

FACETS OF THE BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH POLYTOPE*

FRANCISCO BARAHONA,† MARTIN GRÖTSCHEL,‡
 AND ALI RIDHA MAHJOUB§

The bipartite subgraph polytope $P_B(G)$ of a graph $G = [V, E]$ is the convex hull of the incidence vectors of all edge sets of bipartite subgraphs of G . We show that all complete subgraphs of G of odd order and all so-called odd bicycle wheels contained in G induce facets of $P_B(G)$. Moreover, we describe several methods with which new facet defining inequalities of $P_B(G)$ can be constructed from known ones. Examples of these methods are contraction of node sets in odd complete subgraphs, odd subdivision of edges, certain splittings of nodes, and subdivision of all edges of a cut. Using these methods we can construct facet defining inequalities of $P_B(G)$ having coefficients of order $|V|^2$.

1. Introduction and notation. In this paper we study the polytope associated with the bipartite subgraphs of a graph. We shall exhibit various new classes of facets of this polytope; in particular, we describe several methods with which new classes of facets can be derived from known ones. Using these constructions we obtain facet defining inequalities with integral coefficients in the interval $[0, n^2/4]$ where n is the order of the given graph.

Results about the bipartite subgraph polytope have been used by Grötschel and Pulleyblank (1981) for the design of polynomial time algorithms for special cases of the max-cut problem. These ideas have been successfully implemented by Barahona and Maccioni (1982) for the solution of medium sized real-world problems of this type. We hope that our polyhedral results may lead to the design of new efficient LP-based cutting plane algorithms for the max-cut problem.

The graphs we consider are finite and undirected. Loops and multiple edges do not play a role in what follows, so we assume that our graphs have no multiple edges and no loops. We denote a graph by $G = [V, E]$, where V is the node set and E the edge set of G . The cardinality of V is called the order of G . If $e \in E$ is an edge with endnodes i and j we also write ij to denote the edge e . If $H = [W, F]$ is a graph with $W \subseteq V$ and $F \subseteq E$ then H is called a subgraph of G . We also say that H is contained in G and that G contains H .

If $G = [V, E]$ is a graph and $F \subseteq E$, then $V(F)$ denotes the set of nodes of V which occur at least once as an endnode of an edge in F . Similarly, for $W \subseteq V$, $E(W)$ denotes the set of all edges of G with both endnodes in W .

A graph G is called complete if every two different nodes of G are linked by an edge. The complete graph with n nodes is denoted by K_n . A graph is called bipartite if its node set can be partitioned into two nonempty, disjoint sets V_1 and V_2 such that no two nodes in V_1 and no two nodes in V_2 are linked by an edge. We call V_1, V_2 a bipartition of V .

If $W \subseteq V$ then $\delta(W)$ is the set of edges with one endnode in W and the other in

*Received March 22, 1983; revised December 15, 1983.

AMS 1980 subject classification. Primary: 05C99.

OR/MIS Index 1978 subject classification. Primary: 489 Networks/graphs/theory.

Key words. Bipartite subgraphs, max-cut problem, polyhedral combinatorics, facets of combinatorial polytopes, cutting planes.

†On leave from Universidad de Chile. Presently visiting Institut für Operations Research, Universität Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany. Research supported by a grant from Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung.

‡IMAG, Grenoble, France.

$V \setminus W$. The edge set $\delta(W)$ is called a cut. Clearly, $[V, \delta(W)]$ is a bipartite subgraph of G . We write $\delta(v)$ instead of $\delta(\{v\})$ for $v \in V$ and call $\delta(v)$ the star of v . For a node $c \in V$ the cardinality of $\delta(v)$ is called the degree of v . For $W \subseteq V$ the set of nodes in $P \cap W$ which are adjacent to a node in W is denoted by $\Gamma(W)$.

If U, W are disjoint subsets of V , then $[U, W]$ denotes the set of edges of G which have one endnode in U and the other endnode in W ; for instance $\{(v) : V \setminus \{v\} = \delta(v)\}$.

A path P in $G = [V, E]$ is a sequence of edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k such that $e_1 = v_0v_1, e_2 = v_1v_2, \dots, e_k = v_{k-1}v_k$ and such that $v_i \neq v_j$ for $i \neq j$. The nodes v_0 and v_k are the endnodes of P and we say that P links v_0 and v_k or goes from v_0 to v_k . The number k of edges of P is called the length of P . If $P = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k$ is a path linking v_0 and v_k and $e_{k+1} = v_0v_k \in E$, then the sequence $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k, e_{k+1}$ is called a cycle of length $k+1$. A cycle (path) is called odd if its length is odd, otherwise it is called even. If P is a cycle or a path and w an edge of $E \setminus P$ with $u, v \in V(P)$, then w is called a chord of P .

If v is a node of a graph G , then $G - v$ denotes the subgraph of G obtained by removing node v and all edges incident to v from G .

A polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the intersection of finitely many halfspaces in \mathbb{R}^m . A polytope is a bounded polyhedron or equivalently the convex hull of finitely many points. The dimension of a polyhedron P , denoted by $\dim P$, is the maximum number of affinely independent points in P minus one.

If $a \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$, $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then the inequality $a^T x \leq a_0$ is said to be valid with respect to a polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ if $P \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid a^T x \leq a_0\}$. We say that a valid inequality $a^T x \leq a_0$ supports P or defines a face of P if $\emptyset \neq P \cap \{x \mid a^T x = a_0\} \neq P$. A valid inequality $a^T x \leq a_0$ defines a facet of P if it defines a face of P and if there exist $\dim P$ affinely independent points in $P \cap \{x \mid a^T x = a_0\}$. Two face-defining inequalities $a^T x \leq a_0, b^T x \leq b_0$ are called equivalent if $P \cap \{x \mid a^T x = a_0\} = P \cap \{x \mid b^T x = b_0\}$.

If $P = \{x \mid Ax \leq b\}$, then $Ax \leq b$ is called nonredundant if $P \neq \{x \mid A'x \leq b'\}$ for all inequality systems $A'x \leq b'$ where $A'x \leq b'$ arises from $Ax \leq b$ by deleting one inequality.

For every facet F of a full-dimensional polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, i.e. $\dim P = m$, there exists a unique (up to multiplication by a positive constant) valid inequality $a^T x \leq a_0$ such that $F = \{x \in P \mid a^T x = a_0\}$. This implies that (up to multiplication by a positive constant) there is a unique complete and nonredundant inequality system $Ax \leq b$ such that $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid Ax \leq b\}$. We shall present a quite large, but partial, nonredundant system of inequalities for the polyhedron associated with the bipartite subgraphs of a graph.

If x is a real number, then $\lfloor x \rfloor$ resp. $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest resp. largest integer not smaller resp. larger than x .

2. The bipartite subgraph polytope and the max-cut problem. Given a graph $G = [V, E]$ with edge weights $c_e > 0$ for all $e \in E$, then the max-cut problem can be stated as follows: Find a cut $\delta(W)$ in G such that $c(\delta(W)) := \sum_{e \in \delta(W)} c_e$ is as large as possible. This problem can be approached from a polyhedral point of view in the following way.

If $G = [V, E]$ is a graph and $F \subseteq E$ an edge set then the 0/1-vector $x^F \in \mathbb{R}^E$ with $x_e^F = 1$ if $e \in F$, and $x_e^F = 0$ if $e \notin F$ is called the incidence vector of F . The convex hull $P_B(G)$ of the incidence vectors of all edge sets of bipartite subgraphs of G is called the bipartite subgraph polytope of G , i.e.

$$P_B(G) = \text{conv}\{x^F \in \mathbb{R}^E \mid [V, F] \text{ is a bipartite subgraph of } G\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Obviously, every edge set of a bipartite subgraph of G is contained in a cut of G . This

implies that for positive edge weights $c_e, e \in E$, every optimum basic solution of the linear program

$$\max c^T x, \quad x \in P_B(G), \quad (2.2)$$

is the incidence vector of a cut of G . Hence, whenever the linear program (2.2) can be solved in polynomial time, the max-cut problem can be solved in polynomial time (this implication also holds the other way around).

