

# Two remarks on local edge-connectivity of graphs

Zoltán Szigeti\*

## Abstract

We provide slight generalizations of a result of Lovász and a result of Hamidoune and Las Vergnas on local edge-connectivities.

## 1 Local edge-connectivity in directed graphs

Let  $D = (V, A)$  be a directed graph. Multiple edges are allowed, but loops are not. For a set  $X \subseteq V$ , let  $\delta(\mathbf{X}) = |\{xy \in A : x \in X, y \in V - X\}|$ ,  $\varrho(\mathbf{X}) = \delta(V - X)$ . For  $u, v \in V$ , the **local edge-connectivity** from  $u$  to  $v$ ,  $\lambda_D(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ , is defined as the maximum number of edge disjoint paths from  $u$  to  $v$ . By Menger's theorem,  $\lambda_D(u, v) = \min\{\varrho(Y) : v \in Y \subseteq V - u\}$ . A set  $Y$  providing the minimum is called  **$uv$ -tight**. Note that for every vertex  $v \neq u$ , there exists a  $uv$ -tight set, and by the submodularity of  $\varrho$ , there exists a maximal such set  $U_v$ . We say that the vertex  $v$  is a **core** of  $U_v$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $r$  be a vertex of a directed graph  $D$  such that  $\delta(r) > \varrho(r)$ . Then there exists a vertex  $s$  such that  $\delta(s) < \varrho(s)$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $\sum_{v \in V} (\delta(v) - \varrho(v)) = 0$  and  $\delta(r) - \varrho(r) > 0$ , there exists a vertex  $s$  such that  $\delta(s) - \varrho(s) < 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1** (Lovász [2]). *Let  $r$  be a vertex of a directed graph  $D$  such that  $\delta(r) > \varrho(r)$ . Then there exists a vertex  $s$  such that  $\lambda(r, s) > \lambda(s, r)$ .*

The proof of Lovász [2] for Theorem 1 with a convenient modification provides the following common generalization of the above two results.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $r$  be a vertex of a directed graph  $D$  such that  $\delta(r) > \varrho(r)$ . Then there exists a vertex  $s$  such that  $\lambda(r, s) > \lambda(s, r)$  and  $\delta(s) < \varrho(s)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $T := \{v : \delta(v) < \varrho(v)\}$ . Note that, by Proposition 1,  $T$  is not empty. Let  $\mathcal{U} := \{U_1, \dots, U_k\} := \{U_v : v \in T\}$  be the set of maximal  $rv$ -tight sets where  $v \in T$  and let  $V_i := U_i \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq i} U_j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

---

\*Laboratoire G-SCOP, CNRS, Grenoble INP, UJF, 46, Avenue Félix Viallet, Grenoble, France, 38000.

**Claim 1.** *The core  $u_i$  of  $U_i$  belongs to  $V_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .*

**Proof.** If  $u_i$  belonged to  $U_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ , then by tightness, the submodularity of  $\varrho$ ,  $u_i \in U_i \cap U_j$ ,  $u_j \in U_i \cup U_j$  and the maximality of  $U_i$  and  $U_j$ , we would have  $\lambda(r, u_i) + \lambda(r, u_j) = \varrho(U_i) + \varrho(U_j) \geq \varrho(U_i \cap U_j) + \varrho(U_i \cup U_j) > \lambda(r, u_i) + \lambda(r, u_j)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $V_0 := U_0 := V \setminus \bigcup_1^k U_i$ .

**Claim 2.**  $\delta(U_0) > \varrho(V_0)$ .

**Proof.** By the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$ , we have  $T \subseteq \bigcup_1^k U_i$ , so for every  $v \in U_0$ ,  $\delta(v) - \varrho(v) \geq 0$ . Moreover,  $r \in U_0$  and  $\delta(r) - \varrho(r) > 0$ , thus  $\delta(U_0) - \varrho(V_0) = \sum_{v \in U_0} (\delta(v) - \varrho(v)) > 0$ .  $\square$

Suppose that (\*)  $\lambda(r, v) \leq \lambda(v, r)$  for all  $v \in T$ .

**Claim 3.**  $\sum_1^k \delta(V_i) \geq \sum_1^k \varrho(U_i)$ .

**Proof.** For every  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , by  $u_i \in V_i \subseteq V - r$ , (\*) and the  $ru_i$ -tightness of  $U_i$ , we have  $\delta(V_i) \geq \lambda(u_i, r) \geq \lambda(r, u_i) = \varrho(U_i)$ , and the claim follows.  $\square$

**Claim 4.**  $\sum_0^k \delta(V_i) \leq \sum_0^k \varrho(U_i)$ .

**Proof.** Since  $\{V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k\}$  is a subpartition of  $V$ , every edge is counted at most once on the left hand side. Let  $uv$  be an edge that contributes to the left hand side. Then there exists an index  $i$  such that  $u \in V_i$  and  $v \in V \setminus V_i = \bigcup_{j \neq i} U_j$  and hence there exists an index  $j$  such that  $v \in U_j$ . Since  $u \notin U_j$ , the edge  $uv$  contributes to the right hand side and the claim follows.  $\square$

Claims 2, 3 and 4 provide a contradiction. It follows that there exists a vertex  $s \in T$  such that  $\lambda(r, s) > \lambda(s, r)$  and the theorem is proved.  $\square$

