 2 containing matching neighbors of Level 1
- construct Level 3 containing all neighbors of Level 2
- ...
- stop when a level (apart from Level 0) contains a free vertex

can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$ by a modified BFS

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp

- a shortest augmenting path must go from Level 0 to the last layer constructed
- it can only use edges between layers
- construct a maxim**al** set of vertex disjoint augmenting path connecting the layers
- for this, go forward until you either reach a free vertex or you reach a "dead end" v
- if you reach a free vertex delete the augmenting path and all incident edges from the graph
- if you reach a dead end backtrack and delete v together with its incident edges

Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis Hopcroft-Karp



Analysis: Shortest Augmenting Path for Flows

cost for searches during a phase is $\mathcal{O}(mn)$

- a search (successful or unsuccessful) takes time $\mathcal{O}(n)$
- a search deletes at least one edge from the level graph

there are at most n phases

Time: $\mathcal{O}(mn^2)$.

Analysis for Unit-capacity Simple Networks

cost for searches during a phase is $\mathcal{O}(m)$

- an edge/vertex is traversed at most twice

need at most $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ phases

- after $\sqrt{n}$ phases there is a cut of size at most $\sqrt{n}$ in the residual graph
- hence at most $\sqrt{n}$ additional augmentations required

Time: $\mathcal{O}(m\sqrt{n})$.