Since the max-cut problem is NP-complete we cannot expect to find a complete explicit characterization of $P_B(G)$ for all graphs G . It may however be that for certain classes of graphs G , $P_B(G)$ can be described by means of a few classes of linear inequalities and that for these classes of inequalities polynomial time separation algorithms can be designed, so that the max-cut problem for these graphs is solvable in polynomial time. Examples of such classes of graphs are planar graphs, cf. Barahona (1980), and weakly bipartite graphs, cf. Grötschel and Pulleyblank (1981).

It is trivial to see that $P_B(G)$ is full-dimensional, which implies that $P_B(G)$ has a unique (up to positive scaling) nonredundant defining linear inequality system. Barahona (1980) showed that the following inequalities

$$0 \leq x_e \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } e \in E, \quad (2.3)$$

$$x(C) \leq |C| - 1 \quad \text{for all odd cycles } C \text{ in } G, \quad (2.4)$$

define facets of $P_B(G)$. (We call the inequalities (2.3) *trivial* and the inequalities (2.4) *odd cycle constraints*.) Using matching techniques Grötschel and Pulleyblank (1981) devised a polynomial time separation algorithm for the system (2.3), (2.4) (i.e. an algorithm which decides in polynomial time whether a given vector $y \in \mathbb{Q}^E$ satisfies (2.3) and (2.4), and if not, finds a violated inequality). Thus, the ellipsoid method implies that there is a polynomial time algorithm for the solution of (2.2) whenever $P_B(G)$ is completely determined by the trivial inequalities (2.3) and the odd cycle constraints (2.4). Such graphs are called *weakly bipartite*. It is for instance known that all planar graphs are weakly bipartite, cf. Barahona (1980). In the next two paragraphs we shall introduce various new classes of inequalities defining facets of $P_B(G)$. To simplify technical details in subsequent proofs we now state a lemma which we shall use frequently in the following sections.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $b^T x \leq \beta$ be a valid inequality with respect to $P_B(G)$. Let Y, Y', Z and Z' be mutually disjoint subsets of V and let $v \in V \setminus (Y \cup Y' \cup Z \cup Z')$. Suppose that the incidence vectors of the following edge sets of bipartite subgraphs*

$$B_1 := [Y' \cup Y \cup \{v\} : Z' \cup Z], \quad B_2 := [Y' \cup Y : Z' \cup Z \cup \{v\}], \\ B_3 := [Y' \cup Z \cup \{v\} : Z' \cup Y], \quad B_4 := [Y' \cup Z : Z' \cup Y \cup \{v\}],$$

satisfy $b^T x \leq \beta$ with equality. Then $\sum_{z \in Z} b_{z0} = \sum_{y \in Y} b_{y0}$.

PROOF. Clearly,

$$0 = \beta - \beta = b^T x^{B_1} - b^T x^{B_2} = \sum_{z \in Z} (b_{z0} + \sum_{y \in Y'} b_{yz}) + \sum_{y \in Y, z \in Z'} b_{yz} \\ - \sum_{z \in Z, z' \in Z'} b_{zz'} - \sum_{y \in Y} (b_{y0} + \sum_{y' \in Y'} b_{yy'}) \\ 0 = \beta - \beta = b^T x^{B_3} - b^T x^{B_4} = \sum_{z \in Z, y' \in Y'} b_{yz'} + \sum_{y \in Y, z' \in Z'} (b_{yz'} + b_{y0}) \\ - \sum_{z \in Z} (b_{zz'} + b_{z0}) - \sum_{y \in Y, y' \in Y'} b_{yy'}.$$

Thus, subtracting the two equations from each other we obtain $0 = 2 \sum_{z \in Z} b_{z0} - 2 \sum_{y \in Y} b_{y0}$ which proves our claim. ■

3. Further rank facets of $P_B(G)$. For a graph $G = [V, E]$ let

$$\mathcal{B}(G) := \{B \subseteq E \mid [V, B] \text{ is bipartite}\} \quad (3.1)$$

denote the set of edge sets of bipartite subgraphs of G . Clearly, $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is an independence system on E , i.e. $\mathcal{B}(G)$ satisfies $\emptyset \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and $B \subseteq B' \in \mathcal{B}(G) \Rightarrow B' \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. For every set $F \subseteq E$ the number $r(F) := \max\{|B| : B \in \mathcal{B}(G), B \subseteq F\}$ is called the *rank of F* (with respect to $\mathcal{B}(G)$). If $F \subseteq E$ then the $0/1$ -inequality

$$x(F) = \sum_{e \in F} x_e \leq r(F) \quad (3.2)$$

is by definition a supporting inequality of $P_B(G)$. The inequalities of type (3.2) are called *rank inequalities*, e.g. the odd cycle constraints (2.4) are rank inequalities.

Obviously, every facet of $P_B(G)$ defined by a $0/1$ -inequality is a rank inequality, and it is a very interesting open problem to characterize those rank inequalities of $P_B(G)$ that define facets of $P_B(G)$.

In this section we introduce two new "basic" classes of facet defining rank inequalities, further such inequalities will be derived in the next section.

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph and let $[W, E(W)]$ be a complete subgraph of order $p \geq 3$ of G . Then*

$$x(E(W)) \leq \lfloor p/2 \rfloor \lfloor p/2 \rfloor \quad (3.4)$$

is a valid inequality with respect to $P_B(G)$. (3.4) defines a facet of $P_B(G)$ if and only if p is odd.

PROOF. First of all, it is trivial to see that the right-hand side of (3.4) gives the rank of a complete subgraph with respect to $\mathcal{B}(G)$.

We now show that for p even, inequality (3.4) is the sum of p (positively scaled) inequalities (3.4) for which $|W|$ is odd. Namely, if $[W, E(W)]$ is a complete subgraph of G with $p = |W|$ even, then

$$x(E(W)) = \frac{1}{p-2} \sum_{v \in W} x(E(W \setminus \{v\})) \leq \frac{1}{p-2} p \left\lfloor \frac{p-1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{p-1}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{p}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{p}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

This implies that (3.4) does not define a facet of $P_B(G)$ in case p is even.

Now let us assume that $[W, E(W)]$ is a complete subgraph of G with $|W| = 2k + 1, k \geq 1$, and let us denote the corresponding inequality $x(E(W)) \leq k(k+1)$ by $a^T x \leq \alpha$. Assume, moreover, that $b^T x \leq \beta$ is a facet defining inequality for $P_B(G)$ which has the following property. If a vertex $x \in P_B(G)$ satisfies $a^T x = \alpha$ then x also satisfies $b^T x = \beta$. If we can prove that $b = \rho a$ for some $\rho > 0$ then we can conclude that $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is equivalent to $b^T x \leq \beta$, i.e. defines a facet of $P_B(G)$, and we are done.

To prove the claim above we first show that for any three different nodes $r, s, t \in W$ we have $b_{rt} = b_{st}$. To prove this, we take two disjoint node sets $U, U' \subseteq W \setminus \{r, s, t\}$ of cardinality $k-1$, and apply Lemma (2.5) with $Y = U, Z' = U', Y = \{r\}, Z = \{s\}$, and $v = t$.

Since r, s, t were arbitrarily chosen and since $[W, E(W)]$ is connected we can conclude that for some $\rho \in \mathbb{R}, b_{ij} = \rho$ for all $i, j \in E(W)$. It is a trivial matter to prove that $b_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in E \setminus E(W)$. Moreover, it is easy to see that for every edge $e \in G$ there is a set $B \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ with $e \in B$ and $a^T x^B = \alpha$. This implies that the face defined by $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is not contained in the trivial facet $\{x \in P_B(G) \mid x_e = 0\}$ for some $e \in E$. Hence $b^T x \leq \beta$ defines a nontrivial facet of $P_B(G)$ which by the monotonicity (i.e.




FIGURE 3.1

$0 < x < y \in P_B(G)$ implies $x \in P_B(G)$ of $P_B(G)$ implies that all coefficients of b are nonnegative and at least one is positive. Hence we can conclude that $\rho > 0$ and, thus, $b = \rho a$ holds which proves our claim. ■

In the following we shall refer to the facet defining inequalities introduced in (3.3) as *odd complete subgraph inequalities* or as the K_{2k+1} -*inequalities*.