## 2 Local edge-connectivity in regular bipartite graphs

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an undirected graph. Multiple edges are allowed, but loops are not. For a set  $X \subseteq V$ , let  $d(\mathbf{X}) = |\{xy \in E : x \in X, y \in V - X\}|$ . For  $u, v \in V$ , the **local edge-connectivity** from  $u$  to  $v$ ,  $\lambda_G(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ , is defined as the maximum number of edge disjoint paths from  $u$  to  $v$ . By Menger's theorem,  $\lambda_G(u, v) = \min\{d(Y) : v \in Y \subseteq V - u\}$ . A set  $Y$  providing the minimum is called  **$uv$ -tight**. Note that for every vertex  $v \neq u$ , there exists a  $uv$ -tight set, and by the submodularity of  $d$ , there exists a minimal such set  $X_v$ . We say that the vertex  $v$  is a **core** of  $X_v$ . The graph  $G$  is called  **$k$ -regular** if each vertex of  $G$  is of degree  $k$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $G = (A, B; E)$  be a  $k$ -regular bipartite graph with  $k \geq 1$ . Then there exists a bijection  $\{a_i b_i : a_i \in A, b_i \in B\}$  between  $A$  and  $B$ .*

**Proof.**  $k|A| = \sum_{a \in A} d(a) = |E| = \sum_{b \in B} d(b) = k|B|$  and the proposition follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 3** (Hamidoune and Las Vergnas [1]). *Let  $G = (A, B; E)$  be a  $k$ -regular bipartite graph with  $k \geq 1$ . Then for every  $a \in A$  there exists  $b \in B$  such that  $\lambda(a, b) = k$ .*

The following theorem provides a common generalization of the above two results.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $G = (A, B; E)$  be a  $k$ -regular bipartite graph with  $k \geq 1$ . Then there exists a bijection  $\{a_i b_i : a_i \in A, b_i \in B\}$  between  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $\lambda(a_i, b_i) = k$  for all  $i$ .*

Let  $H = (A, B; F)$  be the bipartite graph where for  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ ,  $ab \in F$  if and only if  $\lambda_G(a, b) \geq k$ . It is well-known that the connected components  $H_1, \dots, H_l$  are complete bipartite graphs. Theorem 4 is equivalent to the following Lemma. Let  $A_i := V(H_i) \cap A$  and  $B_i := V(H_i) \cap B$ .

**Lemma 1.** *For every  $i$ ,  $|A_i| = |B_i|$ .*

**Proof.** In the whole proof we consider the graph  $G$ . Note that by Proposition 2,  $|A| = |B|$ . Let  $a$  be an arbitrary vertex in  $A_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the family  $\{X_b : v \in B - B_i\}$  of the minimal  $ab$ -tight sets where  $b \in B - B_i$ . Note that  $d(X) < k$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ .

**Claim 5.**  *$\mathcal{X}$  is a laminar family.*

**Proof.** Suppose not, and let  $X_{b_1}$  and  $X_{b_2}$  be two crossing sets in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

First suppose that  $X_{b_1} \cap X_{b_2}$  contains  $b_1$  or  $b_2$ , say  $b_1$ . Then, by tightness, the submodularity of  $d$ ,  $b_1 \in X_{b_1} \cap X_{b_2}$ ,  $b_2 \in X_{b_1} \cup X_{b_2}$  and the minimality of  $X_{b_1}$ , we have  $\lambda(a, b_1) + \lambda(a, b_2) = d(X_{b_1}) + d(X_{b_2}) \geq d(X_{b_1} \cap X_{b_2}) + d(X_{b_1} \cup X_{b_2}) > \lambda(a, b_1) + \lambda(a, b_2)$ , a contradiction.

Otherwise,  $b_1 \in X_{b_1} \setminus X_{b_2}$  and  $b_2 \in X_{b_2} \setminus X_{b_1}$ . Then, by tightness, the submodularity of  $d$ , and the minimality of  $X_{b_1}$ , we have  $\lambda(a, b_1) + \lambda(a, b_2) = d(X_{b_1}) + d(X_{b_2}) \geq d(X_{b_1} \setminus X_{b_2}) + d(X_{b_2} \setminus X_{b_1}) > \lambda(a, b_1) + \lambda(a, b_2)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Claim 6.** *For every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $|X \cap A| = |X \cap B|$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\alpha := d(X \cap A, B \setminus X)$  and  $\beta := d(X \cap B, A \setminus X)$ . Then, by  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\alpha + \beta = d(X) < k$ . Since  $k|X \cap A| - \alpha = d(X \cap A, X \cap B) = k|X \cap B| - \beta$ , we get that  $|X \cap A| = |X \cap B|$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{X}^*$  be the maximal sets of  $\mathcal{X}$ . By Claim 5, the elements of  $\mathcal{X}^*$  are disjoint. Let  $X_A := \bigcup\{X \cap A : X \in \mathcal{X}^*\}$  and  $X_B := \bigcup\{X \cap B : X \in \mathcal{X}^*\}$ . By Claim 6,  $|X_A| = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}^*} |X \cap A| = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}^*} |X \cap B| = |X_B|$ . Note that  $B_i = B - X_B$  and  $A_i \subseteq A - X_A$  and hence, by  $|A| = |B|$ , we have  $|A_i| \leq |B_i|$ . Then  $|A| = \sum_{i=1}^l |A_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^l |B_i| = |B| = |A|$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Y. P. Hamidoune, M. Las Vergnas, Local edge-connectivity in regular bipartite graphs, *J. Combin. Theory/Series B* **44** (1986) 370-371.
- [2] L. Lovász, Connectivity in digraphs, *J. Combin. Theory/Series B* **15** (1973) 174-177.