Note that Theorem (3.3) can be used to prove the following.

REMARK. For every graph $G = [V, E]$ the cut polytope $\text{conv}\{x^E \mid W \subseteq V\}$ has full dimension $|E|$.

Namely, we embed G into a complete graph K_{2k+1} . Then we know that the K_{2k+1} -inequality defines a facet of $P_B(K_{2k+1})$. We therefore can make up a nonsingular $\binom{2k+1}{2}$ -matrix M whose rows are incidence vectors of bipartite edge sets in K_{2k+1} satisfying the K_{2k+1} -inequality with equality. Note that each of these bipartite edge sets necessarily is a cut of K_{2k+1} . Now we remove all columns from M corresponding to edges of K_{2k+1} which are not in G . The resulting matrix M' has full rank $|E|$ and the rows of M' correspond to cuts of G . Thus, there are $|E|$ cuts of G whose incidence vectors are linearly independent. Adding the zero vector (which is the incidence vector of $\delta(V)$) we obtain a set of $|E| + 1$ affinely independent points in the cut polytope of G .

A graph $G = [V, E]$ is called a *bicycle p -wheel* if G consists of a cycle of length p and two (so-called *universal*) nodes which are adjacent to each other and to every node in the cycle. A bicycle p -wheel is called *odd* if p is odd. Figure 3.1 shows a bicycle 7-wheel.

THEOREM 3.5. Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph and let $[W, F]$ be a bicycle $(2k + 1)$ -wheel, $k \geq 1$, contained in G . Then the inequality

$$x(F) \leq 2(2k + 1) \tag{3.6}$$

defines a facet of $P_B(G)$.

PROOF. Let v, w be the two universal nodes of the bicycle $(2k + 1)$ -wheel $[W, F]$ in G , and let the cycle C of $[W, F]$ be formed by the edges $u_1 u_2, u_2 u_3, u_3 u_4, \dots, u_{2k} u_{2k+1}, u_{2k+1} u_1$. $[W, F]$ contains the following triangles

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &:= \{vw, vu_1, wu_1\}, & i = 1, \dots, 2k + 1, \\ T_i^+ &:= \{vu_i, vu_{i+1}, u_i u_{i+1}\}, & i = 1, \dots, 2k, & T_{2k+1}^+ := \{vu_1, wu_{2k+1}, u_1 u_{2k+1}\}, \\ T_i^- &:= \{wu_i, wu_{i+1}, u_i u_{i+1}\}, & i = 1, \dots, 2k, & T_{2k+1}^- := \{wu_1, wu_{2k+1}, u_1 u_{2k+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By summing up appropriately we get

$$\begin{aligned} (2k + 1)x(F) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} (x(T_i) + kx(T_i^+) + kx(T_i^-)) + x(C) \\ &\leq (2k + 1)(2 + 2k + 2k) + 2k \\ &= (2k + 1)2(2k + 1) + 2k. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing through $2k + 1$ we obtain $x(F) \leq 2(2k + 1) + 2k/(2k + 1)$. Since for every vertex of $P_B(G)$ the left-hand side of the above inequality is an integer which, by the validity of the odd cycle inequalities, does not exceed the right-hand side, we can round the right-hand side down to the next integer and obtain that (3.6) is valid for $P_B(G)$.

Let us denote our inequality $x(F) \leq 2(2k + 1)$ by $a^T x \leq \alpha$ and let us assume (as in the proof before) that $b^T x \leq \beta$ is a facet defining inequality such that $\{x \in P_B(G) \mid a^T x = \alpha\} \subseteq \{x \in P_B(G) \mid b^T x = \beta\}$. We are done if we can prove that there is $\rho > 0$ such that $b = \rho a$.

First we show that for every node u_i , $1 \leq i \leq 2k + 1$, $b_{vu_i} = b_{wu_i}$ holds. We simply pick an arbitrary node of the cycle C , say u_1 , and apply Lemma (2.5) with

$$\begin{aligned} Y' &:= \{u_3, u_5, \dots, u_{2k+1}\}, & Z' &:= \{u_2, u_4, \dots, u_{2k}\}, \\ Y &:= \{u_1\}, & Z &:= \{w\} & \text{and } v := v. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry we obtain $b_{vu_i} = b_{wu_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2k + 1$. Thus, if we set $\rho := b_{vw}$ we can conclude that $b_{vu_i} = b_{wu_i} = \rho$, $i = 1, \dots, 2k + 1$.

In the next step we show that the b -values of the cycle edges are equal. Set $B_1 := [Y' \cup Z : Z' \cup \{u_1, v\}]$, $B_2 := [Y' \cup \{w, u_1\} : Z' \cup \{v\}]$ then again $B_j \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and $a^T x^{B_j} = \alpha$, $j = 1, 2$. So

$$0 = b^T x^{B_1} - b^T x^{B_2} = b_{vu_2} + b_{vu_1} - b_{wu_2} - b_{wu_1} - b_{vw} = b_{vu_2} - b_{wu_2} + b_{vu_1} - b_{wu_1} - b_{vw}$$

which implies $b_{vu_{2k+1}} = b_{wu_{2k+1}} = \rho'$, $i = 1, \dots, 2k$ for some $\rho' \in \mathbb{R}$. To prove that $\rho = \rho'$ consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} B_3 &:= [Y' \cup \{u_1, u_2\} : (Z' \setminus \{u_2\}) \cup \{v, w, u_1\}], \\ B_4 &:= [Y' \cup \{u_2\} : (Z' \setminus \{u_2\}) \cup \{v, w, u_1\}] \end{aligned}$$

which are in $\mathcal{B}(G)$ and for which $a^T x^{B_3} = a^T x^{B_4} = \alpha$. We get $0 = b^T x^{B_3} - b^T x^{B_4} = b_{vu_2} + b_{vu_1} - b_{wu_2} - b_{wu_1} - b_{vw} = 2(\rho' - \rho)$. Hence we have shown $b_{ij} = \rho$ for all $ij \in F$.

For every pair of nodes u_i, u_j which are not neighbours on the cycle C , it is easy to construct a bipartite subgraph $[W, B]$ of $[W, F]$ with bipartition W_1, W_2 such that $u_i \in W_1, u_j \in W_2$ and such that $a^T x^B = \alpha$. If $u_i u_j \in E$, then of course $B' = B \cup \{u_i u_j\} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and $a^T x^{B'} = \alpha$. Hence $0 = b^T x^{B'} - b^T x^B = b_{u_i u_j}$.

If ij is an edge of E with one endnode not in W , then it is trivial to construct $B \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ such that $B \cup \{ij\} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and $a^T x^B = \alpha$, which implies $b_{ij} = 0$. Altogether we have now shown

$$\begin{aligned} b_{ij} &= \rho & \text{for all } ij \in F, \\ b_{ij} &= 0 & \text{for all } ij \in E \setminus F. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of (3.3) it follows that $\rho > 0$ and thus that $b = \rho a$ which finishes the proof of (3.5). ■

In the following we shall call the inequalities (3.6) *odd bicycle wheel inequalities*. Of

course, we could have considered even bicycle wheel inequalities as well, but as in (3.3) these "even inequalities" do not define facets of $P_B(G)$.

Note that the bicycle 3-inequalities (3.6) are the same as the K_5 -inequalities (3.4). But this is the only overlapping of these two classes of inequalities.

Let us denote the polytope defined by the trivial inequalities (2.3) and the odd cycle inequalities (2.4) by $P_C(G)$. Barahona (1980) has shown that the max-cut problem for the class of graphs G which have the following property "there exists a node v such that the $G - v$ is planar" is NP-complete. Since linear programs over $P_C(G)$ are solvable in polynomial time, we can conclude (unless $P = NP$) that $P_C(G)$ does not equal $P_B(G)$. This observation lead us to the discovery of the odd bicycle wheel inequalities. Namely, if one of the universal nodes of a bicycle wheel is removed then the remaining graph is planar.

In fact, Barahona (1983) has shown that the max-cut problem is NP-complete for the following class of graphs G : " G contains a node v such that $G - v$ is planar and all nodes in $G - v$ have degree at most three". The odd bicycle wheels (except $p = 3$) do not belong to this class. We shall, however, give a construction (node-splitting) with which facets of $P_B(G)$ for graphs G of this type can sometimes be constructed from odd bicycle wheel inequalities. These inequalities however are not rank inequalities, since they have coefficients larger than one (see §6 for an example).

It is obvious that $P_B(G) = \text{conv}\{x \in P_C(G) \mid x \text{ integer}\}$, so one may ask what is the Chvátal rank, cf. Chvátal (1973), for a class of facets of $P_B(G)$ with respect to the trivial inequalities (2.3) and the odd cycle constraints (2.4). The validity proof for the odd bicycle wheel inequalities given in (3.5) shows that these inequalities are of Chvátal rank one. This is, however, not the case for the K_{2k+1} -inequalities. For instance, one can easily show that the K_7 -inequalities are of Chvátal rank 2, and we conjecture the Chvátal rank (with respect to $P_C(G)$) of K_{2k+1} -inequalities grows linearly with k .

4. Contraction and splitting of nodes. In this section we shall describe three methods for constructing "facets from facets". The first one called "node set contraction" can only be applied to the odd complete subgraph inequalities introduced in §3, while the other two, named "odd subdivision of edges" and "node splitting", are universal and can be applied to any facet defining inequality. The latter two operations can also be reversed.

THEOREM 4.1 (Node Set Contraction). Let $[W, E(W)]$ be a complete subgraph of order $2k + 1$, $k \geq 3$, of a graph $G = [V, E]$ and let W_1, W_2, \dots, W_r be a partition of W into nonempty mutually disjoint subsets such that $\sum_{i=1}^r |W_i| \leq k - 1$.

Let $G' = [V', E']$ denote the graph obtained from G by shrinking the nodes in W into a single node w_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$ (i.e. all new nodes w_i are adjacent in G' , and a new node w_j is adjacent in G' to an old node $v \in V \setminus W$ iff W contains a node adjacent to v in G). Set

$$a_{vw} := |W_i| |W_j| \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq s, \\ a_{ww} := 0 \quad \text{for all other } vw \in E',$$

then

$$a^T x \leq \alpha := k(k + 1) \tag{4.2}$$

defines a facet of $P_B(G')$.

PROOF. Denoting by $a^T x := x(E(W)) \leq k(k + 1) =: \alpha$ the odd complete subgraph inequality of $[W, E(W)]$ with respect to $P_B(G)$ we immediately see that a nonzero coefficient a_{vw} of the new inequality (4.2) is equal to $\sum_{v \in W} \sum_{w \in W} a_{vw}$. If we have a bipartition V_1, V_2 of V' we can expand the nodes of V' into nodes of V to obtain the corresponding bipartition V_1, V_2 of V . Then it immediately follows that for the edge

sets $B' = [V_1, V_2]$ and $B = [V_1, V_2]$ we have $a^T x^B = a^T x^{B'}$ which implies that $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is valid with respect to $P_B(G')$.

Assume as in the previous proofs of this type that $b^T x \leq \beta$ is a facet defining inequality for $P_B(G)$ with $\{x \in P_B(G) \mid a^T x = \alpha\} \subseteq \{x \in P_B(G) \mid b^T x = \beta\}$. To prove our theorem we have to show that $b = \rho a$ holds for some $\rho > 0$.

Let W' denote the subset of V' obtained by shrinking the node sets W_1, \dots, W_s . We may assume that $|W'_i| > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $|W'_i| = 1$ for $i = r + 1, \dots, s$. (If $s - r > k + 2$ because of the assumption $q := |W'| + \dots + |W'_i| \leq k - 1$. Set $S := \{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$, $T := W' \setminus S$.)

Let u, v, w be three different nodes in T . Let U be any subset of $T \setminus \{u, v, w\}$ of cardinality $k - 1$ and $S' := T \setminus (U \cup \{u, v, w\})$. Set $Y := (u, Z := (w, Y' := U, Z' := S \cup S'$, then the incidence vectors of B_1, \dots, B_k as defined in (2.5) satisfy $a^T x \leq \alpha$ with equality, and hence $b^T x \leq \beta$ also with equality. Therefore Lemma (2.5) implies $b_{uw} = b_{wu}$ and we can conclude that there is $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ with $b_{uw} = \rho$ for all $u, v \in T$.

Now we choose any $w_i \in S$ and any $v \in T$. Set $Y := \{w_i\}$, let Z be any subset of $T \setminus \{v\}$ of cardinality $|W'_i|$, Z' be any subset of $T \setminus (Z \cup \{v\})$ of cardinality $k - |W'_i|$ and $Y' := (S \cup T) \setminus (Z \cup Z' \cup \{v\} \cup \{w_i\})$. Again, the incidence vectors of B_1, \dots, B_k as defined in (2.5) satisfy $a^T x \leq \alpha$ and hence $b^T x \leq \beta$ with equality, so we can conclude from (2.5) that $b_{vw} = \sum_{z \in Z} b_{vz} = \rho |W'_i|$ thus $b_{vw} = \rho |W'_i|$ for all $w_i \in S$ and all $v \in T$.

Let S_1 be any subset of T of cardinality $k + 1 - q$ and set $S_2 := T \setminus S_1$. Then $B = [S \cup S_1, S_2]$ is an edge set in $\mathcal{B}(G)$ satisfying $a^T x = \alpha$. Hence $\beta = b^T x^B = \sum_{w_i \in S} \sum_{j \in S_1} b_{w_i j} + \sum_{i \in S_1} \sum_{j \in S_2} b_{ij} = \rho k(k + 1)$.

To determine the coefficients $b_{w_i w_j}$ for $w_i, w_j \in S$ (in case $|S| > 1$) we use the following argument. Let S_1, S_2 be any bipartition of S , then by our assumptions we have that $k_1 := \sum_{w_i \in S_1} |W'_i| \leq k - 3$ and $k_2 := \sum_{w_i \in S_2} |W'_i| \leq k - 3$.

Choosing any subset S'_1 of T of cardinality $k + 1 - k_1$ and setting $S'_2 := T \setminus S'_1$ we see that $B := [S_1 \cup S'_1, S_2 \cup S'_2]$ is the edge set of a bipartite subgraph of G' such that $a^T x^B = \alpha$ and therefore $b^T x^B = \beta$ holds. Thus, for every bipartition S_1, S_2 of S we can find an edge set $B \in \mathcal{B}(G')$ with $B \subseteq E(W')$ such that $b^T x^B = \beta$.

Observe that for all edges $ij \in E' \setminus E(W')$ the components x_i^B of the incidence vectors x^B of all these edge sets B are zero by construction. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{E(S)}$ (resp. $y \in \mathbb{R}^{E(W') \setminus E(S)}$) denote the vector obtained from a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^E$ by dropping the components corresponding to edges $ij \in E' \setminus E(S)$ (resp. edges $ij \in E' \setminus (E(W') \setminus E(S))$). Thus for every edge set $B \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ as constructed above we have $\beta = b^T x^B = b^T x^B + b^T x^B$. Since we know already all coefficients b_{ij} for $ij \in E(W') \setminus E(S)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} b^T x^B &= \sum_{w_i \in S_1, j \in S_2} b_{w_i j} + \sum_{w_j \in S_2, i \in S_1} b_{w_j i} + \sum_{i \in S_1} \sum_{j \in S_2} b_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{w_i \in S_1} \rho |S_2| |W'_i| + \sum_{w_j \in S_2} \rho |S_1| |W'_j| + \rho |S_1| |S_2| \\ &= \rho (k_1 |S_2| + k_2 |S_1| + |S_1| |S_2|) \\ &= \rho (k_1 (k - k_2) + k_2 (k + 1 - k_1) + (k - k_2)(k + 1 - k_1)) \\ &= \rho (k(k + 1) - k_1 k_2) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that for every set $B \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ constructed from a bipartition S_1, S_2 of S as above we obtain an equation

$$b^T x^B = \beta - \rho (k(k + 1) - k_1 k_2) = \rho k_1 k_2.$$

Let us write this equation system in the form $A\bar{b} = \bar{\beta}$, i.e. we have $|E(S)|$ unknowns b_{ij} , $ij \in E(S)$, and the matrix A is an $(2^{|S|}-1 - 1, |E(S)|)$ -matrix whose rows are the incidence vectors of the cuts $\delta(S)$ of $[S, E(S)]$, $\emptyset \neq S_1 \neq S, S_1 \subseteq S$, and the right-hand side $\bar{\beta}$ is given as calculated above. This matrix A has full rank $|E(S)|$ (see Remark after Theorem (3.3)), so, if the system $A\bar{b} = \bar{\beta}$ has a solution, it has a unique solution. Now we simply set $b_{w_i w_j} = \rho|W|/|W|$ for all $w_i, w_j \in S$ and can easily see that this stipulation in fact gives a solution of our system. Hence we also know the coefficients of b corresponding to edges in $E(S)$.

It is trivial to show that $b_{ij} = 0$ for all $ij \in E' \setminus E(W')$, thus we have proved that $b = \rho a$ holds. ■

Theorem (4.1) shows that for any K_{2k+1} -inequality, $k \geq 3$, one can shrink one or more subsets of nodes (subject to some cardinality conditions) to obtain new facet defining inequalities with coefficients which are not only zero and one. Moreover the supports of these inequalities $a^T x \leq \alpha$ (i.e. the edge sets $F_a := \{ij \in E' \mid a_{ij} > 0\}$) may also be the edge sets of complete subgraphs of G' of even order.

COROLLARY 4.3. Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph containing a complete subgraph $[W, E(W)]$ of order $k + 4$, $k \geq 2$. Then $P_B(G)$ has a facet defining inequality $a^T x \leq k(k + 1)$ whose support is $E(W)$ and whose coefficients are $0, 1, \frac{1}{2}(k-1), \frac{1}{4}(k-1)^2$ in case k is odd, resp. $0, 1, (k-2)/2, k/2, \frac{1}{4}k(k-2)$ in case k is even. ■

In particular, if G itself is the complete graph of order $n = k + 4$, Corollary (4.3) shows that the coefficients of facets of $P_B(G)$ may be of order n^2 .

We now introduce a facet construction method which will turn out to be a special case of another such method but which is of particular interest and therefore gets its own name.

THEOREM 4.4. (a) (Odd Edge Subdivision). Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph and $a^T x \leq \alpha$ be a nontrivial facet defining inequality for $P_B(G)$. Let $ij \in E$ be an edge with $a_{ij} > 0$. Let $G' = [V', E']$ be a graph obtained from G in the following way. An even number of new nodes i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k is added. The edge set $P = \{ii_1, i_1i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}i_k, i_kj\}$ (i.e. a path of odd length) is added. Any further edge having at least one of the new nodes i_1, \dots, i_k as an endnode may be added. The edge ij may be removed. Let $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$ be defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_{uv} &:= a_{uv} && \text{for all } uv \in (E \cap E') \setminus \{ij\}, \\ \bar{a}_{uv} &:= a_{ij} && \text{for all } uv \in P, \\ \bar{a}_{uv} &:= 0 && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Then $\bar{a}^T x \leq \alpha + ka_{ij}$ defines a facet of $P_B(G')$.
 (b) (Replacing an odd path by an edge). Let $G' = [V', E']$ be a graph and $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ be a facet defining inequality for $P_B(G')$. Suppose the support of \bar{a} contains a path $P = \{ii_1, i_1i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}i_k, i_kj\}$ of odd length $k + 1 \geq 3$ with $a_{uv} = \alpha'$ for all $uv \in P$ and where the degree of all nodes i_1, \dots, i_k in the support of \bar{a} is 2 and ij is not in the support of \bar{a} . Let $G = [V, E]$ be the graph obtained from G' by removing the nodes i_1, \dots, i_k and adding the edge ij (if ij is not already contained in G). Let $a \in \mathbb{R}^E$ be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{uv} &:= \bar{a}_{uv} && \text{for all } uv \in E \cap E', \\ a_{ij} &:= \alpha'. \end{aligned}$$

Then $a^T x \leq \bar{\alpha} - ka'$ defines a facet of $P_B(G)$. ■

Thus Theorem (4.4)(a) shows that we can subdivide "positive edges" of a facet defining inequality an odd number of times and that we will get another facet defining

inequality this way. Theorem (4.4)(b) tells us that this operation can also be reversed without losing the desired properties. Theorem (4.4) is a corollary of the following more general result (set $F = \{ij\}$ and apply (4.5) repeatedly).

THEOREM 4.5. (a) (Node Splitting). Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph and $a^T x \leq \alpha$ be a nontrivial facet defining inequality for $P_B(G)$. Let E_a be the support of a , and let v be a node in $V(E_a)$. Let V_1, V_2 be any bipartition of V such that $a^T x_{\delta(v)} = \alpha$ and assume that $v \in V_1$. Choose any nonempty subsets $F \subseteq \delta(v) \cap E_a \cap E(V_1)$ and construct a new graph $G' = [V', E']$ from G as follows. Split node v into two nodes v_1, v_2 such that v_1 is incident to all edges contained in F and v_2 is incident to all edges in $\delta(v) \setminus F$. The edge v_1v_2 may be added, as well as any further edge vu and $vu \in F$. Moreover, add a new node v_3 adjacent to v_1 and v_2 ; in addition any further edge having v_3 or v_1 as one endnode may be added. The other parts of G remain unchanged. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_{ij} &:= a_{ij} && \text{for all } ij \in E \setminus \delta(v), \\ \bar{a}_{v_1u} &:= a_{vu} && \text{for all } v_1u \in E' \text{ with } vu \in F, \\ \bar{a}_{v_2u} &:= a_{vu} && \text{for all } v_2u \in E' \text{ with } vu \in (\delta(v) \cap E_a) \setminus F, \\ \bar{a}_{v_1v_3} &:= \bar{a}_{v_2v_3} := \gamma := \sum_{ij \in F} a_{ij}, \\ \bar{a}_{ij} &:= 0 && \text{otherwise} \\ \bar{\alpha} &:= \alpha + 2\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

then $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ defines a facet of $P_B(G')$.

(b) (Contraction of a path of length two). Let $G' = [V', E']$ be a graph and $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ be an inequality defining a facet of $P_B(G')$. Suppose G' contains a node v_3 contained in exactly two edges, say v_1v_3 and v_2v_3 , of the support F_a of \bar{a} , that $v_1, v_2 \notin F_a$, that v_1 and v_2 have no common neighbour in $[V', F_a]$ except v_3 , and that $\bar{a}_{v_1v_3} = \bar{a}_{v_2v_3} = \bar{a}(\delta(v_1) \setminus \{v_1v_3\}) \leq \bar{a}(\delta(v_2) \setminus \{v_2v_3\})$. Let $G = [V, E]$ be the graph obtained from G' by removing the nodes v_1, v_2, v_3 , adding a new node v and the edges $\{v|_1\bar{a}_{v_1j} > 0\} \cup \{v|_2\bar{a}_{v_2j} \in E'\}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &:= \bar{a}_{ij} && \text{for all } ij \in E \cap E', \\ a_{ij} &:= \bar{a}_{v_1j} && \text{if } \bar{a}_{v_1j} > 0, \\ a_{ij} &:= \bar{a}_{v_2j} && \text{if } v_2j \in E' \text{ unless } \bar{a}_{v_1j} > 0 \\ \alpha &:= \bar{\alpha} - 2\bar{a}_{v_1v_3}, \end{aligned}$$

then $a^T x \leq \alpha$ defines a facet of $P_B(G)$.

PROOF. The validity of the new inequalities defined in (a) and (b) follows by elementary construction. It remains to prove that the faces defined by the inequalities contain sufficiently many affinely independent points.

(a) Since $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is nontrivial, there are $m = |E|$ bipartite edge sets $B_1, \dots, B_m \subseteq E$ whose incidence vectors are linearly independent and satisfy $a^T x_{B_i} = \alpha$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Set

$$B'_i := (B_i \setminus \delta_C(v)) \cup \{v_1v_3, v_2v_3\} \cup \{v_1u \mid uv \in B_i \cap F\} \cup \{v_2u \mid uv \in B_i \setminus F\},$$

$i = 1, \dots, m$, then B'_i is a bipartite edge set in G' and $\bar{a}^T x_{B'_i} = \alpha + 2\gamma$. Moreover, the incidence vectors $x_{B'_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ are linearly independent.

Let $F_a \subseteq E'$ denote the support of \bar{a} . Using the assumption that $a^T x_{\delta(v)} = \alpha$ and $v \in V_1$, we immediately see that the incidence vectors of the bipartite edge sets $B_{m+1} := \delta_C((V_1 \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{v_2, v_3\}) \cap F_a$ and $B_{m+2} := \delta_C((V_1 \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{v_2\}) \cap F_a$ in G' satisfy $\bar{a}^T x_{B_i} = \alpha + 2\gamma$, $i = m + 1, m + 2$. It is obvious that each of the vectors $x_{B_{m+1}}$

and $x^{B_{m+2}}$ is linearly independent from the vectors x^{B_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, and it is an easy exercise in linear algebra to prove that in fact all the vectors x^{B_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m + 2$ are linearly independent.

Moreover, consider the incidence vectors of the following bipartite edge sets. If $v_1, v_2 \in E'$, set $B_{v_1, v_2} = B_{m+2} \cup \{v_1, v_2\}$. If $v_1, v_2 \in E'$, $v_1 \neq v_2 \neq v_2$, then, if $u \in V_1$, set $B_{v_1, v_2, u} = B_{m+2} \cup \{v_1, v_2, u\}$, if $u \in V \setminus V_1$, set $B_{v_1, v_2, u} = B_{m+1} \cup \{v_1, v_2, u\}$. If $v_1, v_2 \in E'$ such that $v_1 v_2 \notin F$, then, if $u \in V_1$, set $B_{v_1, v_2, u} = B_{m+2} \cup \{v_1, u\}$, if $u \notin V_1$, then set $B_{v_1, v_2, u} = (B_{m+2} \setminus \delta(v_1)) \cup \{v_1, v_2, v_1, u\}$. If $v_2, v_3 \in E'$ with $vu \in F$, then because $\alpha T_x \leq \alpha + 2\gamma$ defines a nontrivial facet of $P_B(G)$ there exists a bipartite edge set $B_u \subseteq E$ with $vu \in B_u$ and $\alpha T_x^{B_u} = \alpha$, and we set

$$B_{v_2, v_3} = (B_u \setminus \delta_C(v)) \cup \{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \cup \{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \cup \{v_2, v_3\} \cup \{v_2, v_3\}.$$

Clearly, these incidence vectors satisfy $\alpha T_x \leq \alpha + 2\gamma$ with equality and the set of $|E'|$ vectors constructed above is linearly independent. Thus $P_B(G) \cap \{x \mid \alpha T_x = \alpha + 2\gamma\}$ contains $|E'|$ linearly independent points which proves that $\alpha T_x \leq \alpha + 2\gamma$ defines a facet of $P_B(G)$.

(b) Let $Q = \{v_1, v_2 \in E' \mid v_1 \neq v_2\} \cup \{v_1, v_2 \in E' \mid \bar{\alpha}_{v_1, v_2} > 0\}$. Then by assumption $\bar{\alpha}_{ij} = 0$ for all $ij \in Q$. If $\alpha T_x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ defines a facet of $P_B(G')$ then the inequality $\sum_{ij \in E'} \bar{\alpha}_{ij} x_{ij} \leq \bar{\alpha}$ clearly defines a facet of $P_B(G' - Q)$. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $Q = \emptyset$, i.e. that in G' no node in $V' \setminus \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is adjacent to v_3 and that no such node is adjacent to both v_1 and v_2 .

By assumption, $\alpha T_x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ defines a nontrivial facet of $P_B(G')$, so there are $m := |E'|$ bipartite edge sets B'_1, B'_2, \dots, B'_m whose incidence vectors are linearly independent and satisfy $\alpha T_x^{B'_i} = \bar{\alpha}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. We may assume that $N \subseteq V'$ is the set of neighbours of v_1 in $[V', F_2]$ different from v_3 , and that $k := |N|$.

Now let M be the (m, m) -matrix whose rows are the incidence vectors $x^{B'_1}, \dots, x^{B'_m}$. We may assume that the last $k + 2$ columns correspond to the edges $v_1, i \in N$, and v_2, v_3 . Moreover, we assume that the sets B'_1, \dots, B'_m are ordered in such a way that the sets B'_1, \dots, B'_k contain both edges v_1, v_3, v_2, v_3 , the sets B'_{k+1}, \dots, B'_m contain v_1, v_2 and not v_2, v_3 and the sets B'_{k+1}, \dots, B'_m contain v_2, v_3 but not v_1, v_3 .

Note that the assumptions of the theorem imply that if $\bar{\alpha}' T_x^{B'_i} = \bar{\alpha}$, then B'_i contains at least one of the edges v_1, v_3, v_2, v_3 , and moreover, if B'_i contains only one of the edges v_1, v_3, v_2, v_3 , then B'_i necessarily contains all edges $v_1, i \in N$, otherwise $B'_i = (B'_i \setminus \{v_1 \mid i \in N\}) \cup \{v_1, v_3, v_2, v_3\}$ would be a bipartite edge set with $\bar{\alpha}' T_x^{B'_i} > \bar{\alpha}$. Thus, our matrix M looks as follows

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} m-k-2 \\ \vdots \\ k \\ \vdots \\ 2 \end{array} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} M_1 \\ \vdots \\ M_k \end{array} \right\} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} M_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ M_m \end{array} \right\} \\
 \begin{array}{c} r \\ s-r \\ m-s \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} k \\ \vdots \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{c} M_2 \\ \vdots \\ M_k \\ M_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ M_m \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 = M
 \end{array}$$

where M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 are some $0/1$ -matrices, the matrices M_5 and M_6 contain ones only and the last two columns are as indicated, where 1 denotes a column of ones.

Now we transform the edge sets $B'_i \subseteq E'$ into bipartite edge sets $B_i \subseteq E$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ as follows

$$B_i := (B'_i \setminus (\delta_C(v_1) \cup \delta_C(v_2))) \cup \{v_1 \mid v_2, j \in B'_i, j \neq v_3\} \cup \{v_1 \mid v_1, j \in B'_i, j \neq v_3\}.$$

Note that this transformation corresponds to a shrinking of the nodes v_1, v_2, v_3 into the node v . (By our assumption $Q = \emptyset$, no multiple edges will occur.) It follows from our

remarks above that $\alpha T_x^{B_i} = \alpha$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. If A is the $(m, m-2)$ -matrix whose rows are the incidence vectors x^{B_i} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, then A looks as follows

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} m-k-2 \\ \vdots \\ k \\ \vdots \\ 2 \end{array} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_k \end{array} \right\} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} A_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{array} \right\} \\
 \begin{array}{c} r \\ s-r \\ m-s \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} k \\ \vdots \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{c} A_2 \\ \vdots \\ A_k \\ A_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 = A
 \end{array}$$

where by construction the following holds: $A_i = M_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, and A_5, A_6 are matrices containing zeros only.

To prove the theorem we now show that the rank of A equals $m-2$.

First we add to M a $(m+1)$ st column which contains twos only and then we add to this matrix a $(m+1)$ st row having zeros everywhere except in positions $m-k-1, \dots, m-2$ and $m+1$ which contain ones. Let us denote this matrix by M' :

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \vdots \\ 2 \end{array} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} M_2 \\ \vdots \\ M_k \\ M_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ M_m \end{array} \right\} \\
 \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 = M'
 \end{array}$$

Since M is nonsingular the equation system $M\lambda = 2$ has a unique solution which, in fact, is nothing but a multiple of the normal vector $\bar{\alpha}$ of the given facet, i.e. we obtain $\lambda_{ij} = 2\bar{\alpha}_{ij}/\bar{\alpha}$ for all $ij \in E'$.

Suppose the last column of M' is dependent of the first m columns of M' , then

$$\sum_{i \in N} \lambda_{i, m+1} = \sum_{i \in N} \frac{2\bar{\alpha}_{i, m+1}}{\bar{\alpha}} = \frac{2\bar{\alpha}_{v_1, v_3}}{\bar{\alpha}} = 1$$

has to hold. But this implies that $2\bar{\alpha}_{v_1, v_3} = \bar{\alpha}$, hence the incidence vector of the bipartite edge set $\{v_1, v_3, v_2, v_3\}$ satisfies $\bar{\alpha}' T_x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ with equality which is impossible by our assumptions. Therefore we can conclude that M' is a nonsingular matrix.

Now we perform the following operations on M' : To each of the columns $m-k-1, \dots, m-2$, i.e. the columns corresponding to the edges $v_1, i \in N$, we add the column $m-1$ and the column m and subtract the column $m+1$. It is easy to see that the matrix M'' we obtain this way looks as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \vdots \\ 2 \end{array} \\
 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} A_2 \\ \vdots \\ A_k \\ A_{k+1} \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{array} \right\} \\
 \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \\
 = M''
 \end{array}$$

M'' is nonsingular, since M' is nonsingular. Deleting the last column and the last row from M'' we again obtain a nonsingular matrix M''' . Deleting the last two columns




FIGURE 4.1

from M'' we obtain a matrix of full column rank $m - 2$. But this matrix is the matrix A , and our proof is complete. ■

To illustrate the methods of facet construction introduced before we now give an example. Let $[V, E_7]$ be the complete graph K_7 , then $x(E_7) \leq 12$ defines a facet of $P_B(K_7)$ by Theorem (3.3). We pick the nodes 6 and 7 of K_7 , and shrink them by node set contraction into a new node $6'$ to obtain the complete graph K_6 . By Theorem (4.1) the inequality $2x(\delta_{6'}(6')) + x(E \setminus (1, 2, \dots, 5)) \leq 12$ defines a facet of $P_B(K_6)$, $\delta_{6'}(V)$ with $V_1 = \{4, 5, 6'\}$ is a bipartite edge set whose incidence vector satisfies the above inequality with equation. Choosing $F = (46', 56')$ we construct the following new graph G' (with 8 nodes) by splitting node $6'$ into v_1 and v_2 and adding a new node v_3 with the method described in Theorem (4.5)(a), cf. Figure 4.1.

The inequality $\bar{a}^T x \leq 20$ defines a facet of $P_B(G')$ where the coefficients \bar{a}_{ij} are equal to one for ij with $1 < i < j \leq 5$, and the other coefficients have the value indicated on the corresponding edges in Figure 4.1. Moreover, this inequality defines a facet of $P_B(H)$ for all graphs H containing G' as a subgraph.

5. Cut subdivisions. We now describe how a cut of the support of a facet defining inequality can be subdivided to get a new facet. We start with a special case.

THEOREM 5.1 (Subdivision of a Star). Let $G = [V, E]$ be a graph and $a^T x \leq \alpha$ be a nontrivial facet defining inequality for $P_B(G)$. Let $v \in V$ be any node and suppose the star $\delta(v)$ of v consists of the edges v_1, \dots, v_k . Construct a new graph $G' = [V', E']$ from G as follows. Subdivide each edge of the star $\delta(v)$, i.e. add k new nodes j_1, \dots, j_k and replace the edges v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k by the edges $vj_1, vj_2, j_1j_2, \dots, vj_k, j_kj_1$. Keep all other nodes and edges, and, moreover, any further edge linking a new node j_s to any other node in V' , and any edge $v_i, s = 1, \dots, k$ may be added. Set

$$\bar{a}_{ij} := a_{ij} \quad \text{for all } ij \in E \cap E',$$

$$\bar{a}_{v_j j_s} := \bar{a}_{j_s j_s} \quad \text{for } s = 1, \dots, k,$$

$$\bar{a}_{ij} := 0 \quad \text{else,}$$

$$\bar{a} := \alpha + \sum_{s=1}^k a_{v_j j_s}.$$

then $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ defines a facet of $P_B(G')$.

PROOF. It should be clear that $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ is valid with respect to $P_B(G')$. Since $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is a nontrivial facet of $P_B(G)$ there are bipartite edge sets $B_1, \dots, B_m \subseteq E$, $m := |E|$, whose incidence vectors are linearly independent and satisfy the inequality with equality.

We claim that there is an injective mapping $\phi: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $B_{\phi(s)}$ does not contain the edge $v_j, 1 \leq s \leq k$, i.e. that we may assume that B_s does not contain $v_j, 1 \leq s \leq k$. Namely, first of all for each edge v_j there is a set B_j not containing v_j , otherwise $a^T x \leq \alpha$ would define the (trivial) facet $\{x \in P_B(G) \mid x_{v_j} = 1\}$. Secondly, if there were two edges v_i, v_j such that each set B_j not containing v_i does not contain v_j , and vice versa, then the nonsingular (m, m) -matrix M whose rows are the incidence vectors of the sets B_j would contain two identical columns, a contradiction. We may also assume that the last k columns of M correspond to the edges $v_j, 1 \leq s \leq k$, i.e. that M has the following form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & \begin{matrix} 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \end{matrix} \\ M_2 & \begin{matrix} \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \end{matrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

where M_1, M_2, M_3 are some $0/1$ -matrices and the (k, k) -submatrix in the upper right-hand corner is a $0/1$ -matrix M_4 with zeros on the main diagonal.

Let $m'_t := |E'|$. We now construct edge sets B'_t in G' as follows:

$$B'_t := (B_t \setminus \delta_G(v)) \cup \{v_j \mid s = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{j_i, j_s \mid v_i \in B_t\}, \quad t = 1, \dots, m,$$

$$B'_{m+s} := (B_s \setminus \{v_j\}) \cup \{j_i, j_s\}, \quad s = 1, \dots, k,$$

and for the k' , say, edges $e_{m+k+1}, \dots, e_{m+k+k'}$ in G' for which one of the endnodes is one of the nodes $j_s, s \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and the other endnode is a node in $V' \setminus \{j_s, i, v\}$, say $e_{m+k+t} = j_i u$, we define $B'_{m+k+t} = \{1, \dots, k\}$ to be the bipartite edge set among the two sets $B'_{m+k} \cup \{j_i, u\}$ or $B'_t \cup \{j_i, u\}$. Moreover, for the (possibly existing) further $m' - (m+k+k')$ edges $e_{m+k+k+1}, \dots, e_m$ in G' for which one of the endnodes is v and the other is one of the endnodes $i, s \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, say $e_{m+k+k+t} = v_i$, we set

$$B'_{m+k+k+t} := (B_t \setminus \delta_G(v)) \cup \{v_j \mid s = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{j_i, j_s \mid v_i \in B_t\} \cup \{v_i\}$$

where B_t is a bipartite edge set in G such that v and i_s are in the same set of the corresponding bipartition of V and such that $a^T x = \alpha$. Note that such a set B_t exists because $a^T x \leq \alpha$ is nontrivial.

It is clear from the construction that each of the sets $B'_t, t = 1, \dots, m'$, is the edge set of a bipartite graph and that its incidence vector satisfies $\bar{a}^T x \leq \bar{\alpha}$ with equality.

Consider now the (m', m') -matrix M' whose rows are the incidence vectors of the sets $B'_t, t = 1, \dots, m'$. We may assume that the columns of M' corresponding to the edges in $E \cap E'$ are ordered in the same way as in M , that the k columns $m - k + 1, \dots, m$ of M' correspond to the edges $j_i, j_s, s = 1, \dots, k$, that the next k columns $m + 1, \dots, m + k$ correspond to the edges v_j, \dots, v_k and that the last $m' - (m+k)$ columns correspond to the further edges $e_{m+k+1}, \dots, e_{m'}$ of G' . Then M' looks as

A graph—of interest in all parts of graph theory—is the Petersen graph P . We display a facet of $P_B(P)$ with coefficients 1 and 2 and right-hand side 16 which is obtained by a metamorphosis of K_5 (showing this way that P is not weakly bipartite). We start from $x(E_2) \leq 6$ and then apply various constructions. We indicate the constructions on the arrows of Figure 6.3, a double line states that the coefficient of the edge in the corresponding inequality is two. The right-hand sides, denoted by RS , of the inequalities corresponding to the graphs shown in Figure 6.3 are also indicated.




FIGURE 6.3

By repeated splitting of one of the universal nodes of a bicycle p -wheel we can construct graphs which have the property that they contain a node v (namely the remaining universal node) whose removal results in a planar graph where all nodes have degree at most three. Figure 6.4 shows such a construction for a bicycle 5-wheel. (The method, however, does not work for all bicycle wheels.) The final graph G of the sequence of splittings shown in Figure 6.4 has the property that $G - v$ is planar and all nodes have degree at most three. The inequality derived from this graph (edges drawn with a double line get coefficient 2, all other coefficient 1) with right-hand side 18 defines a facet of $P_B(G)$.

The algorithmic aspects of our theoretical analysis are still unexplored. We would like to know whether there are polynomial time algorithms for the separation problems involved with the classes of facets of $P_B(G)$ described here.

For instance, for s fixed, one can check whether all K_{2k+1} -inequalities and all bicycle $(2k+1)$ -wheel inequalities, $2k+1 \leq s$, are satisfied by brute force enumeration in polynomial time. But even for K_5 this takes $O(n^5)$ time. We do not know whether there is a polynomial time algorithm for checking all odd complete subgraph inequalities or all odd bicycle wheel inequalities. (Note added in proof: See the paper of B. Gerards in this issue of *Mathematics of Operations Research* on this subject.)

It seems quite hopeless to find reasonable algorithms that solve the separation problems for the classes of facets obtained from the odd complete subgraph inequalities or odd bicycle wheel inequalities by any of the constructions described in §§4 and 5.

Even the simplest case is open, the graphs obtained from K_5 by odd subdivision of edges (Theorem (4.5)(a)). Let us call these graphs *odd homeomorphs* of K_5 . What one has to solve here is the following. Given a graph $G = [V, E]$ and a point $y \in Q^E$, say




FIGURE 6.4

$0 < y_e \leq 1$ for all $e \in E$. Check whether there is a subgraph $H = [W, F]$ of G obtained from K_5 by odd subdivision of edges such that the corresponding facet defining inequality of $P_g(G)$ is violated.

For each odd homeomorph $H = [W, F]$ of K_5 the corresponding inequality can be written as

$$x(F) \leq |F| - 4 \quad (6.1)$$

see (4.4)(a) and (3.3). If y is given as above then we set $w_e := 1 - y_e$ for all $e \in E$. If we can solve in polynomial time

$$\min\{w(F) \mid [V(F), F] \text{ odd homeomorph of } K_5\} \quad (6.2)$$

then we can solve the separation problem for the inequalities (6.1) in polynomial time. Namely, if the minimum in (6.2) is 4 or larger then y satisfies all inequalities (6.1), otherwise for the minimum $F^* \gamma(F^*) > |F^*| - 4$ holds and a violated inequality is found.

Of course, this question can be asked for the odd homeomorphs of K_7, K_9 etc. as well. We have the feeling that at least for the odd homeomorphs of K_5 a polynomial separation algorithm can be found.

References

- [1] Barahona, F. (1980). On the Complexity of Max Cut. Rapport de Recherche no. 186, IMAG, Université Scientifique et Médicale de Grenoble, France.
- [2] ——— (1983). The Max-Cut Problem in Graphs not Contractible to K_5 . *Oper. Res. Lett.* 2, 107–111.
- [3] ——— and Maccioni, E. (1982). On the Exact Ground States of Three-Dimensional Ising Spin Glasses. *J. Phys. A* 15 L611–L615.
- [4] Chvátal, V. (1973). Edmonds Polytopes and a Hierarchy of Combinatorial Problems. *Discrete Math.* 4, 305–337.
- [5] Grötschel, M. and Pulleyblank, W. R. (1981). Weakly Bipartite Graphs and the Max-Cut Problem. *Oper. Res. Lett.* 1, 23–27.

BARAHONA: DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE
 GRÖTSCHHEL: LEHRSTUHL FÜR ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK II, UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG, MEMMINGER STRASSE 6, D-89000 AUGSBURG, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
 MAHJOUB: IMAG, UNIVERSITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE ET MÉDICALE, GRENOBLE, FRANCE

TESTING THE ODD BICYCLE WHEEL INEQUALITIES FOR THE BIPARTITE SUBGRAPH POLYTOPE*

A. M. H. GERARDS

Tilburg University

In their paper on facets of the bipartite subgraph polytope Barahona, Grötschel and Mahjoub pose the question: Is there a polynomial time algorithm testing the odd bicycle wheel inequalities? This note describes such an algorithm.

1. Introduction. Throughout this text $G = [V, E]$ denotes an undirected graph and $P_g(G)$ its bipartite subgraph polytope (see [2, (2.1)]). A bicycle p -wheel in G consists of a cycle C , $|C| = p$, and an edge uv , with $u, v \notin C$, together with all the edges uw and vw with $w \in C$. We call uv the axle of the bicycle wheel. In [2], Barahona, Grötschel and Mahjoub state that the following inequalities induce facets of $P_g(G)$:

$$x(F) \leq 2(2k + 1), \quad [W, F] \text{ is a bicycle } 2k + 1\text{-wheel in } G. \quad (1.1)$$

In §6 of their paper they say that no polynomial time algorithm is known which checks all the inequalities (1.1). In the next section of this note we shall describe such an algorithm. We use as a subroutine an algorithm of Grötschel and Pulleyblank, a version of which tests if a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ satisfies the system (1.2), and if not, finds a violated inequality [3, §5].

$$0 \leq x(e) \leq 1, \quad e \in E, \quad (1.2)$$

$$x(C) \leq |C| - 1, \quad C \text{ is an odd cycle in } G.$$

All the inequalities in (1.2) induce facets of $P_g(G)$ (Barahona [1]). The algorithm of §2 checks the system (1.1) and (1.2) together.

2. The algorithm. If we have an element $x \in \mathbb{R}^E$ and we want to know whether it satisfies (1.1) and (1.2), then we first check (1.2) with the aid of the efficient algorithm given in [3, §5]. If (1.2) is violated we are finished. If not, for each $uv \in E$ we proceed as follows:

Define $V_{uv} := \{w \in V \mid uw, vw \in E\}$, $E_{uv} := \{ww' \in E \mid w, w' \in V_{uv}\}$ and for each $ww' \in E_{uv}$, $y(ww') := 2 - x(ww') - \frac{1}{2}[x(uw) + x(vw) + x(uw') + x(vw')]$. It is straightforward to see that there is an odd bicycle wheel with axle uv , for which the inequality of (1.1) does not hold iff the minimum weight odd cycle in the graph $[V_{uv}, E_{uv}]$ with edge weights y has weight less than $x(uv)$. Moreover $2y(ww') = 4 - x(ww') - x(u) - x(v) - x(ww') \geq 0$, since x satisfies (1.2), and so also the 3-cycle inequalities. Since in [3, §5] we find an efficient algorithm which finds a minimum weight odd cycle in the graph with nonnegative weights on the edges, we hereby have a polynomial time algorithm to test the system of inequalities (1.1) and (1.2).

* Received October 1, 1983; revised November 14, 1983.

AMS 1980 subject classification. Primary: 05C99.

OR / MS Index 1978 subject classification. Primary: 489 Networks/graphs/theory.

Key words. Bipartite subgraphs, polyhedral combinatorics.

† The research was partially done at the Instituut voor Acluariaal en Economie, University of Amsterdam, and was supported by the Netherlands Foundation for Mathematics with financial aid from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO).